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INTRODUCTION

Virginia has been studied thoroughly and enthusiastically by the historian, and her place and importance in history are generally recognized. Her agricultural history, especially her history of agricultural education, however, has received very little attention, in comparison with her political, social, and economic history. As far as the writer can determine, no comprehensive history of agricultural education in Virginia has ever been written, nor does this study undertake such a task. It is well to point out at once, therefore, the purpose, the plan, and the limited scope of this study.

The primary purpose of the present work is to recount, with particular emphasis on the secondary school level, a selected part of the long struggle beginning in the eighteenth and ending at the middle of the twentieth century to establish a system of agricultural education for white people in Virginia. It is not the purpose to present a critical appraisal of the events in this long story except as such appraisal may be necessary to clarify the events themselves. Rather, chief emphasis is given to relating the events in the story in such a manner as to present a comprehensible story of the developments for agricultural educa-
tion. Where deemed necessary to accomplish this purpose of comprehension, the social, the political, or the economic conditions are introduced.

The plan of presentation should be noted. Part I relates the events of the story of agricultural education as it occurred prior to 1900. As a background for the nineteenth-century developments a summary of the factors which occurred prior to 1800 but whose influence clearly extended on over into the nineteenth century and helped shape the events in this latter century is presented and summarized in Chapter I. The program of agitation for agricultural education carried on so vigorously by the agricultural societies, fairs, and agricultural press, as well as the direct efforts to teach agriculture before the successful establishment of an agricultural school, are presented in Chapters II, III, and IV. Since the development of agricultural education became so closely tied up with the struggle for a state-supported public school system, some of the events in this public school struggle having significance for agricultural education are presented in Chapter V.

Following the conclusion of the Civil War and the establishment shortly thereafter of the state agricultural college, the agitation for agricultural education became largely centered around this new college, with little, if any, agitation being carried on for agricultural education
on the secondary school level. Chapters VI and VII, therefore, deal with the establishment and the development of the state agricultural college and thus conclude the story of the nineteenth-century efforts on behalf of agricultural education.

In Part II the story at the turn of the twentieth century is picked up but at the same time is purposely restricted to the developments of agricultural education as an integral part of the white secondary school program. The events of the last part of the nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth century which led to the inauguration of the first agricultural high schools are related in Chapter VIII, along with an account of the actual inauguration of these schools. The subsequent chapters in Part II are devoted to the chief incidents relative to the inauguration and the development of the program in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture offered for boys enrolled in all-day and day-unit classes conducted in the secondary schools of the state.

Restrictions as to the scope of this study should be noted in addition to those briefly indicated in the foregoing plan. This study in no way attempts to tell the full, complete story of the development of the total program of agricultural education in Virginia.

Part I traces the movements, the organizations, the institutions, and the educational developments prior to 1900
which established the foundations and cleared the pathways for the twentieth-century developments in agricultural education. For the period prior to the establishment of the state agricultural college in 1872 the movements and the developments on a wide front are presented. Those parts of the movements, the developments, the institutions, or the programs which did not affect agricultural education have been purposely omitted. Following Virginia's acceptance of the federal land-grant scrip for the purpose of establishing an agricultural college, the story as developed herein is for the last three and a half decades of the nineteenth century restricted to events involved in establishing and promoting the land-grant agricultural college for whites. With the beginning of the twentieth century this study is restricted even further in that consideration is given only to the events in connection with the inauguration and the development of agricultural education as a part of the secondary school program for whites in the state. With the beginning of the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture, attention is restricted yet further to the events connected with the inauguration and the development of the Smith-Hughes program offered for white boys enrolled in the public high schools of the state. Specifically omitted from this study are the Smith-Hughes programs in vocational agriculture in part-time instruction, evening instruction,
veterans' training program, and all other types of instruction not offered specifically for boys enrolled within the high school itself.

The data for this study were drawn from such a wide variety of sources covering such a long period of time that it is extremely difficult to give any brief or succinct description of the sources. The major legislative and legal background was drawn from the official laws, journals, and public documents of Virginia as found in this state's Acts of the Assembly, Journal of the House of Delegates, Journal of the Senate, and Hening's Statutes at Large, Being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature in the Year 1619 [to 1792], published in 1823. By using Hening's Statutes for the period prior to 1800 and the Acts, usually published to cover each meeting of the Virginia General Assembly, rather complete information was to be had concerning the laws significant for agricultural education. The Journals for the House and the Senate in addition to carrying most of the official public documents furnished an excellent source for getting a picture of the legislative thinking and the procedures leading up to legislative action.

Numerous official reports, minutes, and proceedings of official bodies and agencies made up a valuable source of information for this study. The "Minutes of the Virginia
State Board of Education," filed in the office of the State Department of Education, were very valuable and interesting. These minutes have been only partially indexed but are carefully dated and kept in bound volumes. The minutes used in this study were all in longhand manuscript, hence were somewhat tedious to read. The annual reports of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1870 to 1951 represent an invaluable source of information. This annual report after the inauguration of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in 1917 contains a brief section on agricultural education. In addition to this printed report the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education each year since 1917 has prepared a separate, more detailed report of the work in vocational agriculture in the state. Copies of these separate reports, filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, were used extensively and were indispensable for showing the growth and development of agricultural education within the state.

Each year since 1919 the teachers of vocational agriculture in the state have held an annual conference. The minutes of these conferences have been kept in mimeographed form and are to be found in the library of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blackburg. These minutes are invaluable in showing the development of the program of agricultural education at the "grass roots" level and in depict-
ing the extent to which the classroom teachers participated in planning the conferences and in planning the total program of agricultural education in the state.

The most extensive source of data for this study was found in periodicals. Outstanding in this group are the American Farmer, established in 1819; the Farmers' Register, established in 1833; and the Southern Planter, established in 1841. Copies of these three periodicals are to be found in the library at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the State Library in Richmond. The first-named periodical although published in Baltimore was widely patronized by Virginians and carried numerous articles relating to Virginia agriculture and agricultural education. The two last-named periodicals were published in Virginia. The Farmers' Register, published by Virginia's outstanding pioneer in soil science, Edmund Ruffin, although published for only a decade, is one of the most outstanding agricultural periodicals ever to be published in Virginia. Its ten well-indexed volumes give an excellent portrayal of the state agricultural conditions during its lifetime. The Southern Planter, with the exception of a short period of suspended publication during the Civil War, has been in continuous publication since it was started at Richmond, Virginia, in 1841. In style and make-up it is more popular than the Farmers' Register although at times less accurate in its observations.
The Planter is not so well indexed as the Farmers' Register, but for the patient reader it furnishes an excellent and largely unbroken century-long source of firsthand information about agricultural affairs in the state.

Two more periodicals deserve special mention. The Virginia Agricultural Instructor, prepared jointly by the State Department of Education and the Department of Agricultural Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and published (or mimeographed) somewhat irregularly since 1915, is filled with valuable information contributed by the state supervisory staff, the teacher-training staff, and the teachers in the field. A nearly complete file of this periodical is to be found in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Chapter Chats, the official publication of the Virginia association of the Future Farmers of America, is indispensable as a means for getting an understanding of the internal working of the F.F.A. organization in the state.

Considerable information was gleaned from the more popular newspapers published for the several periods included in the study. This source of data is none too important for this type of investigation, however, since agriculture and agricultural education in the press usually played a secondary role to the political issues of the day. The activities of the agricultural societies, especially the presidential addresses, however, were usually fully
covered, as were legislative debates on topics of importance to agriculture. By use of the newspaper collections in the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia and in the Virginia State Library in Richmond much worthwhile, although disconnected, information was found relating to the efforts on behalf of agricultural education. The newspapers of the state were found to be particularly valuable in relating legislative incidents connected with the establishment and early history of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, although it should be fully recognized that much political bias is to be found in the Virginia press during the period immediately following the Civil War.

Contemporary pamphlets, addresses, catalogues, diaries, and letters were sought out and used extensively. This collection of material is very difficult to describe because of the great variety of topics covered and because of the wide dispersal of the material in different libraries. Early catalogues for Washington College were examined at the library of Washington and Lee University, while most of the pamphlets and addresses covering the period prior to 1900 were located in the rare pamphlet collection in the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia or in the Virginia State Library in Richmond. The pamphlet, Address on the Subject of a Manual Labor College by a Committee of the Holston Conference, published in 1836, and the pamphlet An
Inaugural Address Delivered at the Opening of Emory and Henry College, Washington County, Virginia, May 25, 1838, by Charles Collins, both to be found in the rare book collection in the Virginia State Library, Richmond, were very valuable in presenting information on the early manual labor movement in the state. Interesting contributions to the early efforts toward agricultural improvement are to be found in John Taylor's Arator, published in 1814, and in the Memoirs of the Society of Virginia for Promoting Agriculture, published in 1818. Copies of both pamphlets are to be found in the Virginia State Library, Richmond.

One source of information used, which as far as the writer can determine has never before been examined in its relationship to agricultural education, was the collection of William Henry Ruffner's papers deposited in the library of the Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church at Montreat, North Carolina. Ruffner is best known for his great work as the first State Superintendent of Public Instruction, but he was also a successful farmer, an editor of a farm journal, and an ardent worker on behalf of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. The diaries, the letters, and other manuscripts in this collection of papers clearly reveal many interesting facts and observations in relation to agriculture and to the establishment of the Virginia Agricultural and
Mechanical College. An interesting feature of these papers, although of no particular importance to this study, is the fact that Ruffner as he traveled over the state made interesting comments in his diary concerning people and places he visited. Many a local historian in Virginia would find valuable bits of information on local conditions, buried in these papers.

One remaining major source of data for this study should be mentioned -- namely, the material to be found filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. This collection of material dates from 1918, with the beginning of the program of Smith-Hughes work in vocational agriculture, and relates almost entirely to this Smith-Hughes program in the state. The material is not catalogued in any way and, with the exception of the departmental mimeographed publications, is not filed under any rigidly systematic form. The material itself consists of mimeographed bulletins and publications, usually prepared for the teachers in the field, and miscellaneous letters, memoranda, outlines, and other materials filed by members of the teacher-training staff of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute between the periods of 1918 and 1952. This collection of materials, although as yet uncatalogued, is indispensable as a source of information on the development of education in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the state.
Secondary source material was used if available for collecting data for the study and as a means of getting a broad understanding of the social, the political, and the economic backgrounds which influenced the development of agricultural education. Political, economic, sectional, and educational histories and pamphlets on Virginia were examined in considerable detail. Particularly valuable for this study were such sources as Bruce's two-volume *Economic History in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, Volumes I and II of Bruce's *Virginia, Rebirth of the Old Dominion*, and Ambler's *Sectionalism in Virginia, 1776-1860*. Samuel Kercheval's *A History of the Valley of Virginia*, F.H. Hart's *The Valley of Virginia in the Revolution, 1763-1789*, and J.W. Wayland's *The German Element in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia* were particularly valuable in depicting the history of this important section of the state which for so long was looked upon by the aristocratic east as populated by uncouth frontiersmen, valuable chiefly as good Indian fighters.

The legislative and the academic types of educational history of the state have been explored extensively and may be traced in such publications as Heatwole's *A History of Education in Virginia*, Maddox's *The Free School Idea in Virginia Before 1860*, and the excellent series of articles in the January, 1916, issue of the *Sewanee Review* by E.W. Knight. Perhaps the most valuable of all the secondary
source material dealing with the historical development of education in Virginia, however, is the series of doctoral dissertations in this field to be found in the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia. Unfortunately very little of this material has been published; hence it is little known outside of the state, or if the truth must be known, inside the state either. This series of dissertations traces in a definitive manner the development of education, especially that of secondary education from 1619 to 1900 and in addition includes the biographies of some of the later day educational leaders. A series of masters theses treating the development of education on a more local level, although not used in this study, is to be found in the same library.

So much material is available dealing with the period of reconstruction immediately following the Civil War that it seems unnecessary to do more than mention Pearson's *The Readjuster Movement in Virginia* and Knight's *History of Education in the South* as two excellent sources of information depicting the entangled conditions of education and state politics during this reconstruction period.

Virginia's recovery from the devastation of the Civil War has recently been engaging increasing attention from the historian. Of outstanding value for this study was A. W. Moger's *The Rebuilding of the Old Dominion*, a doctoral dissertation done at Columbia University, in 1940. This
dissertation, a copy of which has been donated by its author to the Virginia State Library in Richmond, does an excellent job of showing how Virginia's younger sons of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century turned the political and the economic eyes of Virginia from the glories of the past to the sterner and more demanding present.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* and the *William and Mary College Quarterly*, the former begun in 1893 and the latter begun in 1892, are filled with articles dealing with Virginia's past history. Both of these magazines are thoroughly indexed in E. G. Swem's *Virginia Historical Index*.

Perhaps the most valuable of all the secondary sources used were Craven's *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1606-1860*, and Gray's two-volume *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*. These two publications are typical of the increasing number of publications appearing more recently, dealing with the various aspects of agricultural development in the south. Both works include extensive bibliographies relating to agricultural developments in the state prior to 1860.
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PART I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA BEFORE 1900

CHAPTER I

SOME SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURY CONDITIONS IN VIRGINIA WHICH INFLUENCED THE LATER DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Educational practices seldom, if ever, spring full-blown within any one period, unhampered or undirected by practices, conditions, or beliefs of a previous period; and certainly in this respect agricultural education is no different from any other part of our educational program. In Virginia the major growth of agricultural education, especially on the secondary school level, is so much a twentieth-century development that it tends to obscure the nineteenth-century struggle for agricultural education, a struggle which in reality helped to clear the way and lay the basic foundations for the acceptance of the modern program. The nineteenth-century developments in turn were influenced by certain factors stemming from conditions prior to this time.
In this chapter it is proposed to set forth in a very brief way some of the pre-nineteenth-century factors and developments whose influence on the development of agricultural education extended on into the nineteenth, and in some cases the twentieth, century. For the sake of clarity it is emphasized that this section will be in the nature of a summary of the more obvious developments and will therefore omit many details of the nearly two centuries of events prior to 1800.

For convenience in presentation, the factors and developments will be presented under the following headings: (1) the geographic, the agricultural, and the economic developments, (2) the beginning of sectionalism in the state, and (3) a system of education.

**Geographic, Agricultural, and Economic Developments**

Fundamentally agriculture is conditioned by geographic and climatic conditions; however man in his attempt to develop a system of agriculture adapted to physical conditions is subject to many additional economic, social, and political factors which may or may not be apparent to the observer.

In Colonial Virginia agriculture was never allowed unhampered development;\(^1\) and as the colony spread from its cradle in the James River Basin, certain geographic features began to influence its agriculture and its history. Since these geo-

\(^1\)A.O. Craven, *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland* 1506-1860, p. 39.
graphic features have influenced agriculture and agricultural education from the founding of the colony to the present day, these features will be briefly described here before attention is directed to the systems of agriculture which developed within the state prior to the nineteenth century.

In its physical features Virginia is a geographic unit that may be divided into three general sections: the coastal plain, the Piedmont Plateau, and the Appalachian Mountain region. This latter region is commonly further divided into the Blue Ridge Mountains, the Great Valley, and the Alleghany Mountains. Within each division there are many minor topographical variations with distinct types of parent soil material.

The coastal plain includes the eastern and southeastern part of the state and stretches back to the fall line of the rivers where the older crystalline rocks of the Piedmont break sharply. Here the relatively flat plains give way to rolling uplands of the Piedmont. The coastal plain is characterized by a broad flat expanse of country with an elevation seldom ranging above one hundred feet. This plain is intersected by numerous rivers, bays, creeks, and inlets which

---

2 W.E. Ellett and H.H. Hill, Chemical Studies of Virginia Soils. Virginia Polytechnic Institute Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No. 200, (December, 1912), p. 4. See Appendix M, for map showing these regions.

afforded the early colonists a convenient means of travel and connection with the outside world and consequently at a later date caused this section to be lukewarm to the interior's pleas for internal improvement by way of roads and canals. The soils of this region range from pure sand to sandy loam with some areas of silt and loam.¹

The Piedmont area is in the shape of a right triangle, with its base the northern boundary of North Carolina, its hypotenuse the Blue Ridge Mountains, and its perpendicular the fall line referred to in connection with the coastal plain. The topography is variable but on the whole is characterized by plain-like surfaces with rolling upland and narrow valleys cut by water courses. The soils are mostly residual, varying strikingly in color because of the amount of iron oxide present. The lay of the land is such that it is particularly susceptible to destructive erosion even under moderate rainfall.²

These two sections, the Piedmont and the coastal plain, (the latter more commonly known in Virginia as the Tidewater area) lying east of the Blue Ridge Mountains, are subdivided by rivers into seven peninsulas running in almost parallel lines from the Blue Ridge Mountains to the Chesapeake Bay. Settlement in these peninsulas tended to form

¹Ellett and Hill, op. cit., pp. 5, 6 ff.
mutually independent socio-economic groups, for along these river valleys as the settlement pushed westward were found rich lowlands, waterfalls, timber, grass lands, and rich mineral resources, all the elements needed to support a people, while the rivers furnished a convenient outlet to the east for the produce of the area.\(^6\)

The Appalachian region extends westward from the eastern edge of the Blue Ridge Mountains, the hypotenuse of the Piedmont as already described, to the western boundary of the state. This area is divided into three sections which, beginning at the Blue Ridge adjacent to the Piedmont and moving westward, are (1) the Blue Ridge Mountains, (2) the Great Valley of Virginia, and (3) the Alleghany Mountains. The Blue Ridge and the Alleghany Mountains for ante bellum Virginia constituted "The Great Barrier," once called by a newspaper correspondent "a backbone of from one to two hundred miles of mountains running in parallel ridges, northeast and southwest across her [Virginia's] entire limits . . . a summit level of 2000 feet . . . which no other people on the continent no more than Virginians have yet overcome."\(^7\)

\(^6\)W.A. Maddox, The Free School Idea in Virginia Before the Civil War, p. 15.

which extend into the Piedmont on the eastern slope and the Great Valley on the western slope. The soils from the igneous rocks on the eastern slope of the Blue Ridge are principally the heavy clays, while those derived from the sedimentary rocks of the western slopes are principally the loams and the sandy loams. 8

The Great Valley lying between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghanies is not a river valley but in reality is a rolling plain sloping toward the mountains on either side. It extends across the state from a northeast to a southwest direction. The range of geology found in the Valley is from the Cambrian to the Mississippian; therefore there are soils of many types and of various crop-producing potentialities, 9 making a region of high fertility, well adapted to general farming and grazing. 10

The Alleghany Mountain area in the westernmost part of the state presents a limited and more unfavorable soil for agriculture, although compensating with quantities of mineral wealth. Here grazing and lumbering, with some small grain on the bottom lands, constitute the chief agricultural pursuits.

8Ellett and Hill, op. cit., p. 20.
9Loc. cit.
Until 1861 the present state of West Virginia as a part of Virginia exercised a definite influence on the developments in both education and agricultural education, as will be shown later. It does not seem necessary to give a description of this state's geographical features, however, other than to say that they were such as to encourage small-scale farming, stock raising, some grain growing and, in strong contrast to the eastern part of the state, the development of industries and manufacturing.\(^{11}\)

With such a wide variation of physical features dominating the state, it was but natural that there should develop wide variations in the agricultural practices and demands which evolved within the state.

The Virginia colony was not originally settled with any intention of developing an agricultural economy based on a staple crop,\(^{12}\) but nature and nurture soon combined with economics in such a way as to fasten on the colony a predominantly one-crop system which prevailed east of the Blue Ridge until well past the Revolutionary War. After some experimenting with a variety of crops, most of them sub-tropical, the early colonists hit upon tobacco and soon

\(^{11}\)See especially C.H. Ambler, *West Virginia the Mountain State*, Chapter 1, et passim.

found that it was the most profitable crop, giving an abundant yield from the "lusty soyle" and having a ready and expanding market. Within a short period of time tobacco, because of its great advantages of exchange over other crops, the high price it commanded, its yield per acre, and its adaptability to Colonial facilities for transportation, demanded the colonists' full time to such an extent that agriculture came to rest almost entirely upon its production. The impact of this tobacco culture on the development of Colonial Virginia--especially as this development relates to the purposes of this study--was tremendous. Bruce in discussing this influence presents it most ably as follows:

It most vital influence, however, bore directly upon the fate of the people of Virginia themselves. It shaped that fate absolutely ... Tobacco had not long been cultivated in the colony before the virgin land was discovered to be necessary to its production in perfection since there were no artificial manures in that age for retaining or restoring the fertility of the ground. As soon as the soil gave signs of exhaustion, it was allowed to relapse into coarse grass and finally into forest; a new field was created by the removal of trees over an area selected in the primeval woods which covered the greater part of every plantation and this field was in turn abandoned when it became impoverished and the old course was again adopted for a new

14 Craven, op. cit., p. 30.
15 Ibid., p. 30.
area of forest land. The whole effect of
tobacco culture was to extend the clearings with the utmost rapidity in the ever recurring need of virgin soil. In this need the system of large plantations had its origin. The tobacco planter was compelled to own a broad extent of land in wood upon which he might encroach from year to year as the ground under cultivation lost its fertility. The advantage of possessing a wide range for his cattle, which were thrown on their own resources to gain subsistence was an additional motive in his appropriation of the soil.\textsuperscript{16}

This plantation system of agriculture with all the characteristics as set forth became the dominant basis of the settlement of the Tidewater and most of the Piedmont area, especially of those settlements along the fertile river bottoms.\textsuperscript{17} A few other crops were grown, and there were also many small farms interspersed with the large plantations,\textsuperscript{18} but tobacco growing and the plantation system exercised the dominating influences on the colony.\textsuperscript{19}

The labor requirements for the plantation system were met in Virginia during the seventeenth century largely by

\textsuperscript{16}P.A. Bruce, \textit{Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century, II, pp. 566-67.}

\textsuperscript{17}C.H. Ambler, \textit{Sectionalism in Virginia from 1776 to 1860, p. 8; P.A. Bruce, \textit{op. cit.}, I, p. 559; T.P. Abernethy, \textit{Three Virginia Frontiers}, p. 42.}

\textsuperscript{18}P.A. Bruce, \textit{Virginia, Rebirth of the Old Dominion}, I, Chapters 5 and 16.

\textsuperscript{19}For the story of the development of non-plantation agriculture in Virginia see L.C. Gray, \textit{History of Agriculture in Southern United States to 1860.}
indentured white servants from England\textsuperscript{20} and later by the Negro slave.

Since most of the early colonists were from England, the English customs and influence early came to dominate the colony in religion, ideals, education, political theory, and aristocratic social customs.\textsuperscript{21} As the indentured servants served out their period of indenture, the less competent sank to the low level of the "poor whites"; but the more competent frequently took up land and because of the large profits in tobacco became great landowners often within a comparatively short period of time.\textsuperscript{22} This seemingly easy road to wealth through agriculture in turn tended to speed up the emigration from England to Virginia of large numbers of people interested in the quickest road to fortune but at the same time with practically no background of agricultural information or experience.\textsuperscript{23} One of the cumulative effects of these conditions was to give most of eastern Virginia a population whose chief occupation was agricultural but whose

\textsuperscript{20}Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Patrician and Plebeian in Virginia, p. 160; P.A. Bruce, Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century, I, p. 575.


\textsuperscript{22}P.A. Bruce, Virginia, Rebirth of the Old Dominion, I, pp. 112-126; H.A. Washington, "Social System of Virginia," Southern Literary Messenger, XIV (January, 1848), p. 70.

\textsuperscript{23}P.A. Bruce, Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century, I, Chapter 9; II, p. 574.
training, vision, leadership, and zeal in things of the soil were indeed meager, if not actually absent. Another effect even more blighting, perhaps, was the tendency of the system to divide the population into two sharply distinct social classes. As indicated, land and tobacco represented the quickest and easiest road to wealth and power and were used by the more ambitious and fit of the indentured servants as well as the free settlers. The less ambitious and capable, however, on the termination of their indenture sank into a slavery of poverty and social inefficiency and became the nucleus of the "poor whites" of old Virginia. With the importation of Negro slaves the position of this class became even less favorable. As good land became scarcer, many of the more ambitious whites migrated to western Virginia and to the West, with the result that a type of selection operated to sift the socially fit and competent from the socially unfit and incompetent and send large numbers of the middle class off to western lands. This selective system soon led to a planter-dominated society with the planter and the clergy at the top, the Negro slave at the bottom, and a politically and socially ineffectual middle class of smaller landowners and poor whites who largely accepted the aristocratic social order

24 Ibid., II, p. 574.
25 Maddox, op. cit., p. 5.
and exercised almost no political power prior to the Civil War.26

The well-to-do, freed from labor by slave service and strongly endowed with a sense of noblesse oblige, through management of their plantations early secured training in leadership and directing the affairs of others. Hockett in discussing this development says: "The Virginia system developed a keen sense of responsibility on the part of the governing class, and trained men for leadership as few other plans have ever done. It was no accident that so many statesmen of first rank in the early days of independence hailed from the Old Dominion."27

Unfortunate for agriculture and agricultural education, however, is the fact that this leadership was a long, long time in focusing its attention on things agricultural; and by this time in many sections east of the Blue Ridge, "poverty, deterioration, and despairing inertia spread over the face of the country like a pall."28

With the aristocratic plantation element in control of

26 P.A. Bruce, Virginia, Rebirth of the Old Dominion, I, p. 104; W.T. Crouch, (Editor), Culture In the South, p. 686; A.W. Moger, The Rebuilding of the Old Dominion, p. 3.

27 H.C. Hockett, Political and Social History of the United States 1492-1828, p. 42.

the affairs of the colony, it was but natural that education in Virginia reflected the social philosophy and safeguarded the economic and the social interests of the plantation system. The unfortunate distinction between the "rich" and the "poor" became deeply rooted in the customary thinking of both classes and extended well into the nineteenth century and is clearly reflected in the educational developments of the period, as will be set forth later.

An additional factor resulting from the plantation tobacco culture which had tremendous influence on developments within the state was the soil-depleting force of the tobacco plantation system. As related, tobacco grew best on fertile soil with quickly available plant food. Since there were no known commercial fertilizers as we know them today and it was easier to clear new lands and forests than collect manure, the planters soon developed the practice of planting a field in tobacco from two to three times and then either abandoning the field or planting it in wheat or corn until its productivity was no longer profitable, at which time it was abandoned or "turned out." This practice coupled with a warm climate and rather concentrated rainfall hastened the "wearing out" of the soils to such an

29 Craven, op. cit., p. 33.

30 J. D. Schoeff, Travels in the Confederation, 1783-1784, II, p. 32.
extent that much of the Tidewater was showing signs of soil exhaustion before the middle of the eighteenth century, and some planters were trying out other crops, such as wheat and corn.\(^{31}\) By the nineteenth century the devastating scourge of tobacco planting had been or was sweeping over most of the country east of the Blue Ridge.\(^{32}\)

It is true that other factors, such as markets, relations with European countries, and policies toward western land, entered into the total agricultural picture and helped divert and postpone the planter's giving attention to the steady deterioration of his soil; but even so, soil depletion seems to have been the fundamental problem of agriculture east of the Blue Ridge as the nineteenth century approached. On this topic of soil exhaustion Craven says:

If the efforts and statements of those who most keenly saw the agricultural situation before them is any indication of the fundamental problem of agriculture . . . there is no question but it was produced by the depletion of the soil and removable only by the restoration to the soil of a degree at least of its original fertility.\(^{33}\)

Following the Revolutionary War, a few outstanding men already widely known in fields other than agriculture, men

\(^{31}\)Craven, op. cit., p. 67.

\(^{32}\)Gray, op. cit., p. 909.

\(^{33}\)Craven, op. cit., p. 86.
such as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, John Taylor, J.M. Garnett and others, began to recognize the nature of the problem and began turning their attention to its solution. Their immediate results were not particularly successful and made little impression over the state, but at least the seed of reform had been planted. Stimulated by the agricultural ruin growing out of soil depletion east of the Blue Ridge, this seed of reform grew into a full-fledged program which at the outbreak of the Civil War was making Virginia agriculture highly profitable.

Thus far attention has been directed toward the development of influential factors which developed east of the Blue Ridge. West of the Blue Ridge a set of factors developed almost entirely unlike those of the east and at a later period clashed headlong with them, influencing among other things both general education and agricultural education. Some attention will now be directed toward these western developments.

The colony of Virginia was more than a century old before the first settlements of consequence beyond the Blue Ridge Mountains began in the Shenandoah Valley toward the

---

34 Loc. cit.

35 Kathleen Bruce, "Virginia Agricultural Decline to 1860: A Fallacy," Agricultural History, VI (January, 1932), pp. 3-13; Craven, op. cit., pp. 159-161.
end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century. 36 Although explorers had pushed over the Blue Ridge from the Tidewater and the Piedmont into the Valley, 37 it was not through the advance of the English from Tidewater that the Valley was settled. 38 On the contrary the predominant groups settling here were the Germans and the Scotch-Irish, although there were sprinklings of English, Swiss, Dutch, Swedes, French, Welsh, and Irish. 39 These diverse nationalities living side by side made of the Valley one of the first melting pots for different nationalities in America. 40 Of more importance for this study, however, is the fact that in conjunction with the natural resources of the Valley, under frontier conditions dissimilar to those of Tidewater Virginia, these nationalities developed a society and an economy different in nearly every respect from the society and the economy prevailing east of the Blue Ridge Mountains. 41

36 H. M. Strickler, Massanutten Settled by the Pennsylvania Pilgrim 1726, p. 6.

37 Gray, op. cit., I, p. 117.

38 P. A. Bruce, Virginia, Rebirth of the Old Dominion, p. 324.


41 Abernethy, op. cit., p. 58; Bruce, Virginia, Rebirth of the Old Dominion, I, p. 326; Gray, op. cit., I, p. 122.
The arrival of these nationalities and the development of their society on the frontier at a time before the society and the institutions of Tidewater had reached the Blue Ridge Mountains is of particular significance for Virginia educational history. The westward advance of her peculiar institutions was arrested and in certain instances stopped, and a new society "hostile to things Virginian was planted."42

The Valley unlike the Tidewater was settled in communities which became self-sufficient instead of dependent on one staple crop. The industrial life instead of centering around a huge plantation centered around the small farm which the owner himself usually worked with the help of his family rather than with the help of slaves.43 The homogeneity of interests among the smaller sections as they sought markets or access to them tended to encourage the cooperative spirit which later reflected itself in demands for public schools and other internal improvements.44 In comparison with Tidewater the home life in the Valley was

42 C.H. Ambler, Sectionalism in Virginia, 1776-1860, p. 13. Statements of sentiment such as quoted in part here tend even to this day to annoy people of Virginia "born and bred" west of the Blue Ridge. They feel that the society developed west of the Blue Ridge during the period under consideration deserves to be called "Virginian" just as much as the society of the Tidewater.


simple and plain, at times appearing to visitors as lacking in culture and refinement.

Again in strong contrast to the Tidewater settlers, the immigrants to the Valley brought with them a strong background and tradition of agriculture. This fact was especially true regarding the Germans who were so numerous that at one time it was found necessary to translate the laws of the state into their language. These Germans, and a little later the Scotch-Irish, soon set up a system of diversified agriculture on small farms which they themselves worked. In further contrast to the Tidewater planters, they early practiced a system of crop rotation and of stabling their livestock for manure, exciting an early historian to exclaim, "The Germans erect stables for their domestic animals of every species; even their swine are housed in the winter season."

---


46 Philip Vickers Fithian, Journals and Letters 1767-74, p. 28, passim.


49 Kercheval, op. cit., p. 152.
By the Revolutionary period when Tidewater was beginning to feel the pinch from depleted soils, the Valley farmers were for the most part growing fine crops of hemp, wheat, corn, flax, barley, oats, and rye. Since natural pasturage was also excellent, they were also making a profit on sheep, horses, hogs, and cattle.50

The diversified and conserving type of agriculture practiced in the Valley prevented soil depletion from ever being as acute or as widespread as it was east of the Blue Ridge; hence later when agitation for state aid for agriculture developed in the soil-depleted areas of the east, the agitation found only scattered support west of the Blue Ridge.51

For the purposes of this study the conditions and demands for education of the trans-Alleghany region, a part of Virginia until 1861, may, with the exception of its natural features, be considered as an extension of the conditions and demands of the Shenandoah Valley section unless

50 Hart, op. cit., p. 4.
Hart points out the interesting fact that cattle were frequently driven from the lower end of the Valley all the way to Baltimore, Philadelphia, Fort Pitt, or even across the Blue Ridge to Richmond. To identify their stock the drovers and the farmers often branded their animals and recorded the brands in court. Hart says these drovers were the forerunners of the cattle herdsmen of the Great West.

51 See Chapter IV.
By the beginning of the nineteenth century these diverse geographic, agricultural, and economic features were beginning to operate in such a way as to send the people of eastern and western Virginia along paths so divergent in nature that a bitter sectional struggle developed in the state and in turn influenced practically every major movement or endeavor within the state up until the Civil War and the final separation of West Virginia from Virginia. The major features of this sectional fight as it later influenced the development of agricultural education will be considered at this time.

Beginning Sectionalism Between East and West

From what has been said thus far, it is rather easy to see that early conditions were leading the sections east and west of the Blue Ridge in different directions. The eastern region was continuing to develop an economy built around the plantation and the slave, while the western section was developing one centered chiefly around the indus-

---

trial life of the small farm. These differences caused to
grow up in the Old Dominion "two sections divided by the
Alleghanies: the one, aristocratic, conservative, southern;
the other, extremely democratic, liberal, western." The
conservative planters of the east controlled the wealth of
the state and in the legislature struggled hard to retain
the political power they already possessed before settle-
ment flowed into the western country, while the west fought
with increasing vigor and louder and louder voice for
"rights" it deemed necessary for its welfare. Ambler in
an excellent description of this sectional struggle says:

It was a contest between an older
society with its peculiar institu-
tions and a newer society funda-
mentally different from the older
and inadequately represented in the
law making bodies. It was a contest
between the owners of large estates
and the owners of small farms; between
a population largely English and one
composed of various nationalities; and
between a people whose economic interests
and relations were with the South and a
people whose interests and relations
were mainly with the North.

The difficulty in harmonizing these interests increased
rather than decreased during the first half of the nineteenth
century and tended to obstruct many measures proposed for in-
ternal improvement and public education in the state, hold-

53 C.H. Young, "The Virginia Constitutional Convention
of 1829," The John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-

54 C.H. Ambler, Sectionalism in Virginia 1776-1860,
pp. 5-6.
ing the state in a sort of deadlock until the separation of West Virginia permitted each section to work out its own destiny.55

For the purposes of this study the sectional differences in agriculture and educational theory are of greatest importance. As indicated, the west never did feel the devastation of soil depletion nor face so great a problem in setting up crop rotation and a diversified agriculture as the east. The landowners were usually closer to the soil, did most of their own work, and inherited a traditional love for the land. When agitation began for agricultural education in its various forms, the western part of the state not feeling the need so greatly as the east gave only scattered support to the efforts and lined up almost solidly to defeat the early proposal for an agricultural professorship and experimental farm at the University of Virginia.56

In educational matters the west favored a system of state-supported public free schools, with elementary education receiving first attention, in strong contrast to the east's favoring state support only for the poor and the university. This sectional difference in education will be made more apparent as this study develops.

55C.H. Ambler, West Virginia the Mountain State, p. 72.

A System of Education

The sectional differences in educational matters were not so greatly pronounced in Virginia at the beginning of the nineteenth century as they were to become during this century. Both sections had in general largely accepted the European tradition which they brought with them when they came to Virginia. In Colonial Virginia this influence was almost entirely English, especially with respect to its patently influential and ruling class. The dominant influence was especially aristocratic, with a noticeable tardiness and indifference toward any system of free popular education for all. The system developed reflected the social philosophy and was designed to protect the political, the social, and the economic interests upon which the plantation system was founded.

In actual practice the well-to-do provided education for their own children by tutors or family schools. Some attempt was made to establish parish Latin grammar schools, but the tutorial system and the great distances between the plantations made this institution highly impractical.

A summary of the types of schools which developed in Colonial Virginia is given by Heatwole as follows:


58 Maddox, op. cit., p. 6.
(1) The grammar school, which in addition to the higher branches taught, gave instruction in the elementary subjects of "reading writing and ciphering"; (2) an endowed free school whose primary purpose was to give training in the elementary forms of learning; (3) a community school, later known as the private school, where the heads of various families living in the same neighborhood combined in the employing of a teacher for their children; (4) the tutorial system, a method the rich planter used in providing instruction for his children and sometimes in addition, for the children of his neighbors. 59

All these schools were operated on the basis of individual effort and support with the emphasis placed on the literary aspect. Private philanthropy, it is true, helped provide for free education at some of these schools; but such provisions were nearly always for the poor or the unfortunate, 60 and in fact helped strengthen rather than weaken the aristocratic concept of public support of education as being for the poor.

The period of the American Revolution saw the beginning of the academies in Virginia, but these prior to 1800 were largely private in both control and support hence did little to develop any sense or feeling for a state-supported system before the nineteenth century.

To find the beginning of the long, slow, and at times embittered struggle for a system of public education in Virginia, it is necessary to turn to the poor-relief and

59 Heatwole, op. cit., p. 36.

60 Maddox, op. cit., p. 8.
apprenticeship laws borrowed almost directly from England and gradually adapted to Virginia conditions. The apprenticeship system in itself was in the words of Monroe quite simple:

Children whose parents were able to give them a literary education and whose wealth would keep them from want, were exempt. All other children must receive a training in some vocation. This was secured by binding the youth as an apprentice to some master for a term of years. This period was usually seven years, though it must last until the boy was 21 or the girl 18.

The evolution of the apprenticeship system in Virginia is important not only because of its being the first step in the long evolution of public education in the state but also because of its influence in developing an attitude, or state of mind, prejudicial to vocational education as worthy of any but the poor, a state of mind not at all difficult to discern in Virginia to this day.

The first apprenticeship law in Virginia was passed in 1643 and provided among other things that all orphans be brought up "in Christian religion and in rudiments of


62 Paul Monroe, Founding of the American Public School System, I, p. 34.
learning."63 Three years later the law was expanded to provide for two poor children from each county to be sent at public expense to a public flax workhouse in Jamestown to be taught carding, knitting, spinning, and so on. The act contains an interesting description of the building proposed for this school, perhaps the first industrial school building ever proposed in Virginia.64 In 1672 the apprenticeship law was again enlarged and provided among other things that children of poor parents should be apprenticed to tradesmen and that the church wardens of every parish "be strictly enjoined by the courts to give them an account annually... of all such children within their parish as they judge to be within the said capacity."65

The church wardens by this act were given this important work in the various communities and as far as eastern Virginia was concerned retained this power for more than a century.66

By 1705 the apprenticeship laws had been expanded to require the master to teach the orphans reading, writing,

63 W.W. Hening, Statutes at Large, Being a Collection of All of the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature in the Year 1619, I, p. 261.


65 Hening, Statutes, II, p. 298.

66 Knight, op. cit., p. 31.
and a trade.67

During the entire eighteenth century the state was expanding, strengthening, and developing the apprenticeship system of education with more than sixteen legislative acts, amendments, or provisions passed and with every act tending to promote further the idea of state aid as associated with a system of education for the poor.68 More significant for this study, perhaps, was the tendency for these acts to create the impression that a trade or vocational education was only for the poor and unfortunate, not for the sons of the well-to-do.

As pointed out, the act of 1672 put the responsibility of accounting for the orphans and the poor upon the vestry of the counties. A century later west of the Blue Ridge, however, in the Great Valley sections dominated by the Scotch-Irish and the Germans the vestries were either nonexistent or at most rather weak and ineffectual. At the same time the Indian wars and raids made unusually heavy tolls on heads of families in this area and as a consequence made the number of orphans to be apprenticed unusually large.69 Faced with this situation, the legislature in

---

67 Hening, op. cit., III, p. 375.

68 For a copy of these acts see Hening Statutes, Volumes I through XIII.

69 Hart, op. cit., p. 19.
1778 passed an act empowering the County Commissioners of Botetourt to levy a tax to take care of the poor.70 This act was rather quickly followed by additional acts which for several of the western counties abolished the vestries or other bodies having power to provide for the poor and in lieu of the vestry provided that overseers of the poor be elected in each county to provide for the poor in such a way as previously done by the now abolished vestry.71 From this transfer of authority from the church to elected members of the county officials grew the idea that caring for and educating the poor were state, rather than church or private, responsibilities.

It is significant to note that this idea of state responsibility began west of the Blue Ridge Mountains where class distinction was never so great as in the east and where because of conditions such as those pointed out -- the tendency to settle in small communities, the greater homogeneity of community needs, and the tendency to cooperate in attempting to secure common needs -- the idea took root and in the nineteenth century rather quickly developed into a full-scale demand for a state-supported system of schools. It is equally important to point out at this time the fact that political control of state affairs continued

70 Hening, op. cit., IX, p. 527.

71 Ibid., X (Laws of May, 1720, Chapter 22).
to be in the east where the idea of state support was slower in finding fertile ground.

By the nineteenth century there was little to be found in the record to indicate that Virginia as a whole was interested in a state system of public education. It is true that Jefferson had introduced a very forward-looking bill in 1779, providing for a state system of education; but in spite of the excellence of the bill it was too advanced for the conditions of the time and was not well received.  

The system of education, then, if it can be called a system, accepted by Virginia at the beginning of the nineteenth century was dual in character and in nature. It consisted of a system of privately supported schools for the well-to-do with emphasis on literary studies and of an apprenticeship training program for the poor. In the education of the poor the state looked to the poor laws and the apprenticeship system which "had its origin in the caste system expressed in the two classes, the wealthy and the poor, with a distinct line of demarcation between them," and which placed its emphasis on a practical, or trade, education.

72 Knight, op. cit., p. 39.

The prevailing attitude was that formal literary education was not needed by the poor youth, while the ideal motivating the people was that of every man's "educating his own according to his ability and inclination."\textsuperscript{74} At the beginning of the nineteenth century "what people wanted was to be left free to go their own way about education. That was their inheritance under the old establishment. They had now confirmed themselves in liberty and meant to follow their own lines of voluntary enterprise in education as in all else."\textsuperscript{75}

When one considers all the previously mentioned factors even as briefly as they have been presented thus far, it is obvious that Virginia at the beginning of the nineteenth century faced serious conflicts and differences between the older, more conservative east and the newer, more democratic frontier, or west. This conflict in itself is not unique in American history, having been faced by practically every one of the older colonies as they grew toward and into statehood. The significant thing, as far as this study is concerned, is to realize that this conflict as it was projected into the nineteenth century was shaped and fashioned out of these already mentioned forces and in such a "Virginia-created" form entered into the efforts to estab-

\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., p. 257.

\textsuperscript{75}Morrison, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 130.
lish an educational system, whether such a system was literary or agricultural. The truth of this fact and the manner in which it influenced such developments, especially in agricultural education, will be shown more clearly in the remaining chapters of Part I of this study.

Before proceeding with this development, however, it seems well to indicate very briefly some of the important characteristics which this conflict assumed between 1800 and 1860.

Agriculturally the west continued to move along the road of general, diversified farming and stock raising on small to moderate sized farms cultivated by the owner and his family. The east, on the other hand, continued largely under the plantation system, the land being tilled more and more by the Negro slave. Tobacco continued as one of the major crops, but desperate efforts were made to find new crops and rotations which would help restore the fertility of the soil. Soil depletion continued, however, and this factor coupled with the unhappy lot of the small landowner in a community dominated by the plantation system tended to cause excessive migration of the small land-owner to western Virginia and to the West, leaving behind the "head and the tail, the rich and the poor," but almost no middle class. Many farsighted leaders becoming alarmed over the declining farm yields and the declining population be-

76 James Barbour, "Letter to Editor," Farmers' Register, III (September, 1835), p. 274.
gan to agitate for reforms, one of which was agricultural education. The west, not being faced with either a declining population or an impoverished soil, was not very sympathetic with this effort.

Physically the state continued, of course to be divided east from west by a backbone of from one to two hundred miles of mountains running in parallel ridges northeast and southwest across her entire limits. Numerous abortive attempts were made to join the two sections commercially at least by roads and canals, but the chief results were to increase rather than decrease sectional jealousies and at the same time plunge the state into a huge debt which shortly after the Civil War threatened the very existence of the free school system.

In spite of the orators' pleas not to think of the mountains as an insuperable barrier to trade but to think of them as placed there by a kind Providence to "milk the clouds to make the sweet springs which are the sources of your rivers," the mountains remained as just such a barrier. Commercially the eastern part of the state followed the river trade routes and traded toward the Atlantic Ocean, while the western region following its natural courses car-

\[\text{\footnotesize 77 J.C. McGregor, The Disruption of Virginia, pp. 19-20.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 78 See Chapters V and VII.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 79 J.P. Hambleton, A Biographical Sketch of Henry A. Wise, p. 96.}\]
ried on trade with the cities and towns of the sections drained by the Mississippi. The great Shenandoah Valley lying in between the two sections tended to trade northward toward Baltimore, Alexandria, and other eastern ports.

That the inability to establish commercial relations between the two sections aggravated their differences there can be no doubt. Certainly McGregor's statement that "absence of commercial relations is the grand lever which sets in motion many political misunderstandings" is quite applicable to Virginia at this period. Politics stems heavily from needs, and the commercial needs of the east differed rather widely from those of the west. The west needed roads, canals, and protective tariffs for its developing industry. The east had numerous navigable rivers and had small need for extensive roads and canals in comparison with the west, while protective tariff on manufactured goods not only was not recognized as a need but was thought as a direct steal from the planters. The west needed internal improvements so desperately that it looked with favor upon federal aid for such purposes. The east came to look upon federal aid for internal improvement as federal interference with states' rights and a highly dangerous precedent which might lead to federal interference with the

---


system of slavery. As a result of all these differences, when the east and the west met on the political forum, they were usually poles apart on most questions of intra-state policy as well as on some of the federal ones.

On the political front in the state and national legislature the east steadfastly and successfully clung to its political advantage gained in terms of representation before the west had a sufficient population to demand a more nearly equal representation. As a result of these factors there were very few times when there was political truce between the east and the west before 1860.

Educationally the west needed and wanted public free schools for its people, while the east having succeeded in setting up a system of private schools suitable to its wants was lukewarm to the idea of public free schools but favorable to a state university.

It was from within this matrix of conflicting purposes, philosophies, and industrial systems that Virginia to provide a program of agricultural education began her first real efforts, to which we shall now turn.
CHAPTER II

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES AND FAIRS BEFORE 1860

The first attempts at organization for the purposes of agricultural education in Virginia came about through the agricultural societies and the fairs they established. This movement toward societies and fairs, however, was not indigenous to Virginia but developed among the colonies along the Atlantic seaboard.\(^1\) The societies and fairs as they developed in Virginia followed rather closely the overall pattern of development of these agencies on the national level. This pattern of development was not accidental but was in fact brought about in many instances by the definite efforts on the part of the leaders in the state to secure for Virginia agriculture the benefits which they thought such organizations were securing for agriculture in their sister states to the north.\(^2\) The actual development of the

\(^1\)Benjamin Perley Poor, "History of the Agriculture of the United States," United States Department of Agriculture Report, 1866, p. 513 ff.

\(^2\)See especially the volumes of the Farmers' Register from 1835 through 1940 and the volumes of the Southern Planter from 1845 through 1860.
fairs and societies in this state, however, was definitely influenced by circumstances and conditions peculiar to Virginia and in such development made its contribution to the story of agricultural education within the state.

The agricultural societies sprang up at an early date in the regions east of the Blue Ridge Mountains where soil depletion had reached such alarming proportions that the leaders realized something had to be done to meet the situation. From the eastern part of the state these societies then spread into other sections until at the outbreak of the Civil War every great geographical division in the state from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean to the banks of the Ohio River had developed one or more of these organizations. The programs and the theories advanced by these organizations for the improvement of agriculture were startlingly modern in many respects. Even more surprising to the present day agricultural leader in Virginia is the fact that the efforts of these societies for agricultural improvement were achieving unusual success when the Civil War broke out. Unfortunately this war had such a devastating and paralyzing effect on the state as a whole and agriculture in particular that much of this program was lost and the theories forgotten, not to be rediscovered and re-

---

developed until around the turn of the twentieth century.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present, not the complete story of these societies, but those parts of their story dealing with the attempts to organize for agricultural improvement and those parts of the theories and programs having the greatest significance for the development of the broad field of agricultural education. The direct proposals for agricultural education which will be mentioned as advanced by these societies will be treated more fully in Chapter IV. Major attention will be given to the developments prior to the Civil War, since almost immediately following the war the state college of agriculture was established and gradually assumed many of the prewar educational practices advocated by the societies.

The Efforts to Organize for Agricultural Improvement

During the first four decades of the nineteenth century the agricultural societies in Virginia were made up almost entirely from the wealthier gentleman farmers and outstanding leaders of the day, many of whom were able and forceful
writers. This make-up of membership and the nature of the programs conducted by the societies furnishes an excellent example of the movement so prevalent in Virginia from that day to this whereby the efforts for agricultural improvement spread from the top social stratum downward and outward to the great masses.

The earliest society in Virginia seems to have been the one established at Williamsburg, in 1774, although it cannot be claimed to have been exclusively an agricultural society nor does it seem to have had any particular influence on subsequent developments.

The agricultural society in Virginia was definitely a nineteenth-century development. Many Virginians prior to 1810 were participating in the Columbian Agricultural Society and Fairs held in the District of Columbia, while

---


by this latter date many strictly agricultural societies had been organized in Virginia. As pointed out, soil depletion was a disturbing factor in the older tobacco sections of the state. Many felt that a collection and dissemination of agricultural information would help ameliorate the condition; consequently we find that the Richmond Agricultural Society as early as April, 1810, stated its purpose as being "to collect all the practical agricultural knowledge of the country and convey it to the public in the way which may be deemed most conducive to the general welfare." This encyclopedic statement of purpose, though staggering in the light of present day agricultural knowledge, cannot be considered as too startling for the times in which it was written because of the scarcity of agricultural information to be had then. Interestingly enough this laudable statement of desire to convey agricultural knowledge to the public antedated by exactly a century Virginia's legislative action authorizing the establishment of extension centers in agricultural high schools to accomplish exactly the same purpose of conveying agricultural information to the public.

7 Craven, op. cit., p. 104.

8 Agricultural Museum, April 24, 1811, quoted by A. O. Craven, op. cit., p. 105.

9 See Chapter VIII.
This statement of purpose set forth by the Richmond Society, though later stated in many different ways, remained the basic objective of all the societies formed prior to the Civil War. Perhaps the most pervasive influence shaping the pattern of organization and statement of objectives for the societies organized prior to the fourth decade of the century, however, was Thomas Jefferson's "A Scheme for a System of Agricultural Societies" which he drew up in March of 1811. The records available indicate that the movement for agricultural societies included first a rather wide organization of local county societies followed by an effort to federate these county societies into a state organization. Apparently the first organization in Virginia was the Virginia Society for Promoting Agriculture, organized in 1811 but reorganized in 1816 as the Society of Virginia for Promoting Agriculture. Numerous reports on agricultural topics were presented by members of this society and published in the state papers, especially the Richmond

---


In 1818 this society published its memoirs, the only publication of this kind by a Virginia agricultural society prior to 1853.

John Taylor, the first president of the society and the author of the famous agricultural pamphlet *Arator*, was a contributing member of the older, more widely known Philadelphia Agricultural Society and no doubt was influenced by this organization in shaping the direction of the Virginia Society.

The early success and publicity attained by this state society seem to have stimulated more groups to organize at the local level, with the two outstanding local societies being the Albemarle Agricultural Society organized at Charlottesville, in 1817, and the Fredericksburg Agricultural Society organized at Fredericksburg, in 1818.

This Albemarle Society was organized in the midst of the struggle in the state legislature to establish the University of Virginia and later on, as will be recounted, took

---

12 *Memoirs of the Society of Virginia for Promoting Agriculture, Containing Communications on Various Subjects in Husbandry and Rural Affairs*, by the Society, 1818.

13 See Appendix L for brief biographical sketch of John Taylor.


an active part in trying to get an agricultural professorship established in this institution, being supported in this effort by the Fredericksburg Society. Following the organization of these two groups, there was for the next four or five years "a rage for forming agricultural societies in Virginia," but most of them seem to have been rather short lived.

By 1820 the Society of Virginia referred to before had ceased to function but was followed immediately by a second attempt to set up a state organization by a meeting of delegates from local societies held at Parker’s Tavern in Surry County, in January, 1820. These early societies suffered high mortality on both the local and the state level. They seemed, as so many rural community organizations do today, to flourish for a while and then having served their purpose, brief though the period, to die out. By 1833 all the societies on both state and local levels, with the exception of the Albemarle and the Fredericksburg organizations, seem to have died out or at least to have ceased active programs,


and even these two latter ones were not very active.¹⁸

Interest in the societies reawakened around 1835 and 1836, primarily, it seems, as a result of the efforts of such outstanding leaders as Edmund Ruffin,¹⁹ James M. Garnett,¹⁹ Theodore McRoberts, and others using the columns of the recently established agricultural periodical The Farmers' Register and many local newspapers. The leaders in this press agitation are a bit difficult to identify, for in keeping with what seemed to be the custom of the times many of the writers used pseudonyms; but the results were fairly satisfactory, with numerous local societies being formed²⁰ and sufficient interest being aroused to hold a state convention in Richmond, in 1836, to further the programs advocated by the local groups.


¹⁹See Appendix L for brief biographical sketch of Edmund Ruffin and James M. Garnett.

²⁰For activities and reports of these early societies see Farmers’ Register, I (February, 1834), pp. 509, 553, 513; Ibid., II (January, 1835), p. 491, (February, 1835), pp. 531-35, 521; Ibid., III (January, 1836), p. 575; also W. T. Hutchinson, Cyrus Hall McCormick, p. 31.
This convention of representatives of the agricultural societies and others interested in the advancement of agriculture met in Richmond, on January 11, 1836, and heard a stirring address by James Barbour,\(^1^\) father of Virginia's Literary Fund\(^2^\) and an outspoken advocate for state aid for agricultural societies and agricultural education. This convention addressed a stirring memorial to the state legislature, advocating (1) the formation of a State Board of Agriculture or an Agricultural Society to consist of one practical agriculturist from each congressional district, (2) the establishment of an agricultural professorship and an experimental farm at the University of Virginia to be paid for out of the Literary Fund, and (3) the employment of a person to survey the best agricultural practices in the eastern states and make a written report thereof available to the farmers.\(^3^\) Little success met this effort at this time; but the ideas, especially of a State Board of Agriculture, appealed to many of the local agricultural societies and to the editor of the "Farmers' Register."

\(^1^\)"Address to the Agricultural Convention of Virginia," Farmers' Register, III (March, 1835), pp. 585-589. See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of James Barbour.

\(^2^\)See Chapter V for discussion of the Literary Fund.

\(^3^\)"Memorial of the Agricultural Convention of January 11, 1836 to the Legislature," Farmers' Register, III (February, 1836), pp. 620-626.
Register, with the result that considerable agitation for such a board was carried on through the columns of the last-named publication.

In 1839 a bill to establish a State Board of Agriculture was introduced into the House of Delegates where it passed, only to be defeated by the Senate. It is interesting to note that delegates from only two counties known to have active agricultural societies voted against the proposal in the House. It is also interesting to note that the delegates from the counties with large German elements where agriculture had reached a high stage of development opposed the measure almost solidly, probably because the Germans, being excellent farmers, did not see the need for a board.

The agitation for a State Board of Agriculture continued, however, until in March, 1841, the General Assembly passed an act establishing such a board. This organic act creating the board was very faulty in that it required almost full-time service of the board members but made no provision for reimbursement of any sort. These defects


25Loc. cit.

were vigorously pointed out by Edmund Ruffin who in the Farmers' Register prophesied that the board would be a failure. Ruffin's prophecy proved to be correct; and the board, although made up of outstanding agricultural leaders, including Ruffin himself, was never able to function sufficiently well to secure solid support from either the farmers of the state or the legislature. In fact, only seven farmers in the entire state of Virginia responded to the board's first effort to get agricultural information as a basis on which to formulate a report to the legislature. In 1843 the act establishing the board was repealed, thus terminating Virginia's first attempt to aid agriculture by legislative action.

The official report made by the board before its demise and the legislative debate on the proposed abolishment of the board are so revealing as to the attitude at the time of many toward such organizations and toward this kind of agricultural education that it deserves some attention here.

27 "Establishment of a Board of Agriculture for Virginia," Farmers' Register, IX (April, 1841), p. 239.


In a very pessimistic vein James M. Garnett, the president of the board reported, "The very snug [sic] compendious policy of 'every man for himself', seems to be the order of the day -- at least in regard to agriculture, if nothing else -- so that any present attempt to alter it appears to be a totally hopeless undertaking."30

In May, 1842, Edmund Ruffin reprinted in the Farmers' Register from the Richmond Enquirer the full debate in the House of Delegates over the proposal to abolish the board. In general the persons advocating the retention of the board were the lawyers of the group. They confessed that they were not exactly sure how the board would help agriculture other than in collecting and disseminating information, but they felt that the people were greatly concerned about agriculture and that something should be done for an interest that paid so large a share of the taxes. One member argued that:

Yearly laws were enacted to take care of the terrapins, oysters, fish, and wild fowl of Virginia. Should it be said that we could and would do nothing for the great cause of agriculture. Let an effort be made, and even if no good should result we should have the consolation of knowing that we had made an effort for the cause.31


31"Debate in the House of Delegates on the Board of Agriculture," from the Richmond Enquirer reprinted in Farmers' Register, X (May, 1842), p. 214.
The opponents of the board, on the other hand, marshalled a more specific program and attacked the board as an unnecessary, extravagant, book-farming attempt to help practical farmers who, they scornfully claimed, required "no science, and no reports from a Board of Agriculture to teach men how to handle the plough, the ax, the maul."
The best farmers, they continued, were "those who had been brought up to the plough handle, those who trod their own soil, the honest plain-spoken Germans who never saw the printed report of an agricultural board."32 Voluntary associations, they argued, referring to the now defunct organizations of the agricultural societies on the state level, had tried to do what it was now proposed to have the state board do and had failed. Why would this effort be any more successful? Another member attacked the board through the medium of the state geological survey which he claimed was an example of a board established to aid agriculture, an assertion bitterly denied by Ruffin in the Farmers' Register; but, argued the member, "Year after year we had looked for something to grow out of it [the geological survey] and still the only fact that had been developed was that some oyster shells had been discovered on the Blue Ridge [mountains], a fact no doubt very interesting

32 Ibid., p. 216.
to the philosopher but of no practical value to the farmer." 33

With such weak support and such an emotionally appealing attack coupled with the pessimistic attitude of the president, the board was abolished, not to be re-created until March 5, 1888, more than four decades later. 34

Following the failure of this first State Board of Agriculture, efforts were discontinued in this direction and once more turned to the idea of a state-wide agricultural society, the United Agricultural Society of 1820 having long since passed out of existence. 35 This time the leader in the movement seems to have been the Hole and Corner Club of Albemarle County which, feeling that political bitterness between the eastern and the western parts of the state was abating, drafted a call for a state-wide convention to meet in Richmond to form a State Agricultural Society. 36 The editor of the Southern Planter enthusiastically endorsed the idea and stressed the fact that the purpose of the call was to find the cause for the languishing

33 Ibid., p. 216.


condition of Virginia's agriculture and to "remedy this
defect, to inspire a new zeal, and open the path to agri-
cultural knowledge." The convention assembled in Rich-
mond, on January 20, 1815, and successfully organized a
state-wide society under the name of the Virginia State
Agricultural Society, with Andrew Stevenson as president.

The statement of purpose of this society as set forth
in the Southern Planter shows a decided evolution toward a
realistic recognition and appraisal of sectional differ-
ences and toward a state-wide basis of action, in contrast
to earlier state-wide efforts of members who after lofty
statements of purpose proceeded to set up proposals appli-
cable for the most part only to the section east of the
Blue Ridge Mountains. This time the founders of the organ-
ization expressed the wish to "bring together into consulta-
tion the cattle raiser of the west, and the grazier of the

37 Ibid., p. 7.

38 Considerable confusion prevails as to the first
president of the society organized at this time. Brown
in "Agricultural Science and Education in Virginia Before
1860," William and Mary College Quarterly, Second Series,
XIX, p. 203 and Wise in A Special Report to the Board of
Visitors of the Virginia Military Institute on the History
of Agricultural Education in Virginia, p. 6 name Edmund
Ruffin as the first president. In actual fact it seems
that Ruffin was elected as president (Southern Planter,
V February, 1815, p. 43) but declined to serve, whereupon
Andrew Stevenson was elected. See article on Edmund
Ruffin in Dictionary of American Biography, XVI, p. 214;
also The Farmer, I (January, 1855), pp. 4-5.
Valley with the tobacco planter and grain grower of the east, and teach them [that] their interests instead of being antagonistical are dependent upon each other."

This ambition was not to be fulfilled, however, and the society seems to have made little or no actual contribution toward agricultural education other than to perpetuate the idea of an organization. By 1849 this society like its predecessors had ceased to function.

In the year of 1849 a somewhat amusing incident occurred as a result of the death of this organization, when a Lieutenant Lynch, not knowing that the society was no longer functioning, sent two Khaisi calves from the Holy Land as a present to the organization. Since the society was inoperative, the calves escheated to the state, leaving the Governor with the responsibility of caring for the new-comers to the official circle. The editor of the Southern Planter gleefully seized upon the incident to launch a long article urging the re-establishment and the re-vitalization of the state society. Whether the calf incident was effective or not we do not know, but efforts

---


were renewed once more on behalf of the state-wide organization, with the result that the society was reorganized in February, 1850. Once again the results were disappointing, with the society doing little more than dealing in generalities about the importance of agriculture. The sentiment and desire for an organization to promote agriculture was very strong by this time, however, and in 1852 the society was once more revived and reorganized.

This time the nearly four decades of effort to set up an organization for the promotion of agriculture in the state began to bear real fruit. At long last, experience had demonstrated the ineffectiveness of meeting, listening to a stirring speech, passing equally stirring resolutions and then going home. The executive committee emphasized to the members that just as there was no perpetual motion in physics so there was none in agricultural societies: "Effort! effort! perpetually made and judiciously applied" was what was needed, they insisted. The aid of state newspapers was sought and received; a field agent to tour the state and visit the cities, the towns, and the counties to keep alive interest and secure new members was appointed. The times were beginning to be prosperous; the railroads


\[43\] Journal of Transactions of the Virginia State Agricultural Society from its Organization to the Close of the First Annual Exhibition 1853, p. 104.
of the state were developing and co-operated with the society. Above all, the newly appointed field agent, General William H. Richardson, knew how to attract people. The membership of the local agricultural societies had been expanded to include more of the middle class farmers. Many local societies had organized county fair associations which swelled membership and increased interest. Within nine months after Richardson became field agent, the membership in the state society grew from 339 to more than 5,000 persons, while the treasury showed a corresponding increase; in fact, at the annual meeting of the state society in November, 1853, the official delegates alone subscribed approximately $40,000 for the work of the organization, whereas in 1852 there had not been enough money available to carry on the program at all.

The Virginia State Agricultural Society continued its successful existence until the outbreak of the Civil War, reaching a peak membership at one time of more than ten thousand members. With the outbreak of the war the society

---


suspended operations but in November, 1866, the war being over, once more reorganized, this time to undertake the unhappy task of rebuilding both the society and Virginia's practically ruined agriculture. 47

More particular attention will be given to the efforts of this state organization in behalf of agricultural education in Chapter IV, but it is worthy of noting here that this society at each period of its rejuvenation or reorganization stressed agricultural education as one of the great needs and means of agricultural improvement. In the period 1853-56 it worked arduously for and almost succeeded in establishing an agricultural professorship at the University of Virginia, 48 though perhaps more important for this study is the fact that it worked from 1866 until 1871 for the establishment of a land-grant college of agriculture separate from any of the then existing colleges or universities. 49

Undoubtedly this organization's phenomenal success in the years just preceding the war and its rather quick recovery

47See Chapter VI.

48See Chapter IV.

49See Chapter VI. In 1870-71 the society seems to have divided over the question of a separate college, although several of its members worked arduously for a separate college during the entire legislative debate over the land-grant fund.
following the war helped influence the legislature in its deliberations leading to the establishment of a separate state agricultural college in 1872. This part of the society's activity will be treated more fully later on.

The Programs of the Agricultural Societies

In this section attention will be limited to a consideration of those parts of the agricultural societies' programs, whether advocated or carried out, which seem to have had significant influence on the development of agricultural education in the state. There was a decided similarity among all the societies in their objectives, make-up, programs, and methods of operating. All the earlier ones for which we have any record were made up of the leading men of the community, while most of them charged annual dues and used the money to carry on their work and to provide premiums for agricultural improvements. In some of the societies the practice was followed of rotating the meetings from farm to farm, with each member furnishing a dinner in his turn. In other societies the dinner was had at some local inn or tavern. These expenses and the social features no doubt tended to restrict membership in the organization to the wealthier and to one common social level.

---

The basic fundamental purposes of all these early Virginia societies can be found in the statement of the Virginia Society for Promotion of Agriculture when it stated its objectives as to "aid in improving the agriculture of our country by encouraging and stimulating the exertions of individuals, by collecting facts as extensively as possible and communicating those facts to the public." This rather general statement was followed by a tendency to move in the opposite direction and set up a rather detailed list of objectives to be sought by the society. Examples of this detailed type of listing are to be found in "Objects for Attention and Enquiry of the Society" written by Thomas Jefferson for the Albemarle Agricultural Society and the "Objectives of the Agricultural Society of the Valley of Virginia" published in the American Farmer. This trend toward statements of comprehensive encyclopedic objectives for the societies developed so strongly that Edmund Ruffin writing in the Farmers' Register begged for less high-sounding statements.

---

51 Memoirs of the Society of Virginia (1818), preface, p. iv.


of objectives and more action on behalf of improvement to agriculture.\textsuperscript{54}

Even if we discount the exaggerations of enthusiasm portrayed in the list of objectives, the fact still remains that these lists furnish an excellent clue to the early efforts which were made to improve agriculture by education. In general the objects listed for attention and inquiry by the membership of the society included matters pertaining to the staple and subsidiary crops of the county or region, rotation of crops, development and testing of farm machinery, efficient use of labor, production of livestock, the best modes of tillage of crops and handling of soil, the production and use of manures, and the best modes of rebuilding soil fertility. As if these objects were not sufficient to engage full-time attention, nearly all the lists of objectives included a catch-all statement permitting the society to investigate other areas demanding attention.\textsuperscript{55}

The calendar of work developed by the modern teacher of vocational agriculture in Virginia\textsuperscript{56} is far superior to those early lists, as a functional instrument in guiding teaching activities; but it is highly doubtful if these calendars show any better grasp of the problems involved in improving

\textsuperscript{54}"Constitutions of Agricultural Societies," \textit{Farmers' Register}, III (January, 1836), p. 575.

\textsuperscript{55}See Appendix A and B for illustrations of objectives.

\textsuperscript{56}See Chapter X.
agriculture than that revealed by these objectives of agricultural societies in Virginia a century or so ago.

During the earlier formative periods the societies to accomplish their objectives relied chiefly on meetings at which individual members presented papers or reports setting forth their views on topics or phases of agriculture. These reports were then usually followed by discussions in which all the members participated. Frequently outstanding citizens of neighboring communities would be invited to address the society, usually on topics related to agriculture, while in nearly all cases the president was expected to give a presidential address sometime during the year. These papers, reports, and addresses were eagerly sought by the agricultural journals and newspapers of the day and given full publicity therein.\(^57\)

The before-named methods of accomplishing the objectives of the societies were only partially successful. Once each member had presented his particular paper or report, he had little to say when it came his turn to report again. As a result of this condition many of the organiza-
tions went out of existence once each member "had had his say." 58

To meet this difficulty, the societies early developed three practices which had untold effect on agriculture and in one form or another are still in existence to this day as part of agricultural education. First, they urged the members to start experimenting with new crops, rotations, and machinery, and to keep accurate memoranda of the results and then report the results to the societies. 59 Second, they inaugurated a system of premiums, or awards, to be given to the member or members showing the greatest accomplishment in the areas of agricultural improvement set up by the objectives of the societies. 60 Finally, they inaugurated a system of agricultural fairs. 61

These three ideas of agricultural experimentation, of agricultural contests, and of agricultural fairs, well


established in Virginia by 1825, continue to this day to be an integral part of programs in agricultural education in Virginia; in fact, so well established has the contest idea become in vocational agriculture in secondary schools, that some people in the state are wondering how the teacher of vocational agriculture would teach if the program of contests were eliminated.

At first the entire program followed by the societies was for the membership of the organization, the ones least likely to need help; but with the increasing popularity of the fairs there was a gradual shifting from the more aristocratic type of society to a more democratic organization, especially as far as membership was concerned. These newer organizations frequently dropped the name "society" and simply organized as farmers' clubs. This change in membership was accompanied by a corresponding extension of the privileges of participating in the program to all the members of a community, although there is considerable evidence to indicate that the benefits of the program never did actually reach the great mass of farmers in the state.64

62Hutchinson, op. cit., p. 31.


The agricultural experimentation urged by the societies and the press and carried on by many of the individual members reveals, as would be expected, a varied approach to the application of scientific principles to the great field of agriculture. Such experimentation led to the testing and introduction of new grasses and crops, such as wheat, vetch, and clover; to the try-out under practical conditions of farm machinery; to different methods of crop rotation; to new breeds of livestock; and to many other new practices.  

By the outbreak of the Civil War the idea that agricultural research was more than a matter of individual effort and initiative, important though this was recognized to be, seems to have been making considerable headway. Several of the leaders of the time had clearly recognized a fact all too frequently overlooked today; namely, that agricultural experimentation on an experimental farm should not be expected to be self-supporting and that frequently, in fact, the cause of agriculture was advanced by the failure of an experiment just as much as it was by the success of one.

65 See the Farmers' Register and the Southern Planter for this period.

66 "On the Necessity and Means for Legislative Aid to Agriculture," Farmers' Register, I (April, 1834), p. 691; Ibid., II (June, 1834), p. 52; Edmund Ruffin, "Sketch of the Progress of Agriculture in Virginia and the Cause of Its Decline and Present Depression," Farmers' Register, III (April, 1836), pp. 748-754.
The early experiences gained by these societies in attempting to conduct experiments led them to realize that agricultural experimentation was frequently a long-time, expensive proposition. As a result of this realization the societies developed considerable agitation for state aid for the establishment of pattern, or experimental, farms. This agitation for experimental farms was not unanimous, however, since many farmers felt that every farm was already an experimental farm and that what was really needed was a better dissemination of agricultural information through the press. Many others no doubt felt as one farmer expressed it, "Is it necessary that we should have a score or two of officers with fat salaries to learn us how to farm?"

Unfortunately for the cause of agriculture the growing agitation for experimental farms became another Civil War casualty in Virginia and was not renewed with sufficient vigor to influence the state to appropriate funds for agricultural experimentation until 1906, nearly two decades


after an experiment station had been started with federal funds at the state college of agriculture.\(^69\)

The use of premiums and awards which the societies early resorted to in an effort to accomplish their objectives seems to have been successful, especially when later used in conjunction with their fairs. There is considerable evidence, though, that the societies then, as so frequently is the case now, encountered considerable difficulty in keeping the contests for the awards operating as stimulating and educational devices rather than as mere competitive devices with emphasis on winning at any cost.\(^70\)

The one outstandingly dominant feature of the agricultural societies and clubs soon came to be the annual fairs they conducted and sponsored. These fairs as they expanded their premium lists soon came to appeal to all the members of the community. The ploughing match usually incorporated in the program appealed to the yeomen; and the exhibits of livestock, machinery, farm products, and household goods represented something within his background of experience, something which he could appreciate, criticize, and appraise in his own way, whether accurately or not. This condition proved to be a powerful psychological

\(^{69}\)See Chapter VII.

stimulus in pulling many otherwise uninterested rural people into contact with progressive practices. Usually the winner of a prize or of a premium was there to discuss his product or explain his methods of production. In many instances the regulations stipulated that the exhibitor should make a statement of the methods of cultivation, manuring, and harvesting used in producing the crop, or the methods of care and feeding in developing his livestock. The prize-winning piece of farm equipment was there for the farmer to see in operation. The people from the entire community brought to the fair the tangible results of their efforts to be displayed, discussed, and compared. All in all the agricultural fairs were the first agency for agricultural education which had a popular appeal and which could be so handled as to appeal to all walks of rural life.

With nearly a century of experience with agricultural fairs behind her, it was no accident that Virginia upon establishing a state system of public high schools should almost immediately attempt to develop the school fair as a means of encouraging agricultural education. 72

The Virginia State Agricultural Society upon its

72 See Chapter VIII.
successful organization launched an effort to hold an annual state fair. The effort was successful -- so successful, in fact, that considerable rivalry developed among the cities in the state in their efforts to become the site of the fair, although the financial inducement offered by the cities was not entirely satisfactory to the officials of the society.73

By 1858 the annual fairs had grown to such proportions and involved so much expense that the executive committee of the State Agricultural Society warned that there were yet means other than fairs by which the society could aid agriculture; for example, by "the endowment of an agricultural professorship at the University of Virginia."74

In addition to the program of agitation for experimental farms, of use of premiums, and of development of fairs the agricultural societies from the very first kept up an incessant, persistent, and prolonged agitation for agricultural education. While this part of their program will be more fully developed later on, some brief mention should be made of this fact here.


As early as October 7, 1822, the Albemarle Agricultural Society proposed that all the agricultural societies in the state join together and help establish an agricultural professorship at the University of Virginia.\footnote{R. H. True, "Minute Book of the Albemarle (Virginia) Agricultural Society," \textit{Annual Report of the American Historical Association for Year 1918, I (1921), p. 298.}}

This proposal and the address of the society's president, James Madison, to the other societies of the state received widespread publicity in the press of the day;\footnote{See Chapters III and IV.} but evidently the idea was too advanced for the times, since nothing came of it when the university opened its doors in 1825.

In 1854 the State Agricultural Society proposed to establish a professorship of agriculture at the University of Virginia and even secured $20,000 toward the proposal, but the plan fell through, primarily because of administrative difficulties.\footnote{See Chapter IV.} Considerable feeling was aroused over this proposal and undoubtedly had much to do a little over a decade later in arraying the state society against the university's plea for the Morrill Act land-grant scrip.\footnote{See Chapter VI.}

On the more local level the three decades prior to...
the outbreak of the Civil War saw societies and fairs building up an almost universal demand for agricultural education. The demands, however, were usually presented in the forms of flowery speeches extolling the virtues of agriculture as a profession and bemoaning its neglect in the scheme of education. In some instances the speakers or writers presented a somewhat detailed list of proposals for a system of agricultural education, but for the most part the agitation at the local level tended to be based on an appeal for self elevation, self glorification, and the glorification and elevation of the profession of farming.

A more detailed presentation of the proposals advanced for agricultural education will be presented in Chapter IV, but it can be safely asserted here that the agricultural societies and fairs in conjunction with the agricultural journals had by 1860 succeeded in developing a widespread interest in and a growing demand for agricultural education on both college and secondary school level. Tragically enough this sentiment was also a Civil War casualty in Virginia and was not revived to any great extent until close to the end of the nineteenth century.

79 See Chapter IV; also Farmers' Register I to X and Southern Planter I to IX. Note especially the presidential addresses to the agricultural societies for the period.

There can be no doubt that in addition to building up a favorable sentiment for agricultural education, the societies, the fairs, and the press were improving the condition of agriculture as well. Certainly the gloomy picture of ante bellum southern agriculture so frequently pictured does not seem to apply to Virginia during the decade just prior to the war. 81

An excellent summary of the effect of the societies and their programs of fairs and programs of agitation for agricultural education was given in the state's leading agricultural journal, the Southern Planter, in 1859 as follows:

Among the most prominent evidences of increased interest and energy in the promotion of agricultural progress and prosperity we think the rapid multiplication of fairs throughout the whole state may safely be considered; and they are too the best mode of keeping alive that special interest in all that pertains to husbandry -- which we are glad to believe has been awakened greatly through their instrumentality in the breasts of all our farmers. But a few years since and we had only two exhibitions in our borders, and these were county societies which owed their origin to a few public spirited gentlemen, who by their energetic efforts to induce a more liberal and thorough system of tillage which should better conform

81 For further support of this statement see Kathleen Bruce, "Virginia Agricultural Decline to 1860: A Fallacy," Agricultural History, VI (January, 1932), pp. 3-13; A. O. Craven, Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1606-1860, pp. 158-161.
to the scientific teachings of the age acquired for themselves the reputation of book farmers. ...But time has proved the benefits arising from these associations for developing and improving agricultural interests of the country -- even to the most prejudiced eye.

We have seen the fruits of these annual gatherings, by taste for improvement in our lands, implements and stock of every description, which has been created among the mass of our farmers in every part of the state. A general spirit of inquiry has gone abroad from these scenes [fairs and meetings of the societies] which has greatly tended to swell the ranks of "book farmers" and to furnish to agriculturists a great deal of valuable information of both a scientific and practical character which was entirely unknown to our forefathers...our farmers are not working less but they now think more....

The same spirit of progress which has given rise to these different societies has shown a still greater development in the formation of agricultural schools in connection with our state University and Military Institute...the necessity for such schools has been widely felt among us and we rejoice to know that they will soon be in operation.

In concluding this discussion of the agricultural societies it seems safe to say that the major burden of agricultural experimentation and education and the

---

8² Editorial, Southern Planter, XIX (December, 1859), pp. 774-775. For the references to the agricultural schools at the University of Virginia and the Virginia Military Institute see Chapter IV.
agitation for improvement in these areas was carried by the agricultural societies and their programs, especially their program of fairs, from 1800 to the establishment of the state college of agriculture in 1872. With the establishment of this agency many of the educational features long advocated and promoted by these societies gradually passed over into the program of education developed by this institution. With the subsequent establishment of the agricultural experiment station and the agricultural extension service at the college and the development of the program of these agencies, nearly every educational feature advocated by the Virginia agricultural societies for so long a time became, in fact, a part of the program in agricultural education in the state. It would not be accurate to say that the more than half a century of struggle and effort in Virginia to establish organizations to help agriculture culminated in the program evolved at the state college of agriculture, but it certainly seems reasonable to conclude that this long struggle helped pave the way for the program at the college and made it easier for this program to grow and develop in the state. In this long struggle the agricultural societies were ably assisted by the agricultural press, to which attention will be directed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

THE AGRICULTURAL PRESS

At the beginning of the nineteenth century agricultural books and periodicals in America were very scarce. Some agricultural subjects were treated in the newspapers of the day but not in any organized or systematic manner. The storehouse of scientific research of today was not available to the curious or experimental farmer of the period. He knew little if anything of plant or animal nutrition, of the reason that tillage made plants thrive, or of the chemical composition of plant food. He had no agricultural schools, experiment stations, or farm papers. Steel plows, mowers, rakes, reapers, and other labor-saving machinery were improvements to come only in the future. In addition to the lack of a body of agricultural

---


2A. C. True, History of Agricultural Education in the United States 1785-1925, p. 28.


4Demaree, op. cit., p. 5.
information and a means for its dissemination, the agriculture of the day was greatly hindered by the farmer's excessive caution, skepticism, superstition, and suspicion toward new practices, new ideas, and new machines.\(^5\)

The exhausting type of agriculture referred to as practiced in eastern Virginia had reduced the fertility of the soil to such a low level\(^6\) that many planters were faced with the necessity of changing their practices, moving to the West, or facing ruin. If the available accounts are at all accurate, it seems that all three alternatives were brought into play before a solution was found.

Just before the nineteenth century a few of the more enterprising farmers and planters of Virginia had recognized the nature and the seriousness of the problem and had begun to experiment with new methods and crops. These men, notably Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and John Taylor, men already well known in public life, not only sought new crops and tillage methods but constantly exchanged ideas through letters and the press.\(^7\) Washington's

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 5.


\(^7\)A. O. Craven, Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland, 1605-1850, p. 66.
correspondence with Arthur Young, the foremost English agricultural writer, had caused the latter to hail Washington as a "brother farmer." Nearly half a century later when the fight against soil-depleting practices was getting under way in earnest, parts of this correspondence were spread before the farmers of the state by the Farmers' Register, thereby bringing the great Washington's name back into the struggle for improved agriculture.

The activity of these early reformers did not have much immediate effect on agricultural practices as a whole but did tend to give prestige to agricultural inquiry and experimentation and undoubtedly helped hasten the rallying of Virginia's "gentleman farmers" to a program of agricultural reform. In addition to these effects the experiments conducted by these early reformers added a bit to the storehouse of agricultural information beginning slowly to accumulate at this time.

In order to be of maximum value it was necessary that this storehouse of knowledge be not only increased but also disseminated widely. A few of the early agricultural leaders recognized these facts and very early in the century

---


turned to agricultural pamphlets and to the newspapers as a medium for spreading agricultural information. With the development of the agricultural societies to which reference has already been made, increased emphasis was placed on disseminating agricultural information, with the result that there developed within the state, as elsewhere in the United States, an agricultural press designed chiefly to collect and disseminate agricultural information.

It is the purpose at this time to present a brief sketch of the development of the agricultural press in Virginia as this development influenced agricultural education. No attempt will be made to piece together the total, and as yet untold, story of the agricultural press in all its various phases. In addition to limiting this treatment to those contributions of the press most directly affecting agricultural education, the major emphasis, in harmony with the plan of this study, will be given to the period prior to 1872, the date of the establishment of the state agricultural college.

While it is known that some of the more intelligent of the Virginia farmers were familiar with the Memoirs and Transactions of the Philadelphia Society for Promoting Agriculture and had even on occasion contributed articles
to the society,\textsuperscript{11} the first book or pamphlet seeming to have markedly significant influence on Virginia agriculture was the \textit{Treatise on Practical Farming}, published in 1803 by John Binns, of Loudoun County.\textsuperscript{12} Some controversy seems to have developed at a later date concerning some of the claims of priority for usage and discovery of the value of gypsum as set forth by Binns, but neither this dispute nor the fact that the style of writing seemed to indicate that the writer understood "handling his plow better than his pen"\textsuperscript{13} seems to have impaired the value of the pamphlet. Thomas Jefferson in sending copies of it to England's great agriculturists, Sir John Sinclair and William Strickland, said that the application to Loudoun County soil of the practices set forth in the pamphlet had changed that county from one whose land was exhausted by bad husbandry into "the most productive in Virginia."\textsuperscript{14} R. H. True in commenting on Binns and the effect of his pamphlet says, "It is not given to many men tied by their circumstance to the soil to make a poor

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11}Benjamin Perley Poore, "History of Agriculture of the United States," United States Department of Agriculture Report, 1865, p. 513.
  \item \textsuperscript{12}A. C. True, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 29.
  \item \textsuperscript{13}R. H. True, "John Binns of Loudoun," \textit{William and Mary Quarterly Historical Magazine}, II, Series 2 (January, 1922), p. 20.
  \item \textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 21.
\end{itemize}
county the richest in a great state and to make that county the synonym of progress among thinking men in all parts of the nation."^15

Perhaps the greatest of all pamphlets or books contributing to agricultural education published in Virginia during the first two decades of the nineteenth century was John Taylor's Arator, published first as separate agricultural essays but brought together and published anonymously in 1813, then quickly followed by a revised and enlarged edition under Taylor's name in 1814.^16 This edition was quickly followed by several more, the sixth and last being published in 1818.^17

Arator was the first publication of importance in Virginia, calling the people's attention to the depleted condition of the soils of Tidewater and Piedmont and at the same time offering a system of cure. Taylor has truthfully been called the first great agricultural reformer of Virginia.^18 Writing with a fluent style and the fervid zeal of the true reformer, he pictured agri-


^17A. C. True, op. cit., p. 30.

culture as a great and glorious way of life, superior to all other ways. At the same time he pointed out that faulty husbandry had impoverished the soil and that it now behooved the planter "not to impoverish but to fertilize the soil and make it more useful than in its natural state." After a "trumpet-tongued exposure" of the ruinous practices which he conceived as centered chiefly around tobacco culture, the overseer system on the large plantation, and the tariff, Taylor turned to suggested remedies, the most significant of which centered around his plan for manuring the soil. His successful application of his theories to his own plantation made him generally regarded as one of the great agricultural leaders of the day. He saw the real problem of agriculture as based on soil depletion and insisted that any program of improvement must start with the soil. He rejected the more than a century-old idea that tobacco must have new land to be grown successfully and advanced

19Taylor, op. cit., p. 11.


21Taylor, op. cit., p. 11, ff.

the then somewhat startling idea that instead of new land a system of manuring to restore and enrich the old land was the real need.\(^\text{23}\)

This publication made a stir throughout the soil-depleted sections of Virginia, especially in the Tidewater area where depletion was the worst. Testimonials as to its value were numerous in the contemporary publications of that day and of the two decades following.\(^\text{24}\)

An advertisement in the *Richmond Enquirer*, one of the leading newspapers of the day, is typical of the reception given *Arator* from all quarters:

> *Arator*, by John Taylor, President of the Agricultural Society of Virginia.
> Since the first publication of this work comprising a system of agriculture almost entirely new to this section of country the faces of many districts have been visibly improved. Its merits can scarcely be sufficiently appreciated since within seven years from the publication of the first edition, lands which before exhibited a cadaverous aspect, managed and cultivated on the plan advised by *Arator* have considerably increased both in fertility and product....

---


It is not designed to speak extravagantly of a work already well known, but the improvement of an agricultural country depends very essentially on good treatises and Arator is well adapted for that end.\(^5\)

Unfortunately for the cause of agricultural education many of Taylor's theories were not universally applicable to all the types of soils on which they were tried. When some faults of his theories became known, there was a tendency on the part of many to reject the good along with the defective, while in some instances the disappointments resulting from the failure of his theories turned to open hostility and suspicion of book farming.\(^26\)

In spite of this adverse effect in some sections, Arator hastened the focusing of serious thought on the faults of agricultural practices in Tidewater and much of Piedmont and gave impetus to the idea of seeking new ways to meet the current difficulties. Perhaps the greatest contribution made by Taylor through his Arator was not the actual practices recommended but the stimulus his proposals had in promoting the idea, or belief, that agriculture could possibly be improved by serious study. As Bruce expressed

\(^{25}\) Advertisement, Richmond Enquirer, August 25, 1818.

\(^{26}\) A. O. Craven, Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Maryland and Virginia, 1505-1850, p. III; "On Improvement of Lands in the Central Region of Virginia," Farmers' Register, I (March, 1834), p. 585.
it, John Taylor incited Virginia's young men "...to study agriculture seriously and personally direct their estates."27

Other pamphlets dealing with the problems of agricultural improvement seem to have been published during the first two decades of the nineteenth century, but none seems to have aroused so much enthusiasm as the two just mentioned. Perhaps the most noteworthy one in addition to the two mentioned was the Memoirs, published by the Agricultural Society of Virginia in 1818.28 This publication, somewhat similar to Arator in pointing out the defects of the agricultural practices29 in the state, consisted chiefly of articles written by individual members of the society on practices and ways of improving agriculture. The members of the society felt that although full publicity had been given to their deliberations and proceedings by the newspapers,30 a permanent publication of their experiments would be of additional value in making the advantages derived by a few available to all.31


28Memoirs of the Society of Virginia for Promoting Agriculture Containing Communications on Various Subjects in Husbandry and Rural Affairs (1818).

29Ibid., p. iii.

30Ibid., p. iv.

31Literary and Evangelical Magazine, II (January, 1819), p. 34.
One indirect effect of these pamphlets and booklets was to stimulate faith on the part of many leaders in the value of the printed word as a medium for spreading agricultural information. This faith in turn helped launch many of the agricultural periodicals which played such an important part in the development of agriculture and agricultural education in Virginia during nearly the entire nineteenth century. Altogether there were eleven of these agricultural periodicals published in Virginia prior to 1861. Several additional ones appeared but were discontinued between 1861 and 1900. Of the entire ante bellum group only the *Southern Planter*, established in 1841, has, with the exception of a short period during the Civil War, been in continuous existence to this day.

The *Agricultural Museum*, first published on July 4, 1810, at Georgetown, D. C., seems to have been the first strictly agricultural periodical published in America. This journal, while not published in Virginia, was the official organ of the Columbian Agricultural Society whose programs and fairs were, as pointed out, supported by many Virginians. It was designed to be a repository of agric-

---

32 R. M. Brown, "Virginia Agricultural Periodicals Prior to 1861," N.D. A one-page typewritten list of periodicals. For this list see Appendix C.

cultural information and to serve as a medium of communication of ideas among the farmers of the area; but it was short-lived, going out of existence in May, 1812, no doubt as a result of the War with England. There is no direct evidence that the 
Museum influenced later agricultural periodicals, but it seems reasonable to conclude that it made its small contribution to the developing forces of agricultural education in Virginia. This conclusion seems all the more reasonable when it is realized that men like Jefferson, Madison, and Taylor, early identified with the development of agricultural societies in Virginia, were almost certainly familiar with the Columbian Agricultural Society and the Agricultural Museum.

More important to Virginia than the Agricultural Museum was the American Farmer, started in 1819, at nearby Baltimore, and heavily patronized by Virginians for more than a decade before the successful launching of the Farmers' Register in 1833, by Edmund Ruffin, at Shell-banks, Prince George County, Virginia. Stimulated by the

34 A. C. True, A History of Agricultural Education..., p. 28.

35 Demaree, op. cit., footnote 2, p. 23.

36 Benjamin Perley Poore, op. cit., p. 521.

writings of John Taylor’s *Arator* and aware of the depleted conditions of the soil in his native state of Maryland, John Stuart Skinner decided in 1819 to establish the *American Farmer*. This journal which largely served as a model for agricultural papers throughout the country, especially Virginia, early stated its aim and purpose as being "to collect information from every source, on every branch of husbandry, thus to enable the reader to study the various systems which experience has proven to be the best under given circumstances.""\(^{40}\)

Examination of this periodical reveals that in attempting to achieve this objective it covered a wide range of subjects through original articles and reprints compiled from a variety of sources in this country and abroad. The *American Farmer* spread before its readers numerous articles on new plants, practices, and agricultural experimentation; on common school education, especially agricultural


\(^{39}\)A. C. True, *History of Agricultural Education* ..., p. 28.

\(^{40}\)"To the Public," *American Farmer*, I (April, 1819), p. 6.

\(^{41}\)"Agriculture; Papers," *American Farmer*, VI (June, 1824), p. 97, ff.
education; on the establishment and progress of agricultural societies; and on the improvement of livestock and machinery. Its early volumes carried numerous articles by and about Virginians on Virginia agriculture and the activities of the agricultural societies in the state, and in addition carried the first printing of Edmund Ruffin's famous "Essay on Calcareous Manures."

The proposal of the Albemarle Agricultural Society to establish a professorship of agriculture at the University of Virginia received the hearty endorsement and full support of the American Farmer, while education, especially agricultural education and the manual labor schools, received its almost continuous attention throughout the entire period before the establishment of the Farmers' Register. In his efforts to promote education the editor drew heavily on original contributions and re-

---


44 See Chapter IV.

prints from other papers and then frequently boosted the articles by writing favorable comments or a favorable introduction to them.46

Fellenburg's manual labor school was described in considerable detail on several different occasions, usually with pertinent questions and comments as to the appropriateness of such a scheme for agricultural instruction.47 So enthusiastic, in fact, did the outstanding Virginian, R. K. Meade, become over the efforts of the American Farmer on behalf of agricultural education that he wrote a lengthy letter in some detail concerning the Fellenburg plan and highly commended the editor for all the publicity he had given the cause of agricultural education.48

Undoubtedly the activities of the American Farmer influenced the thinking and the agricultural practices of many leading Virginians and did yeoman service in arousing speculation and spreading thought concerning the possibilities of agricultural education. The times, the conditions, and the state of organized agricultural information in Virginia were not ready for agricultural education in

46 See especially American Farmer, I, IV, VII, IX.


the way of schools; but the American Farmer certainly
helped start the discussions and the thinking which usually
have to precede the establishment of any new educational
program.

The claim for being the first agricultural periodical
actually published in the state seems to go to the Virginia
Farmer, published at Scottsville, in 1832, although this
publication, in the words of its editor "...drooped like
a harebell before the sun" upon the appearance of the
Farmers' Register one year later. No copies of the Vir­
ginia Farmer are known to be extant, but the reprint of
an article from it in the Farmers' Register indicates
that it was attempting to do on a smaller local scale what
the American Farmer had done on a much larger scale.

The Virginia Farmer, as just indicated, was followed
almost immediately by the Farmers' Register, begun by
Edmund Ruffin, in 1833, in Prince George County. This
publication appeared at a most opportune time as far as
Virginia was concerned, for the eastern part of this state
had reached the height -- or perhaps depth is the better
word -- of agricultural depression and ruin caused by the
soil-depleting system of agriculture inherited from Colonial

49 "From the Virginia Farmer." Farmers' Register, I (July, 1838), p. 128.
50 Loc. cit.
Excessive emigration from Virginia was threatening entire counties and was throwing worn-out land on the market, thereby forcing land prices down, while at the same time crop yields from depleted soils were so reduced it was asserted that their worth in 1831 was no more than it had been eighty years before. Bitter intra-state sectionalism between the east and the west was threatening the very existence of the state and affecting all efforts toward programs of internal improvement, education, and even the effort to establish an agricultural professorship at the University of Virginia. Many of the large farms or estates, notably those of Madison, Monroe, and the deceased Jefferson, were either bankrupt or close to being so, while the great estate of Washington, one of the pioneers in agricultural reform, was now reported to be an agricultural ruin. The spectacle of Virginia's ancient aristocracy and plantations was sad indeed.


54 See Chapter IV.

55 Turner, op. cit., p. 59; Schaffer, op. cit., p. 112; "Soils and Farming in Fairfax County," Farmers' Register, I (February, 1834), p. 552.
It was into this condition of despair "...which spread over the face of the country like a pall" that Ruffin projected the *Farmers' Register*. Its acceptance by the agricultural leaders of the day was almost instantaneous. John Stuart Skinner, the noted editor of the *American Farmer*, called it the "best publication on agriculture which this country or Europe has ever produced." James L. Garnett recommended it highly to the Fredericksburg Agricultural Society, while several agricultural societies -- one as far west as Rockbridge County -- offered subscriptions to the *Farmers' Register* as premiums at the annual fair. Numerous letters to the editor from persons claiming to be "practical farmers," "dirt farmers," and "plain farmers" poured out praise for the *Farmers' Register* and were duly carried on its pages.

In an early editorial Ruffin presented a statement in which he set forth his aims and ambitions for the 

57 Quoted by A. O. Craven in Edmund Ruffin, Southerner, p. 62.
60 "Remarks on the First Number of the Farmers' Register," *Farmers' Register*, I (August, 1833), pp. 183-185; See also II and VI.
publication. Since this statement comes so close to picturing what the Farmers' Register actually did accomplish, it is here presented in its entirety:

It would serve the farmers as an Exchange does for merchants -- an institution which would enable every individual to obtain readily any and every kind of information that any other individual is able to furnish. Whenever one of our readers wishes to be informed on any point connected with agriculture, let him freely make the inquiry through the Farmers' Register and let those who can as freely answer.51

At the same time the editor set forth his statement of wishes for his Farmers' Register, he also gave a list of topics which he would include in the publication. This list is also indicative of what the Farmers' Register actually did include and for this reason is presented here as follows:

1. Original communications of experiments, observations and opinions, on agriculture, gardening, and domestic economy.

2. Selections from the best periodicals, publications on agriculture European and American, and from such other agricultural works as have not been published in this country, or as are not generally accessible.

51"To the Readers and Patrons of the Farmers' Register," Farmers' Register, I (June, 1833), p. 52.
3. Reviews or notices of agricultural work.

4. The discussion of such subjects of political economy as are connected with the preservation and support of the interests of agriculture.

5. Chemistry as connected with agriculture -- and with some limitation, botany, mineralogy, geology, and natural history.

6. Reports of the topography, soils, minerals, peculiar manures, and actual state of agriculture of every county of Virginia from which such information can be obtained.

7. The consideration of public improvements by roads, railways and canals.

8. Discoveries in science, or arts, and the occurrence of other events that are considered likely to affect the interests of agriculture.

Ruffin felt that one of the important things needed for the promotion and improvement of agriculture was a more adequate discovery, collection, and dissemination of agricultural information. He believed that individual farmers in different parts of the state through practical experience in operating farms had acquired much valuable information which they could and would share with others through his journal if given an opportunity to do so. This belief in the willingness of farmers to take "pen in

Ibid., p. 54.
hand" and put their knowledge of farming practices into writing seems to have been quite successful at first, with the number of contributors growing from seven to one hundred within the first year of publication. After this initial success, however, this source of information became quite uncertain. It would seem that once each contributor had made his first contribution, he had little more to say and immediately became a reader rather than a contributor or a participant, a situation not unlike the one which constantly faced the agricultural societies of the period. As a result of the decline in the number of contributors Ruffin found it necessary that he himself write most of the material for his publication.

An examination of the ten volumes of the Farmers' Register reveals that information on practically every question that might conceivably interest the Virginia farmer was presented in its pages at one time or another. It encouraged the development of agricultural societies as the American Farmer had done, but at the same time it urged that the programs and fairs sponsored by these societies be not only entertaining but so organized as to contribute to

63 "Number and Increase of Correspondents," Farmers' Register, I (February, 1834), p. 575.

experimentation in agriculture and to the collection and dissemination of agricultural information. 55

Considerable agitation was carried on in the columns of this periodical for legislative aid for agriculture. This agitation clearly reflected the political strife brought on by sectional differences within the state and the paralyzing preoccupation of the politicians with national issues to the decided detriment of internal state conditions. Sometimes humorously and sometimes bitterly the agitators frequently confessed at the outset that they had little hope for help from the politicians. Many letters published in the Farmers' Register at this time expressed a sentiment of bitterness in harmony with the following sentiment expressed by one able correspondent to the effect that the legislator's

ambition is directed not to pull fodder and to secure the staff of life but as orators to gather laurels by making long-winded speeches and to have their names in the newspapers as nullifiers or union men: to make a noise of guarding the phantom of liberty with the sword of oratory while lank poverty comes in like a strong man at their back. 66


Many of the correspondents to the *Register* recognized the dangers of excessive legislative preoccupation with politics to the exclusion of the less exciting agriculture. James Barbour, a former Governor of Virginia, warned in 1835, "The interests of agriculture so far as the government is concerned have been too insignificant in the general strife to receive the slightest consideration."  

In 1834 James M. Garnett added the weight of his trenchant pen to the condemnation of the legislature for its oratory on political abstractions "with which no duty whatever calls upon them to intermeddle." He then proceeded to warn that more trouble was ahead unless aid was forthcoming for agriculture and education. Continuing his warning, Garnett added, "It is education, education alone, not abstract discussions and party politics, which will enable these sons to understand -- to value as they ought -- and defend their rights from whatever quarter they may be assailed."  

Ruffin himself in reporting on the failure of the legislature to act on the memorial of 1836 presented to it by the State Agricultural Society claimed that so in-  

---

67 "On the Improvement of Agriculture and the Importance of Legislative Aid to That Object," *Farmers' Register*, II (April, 1835), p. 703.


69 *Loc. cit.*

70 See Chapter II.
different was the sentiment of the politicians toward agriculture that the memorial was not even discussed in committee, much less reported out for consideration. He then proceeded in a somewhat caustic manner to assail the tendency of the legislature to deal so eloquently with memorials on the national issues and neglect things of importance on the state level. With an insight seemingly not very prevalent in Virginia of his day, Ruffin claimed that this pattern of dealing with national issues was set by Madison, Taylor, Giles, and other such intellectual giants when times and conditions were different and such memorials did change or affect national events. However, Ruffin argued, the conditions which made such procedures effective were past and all that could be accomplished by such a practice now was to turn the legislature into a debating society, accomplishing little on the national level and nothing on the local level. A little later during the same year Ruffin published a letter warning the State Agricultural Convention that if they adopted a memorial asking aid from the legislature to word it so as to avoid the possibility of its being twisted into a party question, "for if it can be twisted, farewell to justice, farewell

71"Result of the Petition of the Agricultural Convention," Farmers' Register, IV (May, 1836), pp. 53-55.

72Ibid., p. 54.
to truth, farewell to all the great interests of state
should they seem to conflict with the interests of the
party." 73

This agitation for state aid and the denunciation of
state neglect of agriculture, although vigorous, was not
very successful during the life-time of the Farmers' Reg-
ister in diverting legislative interest and energy from
the national issues of the day to more local problems,
especially to local problems of agriculture. Even so, it
seems reasonable to believe that it helped plant and nour-
ish the idea that agriculture was worthy of legislative
aid, for that idea has never been dead in Virginia from
that day to this.

In the previously mentioned ways and others the Farm-
ers' Register helped pave the way for agricultural educa-
tion. It published numerous articles condemning the preju-
dice against "book learning" applied to agriculture. 74
It encouraged agricultural tours by individuals and by
agricultural societies as an educational device and, most
interestingly, published a proposal by a subscriber that

73Commentator, "Agricultural Convention," Farmers' Regis-
ter, IV (November, 1836), p. 434.

74"An Apology for Book Farmers," Farmers' Register, II
(June, 1834), p. 17; "Cheap Elementary Agricultural Publi-
cations Needed. Agricultural Books for Schools," Ibid., VI
(August, 1836), p. 262; "The Common Objection to Agricul-
tural Periodicals and Especially Considered in Regard to
an agent be employed to travel over the state to lecture on agricultural topics, to organize agricultural schools and societies, and to carry agricultural information from the agricultural journals and reports to the farmers.75 It is interesting to note that now more than a century later every one of these proposals is being met in one way or another by personnel employed in part or in whole by the state.

For eight years Ruffin succeeded in keeping political discussions and debates out of his journal, but in 1840 he took it into this forbidden field and at once encountered deep hostility.76 This hostility, coupled with other factors which the hotheaded Ruffin construed as general apathy and indifference of the agricultural community toward improvement, caused him in disgust to abandon the publication77 of the Farmers' Register in 1842.

The effectiveness of the Farmers' Register as a medium for spreading agricultural information, promoting the cause of improved agriculture, and laying the foundations for the future development of agricultural education cannot be denied if we are to believe the contemporary and later


77Editorial, Farmers' Register, X (April, 1842), p. 155.
testimonials as to its contribution and value.\textsuperscript{78} Coupled
with the other agencies of reform operating at the same
time,\textsuperscript{79} it helped dissipate the spirit of gloom and despair
which had settled over the country and helped in disseminating
the knowledge of numerous methods of agricultural im-
provement, all of which led to a new spirit in eastern Vir-
ginia in which "despair gave way to hope and to belief that
it was possible to achieve a measure of prosperity without
emigration."\textsuperscript{80}

It was into the light of this new hope and spirit,
largely nurtured and brought alive by the Farmers' Register,
that the \textit{Southern Planter} was born in January, 1841, and
at once entered into its self-appointed task of becoming a
"medium for the promulgation in a condensed form of obser-
vations and deductions of practical men\textsuperscript{81} in the field of
agriculture. This journal was established by Charles T.
Botts, at Richmond, Virginia, and with the exception of a
short period of suspended publication during the Civil War,

\textsuperscript{78}See especially A. O. Craven, \textit{Soil Exhaustion as a
Factor in the Agricultural History of Maryland and Virginia,
1800-1850}, p. 137; E. G. Swem, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 42-43; H. G.
Ellis, "Edmund Ruffin: His Life and Times," John P. Branch
Historical Papers of Randolph-Kacon College, III (June,

\textsuperscript{79}See especially Gray, \textit{op. cit.}, II, Chapter XXXIII.

\textsuperscript{80}Gray, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 915.

\textsuperscript{81}"Prospectus of Southern Planter," \textit{Southern Planter}, I
has served the cause of agriculture in Virginia and the South continuously from that year to this and now claims -- seemingly with good basis -- to be the oldest agricultural journal in America.

Charles T. Boyl, the founder of the Southern Planter, regarded the Farmers' Register very highly but felt that it was too scholarly, high-priced, and theoretical for the great mass of Virginia farmers. He determined, therefore, to introduce into Virginia a paper at so small a price as to bring it within reach of all and to reject "long and even perhaps able essays" in order to secure popular support. In addition he promised to extract work from foreign and domestic publications and to add valuable communications applicable to southern soils.

Just as the Farmers' Register appeared at a fortunate stage in the development of Virginia's agriculture, so did the Southern Planter. By 1814 the forces of agricultural reform were getting under way and a new spirit of hope, enthusiasm, and faith was stirring. The common man was slowly awakening; the agricultural societies were beginning to popularize their programs, and forces demanding public free schools were slowly gathering west of the Blue Ridge

82Demaree, op. cit., p. 358.
84See Chapter II.
and infiltrating the eastern part of the state. The conditions seem to have been favorable for an agricultural journal designed to make a more popular appeal, for while the subscribers to the more scholarly and philosophical Farmers' Register were steadily falling in arrears,\(^5\) the circulation of the Southern Planter started at twelve hundred and rose steadily until by 1855 it had a circulation of more than forty-six hundred.\(^6\)

In general the ante bellum Southern Planter was similar to the Farmers' Register and took up the cause of agriculture in much the same manner as the Register. Each journal made its contribution in its own way. The Farmers' Register, rather somber, intellectual, philosophical, and crusading in style, with its editor inclined to resort to cutting invective on occasion, gave way to the Southern Planter which during the first decade of its existence tended in style to be rather ebullient, optimistic, and effervescent, with its first editor inclined to use the approach of the salesman and the inspirational tactics of the promoter. An excellent illustration of the different spirit of the two journals is revealed by the way each

\(^5\)"Depreciation and Worthless Bank Notes and Subscriptions to the Farmers' Register," Farmers' Register, IX (June, 1841), p. 303; "Editorial Comments," Ibid., X (April, 1842), p. 155.

handled the announcement that the state legislature in March, 1841, had passed an act authorizing the formation of a State Board of Agriculture. The Farmers' Register rather bluntly assailed the act creating the board as unsound, unwise, and unworkable. The editor referred to the law which created the board as "this wretched abortion which is the first born and sole measure of Virginian legislation for the aid or improvement of agriculture."\(^8^7\) The Southern Planter, on the other hand, heartily endorsed the establishment of the board, prophesied great things for it, and congratulated the Henrico Agricultural Society for its persevering action in working for its establishment.\(^8^8\) It is not likely that subsequent events which confirmed the Register's prophecy of failure weakened the Planter because of its more enthusiastic though less accurate report.

The Southern Planter, like the Farmers' Register before it, kept the question of agricultural education constantly before its readers until the Civil War caused its temporary suspension of publication. After resuming publication following the close of the war, it again took up the cause of agricultural education but not with the

\(^8^7\)Editorial note in Farmers' Register, IX (June, 1841), p. 323.

\(^8^8\)"Board of Agriculture," Southern Planter, I (April, 1841), p. 43.
same vigor of prewar days. This lack of vigorous agitation for agricultural education immediately following the war can best be explained, perhaps, by the editor's determination to follow a program of "eschewing politics." To follow this policy the editor most certainly had to be very cautious, for, as will be shown in Chapter VI, agricultural education immediately following the war became closely tied up in the politics involved in disposing of the state's share of the Morrill land-grant scrip. This determination to "eschew" politics probably also explains why the Southern Planter took such a small part in the legislative struggle from 1867 to 1872 to locate the land-grant college of agriculture. With the establishment of the college in 1872 the Southern Planter, though not having participated in its creation, became a staunch supporter of the college and has remained so until this day.

In December, 1873, the Southern Planter passed into the hands of L. R. Dickenson, an outspoken opponent of the public school system just getting under way. Shortly thereafter through the columns of the Southern Planter Dickenson launched a prolonged and bitter attack on the public schools


90 See Chapter VI.
but, apparently did them small harm. Following this futile attack, the Planter reverted to a more conservative program of supporting agricultural schools by articles, usually of a very general nature. This conservative program has been followed rather consistently from that day to this. Perhaps with the agricultural college and later on the experiment station an actuality the need was not so great, but the postwar Planter never crusaded so vigorously for agricultural schools as the ante bellum Planter was wont to do. During the first decade of the twentieth century, in fact, when agitation was getting under way for the teaching of agriculture in the high schools of the state, the Southern Planter seems to have been strangely quiet on the subject, thereby evoking at least two letters of protest from subscribers. Again in 1917-1918, when the Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture was getting under way in the secondary schools, the Planter had very little to say on the subject. In both instances, however, after the programs had been launched, the Planter threw its influence behind them and has been a staunch supporter of


education in agriculture ever since its introduction into the public schools.

As already indicated, other agricultural periodicals were published in Virginia prior to the Civil War, but none achieved the prominence, influence, or wide circulation of the Farmers' Register or the Southern Planter. In general these publications seem to have been similar to the previously named journals, the Farmer, published in Richmond, in 1856-57, being the nearest to these two in quality, style, and general make-up. It was combined with the Southern Planter as the Southern Planter and Farmer in January, 1858.

The Valley Farmer, started at Winchester, Virginia, by J. P. Bentley, in 1841, dealt largely with the problems of agriculture of the Valley section. This publication played a part in the formation of agricultural societies in the Valley and in the adjacent area now in West Virginia.

The Virginia Farmer, published by William G. Stevens, at Harrisonburg, Virginia, from January to December, 1856, has the unique but little known and almost forgotten distinction of having been edited by William Henry Stevens.

---

Ruffner,94 who was later to play a very important part in the establishment of the state agricultural college95 and a yet more important part in establishing the state public school system.96 It seems quite likely that this editorial experience helped shape Ruffner's conviction, shown later, that agricultural education must be practical rather than theoretical.

Most of these journals were short-lived but no doubt can be thought of as getting the ideas and the problems of improved agriculture and indirectly of agricultural education closer to the great mass of people so directly concerned.

The Virginia newspapers of the nineteenth century helped disseminate information conducive to the development of a sentiment for improved agriculture and of agricultural education beginning at an early date in the

94Editorial, The Virginia Farmer, I (April, 1856), p. 1. The only known complete copy of this periodical is to be found in the Ruffner Papers deposited in the Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Montreat, North Carolina. On the cover of this volume in Ruffner's handwriting appears the following statement: "The Virginia Farmer was started by Wm. G. Stevens who induced me to become Editor with the April number. It lasted only one year, 1856." See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of W. H. Ruffner.

95See Chapters VI and VII.

96See Chapter V.
No attempt will be made other than to sketch very briefly the important influence of this segment of the press on agricultural education.

The *Richmond Enquirer* as early as 1804 started publishing an occasional article on agriculture and in 1805 began publishing letters and articles in favor of establishing a state university in the interests of agriculture and agricultural education. In 1811 it embarked on a policy of reporting and printing the transactions of the agricultural societies in the state and seems to have followed this practice rather consistently until around 1820 and then somewhat intermittently until the Civil War. So much attention, in fact, did the *Enquirer* give to agricultural topics other than official society transactions that in 1813 the editor of the *Southern Planter* claimed its editor was "almost as much devoted to agriculture as to"

---


98 Demaree, op. cit., p. 11.


politics," an extravagant claim indeed when it is remembered that the ante bellum Enquirer was chiefly a political organ. By the middle of the nineteenth century the newspapers of the state were reprinting a great deal of agricultural information, so much so, in fact, that the editor of the Southern Planter was constrained to comment that such a practice was fine for disseminating agricultural information but hard on the Planter's subscription list and that readers so dependent upon reprints of agricultural information should remember they were dining at the second table.

The National Intelligencer, although published in nearby Washington, carried numerous references to Virginia agriculture. During the first four decades of the century it also carried on a rather vigorous agitation for manual labor schools to teach agriculture, thereby undoubtedly influencing the thinking of some of the Virginia leaders of the day.


104See National Intelligencer, May 17, 1811; November 30, 1822, January 2, 1841, passim.

Other newspapers frequently reported as disseminating agricultural information and carrying articles relative to agricultural education were the *Lynchburg Virginian*, which served the Piedmont and the southwestern part of the state; the *Fredericksburg Virginia Herald*, which largely served the northeastern part of the state; and the *Norfolk and Portsmouth Herald*, which served the seaboard and Tidewater section.\(^{106}\)

There can be no doubt that by 1850 the agricultural press had made a worthy contribution to the cause of agriculture and agricultural education. In summing up these contributions it must be remembered, however, that the press worked in close harmony and co-operation with the numerous agricultural societies and their fair programs throughout the state; therefore many of the contributions of one were in part the contribution of the other. It would seem that the outstanding contribution of the press up until the establishment of the state agricultural college was its dissemination of nearly every conceivable kind of agricultural information at a time when conservative practices, indifference, isolation, and often open hostility, acted to restrict to the confines of small communities the little bit of agricultural information that was known.

With remarkable unanimity the agricultural press of Virginia appealed to the individual farmers and to the agricultural societies and clubs to make use of their columns in seeking information, giving information, and expressing opinions on agricultural subjects. The press insisted that many farmers already had "model farms" and had already collected much information which only awaited spreading on the pages of journals to reach its maximum value to the farmers of the state. So effective was the press in promoting this idea, in fact, that when the agitation for agricultural schools began, many farmers protested the establishment of such agencies on the grounds that the very best kind of agricultural education could be derived by increased support of the agricultural journals which in turn could communicate the results of the "half a million experimental" farms already operating in Virginia.107

It has already been pointed out that the press with the co-operation of the agricultural societies kept alive for more than three decades before the Civil War the question of agricultural education. This important influence and contribution, however, will be given more consideration in Chapter IV where more attention will be given to the agitation, the proposals, and the efforts toward agricultural schools.

CHAPTER IV

DIRECT AGITATION FOR AND ATTEMPTS AT TEACHING AGRICULTURE BEFORE 1860

Perhaps the first recorded direct teaching of agriculture in Virginia, if not in the United States, occurred in 1609 when Captain John Smith captured two Indians, Kemps and Tassore by name, and had them instruct the Virginia colonists on how to grow corn. More than two and a half centuries elapsed after this first instruction, however, before conditions were such in the state that Virginia was able to establish her first permanent school for the specific purpose of teaching agriculture. This first school, the state agricultural college, was established in 1872; but it was not until the first decade of the twentieth century that attempts were successful to get agricultural instruction set up as a part of the state's secondary school program. The subsequent success of this college program and this secondary school program for education in agriculture has tended to obscure and overshadow the fact that much agitation, thought, and effort preceded these two developments.

and helped assure their present day success in the state. Perhaps of equal significance in obscuring the past efforts and agitation for agricultural education is the fact that the Civil War occurred just as this agitation was reaching its greatest intensity in the state and dealt not only this movement but agriculture as well such a devastating blow that neither made much real progress toward recovery until around the last decade of the nineteenth and the first decade of the twentieth century.

In this chapter the agitation and the attempts prior to 1860 to set up programs of agricultural education either as specific schools or as parts of schools or colleges will be presented. For the sake of convenience and clarity these efforts will be considered under the following headings: (1) the efforts on behalf of agricultural education at the University of Virginia, (2) the efforts on behalf of agricultural education below the university level, and (3) the actual attempts to teach agriculture. This latter division will include Virginia's ante bellum attempts to set up manual labor schools. The establishment of the state agricultural college following the close of the Civil War will be discussed in Chapter VI.
The Efforts on Behalf of Agricultural Education
At the University of Virginia

As early as 1800 Thomas Jefferson had proposed agriculture as one of the sciences to be taught in the university he was proposing for the state, while by 1805 letters were appearing in the Richmond Enquirer, urging the establishment of the University of Virginia to help "agriculture and the republican form of government." This latter type of argument so prevalent for the first two or three decades of the nineteenth century was not in reality so much an argument for direct education for agriculture as it was a plea for help to sustain an agrarian society so ardently espoused by Jefferson.

In 1814 Jefferson in a letter to the president of the Board of Trustees of Albemarle Academy, from which developed the University of Virginia, advocated a school of rural economy for "agricultors" to be included in the plan of studies for the proposed University of Virginia; but when the movement to establish a state university really got under way in the legislature of 1816-17, the question of

2A.C. True, op. cit., p. 57.

3"The Petition of Agriculture and Republicanism to the Legislature of Virginia," Richmond Enquirer, December 6, 1805.

4J.W. Randolph, Early History of the University of Virginia as Contained in the Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell, p. 387.
agricultural education does not seem to have entered into the deliberations to any great extent.

In 1818 the first provision for the establishment of the university was passed by the legislature. This provision was in reality "engrafted" upon the "Act Appropriating Part of the Revenue of the Literary Fund and for Other Purposes" and made no mention of agriculture. In 1819, however, the act entitled "An Act Establishing An University," was passed by the legislature. This legislation was rather complete in detail as to the organization, the administration, and the curricula of the university. Included in the curricula to be taught were "...the principles of agriculture, chemistry, mineralogy, including geology, botany, zoology...." More important, perhaps, than the legal provision for including agriculture in the curricula to be offered was the fact that the debates and the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the university aroused much sectional bitterness, especially between the eastern part of the state which on the whole favored the idea of a university and the western part of the state which opposed the idea of a university chiefly on the grounds that it unjustly took money from the support of education.

---


6 Virginia, Acts of the Assembly 1818-1819, Chapter XIX, p. 15.
of free schools. This sectional bitterness against the university continued until the Civil War and the secession of West Virginia and, as will be shown, influenced the attempts to establish agricultural education at the university.

In 1825 when the university finally opened its doors, the political conditions resulting from the just-mentioned bitterness against it, as well as financial conditions, seemingly had crowded out agriculture as a distinct branch. It was, however, listed as "rural economy," the last named of six sciences assigned to a single professor to teach. Needless to say, agricultural education did not flourish under such conditions.

Even before the university opened its doors, agitation had begun for a professorship of agriculture to be established there. In October, 1822, the Albemarle Agricultural Society adopted a resolution introduced by General John H. Cocke, proposing the establishment of a professorship of agriculture and a model farm at the state university. At the same time the society set aside $1,000 for the professorship and requested the president, James Madison, to write to all the other societies in the state and urge them...

---

to cooperate in establishing this professorship. The preamble of this interesting and remarkable resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the establishment of a Professorship of Agriculture in one of the principal seminaries of learning in this state is a measure eminently calculated to hasten and perpetuate the march of agricultural improvement already so happily commenced; and whereas, there are grounds to believe that such an institution may be incorporated into the University of Virginia a position at once the most advantageous and convenient to every part of the state: And whereas this Society could not make an appropriation of its funds more conducive to the permanent attainment of the primary objects of its institution - and as it is reasonable to expect that all the Agricultural Societies, the Farmers and Planters generally will cheerfully contribute to an Establishment of such universal interest - Therefore, Resolved...

Madison as president of the society prepared an address to the other societies of the state. This address was given wide publicity in the press of the day and was distributed to the members of the legislature. Because


11 Randolph, op. cit., p. 278; see also "Agricultural Schools," American Farmer, V (March, 1823), p. 6; National Intelligencer, November 30, 1822; Niles Register, XXIII (November, 1822), pp. 202-203.
of its influence in shaping the thinking of so many of the advocates of agricultural education for the next several decades but more particularly because of its portrayal of the thinking of the leaders of the day, this address is reproduced in its entirety here:

Sir: The enclosed resolutions of the Agricultural Society of Albemarle, explain the wish of the Society to provide for Agriculture the advantage of a Professorship, to be incorporated in the University of Virginia; the means proposed for making the provision; and the hope entertained of a general cooperation in the scheme.

The present seems to be an important crisis in the Agriculture of Virginia. The portions of her soil first brought into cultivation have, for the most part, been exhausted of its natural fertility without being repaired by a meliorating system of husbandry; and much of what remains in forest and can be spared from the demands of fuel and other rural wants, will need improvement on the first introduction of the plough.

These truths are now sufficiently impressed on the public attention; and have led to the establishment of the Agricultural Societies among us which are so laudably promoting the work of reform.

As a further means of advancing the great object, it has occurred to the Albemarle Society, that a distinct Professorship in the University of the State, if sanctioned by the proper authority might be advantageously appropriated to the instruction of such as might attend, in the theory and practice of rural economy, in its several branches.

To the due success of agriculture as of other arts, theory and practice are both requisite. - They always reflect light on each other. If the former, without the
test of the latter, be a vain science; the latter without the enlightened precepts of the former, is generally enslaved to ancient modes, however erroneous, or is at best but too tardy and partial in adopting salutary changes. In no instance, perhaps, is habit more unyielding or irrational practice more prevalent than among those who cultivate the earth. And this is the more to be lamented as agriculture is still so far below the attainments to which it may fairly aspire.

A professorship of agriculture might derive special advantage from the lights thrown out from the Chair of Chemistry in that Institution. This science is every day penetrating some of the hidden laws of nature, and tracing the useful purposes to which they may be made subservient. Agriculture is a field on which it has already begun to shed its rays, and on which it promises to do much towards unveiling the processes of nature to which the principles of agriculture are related. The professional lectures on chemistry which are to embrace those principles could not fail to be auxiliary to a professorship having lessons on agriculture for its essential charge.

The fund contemplated for the support of such a professorship is to consist of a sum drawn from unexpended subscriptions, from special donations and from a diffusive contribution not exceeding a dollar from an individual. It is hoped that for a purpose of such general utility, the number of contributors will more than make up for the smallness of the respective sums; and that with the other resources, means may be gathered not only adequate to the immediate views entertained; but justifying an enlargement of them.

Should this prove to be the case it will be an improvement of the plan of agricultural instruction to provide and place under the Professor, a small farm in the
vicinage, to be cultivated, partly as a pattern farm illustrating practically a system at once profitable and improving partly as an experimental farm, not only bringing to the test new modes of culture and management, but introducing new plants and animals deemed worthy of experiment. In obtaining these, aid might be found in the patriotic attention of the public and private Naval Commanders in their visits to foreign countries; and it might well happen that occasional success in rearing new species or varieties of peculiar value would yield in seeds and stocks a profit defraying the expenses incurred on this head.

A farm exhibiting an instructive model, observed as it would be by occasional visitors and understood as it would be in its principles and plans by students returning to their dispersed homes, would tend to spread information on the subject of agriculture and to cherish that spirit of imitation and emulation which is the source of improvement in every art and enterprise.

You will oblige, Sir, the Society of Albemarle by laying this communication before that over which you preside; and by transmitting its sentiments thereon; which will afford particular pleasure if they should accord with the views of this Society, and promise so valuable a cooperation in carrying them into effect.12

John Stuart Skinner, the editor of the American Farmer, enthusiastically endorsed the proposal and "hastened to lay it before the readers." "It was to have been expected," he said, "that a society which boasts of its Barbourds, Randolphs, Cockes, Divers, Minors and others -- with President

Madison at its head would do something worthy of themselves and the great objects of their association."\(^{13}\)

The societies and farmers of the state, however, do not seem to have shared Skinner's enthusiasm. The university which as yet had not opened its doors was not very popular over the state as a whole, while the interested friends of the university were already being heavily solicited for donations with which to complete the establishment of the university itself. Altogether a sum of between $3,000 and $4,000 seems to have been raised toward the professorship, but the entire scheme seemingly collapsed when this money was loaned to a person without proper security and "his circumstances having changed, the money was lost."\(^{14}\)

This defection growing out of these "changed circumstances" seems to have brought an end to this particular plan, among the first, if not the very first, advanced in the United States to establish a chair of agriculture at a state university.

The agitation was not dropped, however. In November of 1825 James Barbour, one-time governor of Virginia, United States Senator, Secretary of War, and Ambassador to England,\(^{15}\) and, more important for this study, father of

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 273.

\(^{14}\)Editor's note in Randolph, op. cit., p. 279.

\(^{15}\)See article on James Barbour in Dictionary of American Biography, I, p. 590.
the state Literary Fund for aid to education,16 took up the fight in his presidential address to the Albemarle Society. Barbour, a self-educated man, in his address deplored the excessive interest given by the people of the state to intellectual pursuits and the "learned professions." As a partial remedy he proposed a memorial to the legislature, "asking for the establishment of an agricultural professorship in your University to which should be appended a pattern farm of 'various soil'."17 He argued that a widely dispersed agricultural population needed a focal point where agricultural information could be brought together and from which it could be disseminated.18 Nothing came of this proposal until in the legislature of 1830-31 Barbour submitted two resolutions to the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Delegates, proposing therein a chair of agriculture and "a pattern farm" in connection with it to be established in the university.19 The committee accepted the proposal for the professorship and introduced a resolution proposing that the Board of Visitors of the university be asked to report a plan for an agricul-

16 See Chapter V.
18 Loc. cit.
tural professorship to be established at the university.

In the report accompanying the resolution introduced at this time, the committee recognized the novelty of proposing state aid for agriculture. Mr. Rives, the chairman, frankly stated that the idea had been tried only twice before in Virginia, once in Colonial times to get more tobacco and once during the Revolution to get more food. Since the idea was so new, he felt that the state should move slowly. He did feel, though, that the knowledge of how to improve agriculture was available but as yet awaited some means of promotion and dissemination to the agricultural leaders. The need for improvement, he felt, was acute, especially in the Tidewater section; but any mistake made at this time, he was sure, would do agriculture more harm than good.20 It was probably this feeling of caution as well as the novelty of the proposal that caused the committee to propose having the Board of Visitors of the university introduce a plan for the professorship.

Immediately upon introduction of the resolution with its report, Barbour tried to get an amendment attached to the resolution to provide for a pattern farm as well as the professorship of agriculture.21 The debate on the amendment precipitated a hot fight in the legislature which


21 Ibid., p. 130.
resulted in the defeat of both the amendment and the resolution by the western delegates who took this opportunity to strike at the university they hated so passionately on the grounds that it was only for the sons of the rich and was unjustly depriving the western part of the state of its share of the Literary Fund.

Barbour, however, did not give up the fight for the professorship with the defeat of his proposal at this time. In 1835 in yet another address to the Albemarle Agricultural Society, he reiterated many of his proposals made nearly a decade earlier to the same society. His plan at this time revealed considerable evolution toward a more nearly complete system of agricultural education. In addition to having his proposed agricultural school a place for collecting and disseminating agricultural information for instructional purposes, he now proposed to have it a place for testing agricultural information and experimenting with new ideas and machinery; furthermore he now proposed that the school have a press devoted exclusively to col-


23 See Chapter V.
lecting and disseminating agricultural information.\textsuperscript{24} Little did he realize that half a century was to elapse before these advanced ideas would become a reality in Virginia.

To defend his proposal that money from the Literary Fund be used to support this "agricultural professorship," Barbour advocated that one youth from each state senatorial district be given a free education in agriculture and thereby, he claimed, provide a chance to redeem the unwritten intent of the legislature establishing the Literary Fund to educate free at least one youth from each senatorial district.\textsuperscript{25}

This address was followed on July 23, 1835, with a letter to the Farmers' Register, urging the establishment of a professorship of agriculture at the university and suggesting that a convention of agricultural societies and farmers be called to meet in Richmond to consider the matter. Edmund Ruffin as editor of the Farmers' Register heartily approved the idea, although both he and Barbour expressed doubts as to the success of getting legislative aid. Both, however, agreed that it would be good for the "agricultural interests" to get discussions started on the

\textsuperscript{24} "On the Improvement of Agriculture and the Importance of Legislative Aid to That Object," Farmers' Register, II (April, 1835), p. 703.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 704; "Address to the Agricultural Convention of Virginia," Farmers' Register, III (March, 1836), p. 688.
This convention assembled in January, 1836, and elected Barbour as president. His address was largely an elaboration on his previous statements and efforts in behalf of a professorship of agriculture at the university, but to his rapidly growing list of proposals for state aid he now added another demand; namely, the demand for a State Board of Agriculture.

This convention is recalled primarily in the history of education in Virginia as the one in which Barbour in his address clinched his arguments claiming paternity for the Literary Fund. An examination of the addresses, proceedings, and especially of the memorial to the legislature drawn up by the convention would seem to go beyond this, however, and establish this convention as the beginning of a series of such meetings on behalf of education which swept the entire state in the decade between 1840 and 1850 and in fact stopped only with the outbreak of the Civil War. The memorial adopted by the convention reviewed the adverse conditions of agriculture in the eastern part of the state, pointed to the excessive emigration from the state to the West, and then bemoaned the tendency of the


earlier legislatures not to do anything for the general welfare of the state by the way of internal improvements and popular education. "Popular education," it said, "that indispensable basis, that life blood of all republican government without which it can have no permanent existence and internal improvement, the all-essential means of its prosperity and preservation seem never for a moment in those days to have been thought fit subjects of legislative deliberation. A school to which every citizen could not send his own child, a road, or bridge, or canal that each could not use himself was looked upon, it seems, as contraband articles in our legislative halls. Even now the attention of our legislators .... falls short of their requirements."\(^{28}\) The only hope for remedy of the deplorable conditions facing the state, the memorial held, was "popular education and internal improvements"\(^{29}\) at the head of which stood agriculture. Three plans for improving agriculture were advanced: (1) a professorship of agriculture and an experimental farm to be established at the university, (2) a State Board of Agriculture to consist of one member from each congressional district, and (3) the appointment of a competent person to survey the agriculture of the cultivated parts of the Atlantic states and to re-


\(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 626.
port on all the best and most approved methods of agriculture being practiced.

As for the professorship at the university, the memorialists evidently feared too much theoretical teaching, for they further petitioned that the professorship was "never to be filled by any but a scientific and practical agriculturist." The experimental farm and the chance of redeeming the unwritten pledge as claimed by Barbour were included in the memorial much as they had been in his two previous addresses.30

The memorial was duly presented to the legislature where it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Manufacture and ordered printed, but Ruffin writing in the Farmers' Register says that the petition was then ignored completely for five or six weeks and finally on the insistence of the chairman taken up, only for the committee to ask to be dismissed from its further consideration, a dismissal "which was done with the utmost readiness" by the House, without, as Ruffin disgustedly reported, any debate or consideration whatever.31

Following this memorial, the agitation for aid for agriculture was concentrated on getting a State Board of

30Ibid., p. 625.

31"Result of the Petition of the Agricultural Convention," Farmers' Register, IV (May, 1836), p. 54.
Agriculture, as indicated. However in 1842 William C. Rives, president of the Agricultural Society of Albemarle, returned to the proposal for an agricultural professorship at the university. This time, no doubt influenced by the great "common school revival" of 1840 which hit Virginia at about this time, the plea for agricultural education went beyond a professorship and included a plan for those not destined to take the regular course of study.\textsuperscript{32} To accomplish his purposes Rives proposed two types of agricultural education at the university. The first type would be taught by the professor of agriculture as a part of the general course of liberal studies, while the second type to be taught would be more vocational, more practical in nature. To accomplish the teaching of this second type of agriculture he proposed that a "special agricultural institute" be established in connection with the university and patterned after the "admirable and celebrated establishment of Von Fellenburg, at Hofwyl" which Rives had recently visited.\textsuperscript{33} To this institute Rives would have those go "who might not wish or find it convenient to follow the general course of University studies, but whose object would be to acquire in shorter time or at less expense,


\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Loc. cit.}
the professional education of an instructed agriculturist, as well as the general accomplishments of an intelligent and useful citizen."

Rives' proposal never resulted in any legislative action, but it seemed to touch off, in conjunction with the wave of interest being shown at this time in public school education, a series of articles and letters in the agricultural journals and newspapers, dealing heavily with proposals for agricultural schools below the university level. In fact, the appeal of the idea of some type of practical agricultural school for the farmers' sons seems to have operated as a definite impediment to the agitation for a professorship at the university.

The year of 1845 marked one of the few times prior to the formation of the state of West Virginia that the east and the west were not at great political odds; consequently a general feeling of optimism that something would

---

34 Loc. cit.

35 See Chapter V.


be done for education spread over the state. "C. L." in a letter to the Southern Planter commented on this "political truce" and urged the Virginia State Agricultural Society, the Southern Planter, and the local farmers' clubs to take advantage of it and unite to set up a professorship of agriculture at the university to offer a one-year course with a B.F., a degree of Bachelor of Farming; however at this time, as indicated, these agencies were busy trying to perfect a stronger State Agricultural Society, while the efforts of the educational leaders were largely focused on establishing a system of public free schools which they partially succeeded in setting up in 1846.

In 1849 Governor Floyd proposed that the state establish a professorship of agricultural chemistry at the University of Virginia and the Virginia Military Institute, but by this time the truce between east and west was over, and nothing came of the proposal.

In 1854 the State Agricultural Society adopted a proposal to endow an agricultural professorship at one of the state's institutions of learning. A committee was appointed

---


40Maddox, op. cit., pp. 154-155.

and after conferring with the officials of both the University of Virginia and the Virginia Military Institute reported that both institutions were agreeable to the proposal to set up an agricultural professorship. However since the university had greater facilities, such as law and medical schools, and seemingly could acquire the use of a farm with greater ease than the Virginia Military Institute, the committee proposed that the State Agricultural Society set aside $20,000 for the endowment of the professorship at the university rather than at the Virginia Military Institute. In 1856 the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society decided that such a system of public education should come from the legislature; hence they asked the Board of Visitors to petition the state legislature for permission and for funds for such a professorship. The Board of Visitors secured such permission but no funds and invited the committee to confer with them concerning the proposal.42

In the meantime Philip St. George Cocke, president of the State Agricultural Society, offered to donate $20,000 toward the endowment, with the restriction, however, that he be allowed to name the professor and that at his death such power to name the professor revert forever to the State Agricultural Society, any nominations so made to

be subject to the approval of the Board of Visitors. In addition, Cocke, and after him the State Agricultural Society, was to have the authority to name two "scholars" to study agriculture at the university.\footnote{Ibid., p. 364.}

These reservations seem to have stemmed from the fear noticeable in all the proposals discussed thus far that the professorship might not follow practical lines but become too theoretical.

It is worth noting at this time that this fear of impracticality was picked up and echoed by none other than William Henry Ruffner, then editing an agricultural journal, the \textit{Virginia Farmer}, at Harrisonburg, Virginia. Writing in this journal, Ruffner endorsed the idea of an agricultural professorship but at the same time cautioned that the plan to be really successful must be made to serve practical purposes.\footnote{Editorial, \textit{Virginia Farmer}, I (November, 1856), p.180.} Less than two decades later Ruffner as a member of the Board of Visitors of the newly established state agricultural college was to be given a chance to put his convictions into practice.\footnote{See Chapters VI and VII.}

The efforts of the State Agricultural Society to insure a practical program proved to be a serious stumbling

\footnote{Ibid., p. 364.}
\footnote{See Chapters VI and VII.}
block in this instance, for the Board of Visitors refused to accept the donation with the restrictions, their argument being that by law they had no right to relinquish their authority to name the faculty. At the same time the university reiterated its willingness and desire to cooperate in setting up a professorship of agriculture.\textsuperscript{46}

Efforts were made to effect a compromise but to no avail, the rector and the Board of Visitors steadfastly insisting that they had no authority to accept the proffered grant under the proposed terms. Some of the officials of the State Agricultural Society seemingly doubted the sincerity of the desire of the Board of Visitors to establish such a professorship and wrote to them, suggesting that if lack of authority were the only objection the board had, then an appeal to the legislature would no doubt remove this remaining barrier. To this suggestion the board replied, stating that they did not mean to say they had no other objections than that of appointing the professors but that they did not think it necessary to state any others. They declined to ask the legislature for permission to accept the grant, on the grounds that it would divide the governing authority of the board.\textsuperscript{47} The State Agricultural Society

\textsuperscript{46}"Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, July 1, 1856," Virginia, Governor's Message and Reports of the Public Officers of the State (1857), Document 12, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{47}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 95.
thereupon adopted a resolution asking the legislature to compel the board to establish the professorship, but nothing came of the resolution.

This controversy seemed to arouse considerable interest and was given full airing before the annual meeting of the Farmers' Assembly of the State Agricultural Society and in the press. Undoubtedly the feeling aroused and the final outcome influenced the State Agricultural Society a decade later to start agitation against the university as the recipient of the land-grant fund and to urge that a separate agricultural college be set up. Evidently many felt, as one writer expressed it, "Carriage horses don't draw well with plow horses. If we want our agricultural school we had better have our own team of horses." It is somewhat ironical that more than four decades of almost continuous agitation for an agricultural professorship at the state university should terminate with a series of incidents which seemingly lined up so many leading farmers against the university as the place for establishing a school of agriculture.


50"Agricultural Professorship at the University," Southern Planter, XVII (September, 1857), p. 533.
Efforts For Agricultural Education Below the University Level

The demand and the proposals for an agricultural professorship at the university did not absorb all the thinking and energy of those who prior to 1860 were demanding agricultural education. In Rind's Virginia Gazette for March 1, 1770, an announcement of a plan for an academy to be opened at Providence in New Kent County lists the usual literary subjects to be taught and then adds that in order to make Virginia the

Garden of America . . . the important art of husbandry and agriculture will be attempted to be studied on a rational and a practical plan and recommended with that regard its vast importance demands, especially in this colony where farming is yet in infancy.51

This somewhat cautious declaration of intent seems to have remained just that for more than a century as far as Virginia was concerned, for as the careful studies of Phippins and Boitnott show, no academy in Virginia succeeded in establishing a course in agriculture prior to 1872.52

Failure to establish an agricultural school prior to this date does not mean that efforts were not made on be-

51 Advertisement, Rind's Virginia Gazette, March 1, 1770, reprinted in William and Mary Quarterly Historical Magazine, III (January, 1923), p. 56.

half of such schools. In this section the agitation for agricultural schools below the university level will be considered, but the actual efforts to teach agriculture will be reserved for the next section.

The American Farmer, the Farmers' Register, and the Southern Planter contain numerous references to agricultural education. The American Farmer in particular carried many articles relating to Fellenburg's manual labor schools. Most of the early agitation in the farm journals was very general in nature and resorted largely to exhortation and appeal to lift the profession of farming by use of education to its rightful place due its true importance.

As early as 1820 "Cincinnatus" writing in the American Farmer set forth his ideas for a system of schools adapted to rural areas. He would have three levels: primary, secondary, and collegiate, with a school farm attached to each. On the primary and the secondary levels "Cincinnatus" held that the leading planters and farmers could do much to help the teacher understand the agriculture of the community and urged that they help the teacher select subject matter and specimens for study, such proposals thereby antedating by nearly a century the idea of the farm survey.


54 "A Planter or Farmer," American Farmer, II (June, 1820), p. 91.
technique of collecting subject matter and the modern idea of the advisory committee to help the teacher of agriculture. In addition to these advanced ideas he also proposed that each graduate spend a year of internship with successful planters and farmers.

In 1821 Richard K. Meade, of Frederick County, addressed a long letter to the American Farmer, inquiring "of those who are better qualified to judge than myself whether the establishment of institutions for purposes of teaching the art of agriculture scientifically as well as practically would not be of great advantage to the community." Meade was successful in convincing himself at least that such a school would be worth while, for after studying the various plans advanced for agricultural education, he announced in 1830 his intentions to open a school based on Fellenburg's manual labor system. A complete prospectus of this proposed school was published in the Winchester (Va.) Republican and reprinted in the National Intelligencer and the American Farmer. This proposed school is particularly interesting in that it represents an attempt to apply the prevalent philosophy and practices of the private family school common in Virginia of that day to the teaching of

---

55"Agricultural Schools, Should They Not Be Established by the Several States?" American Farmer, III (May, 1821), p. 62.

56"From the Winchester (Va.) Republican," American Farmer, XII (October, 1830), pp. 226-27; National Intelligencer, September 29, 1830.
agriculture by the manual labor scheme. A few excerpts from the prospectus will serve to reveal the general nature of the proposed school:

The subscriber, wishing to educate an only son under his own eye for the profession of agriculture, and to afford him at the same time all the instruction to be derived from a thorough knowledge of the English language, and finding the expense of an appropriate teacher and apparatus greater than ordinary competency can afford, will be pleased to receive into his family one dozen boys from eight to ten years old to form if possible a permanent class which would probably in six or eight years derive the anticipated benefits from this mode of education.....

To enter into a detail of the studies comprehended under English teaching would be too lengthy for an ordinary notice: suffice it to say that a teacher will be employed whose reputation has been established in the Renssellaer school (having first passed through the theory of college learning) and is now made practical in that establishment. The discipline and economy of the justly celebrated Hofwyl school will be united with the most successful practices in similar establishments in our own country. . . . 57

In the same prospectus Meade published a letter from James Monroe, approving the plan as one designed to help carry education to the whole community. In the place of foreign languages Meade proposed to "make agriculture an interesting amusement as far as possible, [and promised that] their labours will be chiefly applied to a small but fertile spot of ground, greatly for their benefit in the

57 Ibid.
creation of individual agricultural libraries [knowledge]

... If at any time it should be extended beyond this
measure it will be with no other view than to give them
a practical knowledge of every necessary operation on a
farm."58

It is highly debatable as to just how effective this
plan for incorporating manual labor features with the
Virginia family school would have been for agricultural
instruction. Unfortunately the answer is not to be had,
for Meade died before he had an opportunity to put it into
effect.59

Just before his death, however, at the request of the
editor of the Virginia Farmer, Virginia's first agricul-
tural periodical, Meade wrote a rather lengthy article on
agricultural education, giving particular attention to the
Fellenburg system and its peculiar advantages to Virginia.
This article, intended for the consideration of the state
legislature, clearly reflects for the poorer classes the
concern of the Sunday-school movement, then approaching its
climax in Virginia.60 Meade in this letter proposed that

58"From the Winchester (Va.) Republican," American
Farmer, XII (October, 1830), p. 227.


60Maddox, op. cit., pp. 37-41.
a system similar to the one briefly indicated be set up
over the state, with the individual planters in the several
geographical divisions of the state assuming responsibility
for the schools on their own plantations, but with the
state contributing a small amount to defray the cost above
the value of the pupils' labor. He says, "It is not in­
tended here to enter into a detail of any system, but
merely to suggest in plain language an entire conviction
that a large portion of the poor youth of our country might
be made mainly to educate themselves by their honest labour
in some judicious system founded on the principle of the
Fellenburg plan."61 One rather unusual argument advanced
for the plan was that if put into wide practice it would
increase the value of white laborers and thereby reduce the
value of slaves and hasten the end of the slave system
which Meade, along with so many in Virginia of that day,
disliked.62

Agitation for the manual labor system continued to
grow but with a decided shift of emphasis from its value
to agricultural education to emphasis on its value as an
 economical system of educating the poorer classes, a prob­
lem which was very much to the forefront in Virginia in the
two decades between 1830 and 1850.63 This shift of em­

Farmer, XV (May, 1833), pp. 90-92.
62 Loc. cit.
63 Maddox, op. cit., pp. 23-41, passim.
phasis was so pronounced that Edmund Ruffin reprinted an article from the Genessee Farmer, strongly protesting the calling of schools with manual labor departments agricultural schools. Most such schools, the article held, were theological schools with a manual labor feature, not agricultural schools at all. Perhaps this charge was true, but for Virginia the two manual labor schools established in the decade between 1830 and 1840 were the nearest approach to agricultural schools on the secondary level achieved before 1860.

With the revival of agricultural societies shortly after the inauguration of the Farmers' Register in 1832, agricultural education became one of the popular topics for presidential addresses and discussion; but here too the proposals were largely inspirational in nature, setting forth the importance of agriculture and the elevating influence a system of agricultural education would have for it. When these addresses did deal with particulars, some type of manual labor scheme was usually called for. But the appeal here was for self-elevation, an attempt to make

64 "Agricultural Schools," Farmers' Register, I (January, 1833), p. 474.

65 See pages 151 ff.
farmers glorify self and raise the profession.\(^6\)

By the decade beginning with 1840 the agitation for agricultural education underwent yet another change in that it began to reflect the general growing unrest and dissatisfaction with strictly literary education. At the same time emphasis on manual labor schools for the poor began to give way to the idea of manual labor schools for the promotion of agriculture.

In 1844 W.H. Richardson, reporting the agricultural tour of the Henrico Agricultural Club, commented that such a tour brought home the fact that the clubs were not meeting the needs of the great mass of farmers. He suggested that agricultural schools were the best remedy; but if such schools could not be established, then the clubs should be organized in such a way as to secure wider participation of all social strata.\(^6\) The editor of the Southern Planter announced the great educational convention\(^6\) to be held in Richmond, in December, 1845, and took the occasion to attack the idea of a literary education as having value for


\(^6\)See Chapter V.
all. He urged that the people and the convention give serious consideration to providing a more practical type of education, such as that of the manual labor schools for those not destined for or interested in the literary pursuits. Several proposals were advanced for the establishment of manual labor schools under the auspices of the State Agricultural Society, while a private agricultural college to be located at Buckingham was planned in 1845. This latter proposal serves as a good illustration of the visionary beliefs and underestimation so common at the time with respect to the real problems involved in agricultural education and deserves some consideration.

In speaking of this proposed school its originator, a Mr. J.F. Schermerhorn, said,

I have been looking about for proper persons to be employed as professors. I want one of language, one of philosophy and mathematics, and one of practical agricultural chemistry. This last professorship is difficult to fill... I mean that my students shall be able to take hold of any profession, but my

---

Then follows a long and complete list of agricultural practices which he expected all his boys to learn. Part of his expected outcomes follow:

I mean that like physicians they shall know well the diseases of soils and remedies. Every boy that possesses the necessary faculties shall be able to do this himself. I shall teach boys that in farming, the first law is economy.

I shall cause the boys to learn practically with chain and compass land surveying and civil engineering. They shall learn, when a stick of timber is required for any purpose, to go into the woods, select the best tree and make no mistake in cutting my trees down to waste. They shall take a bag and hammer and collect minerals and when brought home thoroughly understand and describe what they are; and the like practical course in botany. In the garden, they shall cultivate all the useful vegetables and fruits, and not omit those that are merely ornamental; nor shall they fail to understand the medicinal plants and all useful plants whether for man or animal. ... Boys get weary of study in confined rooms. I intend that mine shall use the old peripatetic plan -- they shall walk and talk and learn.

As if this would not be sufficient, Schermerhorn then lists experimental farming, gardening, fruit growing, animal crossing, feeding, and breeding as topics to study.

---


72 Ibid., pp. 102-103.
For rainy and bad weather he says, "I mean to apply art to agriculture -- have a shop where the boys shall learn how to make every implement -- stock a plough, make a harrow and every other implement." 73

This utopian proposal must have surprised even the ebullient Mr. Botts, editor of the Southern Planter, for although he endorsed the proposal, he cautioned that too much undertaken might ruin the plan and that "a failure will strike a severe blow at agricultural improvement." 74

The proposal was never put into practice, although Mr. Schermerhorn in a letter to the Southern Planter, announcing his intention to give up the idea, reiterated his belief in such a school, presented his plan in considerable detail once more, included a picture of the building in Buckingham which was available for the school, and urged that the State Agricultural Society establish an agricultural school on the premises. 75

Soon after the collapse of the just-mentioned proposal, the editor of the Southern Planter launched a series of articles on the subject of agricultural education in the hope that he could encourage some one to open a school of agri-

73 Loc. cit.

74 Ibid., p. 102.

Failing to accomplish this objective, he then turned to demands that the legislature establish such schools. He struck out at the prevailing type of literary education in the state as of no value to the farming interests and insisted that a professorship of agriculture would not be worth a "fig" because it would not be practical. Continuing, he said, "We want a school exactly like the Institute at Lexington with the exception of substituting agriculture for military exercises. To know how to kill men is all very proper and sometimes very necessary, but it is hardly less useful to teach the great art of feeding and clothing them... running a furrow is not more laborious or less useful than mounting guard over nothing... the boys should be taught to drill -- corn; to plant, not standards, but potatoes; to open, not trenches, but ditches, to clean, not cavalry but work-horses, in short to be creative rather than destructive."78

In another article of this series the editor urged the State Agricultural Society to set up an experimental manual labor school. The only way to get the legislature and the people to act in setting up agricultural schools, he argued, was to let them once see such a school in suc-


77 The Virginia Military Institute at Lexington, Virginia.

78 "Agricultural Education," Southern Planter, VI (March, 1846), p. 60.
cessful operation. Interestingly enough this same argument was to be used more than half a century later when Virginia undertook to establish her system of congressional district agricultural high schools. 79

Just at the height of all this agitation for agricultural schools, a new man took over the editorial post of the Southern Planter and almost at once changed its policy from one of vigorous agitation for such schools to one of cautious scepticism based on the belief that insufficient knowledge of agriculture's secrets was at hand to make an agricultural school successful. 80

At the same time in an editorial the new editor, John M. Daniel, in analyzing the "art of agriculture" clearly isolated the issue of theoretical versus practical agricultural education, an issue which was to plague the newly established college of agriculture nearly two decades later and which even to this day continues to be debated hotly in Virginia agricultural educational circles. Said Daniel in discussing the art of agriculture:

If the science [theoretical] is one of the most noble and most profound, the manual [practical] operations that are required to carry it into practice are of the roughest and most laborious description. Geology, chemistry and

79 See Chapter VIII.

botany are included in the one; hoeing, digging, and ploughing are embraced in the other; they will never be united in the same individuals; nor indeed is there any necessity that they should be; it is true that the theory of combustion is intimately connected with fire-making, but we would as soon think of recommending the study of natural philosophy to every fire maker as we would of requiring every cultivator of the soil to be profoundly skilled in the science of vegetable chemistry.81

Daniel concluded his editorial with the advice to farmers and farmers' sons to

stay at home, eschew agricultural schools and agricultural professors, read books only which propose to keep you informed of practical results, learn the best mode of making and using (professors know nothing about them) a hoe, a plough and spade; learn how an ax should be ground and a plough pointed...82

This editorial undoubtedly expressed an opinion very popular and prevalent at the time and quite in harmony with the accepted aristocratic social order; but it did not stop the agitation for agricultural education, although during the next decade the emphasis shifted back to the college and university level.

Perhaps the most effective and far-reaching of all proposals for a system of agricultural education drawn up before the war was the one proposed by Edmund Ruffin in

81 Ibid., p. 29.

82 Loc. cit.
his Premium Essay on Agricultural Education Submitted to the Southern Central Agricultural Association in 1852 but given wide publicity in Virginia in 1853. Ruffin held that improved agriculture benefited all classes and industries and that therefore agricultural education was and should be a legitimate object for state aid. While most of the essay dealt with the college level, many of his observations were equally applicable to agricultural instruction on the secondary level but unfortunately were forgotten in Virginia and had to be relearned more than half a century later when the state embarked on its system of congressional district high schools during the first decade of the twentieth century.

Ruffin proposed a school farm, but he stressed that its purpose should be for instruction, not profits, and therefore would require a regular force of laborers in addition to the labor furnished by the pupils. Ruffin particularly stressed this point of not depending on student labor for the success of the school farm. In addition to this fact he objected to the traditional idea of manual labor features set up to help defray the students' expenses. He held that if educational values were not to be derived

---


84 See Chapter VIII.
from the labor, then the labor was harmful. "It would be a grievous waste of intellect and of time to require of pupils capable of high attainments, to spend half of every day in agricultural labor, not to derive instruction, but for their support . . . the manual labor which I propose is not designed for profit to avoid expense -- but to gain the important benefit of instruction . . . beyond this useful object such employment would be useless."®5 As for the school farm itself, Ruffin with a foresight all too infrequent even to this day carefully pointed out that such a farm to render the greatest educational value could not and should not be expected to operate at a profit. It should be operated first and foremost for educational purposes and conducted to keep down "a moderate annual loss."®6 In the academic area Ruffin proposed to have the students study natural philosophy, chemistry, geology, and mineralogy [basic sciences of his day] before entering into the study of agriculture, while for discipline he proposed a strict military organization.

Ruffin's reputation as a great agricultural leader gave considerable weight to the proposal and caused it to be widely read,87 no doubt at the same time helping influ-

®5 Edmund Ruffin, Premium Essay on Agricultural Education... , p. 16.
®6 Ibid., p. 20.
ence the Virginia State Agricultural Society to inaugurate their efforts discussed previously to establish an agricultural professorship at the university. It is quite likely too that Ruffin's plan also influenced the Union Agricultural Society to petition the legislature in late 1855 for funds with which to set up an agricultural school on the society's "model" farm to be located near Petersburg, although this petition was not granted. 88

In the Virginia Educational Convention held in Richmond, in July, 1856, agricultural education received greater attention than in any previous meeting of this convention - in fact, this convention of 1856 seems to mark the first time that a state-wide group of any kind other than farmers or planters gave serious attention to agricultural education. It definitely marked a milestone in the long story of agricultural education in Virginia in that a convention made up primarily of college representatives and friends of education included agricultural education as a topic for study and consideration.

A resolution was adopted to appoint a committee of three to report the practicability of establishing within the state a school of "applied science combining agricultural chemistry, botany, geology, the mechanic arts, and

other studies as may be deemed expedient with a view primarily of educating agriculturists and mechanics for their calling." Governor Wise advocated before the convention of August, 1857, the establishment of two colleges for agriculture. One was to be established at Blue Sulphur as a "Moeglin institute, a special agricultural school to teach the applied sciences." This school was to teach the agriculture for the cold mountain climate and hold summer sessions only. For eastern Virginia he proposed another agricultural school to be established on the plan of "Father Von Thaer of Prussia." This school was to have a winter session only and teach the agriculture of the warmer eastern part of the state. Wise stressed that he would have these schools established as special ones purposely to avoid competition with the purely literary institutes.

On the basis of the deliberations of these two conventions a thorough-going plan for a complete educational program for the state was proposed whereby all educational agencies in the state would be under the supervision of the university. The plan included primary schools, elementary schools, colleges, a medical college, a military in-

---
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stitute, two agricultural schools, and a university. The long agitation for agricultural education had at last succeeded in getting this type of education a definite place within the proposed family of schools. The hovering clouds of war, however, prevented any definite action from being taken at this time to put this program into operation.

Actual Attempts to Teach Agriculture Before 1860

Although most of the ante bellum effort in behalf of agricultural education spent itself in agitation and proposals, there were a few instances of actual efforts to teach agriculture in schools. These efforts will be presented in this section.

The Virginia Baptist Education Society opened a manual labor school on a four-acre tract near Richmond, Virginia, on July 4, 1832. The school was called the Virginia Baptist Seminary. By 1836 it had moved closer to the city of Richmond and had purchased some fifteen acres for its farm, to give larger scope to the manual labor feature. The manual labor feature was not successful and therefore was dropped in 1841, although the college grew and exists today as the University of Richmond.93

92 Loc. cit.; E.W. Knight, Public Education in the South, p. 214.

A subsequent discussion of its manual labor feature by Robert Ryland, the president of the school at the time of its inauguration, is particularly good in presenting a picture of this early attempt at agricultural education and follows:

On July, 1832, opened the Virginia Baptist Seminary: They determined to combine with study a system of manual labor, thus improving the health, diminishing the expenses, and perhaps guarding the humility of the young preachers. They hired a gardener, bought utensils, built workshops, secured a market cart, and prescribed three hours work daily to the students.

The manual labor system conciliated public sentiment and was cheerfully submitted to by the pupils, but a fair and faithful experiment of more than three years proved its inexpediency. Tools to be used three hours a day cost as much as if they were in constant service, handled by inexperienced operators they not only yielded a smaller profit, but they were more frequently destroyed than if handled by the skilful. The profits of one session sometimes came in during the following session when new laborers had come in and old ones had gone out, thus making the division complicated and inconvenient. As all the workers left in the summer vacation, the farming and the gardening interests suffered by neglect at that season beyond the possibility of recovery. But the most serious objection to the system was that the cost of a suitable manager of this department either consumed all the earnings of the students, thus making them reluctant to work, or took too large a part of the funds contributed by the public for education in the higher sense. For these reasons the working feature of our enterprise was adjudged unprofitable and by common consent laid aside.94

94 Robert Ryland, The Virginia Baptist Education Society, p. 11.
Before laying aside the feature, however, Ryland himself, a minister, undertook to manage the farm but gave up shortly after killing an entire field of corn by carefully placing at the root of each stalk a handful of salt from a fish barrel.95

By 1835 agitation for manual labor schools was being carried on in two widely separated sections of the state: at Hampden-Sidney College in the Piedmont area and at Emory in far southwestern Virginia. In the former case Hampden-Sidney accepted a proposal made by the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church to establish an agricultural manual labor department in return for $25,000 to be donated by the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church on the condition the college accept twenty-five students to receive free tuition.96 The plan, however, seems never to have been put into effect.

The effort at Emory was more pretentious and was definitely undertaken under the leadership of the Holston Conference of the Methodist Church.97 The manual labor feature of this institution was carefully planned by a

95Ibid., p. 12.

96A.J. Morrison, The College of Hampden-Sidney Calendar of Board Minutes, 1776-1876, p. 112.

97Semi-Centennial Catalogue and Historical Register of Emory and Henry College, Washington County, Virginia, 1837-1887, p. 7.
committee appointed by the Holston Conference to investigate its practicability. The report of this committee and also the inaugural address of the president showed a rather thorough familiarity with the prevalent theory of manual labor schools, if not with their more practical aspects. 98

A six-hundred-acre farm was provided, and on the opening of the college in 1836 the manual labor feature was given a prominent place depicted as follows:

The students were divided into small companies of eight or ten each and each company placed under the supervision of one of the older students. These companies were taken at two o'clock each afternoon out upon the farm for two or three hours. They were allowed from three to five cents per hour for work according to their skill and industry as estimated by their leaders. The impracticability of the manual labor system soon became apparent. The farm work could not be done successfully in this way. A hundred hands were to be employed by the superintendent for two or three hours; the most of these had never been taught to work and they often did more harm than good. Implements and work stock in corresponding numbers had to be provided, these to be idle three-fourths of every day, and often the fields would scarcely be reached before the bell would summon them to return and that too often at a time when the care of the crop required immediate attention. It was soon discovered that a full corps of regular hands had to be employed in ad-

98 Address on the Subject of a Manual Labor College by A Committee of the Holston Conference (1836); Charles Collins, An Inaugural Address Delivered at the Opening of Emory and Henry College, Washington County, Virginia, May 25, 1833.
dition to the students, but the students had to be paid for their labor for the subscribers and patrons had been led to expect that in this way a student could meet the greater part of his expenses. The consequence was that debts... began to accumulate. The fact became apparent that manual labor institutions must be well endowed to insure their success. The system, however, was not speedily abandoned but was persisted in for eight or ten years, changing gradually into a voluntary instead of a compulsory system. Then as might have been anticipated, it soon ceased altogether.99

The demise of the manual labor feature did not bring an end to the college, for after considerable early struggling it found its course and exists today as the flourishing Emory and Henry College, serving southwest Virginia so well.

One outstanding ante bellum effort to establish a school to aid agriculture remains to be sketched. This effort is clearly traceable in the records, but at the same time it is an effort almost completely forgotten today because of the fact that the Virginia Military Institute, the school with which the effort was associated, has since become famous along military lines rather than along lines of agricultural endeavor.

In 1845 the agricultural societies and the press were, as indicated, agitating rather vigorously for some system of agricultural education. William H. Richardson, a member

99Semi-Centennial Catalogue and Historical Register of Emory and Henry College, pp. 7-12.
of the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Military Institute, was an ardent supporter of these societies in their effort on behalf of agricultural education and interested the Board of Visitors in establishing a chair of physical sciences at the Institute. It was his idea to adapt the work of this chair to the cause of agriculture. Francis H. Smith, superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute, at the direction of the Board of Visitors, appeared before the legislature in 1845-46 on behalf of the proposed chair. No appropriation was forthcoming during this session, but in the next session the legislature appropriated a fund of $1,000 for a chair of physical sciences to which William Gilham was called.

Gilham was so successful in his work, especially in the area of chemistry and mineralogy related to the agriculture of the state, that the chair was divided in 1851.

100 The Virginia Military Institute, more familiarly known as V.M.I., was founded in Lexington, Virginia, on a site adjacent to the Washington College (now Washington and Lee University) in 1839.

101 J.C. Wise, A Special Report to the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Military Institute on the History of Agricultural Education in Virginia and the Virginia Military Institute as a School of Agriculture, Including a Sketch of the Physical Survey of Virginia by the School of Applied Science, September 11, 1914, p. 12.

102 P.H. Smith, The Virginia Military Institute, Its Building and Rebuilding, p. 110.
and Gilham given the newly created chair of industrial chemistry, thereby being enabled to concentrate in this field.\textsuperscript{103} In setting up his new chair Gilham among his other duties served as state agricultural chemist and included material in agricultural chemistry in his new work at the Virginia Military Institute.\textsuperscript{104} An examination of the character of this course would seem to indicate that it was moving rapidly toward agricultural education and experimentation at least in the area of chemistry. Wise says:

\begin{quote}
The instruction [at this time] consisted of tri-weekly recitations in Geology, Mineralogy and Scientific Agriculture for First and Second [senior and junior] classes. The textbooks employed were Dana's \textit{Mineralogy}, Adam and Gray's \textit{Geology}, Norton's \textit{Elements of Scientific Agriculture}, and Johnston Turner's \textit{Chemistry}. Extensive practical work was conducted in the laboratory where samples of soil, fertilizers, lime, minerals, etc., etc. [sic] were constantly received from all quarters of the state, analyzed and returned with full reports containing careful and expert advice.\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

In addition to this class work Gilham was at the same time with the aid of his students carrying on a program of

\textsuperscript{103} It is interesting to note that to fill the second chair created out of Gilham's original Chair of Physical Sciences, T.J. Jackson, later to become famous as "Stone-wall" Jackson, was called.

\textsuperscript{104} Wise, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Loc. cit.}
soil analysis for the farmers of the state. In 1852 he inserted the following interesting advertisement in the *Southern Planter*:

The undersigned is prepared to execute the analysis of soils, guano, Marls plaster, etc. etc. at the laboratory of the Virginia Military Institute. Persons desiring further information will please address

William Gilham
Prof. Chemistry and Agriculture, V.M.I.106

Gilham's work, particularly in agricultural chemistry, received high praise in the *Southern Planter* from the editor, Frank G. Ruffin,107 but was handicapped by lack of a college farm.108

As already indicated, the State Agricultural Society in 1854 undertook the establishment of a professorship in agriculture at one of the state institutions. A committee visited the Virginia Military Institute and the University

106*Southern Planter*, XII (June, 1852), p. 191.

107"Analysis of Some Specimens of Marl," *Southern Planter*, XIII (May, 1852), pp. 152-153. It has been implied that this article praising Gilham's work was written by the "ardent Ruffin," who can be interpreted only to mean Edmund Ruffin, the great agricultural reformer. (Wise, *A Special Report to the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Military Institute on the History of Agricultural Education in Virginia*, p. 17). While it is true that Edmund Ruffin approved Gilham's work, this particular article definitely seems to have been written by Frank G. Ruffin rather than Edmund Ruffin.

of Virginia but decided in favor of the latter because of lack of facilities at the former. The story of the failure to get the professorship established at the university has already been told. On the collapse of the plan at the university, Philip St. George Cocke, now once more a member of the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Military Institute turned his attention along with and probably because of that of W.H. Richardson to the possibility of expanding this institution to include a school of agriculture. General Cocke, who by this time seemed convinced of the impossibility of getting the university to do anything toward the establishment of a practical system of agricultural education, provided funds to send Superintendent F.H. Smith of the Virginia Military Institute to Europe to visit and study the chief military, scientific and agricultural schools to be found there.

Smith upon his return prepared a detailed report which contemplated the creation of a school of agriculture for the state and presented a detailed plan for its organiza-

---

109 See p. 128.


111 William Couper, *One Hundred Years at V.M.I.*, I, p. 349.

112 See letter from Cocke to F.H. Smith quoted by Couper, *One Hundred Years at V.M.I.*, pp. 349-350.
tion. This report was printed by the legislature and given wide circulation.\textsuperscript{113} It proposed that the Virginia Military Institute should be reorganized as a general scientific and military school made up of three smaller schools of application: (1) agriculture, (2) engineering, (3) fine arts. The School of Agriculture was to include a Department of Chemistry; a Department of Scientific Agriculture; and a Department of Human Physiology, Anatomy, and Veterinary Medicine. A farm for experimental and practical work in connection with the school was to be purchased; and a large hall to house classrooms, an agricultural museum, a forestry museum, and a museum of agricultural implements was to be constructed. "With these additional means of instruction in the special School of Agriculture the institution would afford facilities to the agriculturist equalled by few institutions of the kind in this or any other country,"\textsuperscript{114} wrote Smith.

The Board of Visitors adopted Smith's proposals, whereupon Cocke donated the $20,000 previously offered the University of Virginia; and William C. Rives, also formerly active on behalf of the professorship at the university, directed a fund of $10,000 to the Virginia Military Institute. This fund had in reality been donated by W.N. Mercer, \textsuperscript{113}\textsuperscript{114}\textsuperscript{Special Report of the Superintendent of the V.M.I. on Scientific Education in Europe.}

\textsuperscript{114}\textsuperscript{Smith, op. cit., pp. 152-154; Wise, op. cit., p. 21.}
who in donating the fund left it to Rives' discretion as to which school or institution should receive it. These gifts were followed by another donation, this one from Mrs. E.L. Claytor for the erection of a Hall of Natural History. With these funds at hand the Board of Visitors proceeded as far in the reorganization of the Institute as to establish two chairs of agriculture with William Gilham and M.B. Hardin as the incumbents. With these chairs an accomplished fact, a full report was made to the legislature with a request for a state appropriation to promote and complete the reorganization of the Virginia Military Institute. The request was acted upon rather promptly; and in March, 1860, the annuity of the Institute was increased from $9,210 to $15,000, while the sum of $20,000 was appropriated for building purposes. Before complete reorganization could be effected, however, the Civil War broke upon the state, and all efforts toward reorganization were suspended.

Too much weight should not be attached to the legislature's prompt action in providing money for the Virginia Military Institute at this time as evidence of any great interest on the part of the legislature for agricultural education. It must be remembered that the state at the

115 William Couper, One Hundred Years at V.M.I., I, p. 350.

116 Smith, op. cit., p. 162.
time was on the verge of war and that matters of military defense were of tremendous concern. Military preparedness stood to gain as much from the appropriation as agricultural education, if not more. At the same time the fact remains that an embryo School of Agriculture, even though established by private donations, had been set up in a state institution. It is interesting to speculate as to the future this embryo school might have faced had not the war intervened. Certainly many of the proposals advanced for it were later embodied in the state agricultural college program. Gilham himself had already received rather wide recognition for his work, particularly in agricultural chemistry. In January, 1861, he became associate editor of the Southern Planter and immediately expressed his determination to do his best to increase the usefulness of this journal to the farmers of the state. At the same time in speaking of his new work at the Virginia Military Institute he said:

The institution to which I am attached has by the munificent bestowal of funds by a few individuals . . . been enabled to establish a School of Agriculture wherein we hope to train young men in those arts and sciences upon which successful agriculture so much depends; and I have been honored with a chair in this school. Henceforth my time and labors are to be given to the advancement of the cause of agriculture - to building up this school, to aid in
building up the fabric of scientific agriculture, and to spreading its principles far and wide over Virginia... 117

At the outbreak of the war Gilham joined the Confederate Army, and the School of Agriculture along with so many other efforts of the day for agricultural education became a war casualty. The fruitless efforts to resuscitate this first School of Agriculture in a state institution of Virginia will be briefly related in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER V

SOME DEVELOPMENTS IN THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY EFFORT TOWARD A PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN VIRGINIA SIGNIFICANT FOR AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

The fact that Virginia was not successful in establishing a state-wide public school system until after the Civil War has tended to obscure the fact that much agitation, effort, and struggle for free public schools went on prior to the war. This oversight remains true to this day, even though it has been rather well established by the historians that the basic foundations for the state system of public schools had been advanced, laid, and in part tested prior to the war.¹ This movement for free schools started very early in Virginia but gained momentum rather slowly until the second quarter of the nineteenth century when, under the influence of the rising tide of Jacksonian democracy particularly in the western counties and the beginning agricultural revival of the eastern counties, it reached a persistency perhaps unequaled by any other state in the Union.² The divergent


²Maddox, op. cit., p. 152.
nature of the paths of development followed by the east and the west has been pointed out. As the western counties grew and gained power and social self-consciousness, their leaders soon took the lead in the fight for free common schools. In this fight they were often joined by many of the thinking people of the east.

Unfortunately when the proposals for improved education reached the legislative halls, the divergent sectional interests clashed so bitterly that compromises which satisfied neither group were usually the outcome. Two important factors in addition to the ones briefly outlined in Chapter I persisted throughout the entire ante bellum period and helped to emasculate the efforts to provide for a state public school system. The one, the fear of a strongly centralized government, was an inheritance from the Revolutionary period, rather carefully woven into the socio-political fabric of the state by Jefferson and others; the other was the fear and the unwillingness on the part of the property-owning class of taxing and being taxed for the benefit of others. This former fear was rather widespread over the state, while the latter was particularly concentrated in the wealthy east where in 1815, just as the agitation for a state system of public schools was really

---

3 See Chapter I.

4 Maddox, op. cit., pp. 138, 149.
getting under way, the tax revenue was reported as 350 times the tax revenue from the west.\(^5\) In light of this differential in taxes raised, it is small wonder that some in the east looked with alarm upon the public school tax-raising proposals of "the wild democrats of the middle and western Virginia."\(^6\)

It is a bit difficult, if not impossible, to state specifically how much this free school movement influenced the efforts toward agricultural education or conversely how much the movement for agricultural education helped the free school movement. Since most of the efforts of the two movements were contemporaneous and in many cases were participated in by the same people, it seems reasonable to conclude that the two movements were at least interrelated, if not actually mutually beneficial.

In the remainder of this chapter four developments which are commonly thought of as a part of the movement toward a public school system in the state but which at the same time seem to have had considerable significance for agricultural education will be sketched briefly. In addition to limiting this chapter to these four developments, a further limitation will be imposed in that only as much of the story of these

---

\(^5\) *Virginia, Proceedings, Constitutional Convention 1829-30*, p. 112, passim.

developments as seems necessary in order to understand their impact on agricultural education will be presented.\(^7\) These four developments which will be presented are (1) the creation and the use of the Literary Fund, (2) the common school revival of 1830-60, (3) the establishment of the state public school system, and (4) the influence of the academies.

The Creation and the Use of the Literary Fund

In Chapter I it was pointed out that responsibility for educating the orphans and the poor within the counties had gradually passed from the hands of the church vestries to overseers of the poor for each county. During Colonial times each parish of the Established Church owned about 250 acres of glebe, or parish land, which was used to support the minister and the work of the church,\(^8\) which included the education of the poor. By the Separation Acts of 1802 this land was taken away from the church and sold for the benefit of the poor. Since this land had for so long been associated in part with the education of the poor, it was quite natural that the proceeds from its sale should be used for a similar purpose; consequently it was not long

\(^7\)Persons wishing a more detailed presentation of the development of education in Virginia are referred to a series of excellent Doctoral dissertations on this subject in the library of the University of Virginia.

\(^8\)Maddox, op. cit., p. 42.
before the several counties of the state were granted permission to sell the glebe land and apply the funds to "free" schools. The overseers of the poor were made trustees of these funds derived from such sales and were instructed to care for the poor as the county court and vestry had been required to do under the older law. The funds thus derived were used in executing the apprenticeship laws and in establishing charity schools or supporting pauper children in already established schools. In addition to this glebe-land source of income for the schools, there was in existence at the time a series of private endowment funds which had been set up in many instances by pre-Revolutionary War legacies drawn in support of free schools. These charity funds, as well as the funds from the sale of the confiscated and forfeited lands, were indifferently administered, particularly on the local level; consequently considerable dissatisfaction developed with the

---

9See Virginia, Journal of the House of Delegates, 1802 through 1810 for the several bills.

10Maddox, op. cit., p. 43. This use of the proceeds of the glebe lands for education rather than levying a tax for this purpose is very interesting in that nearly two centuries before, in 1618, the instructions from England authorizing the setting aside of such lands justified the action on the grounds that the proceeds from such land would help free the colonists from the burden of taxes. See Brydon, Virginia's Mother Church, pp. 414, 415.

administration of these funds on behalf of the lower class and gradually led to a feeling on the part of a few people that steps should be taken to secure a more efficient handling of this income. To secure this disposition, a bill was introduced into the legislature and was passed on February 2, 1810, directing that "all escheats, confiscations, fines penalties and forfeitures, and all rights in personal property accruing to the Commonwealth as derelict and having no rightful proprietor" were to be appropriated to the encouragement of learning. The fund established under this bill was to be known as "The Literary Fund of Virginia." As such this fund became the foundation of nearly all school legislation throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century and has continued to play a significant part in public school education in Virginia to this day.

In 1811 an act was passed, defining the purpose of the Literary Fund more clearly and at the same time planning for its management by a board composed of state officers. The same act provided that a school or schools for the education

---

13 Maddox, op. cit., p. 48.
of the poor in each and every county of the state should be provided as soon as sufficient funds were available. An agent was to be appointed in each county to look after the returns to the fund and to see that the money was used legally. At the same time a "solemn protest" was made against the use of the Literary Fund at any time for any purpose other than the education of the poor.  \(^{16}\)

In 1816 the General Assembly agreed to deposit to the credit of this fund all money repaid or to be repaid to Virginia by the United States government for loans advanced by Virginia for the prosecution of the War of 1812. As a result of this action the Literary Fund was increased from about $50,000 to $450,000, with the exciting possibility of increasing in value to more than $1,000,000 in a very short period. \(^{17}\) This greatly augmented fund awoke great hope and enthusiasm in the state for education. In the words of Maddox: "Interested friends of primary schools, academies, private and denominational colleges, and several factions of the university party, alike saw in this enactment a chance for state subsidy for their particular interest." \(^{18}\) To this list, as will be shown, should be added interested

\(^{16}\) Loc. cit.

\(^{17}\) Maddox, op. cit., p. 55.

\(^{18}\) Maddox, op. cit., p. 55.
friends of agricultural education. With this fund Virginia found herself in the unusual position of having a rather large sum of money to spend for education but with no state system of education on which to spend it. The "solemn protest" against spending any of the money in the fund for purposes other than for the poor was forgotten or ignored, and as a consequence numerous widely divergent proposals were advanced suggesting ways to spend the money. As a result of these divergent proposals, there ensued in the Virginia legislature of 1817-18, a bitter struggle between the proponents of the different proposals for the use of the fund or a part of it. In many respects this struggle was to repeat itself a half century later when the legislature was again faced with the necessity of allocating for educational purposes a sum of money to be received from the federal government in the form of the land-grant scrip from the Morrill Act. This 1817-18 legislative struggle over the disposition of the Literary Fund income had the effect of bringing the public school sentiment of the state into rather clear focus. The western part of the state in general stood for a system of popular, or "free" common school, education to be established first. If sufficient funds were available, the common schools were to be followed by a system of academies and then by a university. The eastern part of the state, on the other hand, stood for beginning with the state university first and
working down through the academies to the common school. Thomas Jefferson through Joseph C. Cabell in the Senate threw himself into the fight on behalf of the university movement, while Charles Fenton Mercer emerged as the outstanding advocate of the common school idea supported by the western delegates. Before the struggle was over, partisan politics and a multitude of sectional and denominational interests had been injected into it. Trading of votes among the delegates and clever manipulation of sectional and religious prejudices were common. Finally a bill disposing of the revenue of the fund was passed by the House. This bill without mentioning the academies or the university at all "delegated the Literary Fund revenue to the care of certain local officers or commissioners who would replace the Overseers of the Poor — who in turn had replaced the Colonial Church vestry — in providing a plan for elementary education of poor children of each county." When the bill reached the Senate, a provision for a state university was "engrafted" upon it


20Maddox, op. cit., p. 73.

21Loc. cit.; Richmond Enquirer, February 12, 1818.

22J. W. Randolph, Early History of the University of Virginia as Contained in the Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell (N. F. Cabell was the true editor of this work. cf Alexander Brown's Cabells and Their Kin, p. 603.)
before it became a law on February 21, 1818.

This act of 1818 had the effect of making primary education a gift to the destitute, to those willing to accept the brand of pauperism in a social system characterized by wealth and caste. It created the top and the bottom of a state system of education; but the academies, or intermediate schools, were not subsidized. The rich and the poor were provided for, but the great middle class was left with no aid in educating its children. The state university created by the act came almost immediately to be looked upon as an institution for the privileged class. This attitude toward the institution prevailed throughout most of the remaining part of the nineteenth century and, as related, entered into nearly every discussion and effort to set up a system of agricultural education at the university.  

The disposition of the Literary Fund as provided for in this act of 1818 was never popular. The free school people, centered particularly in the western part of the state, felt that they had been deprived of their share of the fund for the sake of a university which they did not want and could not use because of its great distance from them. The friends of the academies and colleges were dissatisfied because they had been left out entirely, while

---

23 See Chapters IV, and VI.
the charity feature of the law made the poorer classes unhappy. As time went by, this dissatisfaction coupled with ineffective administration and disbursement of the revenue from the fund at state and local levels tended to cause an accumulation of unused funds to build up. This slowly accumulating fund not being put to use in turn began to excite all the special interest groups once more and caused the politicians to start using the fund as a political plaything. 24 It was soon realized that the provisions for free schools in the act of 1818 were inadequate. In 1829 this law was revised by the District Free School Act which gave the counties an optional authority to use a part of their Literary Fund, if supplemented by local subscriptions, to erect school houses for common use. 25

In the meantime, however, the friends of the middle schools had waged a bitter fight for a share of the Literary Fund and had succeeded in securing legislative permission to share in the fund when its income should exceed $60,000, the amount already voted the primary schools and the state university. 26 All these departures from the previously agreed upon uses of the fund helped stimulate yet further

24 Heatwole, op. cit., p. 106.
26 Maddox, op. cit., p. 91.
demands, especially from the colleges, for a share of the fund. One demand of particular interest for this study was that of the agricultural convention of 1836 for a part of the fund to support an agricultural professorship at the university. It is worth noting that this demand was brought forward by James Barbour, the father of the original act creating the Literary Fund. The features of Barbour's proposal whereby indigent students would be given free scholarships to the university were quite in keeping with the spirit in which the fund was being used; but as related, the proposal when it reached the legislature was killed by the vote of the western delegates.  

There can be no doubt that the Literary Fund operated as a great stimulus to the cause of education in Virginia. Until 1850 it provided the only state fund available for the public schools. While the distribution of this fund was a matter of almost continuous dispute between the east and the west, this very dispute helped keep alive in the press, in the debate societies, on the political forum, and in the legislative halls the question of a state system of free schools and thereby unquestionably helped pave the way for the final establishment of the state public school system.

---

27See Chapter IV.
The Common School Revival of 1840-60 in Virginia

Every governor of Virginia during the first years of the nineteenth century urged upon the people and the legislature the importance of universal education, but the creation of the Literary Fund in 1810 as already described was the first organized effort toward universal education in the state. The operation of this fund stimulated much discussion pro and con concerning education. At Hampden-Sidney College in particular the discussion and interest became so great that an Institute of Education of Hampden-Sidney College was formed in September, 1831, for the purpose of improving common schools and other literary institutions. This society, the first to be established in Virginia for the purpose of promoting public schools, went out of existence in 1836 but not before it had heard and published numerous speeches on behalf of an improved educational system for the state.

In 1836 a convention of persons interested in the cause of agricultural education was held in Richmond. This Farmers' Convention was attended by some of the same persons associated


29Morrison, Ibid., pp. 54-57.
with the Hampden-Sidney movement, but beyond this it is not clear as to whether or not this older movement had any influence on the convention. The memorial adopted by this Farmers' Convention in addition to pleading for aid for agricultural education from the Literary Fund strongly urged the legislature to give more consideration to the cause of public education.  

At least one local agricultural society joined in the agitation for better common schools. The Rockbridge Agricultural Society with William Ruffner, of whom more will be said later, as an active member memorialized the legislature for better schools and proposed a plan for a state normal school to be established to train teachers for the schools.  

By 1839 Virginia was entering into a veritable common school revival which continued with varying degrees of intensity for the next two decades. The leading newspapers of the entire state published many articles and editorials on behalf of the common free schools, while the lyceums, then highly popular in Virginia, devoted much time to the cause of public education.  

---

30 See Chapters II and IV.

31 Lexington Gazette and Rockbridge Farmer, June 23, 1840.


33 Maddox, op. cit., p. 128.
among the lyceum movement, the agitation for scientific farming, and the efforts for better schools is revealed in a letter to the Portsmouth *Old Dominion* for September 14, 1839. The writer, probably Josiah Holbrook, proposed a school to be taught by a scientific farmer in the winter and by the farmer's wife or daughter in the summer. For part of the theory he would have weekly or semi-monthly lyceums with great teachers, where the farmer-teachers and the community could see the sciences demonstrated with the new scientific apparatus. One of the chief arguments he advanced for his school was that it would combine agricultural experimental knowledge with theory. Local meetings to consider the best system of education for all the children were held in widely separated parts of the state. In the Assembly of 1839-40 a large number of plans, reports, and resolutions concerning education were considered; but apparently nothing specific came from any of them.

During this same year of 1839 Benjamin M. Smith at the request of Governor Campbell submitted to Campbell a communication containing "a report on the Prussian primary school system, and suggestions on the application of this

---


35 *Richmond Whig*, September 27, 1839.

system of primary schools to Virginia." 37 This remarkable report was printed in full by the General Assembly 38 and given wide publicity. Of particular interest for this study is Smith's suggestion concerning the subjects of instruction. He urges "the introduction of history, the study of our constitution, of the first principles of natural science, and of drawing, and above all the elements of agricultural science. . . ." 39

In the midst of all the foregoing agitation for better education the educational statistics of the United States census of 1840 were released. In the words of Maddox this census

stung the pride of Virginians by placing in bold relief the state's illiteracy, and stirred a new and greater effort for common school legislation of the character that all the Northern and Western states were then contending for. The trans-Alleghany sections took the leadership in this renaissance but the impulse was felt throughout the state. 40

Continuing his discussion of this movement at this time, Maddox says, "The thinking people, if not the masses, were aroused to the necessity of better schools. Every

40Maddox, op. cit., pp. 131-132.
conceivable device was resorted to to bring the people
together on a common plan of administration and support.\textsuperscript{41}
A number of educational conventions were called, the first
one of importance being held in Clarksburg [now in West
Virginia] on September 9, 1841. Henry Ruffner, president
of Washington College [now Washington and Lee University]
submitted a plan for improving the common schools of Vir­
ginia. As it turned out, this plan was to have tremendous
significance for the state when Ruffner's son became Superin­
tendent of Public Instruction nearly three decades later.\textsuperscript{42}

Throughout this entire convention the old resentment of
the west toward the east for its policy toward the university
was very noticeable. This latter institution was openly
attacked as essentially for the \textit{very rich} and therefore not
accessible to the great body of the people of Virginia.\textsuperscript{43}

This convention was followed by one at Lexington, on
October 26, 1841, under the auspices of Washington College.
Out of this convention came the Ruffner Plan for District
Schools. Many features of this plan were later to be incor­
porated into the act of 1870 creating the first state system

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., p. 138.
\textsuperscript{42}Intra.
\textsuperscript{43}Maddox, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 138.
of public instruction. The minutes of this convention and the Ruffner Plan were given wide publicity in the press of the day and helped fan the flames of desire for a better educational system. A state convention was planned, to meet in Richmond, on December 9, 1841. In preparation for this great state convention, county conventions met, discussed educational problems, drew up resolutions, and elected delegates to attend the Richmond meeting.

The Richmond educational convention as indicated met on December 9, 1841. After considerable discussion this convention addressed a memorial to the legislature concerning all types of schools in the state, with a special emphasis placed on the lower schools. A bill embodying the chief features of the memorial, especially as it related to the establishment of a system of public free schools, was introduced into the legislature in February, 1842, by W. C. Rives, who, it may be added, was also a strong advocate of agricultural education. The bill passed the House but was defeated by the eastern aristocrats in the Senate.

---

44 Ibid., p. 140.

45 Ibid., p. 140. Also see Richmond Enquirer for October to December, 1841.

46 See Chapters II and IV.

47 C. W. Dabney, Universal Education in the South, I p. 86.
The agitation for better schools continued for the next three years and until another convention met in Richmond, on December 18, 1845. On this occasion the "aristocrats of the east" captured the convention and in a majority report largely declared for the old plan but proposed that the state should empower each county to adopt the system of schools desired by the majority of the people, a proposal branded by Dabney as "a miserable straddle on a great question." 48

Dabney sums up the results of these conventions in the following excellent way:

The net result of these conventions and this agitation was special laws, giving authority to the counties to establish public schools, if they desired. In the attempt to meet the wishes of all sections, the law left the counties to decide, each for itself, whether they would levy a tax for the schools. A petition from one-third of the voters was required before an election could be held on the proposition to have schools at all, and then two-thirds of the voters had to approve all taxes before free schools could be started - a method which could be overcome only by general interest and cooperation, which did not exist in most counties. The influence of the aristocrats, who did not wish schools is seen in all this. The friends of schools in fourteen counties forced an act through the legislature, giving their counties statutory permission to vote this tax without the preliminary petition. In all other counties the schools

---

still depended upon the limited revenue of the Literary Fund. The charity feature continued, and no general system was created.

One of the acts contained, however, a valuable provision; it created a system of county superintendents with small compensations and limited powers. But it made no provision for a state superintendent or a board with any powers beyond those of the old Literary Board. With these various laws and without a unifying force, the state labored under a confusion of systems, and little progress was made. The masses still continued indifferent, and there was no strong central authority to educate them about their duty to their children.\(^49\)

In 1856 and again in 1857 educational conventions were held once more in an effort to improve and co-ordinate a system of education for the state.\(^50\) By this time interest and agitation for agricultural education had grown to such an extent that this subject was assigned a place on the convention agenda and included in the proposal adopted in 1857 and submitted to the legislature.\(^51\) These conventions and their proposals, coming as they did at the end of nearly three decades of vigorous agitation for a system of public free schools and a like period of agitation for agricultural education, are worthy of some comment. The first meeting, held in July, 1856, appointed committees to study the

---

\(^49\) W. Dabney, *Universal Education in the South*, p. 37.


educational conditions of the state, with special reference to the operation of the Literary Fund. One of the committees appointed was to report on the practicability of establishing within the state a school of "applied science combining agricultural chemistry, botany, geology, the mechanic arts, and such other studies as may be deemed expedient with a view primarily of educating agriculturists and mechanics for their calling." Two of the men, Maupin and F. G. Ruffin, appointed to the committee were very active participants in the State Agricultural Society at the time. It will be recalled, furthermore, that the last-named society was engaged in a controversy with the University of Virginia at this very time over the question of establishing a professorship of agriculture in that institution. Whether this controversy influenced the convention is not known, but in a cautiously worded statement the committee investigating the use of the Literary Fund reported that agriculture should be included in the scheme of education but added that whether "connected closely or only remotely with our university is a question not submitted to our committee." Governor Wise addressed both the 1856 and the 1857 sessions and on both occasions made a florid but strong plea for public schools and a system

---

52 Ibid., Document 1, p. 33.
53 See Chapter IV.
Borrowing from his famous campaign speech of 1855 in which he said that "next to brandy, next to card playing, next to horse racing, the thing that has done Virginia more harm than any other in the course of her past history has been her insatiable appetite for federal politics," he now substituted ignorance of agriculture for federal politics, and fox-hounds for card playing and before the convention claimed that ignorance of agriculture had ruined more men in Virginia than "any other cause known to me except brandy, fox-hounds and horse racing." The plan finally drawn up by this convention clearly reflected a merging of the long agitation for a system of public schools and of the agitation for a system of agricultural education. It included primary schools, higher primary schools [secondary level], colleges, a medical college, a military institute, a university, and three new colleges and schools for instruction in all the applied sciences of agriculture. This plan, the culmination of more than three decades of arduous effort for a system of public education and agricultural education, was never put into effect. The people of the state were even then facing

---

55See Chapter IV.
56Hambleton, op. cit., p. 99.
57E. W. Knight, Public Education in the South, p. 214.
58Loc. cit.
war, and little could be done to further education. In 1861 the proceeds of the Literary Fund, with the exception of the usual appropriation to the Virginia Military Institute and the University of Virginia, were appropriated to the military defense of the state; and most agitation on behalf of education came to a temporary end until after the war, although the free school idea was kept alive during the entire period of the war.

The Establishment of the State Public School System

The Literary Fund, the common school revival, and the agitation for agricultural education, along with certain other factors, clearly brought a state system of public education and a school of agriculture into sight several times before the Civil War. The fact remains, however, that ante bellum conditions were never just right to give the final effort necessary to bring either the public school system or the agricultural school into full existence. When the conditions did finally make these two programs possible, the circumstances were such that both the state public school system and the school of agriculture were launched into an atmosphere anything but favorable for the

---

59 Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1861, Ordinance Adopted at the Adjourned Session in June and July, 1861, Number 66, p. 57.

60 Meade, op. cit., p. 101.
survival of either. It is interesting to note further that the public school system and the agricultural school [college level] were launched within a year of each other. With the college of agriculture an established fact, agricultural education on the secondary school level in Virginia awaited the establishment and the development of the public school system before it began to expand in this area. In this section a brief account of the establishment of the state public school system will be presented.

The conditions in Virginia at the close of the Civil War probably were more desperate than in any other state. The state had been a battleground for four years; part of her territory had been laid waste by military order; and she had been shorn of a large part of her territory. The freeing of the slaves not only had reduced her wealth but also had resulted in the creation of a huge body of free citizens poorly equipped to assume the responsibilities of economic or political citizenship. In addition to all these problems the state in March, 1867, had been organized as Military District Number One under the rule of the United States Congress acting through the army. As one requirement for readmission to the Union, Virginia was required to write a new state constitution. As the time for the constitution

---

drew near, many of the men who had been working for the cause of public schools seized this time as an opportunity to lay the foundations for a complete system of public schools. 62

The convention to rewrite the constitution met in Richmond, on December 3, 1867. In the words of Knight the composition of this convention was altogether unlike anything ever before seen in a constitutional or legislative body of the state. Of the 105 members more than a score were Negroes; the radicals numbered seventy-two and the conservatives thirty-three. Fourteen of the [radical] delegates came from New York, three each from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and England; one each from Maine, Vermont, Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, Washington City, South Carolina, Ireland, Scotland, and Canada; twenty-two were native Virginia Negroes and thirteen were native white radicals.64

62 Dabney, Universal Education in the South, I, p. 132.


64 E. W. Knight, "Reconstruction and Education in Virginia," South Atlantic Quarterly, XV (January, 1916), p. 27. Knight credits Eckenrode, The Political History of Virginia During Reconstruction, for this information. This breakdown does not add up to the total number of radicals reported. Apparently the 4 radical officials of the convention are omitted. Goode, Recollections of a Lifetime, p. 99, and Chandler, History of Suffrage in Virginia, p. 60, give yet different distributions of the state of origin and political make-up of the members of this convention. All agree on the essential point, however; namely, that the convention was largely alien to Virginia and Virginia conditions.
The resulting constitution framed by these "aliens to the Commonwealth and newly emancipated slaves" was immediately unpopular with large segments of the white population from the circumstances of its origin and in the words of Porter "would have been unpopular if it had been the best written constitution ever produced, which it was far from being." 66

Under Article VIII of this constitution, adopted July 6, 1869, the General Assembly was required to provide for a uniform system of public free schools for the state. Of particular significance for this study is section five of this same article. It reads as follows:

"The General Assembly shall establish, as soon as practicable, normal schools, and may establish agricultural schools and such grades of schools as shall be for the public good." 68

Thus did the two more than a half-century-old contemporaneous struggles, one for a state system of public free schools and the other for agricultural schools, culminate in the state constitution. The educational provisions of this

65Goode, Recollections of a Lifetime, p. 98.


67Heatwole, op. cit., p. 214.

constitution were not popular with many of the wealthier aristocratic element of the state, but the legislature acted promptly and on July 11, 1870, passed an act entitled "An Act to Establish and Maintain a Uniform System of Public Free Schools." This act had been drafted by William H. Ruffner, the newly elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the son of W. A. Ruffner, of whom mention has already been made in connection with the educational plans developed at the Clarksburg, and the Lexington educational conventions nearly three decades earlier. Since the plan as set forth by the younger Ruffner is so nearly the same as the one advanced by his father at these earlier conventions, it is generally assumed that this earlier plan influenced the later one.

In passing this act, Virginia, in the words of Maddox, "did not create a new system of free schools. It rather perfected its old system by the addition of features repeatedly suggested before the War." Hardly had the act been passed until the ante bellum prejudices which had pre-

---

69 W. C. Pendleton, Political History of Appalachian Virginia 1776-1927, p. 283.


71 Supra.

72 E. W. Knight, History of Education in the South, p. 326.

73 Maddox, op. cit., p. 172.
vented the adoption of the now included features reasserted themselves. This time the prejudices were reinforced by the chaotic conditions following the war and by the resentment of the act as something imposed on a conquered people by an alien power. Fortunately for the cause of education in Virginia the first State Superintendent of Public Instruction, William H. Ruffner, was a native Virginian in confidence of the best people of the state and able to interpret the new scheme of education in terms of the history of the state. His first effort as State Superintendent was to convince the people "from their own history that the new act was the fruit of their own effort made before the carpet-bagger and scalawag came." In this effort he was only partially successful, but under his leadership the state system of public free schools was given a firm foundation which has survived to this day.

At the outset of the operation of the free school act, preference was to be given to the elementary schools; but in 1875 in an act entitled "An Act to Encourage Intermediate Grades of Instruction in Public Schools" provision was made whereby the "higher branches" [secondary school subjects] could be taught in the public schools.  

This provision for the "intermediate" school as a part of

---

74 Addox, op. cit., p. 174.

75 Virginia, Acts of the Assembly 1874-75, p. 269.
the state system, however, was not used to any great extent at this time except in some of the cities of the state; in fact, the public high school development in Virginia is definitely a twentieth-century movement. For the purposes of this study it is not necessary to trace the establishment of the public school system much further. The two decades from 1870 to 1890 saw painfully slow progress being made in public education in Virginia. The entire social and economic life of the state was undergoing a painful recovery from the effects of the war, and the schools had to await this recuperation before they could move ahead. 76 This recuperation began around 1890 as a result of the Farmers' Alliance, the Grange, and other agencies and helped rejuvenate education and revive interest in agricultural education. The story of this rejuvenation, however, is reserved for Chapter VIII.

The provision of the constitution permitting the establishment of agricultural schools was not invoked in so far as education below the college level was concerned until the first decade of the twentieth century. 78 An explanation for this fact is probably not hard to find. In the first place, as already mentioned, most of the high schools established prior to 1900 were in the cities where there was little if any demand

76See E. W. Knight, Education in the South, Chapter XII, for an excellent treatment of the economic and social shackles affecting education at this period.

77See Chapter VIII.

78See Chapter VIII.
or need for agricultural instruction. In the second place, and probably most important of all, the state agricultural college had been established in 1872 and probably, in the thinking of the people at least, was providing all the formal agricultural instruction needed.

**Influence of the Academies on Agricultural Education**

It is generally conceded that the academies by their diversified, more practical offerings paved the way for the introduction of the more practical subjects into the secondary school program. Whether these more practical subjects in turn influenced the introduction of agricultural education into the program is a teasing probability which the available records do not make very clear for Virginia. Since these academies, however, played such a significant part in developing the concept of the secondary school curriculum which prevailed for so long in Virginia and since this concept in turn affected the development of agricultural education, some attention will be given to the academy period in Virginia.

By the nineteenth century there were at least twenty-five academies in Virginia. These schools were at first generally known as "classical schools," the term academy coming to be

79See Chapter VI.
applied to them as they introduced the sciences. These schools by their very nature were adaptable to the scheme of things in ante bellum Virginia. The state was opposed to taxation and central control of public matters. The academies, being privately supported and locally controlled, fitted into this pattern nicely. Voluntary enterprise and individual initiative were the order of the day. Again the academies fitted this pattern nicely. "If in a county there were a few people of academic interests, they saw to it that something was done for academic interests." As a result of this local interest many of these schools were established on a local level and, though capable in general of supplying creditable educational facilities, were short lived. With an increase in population the educational facilities of some increased, and many of them were chartered by legislative enactment, with some of the most influential men of the community as trustees. Some of these academies grew into colleges, while many continued to exist as academies until

80 Heatwole, op. cit., p. 124.
82 E. W. Knight, Public Education in the South, p. 76.
83 Heatwole, op. cit., p. 125.
well into the twentieth century. These academies were very popular in the state and by the Civil War had been established with a rather remarkable degree of equal numbers in every great geographical division from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ohio River. With the period of the educational revival and the agricultural revival referred to before, there was a spurt in the number of academies granted charters, 155 being chartered during the three decades between 1826 and 1856.

Since the public school act of 1870 did not provide for state supported public high schools, the academies continued to be popular, nineteen having been chartered even in the decade prior to 1906, the date the state launched its high school program. The final transition in Virginia from the academy to the high school was slow and gradual. As just pointed out, the public school act of 1870 did not provide for high schools. In 1875 the legislature partially solved this omission by passing an act permissive in nature which made it possible to introduce the "higher branches" into the academy as high school courses.

84 The writer as a boy in Virginia was more familiar with the word academy than with the term high school.
87 Ibid., p. 7.
88 See Chapter VIII.
larger elementary schools. This act is interesting in itself. It provided that the school board of "Rockbridge County or any other county" could introduce the higher branches into the public elementary schools if the board wanted to do so.\textsuperscript{89} The act, however, specifically stated that such instruction was not to interfere with the regular instruction of the elementary school. In addition to permitting the "higher branches" to be taught, the act permitted the school board to charge tuition of those enrolled in the courses. As a result of this act there grew up in Virginia between 1870 and 1900 a system of semi-public high schools sponsored by cities, corporations, or special districts.\textsuperscript{90} As the twentieth century approached, the name academy gradually began to yield to the term high school, although in most instances there was very small difference if any in the curricular offering. In 1906 when the state embarked on its public high school program, the name academy was generally dropped so that today only a few public high schools in Virginia go by the name academy.

\textsuperscript{89}Virginia, Acts of the Assembly 1874-75, p. 269.

\textsuperscript{90}R. P. G. Bowman, Secondary Education in Virginia 1870-1886, (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1938), p. 37. Rockbridge County mentioned by name in the act found the tuition feature so successful that the practice was retained far into the twentieth century. The writer as a teacher in this county collected tuition from high school pupils in 1935, the last year the county followed the practice.
It was perhaps in the area of the curriculum that the academy exercised the greatest influence on the high school and thus indirectly on agricultural education. This influence can be quickly and briefly related. As already pointed out, the early academies grew for the most part out of the older classical schools; hence they nearly always kept the strictly literary subjects as the core of the curriculum. As time passed, some of these schools, usually in an effort to attract pupils, expanded their offerings to what would today be considered a ludicrous extent. With the exception of the sciences most of these new courses were soon abandoned, and even the sciences in Virginia schools were looked upon for a long time with grave suspicion and open doubt as to their mental and moral value. The result was that although the academies did usher in some new subjects, the curriculum remained heavily weighted with the more strictly literary subjects. As the high schools developed, they tended to follow the curriculum of the academies, thus developing a literary type of program also. Since this type of curriculum was favored by the colleges and at the same time blended in nicely with the nostalgic reminiscences of the bygone glory

---

91 See especially Bowman, op. cit., Boitnott, op. cit., and Phippins, op. cit., for illustrations of curricula offered by these schools.


93 Heatwole, op. cit., p. 135; Bowman, op. cit., p. 796.
of a day that was gone forever, it acquired a hold on the people of Virginia and assumed prestige in such a way that its direct influence is definitely reflected in the Virginia school curriculum to this day.

The result of this concept of the secondary school curriculum was to retard the acceptance of agricultural education as a subject worthy of study. Much lip service was given to the cause of agricultural education, but the real joy came from turning out of the high school, not good farmers, but students thoroughly qualified for admission to the liberal arts colleges of the state. That this attitude has been detrimental to agricultural education in an agricultural state there can be no doubt. Fortunately this attitude has undergone considerable change in Virginia during the past two decades, with the result that today agricultural education, along with other programs of vocational education, is being given a ready acceptance in the secondary schools of the state.
A quick glance backward over the story of education in Virginia as thus far presented will reveal that Virginia on the eve of the Civil War was on the verge of setting up some type of agricultural education; in fact, by means of private donations such a school had already been established at the Virginia Military Institute. It yet remained for the state officially to give recognition, support, and direction to such a school. Before such state action could be taken, the Civil War broke out; and all organized attempts toward agricultural education in Virginia were suspended. On the national level, however, the Civil War seemed to intensify the agitation which had been growing on behalf of federal aid to schools and colleges to encourage the teaching of agriculture. This national agitation for aid to agricultural instruction resulted in the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant Act which became a law on July 2, 1862. This act, named for its sponsor, Justin S. Morrill, provided federal aid to encourage the establishment of schools of agriculture and mechanic arts.

1A. C. True, A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785-1925, p. 100.
in the several states. Since Virginia in an effort to secede from the Union was engaged in the Civil War at the time of its passage, she naturally did not attempt to take advantage of the act until the end of the war. At this time the conditions in the state were so chaotic and disturbed that it was with great effort and struggle that Virginia finally marshalled her strength and forces sufficiently to take advantage of the proffered federal aid and establish a state school of agriculture. Even with the school established it was yet nearly two decades before the state recovered sufficiently from the effects of the war to start giving it the help it needed to make a real contribution to the agriculture of the state.

In this chapter it is planned to present a brief story of the establishment of this state agricultural and mechanical college and its early struggle to survive. The birth and the development of an institution must be considered in the light of the conditions and circumstances existing at the time. For this reason, in the subsequent discussion some attention will be given from time to time to certain economic and political conditions of the period which affected the establishment of the college and its effort to survive. The content of the chapter will be selected and organized in an effort to present the story of the establishment of this institution as a part of the long story of agricultural education in Virginia. It should be
clearly understood, therefore, that this chapter is not intended as a complete history of the agricultural college at this period.

Before entering into a consideration of the college proper, it is worth while recalling a few of the antebellum developments in Virginia's struggle for an educational system. It will be remembered that the struggle for a system of common schools was largely a struggle of the great middle class which had grown up west of the Blue Ridge Mountains. In this struggle the people had been ably assisted by some of the best leaders from all sections of the state. The struggle for agricultural education, on the other hand, was largely a struggle of the upper class landowning gentry located for the most part east of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

The war was not over before some of the leaders in the common school movement started renewing the agitation for these schools. With agricultural education it was a different story. It is true that the Virginia State Agricultural Society made a rather quick recovery following the war, but the nearly collapsed state of agriculture demanded immediate

2Dabney, op. cit., p. 132.

attention, while agricultural education was something that could wait. As a result of the press of more urgent needs on the system of agriculture, postwar agitation for agricultural education was rather slow getting under way. When this agitation did finally start, it was, in comparison with the ante-bellum effort, a rather feeble, half-hearted, hesitant movement. No James Barbour stepped forward to electrify the people with his proposals, and no Edmund Ruffin was on the stage to suggest plans for translating proposed programs into action. This weak postwar agitation for agricultural education received a boost from sources outside the state in the form of a federal land grant for agricultural and mechanical schools.

This federal land-grant act, commonly referred to as the Morrill Act, provided that thirty thousand acres of land be given to each state for every member of Congress from that state. The land thus donated was to be sold and the proceeds invested in state bonds at not less than five per cent interest. The income from the act was to be used for the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college [in each state] where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to

---

4 The Barbours and the Ruffins working on behalf of agricultural education at this time should not be confused with James Barbour and Edmund Ruffin of ante-bellum fame.
teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of the states may prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial class in the several pursuits and professions in life.5

The action on the part of Congress in passing this act was the result of a deep-seated, urgent, and nation-wide demand of the common people, especially the farmers, for an education adapted to their needs. The idea or philosophy involved sprang, not from the educational leaders, but from the rank and file of the people themselves.6

The act itself left it up to the individual states to determine whether the fund should be given to an existing college or to a new institution. At the same time it left the states free to determine the curriculum to be followed in the endowed school. The arrival at a decision concerning these choices caused a long struggle in Virginia, as we shall see; and the matter of a curriculum for the agricultural school has, fortunately perhaps, never been solved with finality even to this day.

Ante-bellum Virginia, largely under control of the people east of the Blue Ridge Mountains, in conformity with

5"An act donating Public Lands to the several States and Territories which may provide Colleges for the benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts," United States Statutes at Large, No. 12, Folio 503, reprinted in Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College - Its History and Organization, 1872, pp. 1-2.

6F. B. Mumford, The Land Grant College Movement, University of Missouri College of Agriculture, Agriculture Experiment Station, Bulletin 419 (July, 1940), p. 6.
her position on states' rights, was opposed to federal aid for agricultural education. On February 5, 1864, however, the "Unionist," or loyal legislature, meeting in regular session at Alexandria passed an act accepting the federal donation for agricultural schools. At the time, the war was still in progress; and this legislature was in control of only a small part of the state, and that only by grace of federal bayonets; hence the act merely provided for Virginia's acceptance of the grant under "the conditions and provisions therein prescribed" but made no effort to dispose of the fund.

On May 9, 1865, after the end of the war, the seat of government was by order of the President of the United States returned to Richmond, with Francis H. Pierpont continuing as Governor. In December of the same year Pierpont in his message to the legislature then in session reminded the members of the action taken at Alexandria with regard to the land-grant act. At the same time he gave a rather lengthy statement of the value of a "polytechnic" school to the state and attempted to indicate its curriculum

---

7 Editorial, Southern Planter, XVIII (February, 1858), p. 104.
9 Loc. cit.
content as far as agriculture was concerned. An examination of his proposals reveals little if any progress beyond the encyclopedic ideas of agricultural education so prevalent before the war. In this same message Pierpont offered it as his opinion "that we have in the Virginia Military Institute the elements of the proper organization to take charge of this school and give it proper direction." It is quite likely that Pierpont was influenced in his suggestion at this time by the fact that representatives of the Virginia Military Institute had in the fall of 1865 appeared before him and requested his support of plans for rebuilding the Institute along the organizational lines the institution was embarking upon when the war broke out. No doubt, too, the Governor was influenced by the zeal of the Adjutant General of the state who as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Military Institute had in October of the same year reminded the board of Virginia's action in 1864 in accepting the federal land grant. The money from this grant if secured for the Virginia Military Institute would, he told the board, "secure the future of the Institute and even place it upon a better footing than ever before." It is interesting to note also that

---

12 Ibid., p. 19.
13 Couper, op. cit., p. 114.
Pierpont favored moving the Virginia Military Institute from Lexington to a site near Richmond, because he believed that "the college or school to which this donation shall be applied should be located at the city of Richmond which is central, and easily accessible from all parts of the state." Pierpont did not put all his support back of the Virginia Military Institute, however, as has been implied, for in this same message after dangling the land-grant fund of $300,000 estimated to be received by the state, before the eyes of the legislature and the war ravaged and pauperized colleges, he said, "Doubtless a number of institutions of learning in the state will be willing to add the agricultural and military features required by this act to their institutions, to procure this endowment thus offered." Subsequent expressions of "willingness" on the part of the colleges proved this statement of the Governor to be one of gross understatement.

The Virginia Military Institute having, as she felt, both the agricultural and the military features called for in the federal act, immediately petitioned the legislature

14Ibid., p. 116.


for the land-grant scrip; but the legislature acted only to refer the petition to the Committee on Schools and Colleges and to order five hundred copies of the act of Congress [Morrill Act] setting aside land to be used for education to be printed for the use of the legislature. This additional publicity coupled with Pierpont's thinly veiled invitation set off a wave of requests and maneuvering for the land-grant fund from every college in the state, the state university, and several academies. As probably was to be expected, none of the claims for the fund which the colleges sought showed any particular scheme or plan for agricultural education, the applicants undoubtedly being more interested in securing the money than in setting up a school of agriculture. Again no specific legislative action was taken to dispose of the fund at this time. This delay on the part of the legislature in disposing of the fund at this particular time is just a bit puzzling. It is perhaps best explained by saying that the conditions of the state following the close of the war were so confused that the legislature hesitated to take definite action.

---


19 Ibid., p. 69.

20 See especially the Journals of the House of Delegates for 1865-66 and 1866-67 for the several claims put forward for the fund.
At the 1866-67 session of the General Assembly, Governor Pierpont again brought up the subject of disposal of the land scrip. At this time he switched his support from the Virginia Military Institute and proposed that the College of William and Mary be moved from Williamsburg to Richmond and made over into "the great polytechnic school contemplated by the munificence of Congress, and so much needed by the state."\(^{21}\)

By this time the State Agricultural Society was getting reorganized following the war and now began to show some interest in the proceedings. As indicated, this society had been working for an agricultural school for a long time; but it was also determined that such a school be a practical one. Acting in line with this determination, the society on January 28, 1867, presented a memorial to the legislature, urging that the fund be used to establish an independent agricultural college separate from any literary institution.\(^{22}\)

During this same session of the legislature William H. Ruffner, later to win fame as Virginia's first State Superintendent of Public Instruction, entered actively into the struggle for a better educational system and for a school of agriculture. He addressed a lengthy communication to the legislative Committee on Schools and Colleges, attacking the idea of giving the fund to any literary


institution and urged that the fund be used to create a separate practical technical school. His arguments were that only by such a separate school could the great farming and mechanic class hope to get a truly practical, useful education.\(^2^3\)

The state political situation at this time, especially with reference to relations with the United States government, had become confused;\(^2^4\) and in the midst of the developing discussions on the disposition of the land-grant fund, the United States Congress which for four years had fought to keep Virginia and the other Confederate states in the Union now decided that these same states were out of the Union. Acting on this basis, Congress in March, 1867, passed an act creating Virginia as Military District Number One, and through the medium of army officers made her subordinate to the will of the federal legislature.\(^2^5\) It is beyond the scope of this study to give more than passing notice to this period of so-called reconstruction. The state had accepted defeat on the field of battle and had set about rebuilding her economy. Under the reconstruction program the task of rebuilding was largely taken out of the hands of


\(^2^5\) Ibid., p. 537.
native white Virginians and given over to aliens, carpet-baggers, scalawags, and the recently freed Negroes. To many Virginians the indignities of the reconstruction regime appeared as an effort to inflict upon the state not only a broken spirit but a contrite heart as well. The bitterness engendered by the harsh treatment received at this time was felt for many years afterward and in fact is still a factor in many state-wide programs and policies. In the field of education the results of the reconstruction period and its attendant bitterness were particularly destructive.

As one requisite for reconstruction and readmission to the Union the state was required to adopt a new constitution. One of the provisions of this constitution of particular interest here was, as related, the clause permitting the state to establish agricultural schools.

Other than this constitutional provision, permissive in nature, no official state action or consideration was given to the land-grant scrip from March, 1867, when Virginia was created as Military District Number One, until

\[26\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 541\ \text{ff.}\]

\[27\text{The writer distinctly remembers as a small boy hearing this sentiment expressed by his grandfather who was a Confederate veteran, by several of his great uncles who were also Confederate veterans, and by numerous "old-timers" living in the community.}\]

\[28\text{E. W. Knight, History of Education in the South, p. 307, ff.}\]

\[29\text{See Chapter V.}\]
she was readmitted to the Union by act of Congress on January 26, 1870.\textsuperscript{30}

The land-grant fund most definitely had not been forgotten by the colleges or by certain friends of agriculture during this time; in fact, the great cause of agricultural education, with or without land-grant aid, had not been completely out of the thinking of certain leaders. Since all these intervening factors provided a new background for the discussions in the legislature when the debates on the land-grant fund were resumed in 1870, it will be necessary to turn aside at this time and briefly trace these developments as they contributed to agricultural education.

In 1869 the University of Virginia received a gift of $100,000 to be used "for the establishment of a department of scientific and practical agriculture."\textsuperscript{31} By the time the legislature resumed consideration of the land-grant fund, the university had appointed two professors in connection with the school and had in addition secured a farm to be operated in conjunction with the instruction in agriculture. The university was now ready, if given the land-grant money, it was reported, to set about completing the university in the manner contemplated by its great

\textsuperscript{30}See Mathew Page Andrews, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 545, for the story of Virginia's readmission to the Union.

founder, Thomas Jefferson. There was no question about the willingness of the university to accept the money, but again the belief seemed to prevail that such a school would be too theoretical to be of practical value to the farmers. As one person expressed it "... it was well understood in the legislature that the University did not favor the plan of establishing a school of the manual or highly practical order. Indeed the supporters of the University were much divided in the whole matter, and as a result their influence was not brought to bear in the most effective way."

Over in Lexington, Washington College under the leadership of Robert E. Lee had not been idle. One of the first men in the South to see the real need for a practical education, Lee had in conjunction with his faculty worked out a plan of reorganization for the college to include a school of agriculture with a farm for demonstrating agricultural methods and for conducting agricultural experiments. A part of this plan as it related to agriculture is worth noting and reads as follows:

[Footnotes]

32Ibid., p. 5.
35Dabney, op. cit., I, p. 93; "Scientific and Practical Departments of Collegiate Education," Southern Planter, XXIX (February, 1869), p. 120.
Agriculture is at present the most important interest of the Southern People, and must continue so for years to come. No effort, therefore, should be spared to advance it, and to extend to it all the advantages which science has bestowed upon manufactures. An agricultural school, where scientific principles and processes may be applied and illustrated will be of efficient service.

The objective stated by Lee for this new school was "to provide the facilities required by the large class of our young men who looking to an early entrance into practical pursuits of life need a more direct training to this end than the usual literary courses." Here indeed was a statement of objectives in strong contrast to the usual statement from the literary schools! Lee did not live long enough to carry the claim of Washington College for the land-grant fund before the legislature, but his great name remained a powerful influence with the small "Confederate clique" in the legislature at the resumption of the land-grant debate.

In the same town the neighbor of Washington College, the Virginia Military Institute, had called Mathew Fontaine Maury to the chair of physics and with his great skill was planning to make a physical survey of the state and to resume the ante bellum work in agricultural education.

---

36 Ibid., p. 121; Catalogue of Washington College, Lexington, Virginia, 1858-69, p. 56 ff.

37 Loc. cit.
Already when the very life of the institution was being threatened, Maury's name and fame had been rather adroitly used by the Institute's representative to gain political favor with the "Reconstructors" at the state capitol. 38

Yet another development interesting for the story of agricultural education took place in Lexington during this time. William Henry Ruffner, who was now living on his farm near Lexington, was as stated, definitely opposed to giving the land-grant fund to any of the existing colleges. He seemingly proposed to F. H. Smith, superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute, that an effort be made to unite the interests of Washington College with those of the Virginia Military Institute against the interest of the University of Virginia and in behalf of a separate school. 39 Smith defended the Virginia Military Institute's claim to the fund and at the same time depreciated the university's claim or chances for the fund because of the well-known prejudice there against practical education. 40

There was on the faculty of Washington College at the same time a professor, John Lyle Campbell, who had taken a

38 Smith, op. cit., p. 220.
39 Letter from F. H. Smith to W. H. Ruffner January 22, 1867. In Ruffner Papers deposited in the Historical Foundation of the Presbyterian and Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Montreat, North Carolina. (This collection will be referred to hereafter simply as the Ruffner Papers.)
40 Ibid.
great interest in agricultural education and in 1859 had published a textbook on agriculture, intended for use in academies and colleges.\textsuperscript{41} This book, far ahead of its time in its attempt to combine agricultural facts and principles with its interpretative related science, had received enthusiastic acclaim from the agricultural press, the State Agricultural Society, and even from the heads of certain "high schools" [sic] of the day.\textsuperscript{42}

Both Washington College and the Virginia Military Institute were planning an extensive physical survey of the state\textsuperscript{43} which both felt would have significant value for the development of agricultural interests.

With all these just-mentioned forces operating in the small town of Lexington at the same time, it is little wonder that some friction and misunderstanding should develop.\textsuperscript{44} What is not so well known - in fact, is almost unknown - is that out of all the confused developments a plan was evolved which proposed to set up an agricultural

\begin{enumerate}
\item J. L. Campbell, \textit{A Manual of Scientific and Practical Agriculture for School and Farm}.
\item Couper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 197.
\end{enumerate}
institute to be operated jointly by Washington College and the Virginia Military Institute. The plan itself called for a farm, a shop, buildings, a manual labor feature, a complete and detailed agricultural and geological survey of the state, and a practical agricultural journal. The plan also presented ways of co-ordinating the work of the two colleges to avoid unnecessary duplication and overlapping of work and at the same time to provide for joint faculty participation in the agricultural institute. Nothing seems to have come of this plan, nor is there any record of its ever having been put before the legislature as an argument for the land-grant money.

Outside of the partisan college groups, sentiment, where any was expressed, seemed to be developing in favor of a separate agricultural and mechanical college. One of the most effective agitators and spokesmen for this separate college group was W. T. Sutherlin, a highly popular self-made non-college business man from Danville. Speaking before the Mechanics Association of Danville in 1867, he argued in regard to the disposal of the land-grant fund that

\[45\]\footnote{A full copy of the proposed plan is in the Ruffner Papers.}

\[46\]\footnote{Memorial of the Life, Public Service and Character of William T. Sutherlin as Furnished by His Friends and Published by His Family, p. 8.}
To make the federal endowment most available it should be appropriated to a new educational enterprise designed to secure practical benefits to the masses. 47

Sutherlin's stand at this time is worth remembering, for he was closely identified with the State Agricultural Society 48 and exercised tremendous influence with both the farmers and the mechanics of the state. In 1871 he entered the legislature 49 and immediately took up the fight on behalf of a separate college of agriculture.

The agricultural journals of the state during this period were slowly recuperating from the effects of the war; and while from time to time they definitely expressed opinions favorable to practical agricultural schools, they did not wage a very vigorous campaign one way or another for any particular plan. The editor of the Farmer, published at Richmond, did urge that someone, preferably a committee from the State Agricultural Society, draw up a plan whereby a "practical" educational program could be set up. 50 Someone signing himself "Farmer" and writing in the same journal


urged that a committee of agriculturists and mechanics be permitted to determine the manner in which the land-grant money should be spent. In somewhat the same vein the editor of the *Farmer's Gazette* bemoaned the lack of interest in agricultural education shown by the farmers themselves. Continuing, he said, "In this state there is no institution specially devoted to agriculture... men in all other pursuits but agriculture are especially trained for their vocations. Why should not this be equally true with respect to agriculture?" Then the editor proceeded to call on the State Agricultural Society to present to the legislature a "digested scheme" for the improvement and the advancement of agricultural education. The editor of the slowly recuperating *Southern Planter* frankly stated that he approached the subject of agricultural education with considerable trepidation. His honest confession seemed to be good for his editorial soul, however, because he at once launched an attack on the idea of anyone's receiving any "practical" good from the agricultural instruction getting under way at the University of Virginia and at the Virginia Military Institute and urged that steps be taken to set up

---


The legislature was in session when Virginia was readmitted into the Union early in 1870, and almost immediately thereafter the question of disposal of the land-grant fund was resumed.54 This legislature as the result of reconstruction days and the enfranchising of the Negro was different from any other legislature ever before or since assembled in Virginia. It had many names and faces new to the political scene and perhaps less susceptible to the appeal of old Virginia traditions than the members of any other legislature ever assembled in the state.55

As it entered into the debate over the land-grant fund, no Jefferson, Cabell, or Mercer was available or emerged to rally support to any plan as had occurred about half a century earlier in the struggle over the state university.

The debates in the legislature at this time quickly

53 "Farm Schools," Southern Planter, (n. s.), V (January, 1871), pp. 1 and 52.


55 This legislature has often been called the "Black and Tan" legislature because of the mixed color of its members. It was made up of aliens, Negroes, carpetbaggers, scalawags, and native white Virginians. The representatives of the older traditional aristocratic Virginia were in the minority. If one judges it from the cross section of society represented, this legislature was truly the people's legislature.
crystallized around two major questions; namely, should the grant be given to a presently existing college or institution? or Should it be used to establish a separate institution? At first the sentiment appeared to be in favor of the first choice, a bill being introduced to divide the grant, with one-third going to the University of Virginia, one-third to the Virginia Military Institute, and one-third to the Hampton Institute for the colored. This bill failed to pass, and there at once arose in the legislature a prolonged, bitter, and at times acrimonious struggle over the disposition of the fund. Old sectional jealousies which had played such havoc with ante bellum efforts at internal improvement were aroused. Sectarianism entered into the fight, as well as long bitter attacks leveled against the University and the Virginia Military Institute as being too aristocratic, too expensive, and too theoretical for the great masses intended to be benefitted by the


59 Letter from "South Side," Richmond Daily Dispatch, January 2, 1871; Ibid., January 6, 1871.
It is beyond the scope of this study to trace the details of this legislative struggle. Altogether some twenty schools clamored for a share of the fund, with all of them demonstrating more interest in the money than in the cause of agricultural education. A private university was chartered to teach "agriculture and the useful arts" but failed to get the land-grant fund. Political alliances and combinations of sectional support were formed and tried. The faculty of the University of Virginia was reported to be divided on the question of accepting the grant, but the Board of Visitors denied this fact and earnestly sought the fund and secured considerable support in the legislature.

---


61 Couper, op. cit., III, p. 234.


in spite of the fact that many recalled the university's action concerning the proposal for an agricultural professorship advanced in 1854-57 by the State Agricultural Society. 66

As the seemingly endless debate dragged on and on, one member of the legislature suggested that Congress be notified that Virginia did not want the fund, because it was more trouble than it was worth. 67 The editor of the Educational Journal of Virginia during the debates admitted that he did not know the exact status of the fund, although listening to the debates was, he agreed, "better than going to the opera or theater." 68 In far southwestern Virginia the Pearisburg Gazette disgustedly reported that the House "talk-e-talked" [sic] on the subject of the landscript, 69 while a writer to the Richmond Daily Dispatch by applying a mathematical formula to the number of schools trying to get the fund and to the days spent by the legislature in debate facetiously proved it would cost the state

66 Educational Journal of Virginia, I (June, 1870), p. 245.
67 Richmond Daily Enquirer, March 15, 1871.
69 Pearisburg Gazette, February 3, 1872.
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£4,268,160,000 to dispose of the fund.

During all this struggle the advocates of a separate school remained steadfast in their demands. W. T. Sutherlin in the House presented a forceful speech on behalf of a separate school and warned against giving the fund to a literary college and failing thereby to insure compliance with the federal act. The State Agricultural Society again appealed to the legislature for a separate school, and petitions from various sections of the state began to pour in, asking for the same thing.

It is not exactly clear now, nor apparently was it clear at the time, how all these various forces ever coalesced into the final movement establishing the college. Ruffner writing as early as 1873 referred to the different accounts already being publicly given about the establishment of the college. He then proceeded to give credit to Senator John E. Penn for the successful movement. The editor of the

70 "Progress of the War of Colleges," Richmond Daily Dispatch, January 29, 1872.
71 Ibid.
72 "Annual Meeting of the Agricultural Society," Southern Planter, XXXI (December, 1871), p. 721. It is clear that the society opposed giving the fund to any existing college but it is not exactly clear just what the society proposed as a substitute.
Richmond Daily Dispatch, however, said that Major W. T. Sutherlin's plan for the establishment of a separate agricultural and mechanical college "seems now to have the vantage ground in both Houses."75 Goodrich Wilson, on the other hand, in the Roanoke Times gave the credit to General Gabriel C. Wharton.76 To add to the confusion, Jennings Cropper Wise, an ardent supporter of the Virginia Military Institute, commented, "This action [in establishing the agricultural college] seems to have been the result of a shrewd deal between the blacks and the western faction in the legislature by which the spoils were to be divided between them while the supporters of the various colleges pressing their claims contended among themselves."77 To a person familiar with this period in the history of the state this latter assertion seems reasonable, but the present writer can not find any documentary evidence of any sort whatever to support it. It seems that the following presentation might more nearly approach the real story.

The times and the conditions were ripe for a college of agriculture on the eve of the Civil War. Along with the demand for a school of agriculture there was a deepseated

75 Richmond Daily Dispatch, January 29, 1872.

76 Goodrich Wilson, "The Southwest Corner," Roanoke Times, October 8, 1939.

77 Wise, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
conviction and desire that such a school be practical rather than theoretical. This desire, as shown in previous chapters of this study, frequently expressed itself in outbursts against the uselessness of literary education for farmers. The war simply checked but did not change this ante bellum atmosphere, so favorable for the idea of a practical agricultural school. When the debate began in the legislature, enough of this sentiment was alive to block immediate attempts to give the fund to any of the established literary institutions; and as the sectionalism, sectarianism, and inter-collegiate jealousy began to throw the legislature into a deadlock, the sentiment for a practical "people's education" became identified with the movement for a separate school and gradually gained sufficient strength until this idea dominated the legislature. The writer's interpretation is supported by a statement by Ruffner when in discussing the struggle during its later stages he referred to it as a struggle between the "claims of the people as against the claims of the colleges."78

The culmination of the long fight is rather simply told. Colonel John E. Penn by means of an amendment to the bill providing for the distribution of the fund to the

University of Virginia, the Virginia Military Institute, and the Hampton Agricultural Institute got the bill changed to provide that one-third of the land-scrip fund should go to the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute and two-thirds to a new institution, or the endowment of a school which would give up its previous name and object and become the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. A blank was left in the bill for the name of the college to receive the fund. This bill passed the Senate but too late to be acted on by the House before adjournment. In 1871-72 the battle was resumed, with Senator Penn pressing for his bill or amendment of the previous year in the Senate and Gabriel C. Wharton pressing for an almost identical bill in the House.

There was in the town of Blacksburg a Methodist school chartered by the legislature in 1854 as the Olin and Preston Institute but in 1872 known as the Preston and Olin Institute. This institute, named for a great Methodist

---


81 Catalogue of Preston and Olin Institute, Blacksburg, Montgomery County, Virginia 1869-70, p. 11.
preacher and educator and the Preston family, powerful leaders in the social and political life of the state and especially the southwest, belonged to the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The trustees of this institution were rather widely scattered throughout the section rather than concentrated in one county and therefore could exercise considerable influence. This institute became one of the claimants for the fund and being in Penn and Gabriel's district received their full support. The trustees of the institute agreed to turn the property over to the state, and the county of Montgomery wherein Blacksburg lay agreed to raise $20,000 for the school if the state appropriated the land-grant fund to it.

In the legislature, in the meantime, the deadlock over the disposition of the fund continued, with Penn in the Senate and Wharton in the House repeatedly trying to get the name Preston and Olin Institute inserted into the bill as the recipient of the grant. The struggle seemed hopeless at first, but in the words of Ruffner: "Just when the contest seemed fiercest, there was a sudden truce, a

---

82 Catalogue, Preston and Olin Institute, Blacksburg, Montgomery County, Virginia, Session 1869 and 70, p. II.

negotiation, and a very general acceptance of Colonel
Penn's idea including the location. As a result, the
legislature on March 19, 1872, approved an act appropriat­
ing two-thirds of the land-grant money to the Preston and
Olin Institute at Blacksburg in Montgomery County, with the
conditions that the trustees deed the property to the state
and that the name of the institution be changed to the
Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.

These conditions were complied with and the Governor
proceeded by the authority of the act to appoint the Board
of Visitors, which was to include as ex-officio members
the president of the State Agricultural Society and the
members of the State Board of Education. This board
met at once and took up the task of laying out a plan of
organization and instruction for the new college. This
task proved to be very difficult, since there was no one
established pattern, theory, or practice in agricultural
education to use as a guide. A committee consisting of
William H. Ruffner, by now State Superintendent of Public

85 Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1871-72, Chapter 234, p. 312. See appendix D for a copy of the act.
87 Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College Its History and Organization, 1872, p. 1. In V.P.I. Miscellaneous Pamphlets.
Instruction, J. R. Anderson, and W. T. Sutherlin was appointed to report to the board a plan of organization and instruction for the new college.  

Ruffner himself entered upon this responsibility with great vigor. In 1856 as editor of the Valley Farmer at Harrisonburg he had advocated a practical education for farmers and again in 1866-67 had urged upon the legislature the necessity of a separate practical college of agriculture. Now he was to be given a chance to help work out such a system. Unfortunately much of Ruffner's work on behalf of the college at this stage has been overlooked because of its being overshadowed by his great work as State Superintendent of Public Instruction that went on at the same time. Immediately upon being appointed to the committee to draw up the plan of organization and instruction, he began making a serious study of the reports of technical schools of Europe and the United States. He

88 Ibid., p. 1.
89 The only known copies of this journal are in the Ruffner Papers in Montreat, North Carolina, where a complete, well-kept file may be found.
90 See Chapters III and IV.
91 Diary, William H. Ruffner. Entry for September 11, 1880, Ruffner Papers.
visited and studied the program at Oswego and Cornell, at the latter institution being "guided by Cornell himself." However his views did not find full support from the rest of the board. An excerpt from "Notes of William Henry Ruffner" to be found in Ruffner's Papers throws so much light on this period of the college's struggling beginning that even though the language may be a bit blunt at times it is given in full here:

... None of the members of the Board [Board of Visitors for the new college] except the Superintendent of Public Instruction knew anything of technical education in agriculture and the mechanic arts. It appeared at the first meeting of the Board that a large majority of the members were full of the idea of simply reproducing the University of Virginia for the benefit of the South West [Blacksburg is in the southwestern part of Virginia]. The Superintendent of Public Instruction [Ruffner] laid out all his strength in defeating this scheme and succeeded to a large degree though not perfectly. He [Ruffner] claims for himself the entire credit of whatever technological elements were in the original organization of that institution. Sutherlin and Anderson gave him some support.

Two important converts were made among the members of the Board residing in the South West viz Wm. A. Stuart and Dr. Robert [sic] Black who from the first meeting of the Board were W. H. Ruffner's warm personal friends and official supporters. Governor Walker who was also on the Board saw the point after a time, as did Robert Beverley but Daniel De Jarnette and Major James Taylor, Attorney General led the opposition and never were anything but marplots.

93 Diary, William H. Ruffner. Entry for May 28, 1872, Ruffner Papers.
94 This should be Dr. Harvey Black.
and nuisances! After a fearful struggle, however, continued through numerous meetings held in quick succession a scheme of organization was adopted which had in it the vital elements which belong to such schools, though overlaid with much that was objectionable. Lewis E. Harive was another of the cranks of the Board. When the time came to elect a faculty we had even more trouble in getting suitable men than we had in shaping a suitable scheme. They all had to be Virginians, Democrats, and Confederate veterans while a previous technical education and practice was not deemed at all important.

The College property having been given by the Methodists they claimed the moral right to name the president. Their man was Thomas Conrad a hickory preacher and a knave who had been the principal of the Academy. [Preston and Olin Institute] The faculty chosen consisted of educated gentlemen not one of whom had the least idea of what a technical college ought to be. No two agreed in their views. They argued, they struggled, and they wound up in a fist fight.95

Despite all the difficulties encountered, a plan of organization and instruction was adopted which provided that the college should be practical and that it should seek to train practical agriculturists and mechanics. A schedule calling for a three-year course was set up with the first-year studies common to both agricultural and mechanical students, and with manual labor features for both.96

Writing in the Educational Journal, Ruffner at the

95Notes on William Henry Ruffner - notebook marked No. 1, pp. 11-12-13, Ruffner Papers.

96Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College Its History and Organization, 1872, pp. 5-35. See appendix E for the complete schedule.
request of the Board of Visitors described the new school to the public as follows:

The school will be sui generis - a truly technical school of secondary grade. Its whole cast will have special reference to the wants of the industrial classes by which are meant those who are directly (not remotely) engaged in producing, developing, or shaping the material products of the State, and its ultimate object is not to educate them out of but in and for their vocations.97

With a plan of organization and instruction adopted, the board elected a president and a faculty for the college on August 14, 1872,98 and with this faculty opened the college on October 1, of the same year, a little more than six months after the legislature had passed the act of authorization for the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.

There was no fanfare or pomp at the opening; in fact, the press, including the Southern Planter, hardly did more than give casual mention to this event,99 but the response in terms of numbers of students seems to have been very satisfactory, the number increasing from 132 the first year


99See Richmond Daily Dispatch, October 5, 1872; Southern Planter, XXXIII (October, 1872), p. 621. This notice in reality gives the impression that it was used as an editorial "filler." It has no title.
to 255 within three years.\textsuperscript{100}

This somewhat dubiously successful launching of the college did not end its problems, however, for as to be expected its survival and prosperity depended upon the social, political, economic, and industrial factors and conditions of the state, especially as these factors affected agriculture. The Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was so completely at the mercy of these already mentioned factors for the first two decades of its life that it seems well to turn aside at this time for a brief summary of these conditions before relating the struggle of the college for survival.

The final struggle between the armies of Lee and Grant had left much of Virginia in such a state that desolation and despair continued to rule many of the agricultural sections for three decades after Appomattox.\textsuperscript{101} Farm lands as a result of the change from slave to free labor became less desirable from a social point of view and less productive. By selling off land many of the big farmers were able to survive. This selling tended to increase the number of small farmers but at the same time helped hasten the transfer of the social and business centers to the towns to which so many whites had fled after the fall of

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{100}Report of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1873 and 1875-76.

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{101}D. W. Sheldon, Populism in the Old Dominion - Virginia Farm Politics 1885-1900, p. 1.
slavery. The conditions in the agricultural areas of the older slave-holding sections whence state leadership had come for so long were particularly tragic. The wealth represented by the slaves had vanished and in many cases had even become a liability. The freedmen were for the most part so "ignorant, untrained and totally lacking in any comprehensive system of scientific agriculture" as to make any intelligent economic system almost impossible.

At the end of the war the state's great system of canals for which she had gone so far into debt was in utter ruin and had either to be rebuilt or to be replaced by railroads before agricultural produce could be moved readily to market. The tax-paying capacity had been reduced, and local or state capital simply was not available for the tremendous task of both rebuilding and developing the state at the same time. Many people and sections of the state at this time were embittered by seeing their interest in property, natural resources, and utilities pass into the control of northern capital.

Discouragement, frustration, defeatism, and a paralyzing


103 Sheldon, op. cit., p. 2; See also Richmond Daily Dispatch, January 14 and 16, 1871; J. H. Claiborne, Seventy-five Years in Old Virginia, p. 377 ff.; Moger, op. cit., pp. 45-63; Andrews, op. cit., pp. 526-550 for a more thorough treatment of the difficulties facing rural Virginia at this time.
loss of prewar vigor tended to creep in and postpone or delay progressive attempts to go forward, even though beginnings in adaptation to new conditions were made.

This deadening effect was felt in the legislature where state finance and railroad battles took up most of the time. Agricultural education, never a particularly popular topic in legislative circles of the state, was again forced to give way to what the legislature thought to be more important problems. The creation of an agricultural college could not change this attitude over night. As Pearson expressed it, "Leaders of public thought were too busy with race politics, and legislatures with railroad wars and state finance to provide good roads or agricultural schools, or even a respectable department of agriculture, to enable the farmer to meet the competition which railroad extension made inevitable."\(^{104}\)

As pointed out, the legislative debates preceding the creation of the college tended to arouse prejudices, animosities, sectarianism, and sectional issues. Coupled to this condition was the fact that the new college was located west of the Blue Ridge in the southwestern part of the state which had never been very closely identified with the traditions of the ante bellum aristocratic east; in fact, southwestern Virginia, along with West Virginia on

\(^{104}\) Pearson, The Readjuster Movement in Virginia, p. 92.
several occasions had been caustically referred to by eastern residents as the site of the "wild eyed democrats" with empty pocketbooks.

Certainly it may be safely asserted that none of these just-related factors was such as to secure enthusiastic state support, financial or otherwise, for the new member of the educational circle. More important for the immediate welfare of the college was the fact already noted that the faculty itself soon disagreed as to the best procedure to follow. This disagreement seemed to stem from a difference of opinion as to the best or proper mode of military training, but it soon spread to include the entire question of discipline and instruction. One of the leading church papers took up the issue, chiefly on the grounds of encouraging better discipline in the school. The discussion soon spread until the paper was in reality attacking the entire school. Perhaps the real motive behind the attack is revealed in the following statement taken from the church paper in question and quoted in the student publication, the Gray Jacket: "But what folly in the farmer to send his son to learn the art of agriculture to a school where the President came not from the plantation with its experience, but from an Episcopal Seminary in Virginia, Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention, 1829-30, p. 337, et passim.

Smyth, op. cit., p. 5.
Tennessee, and who knows less of practical farming than hundreds of Negro foremen in Virginia."

In addition to all these factors the wounds and disappointment created by the bitter legislative debates over the land-grant scrip tended to keep many people, if not openly hostile to the winner, at least not openly enthusiastic. Many perhaps felt, secretly at least, a sympathy for the idea expressed by one writer when he suggested that Virginia abandon the college, sell the farm, and reestablish a school of agriculture at Emory and Henry College.108

By 1879 the conditions at the college were at a low ebb. The dissension in the faculty had broken into the open, and newspapers all over the state had begun to bring the matter before the public. As to be expected, public opinion was divided but was becoming vociferous, so much so, in fact, that the editor of the Amherst Enterprise became alarmed and warned that "we know of nothing better calculated to excite sourness on the part of the people than the continued 'picking' at the conduct of the affairs at our Agricultural and Mechanical College."109

107 Gray Jacket, II (October, 1876), p. 5.

108 C. R. Boyd, Resources of South-West Virginia, p. 12.

109 Amherst Enterprise, October 30, 1879, reprinted in the State, November 7, 1879.
The Board of Visitors, realizing that the conditions at the college were in a serious state, started an investigation and instituted a reorganization to correct the conditions. Before the reorganization was completed, however, the affairs of the college were caught up in the whirlpool of the state affairs, especially politics, and given such a buffeting as is seldom survived by any college. The fact that it did survive is in the writer's opinion a tribute to the effectiveness of the prewar agitation already traced for a system of agricultural education.

Attention to the efforts to set up a functioning organization will be considered in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VII

THE REORGANIZATION PERIOD OF THE STATE AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

Although the ante bellum effort and agitation for agricultural education had stirred up interest in the cause and had raised hopes and expectations as to the benefits to be derived from such a program, no definite plan of organization for such a school of agriculture had been accepted. All the attempts in the state to teach agriculture prior to the establishment of the college at Blacksburg had been in institutions where agricultural education was secondary to some other more readily accepted objective. Now the newly established college was to stand on its own feet and develop its own program for promoting agricultural and mechanical education. As far as Virginia was concerned, this had to be a pioneer program undertaken by a college which many felt had been "erected by the State at a time when her financial embarrassments were such as to render it impossible for her to put enough money into it to either complete it in a manner to meet the objects for which it was organized, or to maintain it properly when so built . . . ."¹

¹C. R. Boyd, Resources of South-West Virginia, p. 12.
The state conditions into which the new college was launched have been briefly set forth in the preceding chapter. The attitude of the people toward the college was mixed. The great mass of farmers seem to have been indifferent or apathetic, while many of the leaders in the state seemed to believe "that the legislature had ensured a failure in placing the school where it would be remote from a large part of the State, inaccessible by rail, with a climate and soil as far as possible from an average of the State, deprived of all the advantages of the already established courses of instruction and means of illustration, which [the] old colleges would have afforded had the land-scrip been assigned to them."  

As already pointed out, the first organization set up attempted to provide a practical type of instruction. For various reasons this type of instruction did not prove to be popular and in conjunction with the disagreement over military training soon led to serious faculty discord. This discord in turn soon led to a determination on the part of the Board of Visitors to reorganize the school. When this step was undertaken, however, it touched off a series of
events which led to one reorganization after another in quick succession for the first two decades of the existence of the college. It is this period of struggle and groping for an organization to fit the conditions of the state which the writer has somewhat arbitrarily designated as the reorganization period of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. In this chapter, then, attention will be directed to these reorganization attempts and the significance which the attempt had for agricultural education.

The practical program undertaken by the college upon its establishment had by the session of 1877-78 been so heavily attacked that the president in his annual report for the year obviously devoted considerable effort to a justification of the policy which had been followed. The following excerpt from this report clearly indicates this policy which by now was under fire:

The natural ambition of the professors to rival in scholarship the other colleges of the State was laid aside; the fact was recognized and acted on that the State had elsewhere made ample provision to train its sons for the learned professions and to provide scientists who might analyze her soils and detect poisons, and such engineers as might plan her railroads or project her mines, such military officers as might serve her in time of need; that the task of this College should be to train practical workingmen, who should till her farms rather than theorize about scientific agriculture, build rather than plan her houses, construct rather than supervise her railroads, sink rather than project her mines, rather be guided intelligently by the analysis of
others than make analyses themselves, and furnish in time of need a large number of men well trained in company battalion drill. 3

If the farm people of that day were at all like the farmers of today, it is small wonder that this program of teaching the farmer to do the work while teaching others to do the thinking was most unpopular.

By 1879 the state-wide agitation both pro and con concerning the college had become so great that the Board of Visitors took cognizance of the situation and made an investigation of the affairs at the school. Some changes were determined upon, and a "card," or announcement, was run in the papers of the state, reassuring the people that all trouble at the college had been ironed out and all causes for complaint corrected. The plan did not succeed, for, as "Rusticus" writing in the State excitedly charged, the board's mind "did not hold"; and four months later the board proposed to reorganize the college along strictly military lines. 4 This proposal really started trouble. A storm of protest over this proposed military feature arose,

---

3 Ibid., p. 7.

4 Letter signed "Rusticus" in the State, December 1, 1879.
It was not long before the protest began to center on the organization and the administration of the college, although a citizen signing himself as "Taxpayer" claimed in one of the state papers that many of the criticisms could be traced to disaffected officers and faculty.6

The Board of Visitors, on the other hand, proceeded with their plans of reorganization along military lines and replaced President Minor with John Lee Buchannan, a native southwestern Virginian, who assumed office on March 1, 1880.

In the meantime a political situation had developed in the state which now began seriously to affect the college. To understand subsequent events it will be necessary to turn aside from the story of the reorganization of the college and briefly review this state situation.

Virginia had entered the Civil War with a huge state indebtedness. At the conclusion of the war the question of payment of the bonds of indebtedness came up. One group in

---

5 See especially the Richmond Daily Dispatch, November 3, 1879. It is interesting to note that during the session of 1951-52, at the very moment this is being written, a friendly student demonstration against the military system followed by the college is being carried on, while the campus itself is placarded with posters announcing, "The Corps Must Go."

6 Letter signed "Taxpayer" in the Richmond Daily Dispatch, November 3, 1879, brings this point out very forcefully.
the state stood for funding the debt and paying it even if it meant depriving state agencies of support to do so. Another group, drawn heavily from the leaders close to the great masses of people, stood for readjusting the debt in line with the newer conditions and times. This latter group, drawn from all political parties in the state, came to be known as the "Readjusters." In 1879 they gained control of the state legislature and in 1881 not only retained control of the legislature but elected a Governor as well. This readjuster movement, which in the words of Pearson originated as "a protest of the plain people against the very honest but also very narrow and unsocial minded regime which came into control as a result of the Civil War and Reconstruction," inaugurated many far-reaching social reforms. Once in office many of the leaders turned the movement into an attempt to make the Readjusters into a state party. The possibilities of using the public school system and the new agricultural college for patronage purposes appealed greatly to this new group; in fact, some of the leading Readjusters, as a screen for this true purpose of patronage, had promised if elected to put all adminis-

---

8 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1932, No. 7, p. 5.
9 Ibid., p. 8; The Commonwealth, February 5, 1880.
10 Pendleton, op. cit., pp. 348-49.
trative departments of the state government "in sympathy with the people,"\textsuperscript{11} When it is recalled that at this time the legislature approved or disapproved the appointment of all county and city school superintendents who in turn nominated the youth from their respective counties or cities to attend the agricultural and mechanical college on a free scholarship,\textsuperscript{12} it is readily seen why any political party would look with a somewhat eager eye at these two agencies in the state.

The internal dissension at the college, along with the rather state-wide discussion over the proposed military reorganization getting under way for the school, gave the Headjusters a ready excuse to make an investigation in an effort to put the college in "sympathy with the people."

A legislative committee was appointed to make the investigation and to report their findings and conclusions to the legislature. This committee after its investigation agreed that the college was in very poor condition but disagreed as to the best remedy. The majority report favored a complete reorganization of both the Board of Visitors and the faculty, while the minority report favored reorganizing the board only.\textsuperscript{13} The state press entered into the controversy,\textsuperscript{\textit{Loc. cit.}}

\textsuperscript{12}See appendix D for this provision in the act creating the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.

\textsuperscript{13}The \textit{Commonwealth}, March 1, 1880.
seemingly on strictly political party lines, and both attacked and defended the report.\textsuperscript{14} It is interesting to note that in all the controversy in the legislature and in the press regarding the college no effort was made to abolish the college. The struggle seemed to be one of how to organize the college and, more important yet, who should organize it.

In the midst of all this growing turmoil the legislature, ignoring the fact that the Board of Visitors were busy reorganizing the college under a new president, on March 9, 1880, passed a joint bill directing that a new board of Visitors be appointed and given power to remove all or as many of the college faculty as they thought necessary. This act further provided that the Governor name the new board members with the approval and concurrence of the Senate.\textsuperscript{15}

The Governor, however, not being a Readjuster, did not seem to be in sympathy with the move on the part of the legislature. He waited, therefore, until this body had adjourned before he made his appointments to the new Board of Visitors in April of the same year.\textsuperscript{16} It may be a moot

\textsuperscript{14}See especially the Commonwealth for February and March, 1880 and the Salem Weekly Register, August 8, 1879, for incidents leading up to the action of 1880.

\textsuperscript{15}Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1879-80, pp. 236-237.

\textsuperscript{16}Report of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Virginia for the Year Ending June 12, 1880, p. 5.
question as to whether the Governor was motivated in this move by a desire to circumvent the Readjusters or by a desire to promote the interests of the college. The records do not make this point absolutely clear, but the evidence seems to favor the belief that the Governor was more interested in outmaneuvering the Readjusters than in protecting the college.

The newly appointed members, although not having been confirmed by the Senate, went ahead and organized as a board, and on June 7, 1880, vacated all the offices of the college from the president on down and shortly thereafter proceeded to make "a rearrangement of the chairs and some modification of the curriculum." ¹⁷ The board's intent and desire to establish an agricultural and mechanical school is clearly reflected in the following excerpt from its report for 1880:

This Board conceives that it was not the design of the Assembly, or of Congress, to establish here a military school, an academic college, or a university, but an institution whose primary function should be to turn out scientific farmers and mechanics, so far as a school may serve that purpose, and whose secondary object should be to accompany that special training and teaching with so much of a liberal general education as may consist with and conduce to the primary aim. ¹⁸  

¹⁷Report of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Virginia for the Year Ending June 12, 1880, p. 5.  
¹⁸Ibid., pp. 5-6.
This objective apparently was clear enough, but the methods and the organization for achieving it definitely were not at hand. To add to the difficulties encountered by the novelty of creating an agricultural and mechanical college, the students applying for admission were poorly prepared for technical instruction. This condition of course can be easily understood when it is recalled that the state system of public elementary schools was just getting under way, while the public high school system was not even in existence at the time. The Board of Visitors recognized this weakness and in 1880 reported:

Such is the lack of preliminary training among the bulk of youths for whom this college is specially designed that, for the present at least, it must be burdened with an amount of elementary work ordinarily finished in public schools of a very moderate grade.19

The "rearrangement of the chairs and some modification of the curriculum" which the board reported at this time seem to have been motivated by a desire to secure a more closely knit administrative unit and by a desire to reduce operating expenses of the college rather than by any increased understanding of the problems of agricultural education. Although the agricultural press of the day was beginning to recognize a differentiation of agricultural

19 Ibid., p. 5.
knowledge into distinct fields, such as horticulture, livestock, and so on, no such differentiation for purposes of instruction was suggested for the chair of agriculture in the reorganized curriculum. It may be said, in fact, that the trend in this reorganization of 1880 was away from a differentiation of any field into its special divisions as the following excerpts taken from the board's report on the arrangement of studies will show:

At meetings of the Board . . . these points were decided:

1. That the English Language and Literature shall be one chair, and that the incumbent of that chair shall also instruct the classes in Latin and French, and shall have charge of the preparatory school.

2. That Mathematics and Physics shall be united in one chair, and be taught by one Professor.

3. That Agriculture, Chemistry and Natural History shall form one chair, the incumbent of which will have the direction of the Experimental Farm when established . . . That there shall be elected a Farm manager to conduct the operations of the Farm under the supervision of the president.20

After nearly a decade of existence the college was still a long way from finding any distinct organization or methods by which to fulfill its peculiar function as an agricultural and mechanical school.

Following the rearrangement and reorganization of the curriculum, the board met in August, 1880, to elect a new

20 Report of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Virginia for the Year Ending August 11, 1881, p. 5.
faculty. William H. Ruffner was offered the presidency, but he refused it; whereupon Colonel Scott Shipp of the Virginia Military Institute was elected president. Shipp accepted the presidency but resigned at the end of four days when he determined he would not have a very free hand in administering the college. Shipp's resignation on the eve of the new session put the board in a real dilemma, but they appointed Professor Hart as acting president and renewed their search for a new president. William H. Ruffner was again offered the presidency. This time he agreed to consider the matter if the salary were made $2,500 a year and, more important still, if he were authorized to visit and study other land-grant agricultural and mechanical colleges to collect such information as might be useful in shaping the policy of the new college. This permission was granted, and Ruffner visited and studied nearly every land-grant college east of the Mississippi, visited

---

21 Diary, William H. Ruffner, September 11, 1880, in Ruffner Papers.

22 J. C. Wise, Personal Memoirs of Scott Shipp, p. 41. Referred to by W. C. Couper in One Hundred Years at V.M.I., III, p. 231; Report of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Virginia for the Year Ending June 12, 1880, p. 6. The election of Scott Shipp took place after the close of the year covered by this report but is recorded in the report anyway.

23 Diary, William H. Ruffner, September 11, 1880, in Ruffner Papers.
agricultural schools in Canada, and corresponded with practically all the other land-grant schools in the country. His report of this tour, almost completely overlooked today, is still interesting and valuable as a chapter in the history of the early land-grant movement in the United States.

This study of Ruffner's, along with his previously referred to study of the European agricultural schools, probably made him the best qualified man on agricultural and technical education in the state at the time. That he was interested in the presidency seems evident, but he was also by now becoming extremely disgusted with politics in educational matters. Evidently he conveyed some of his doubts about politics and the college presidency to Richard V. Gaines, one of the influential members of the Board of Visitors, for in a letter to Ruffner, Gaines frankly stated it as his opinion that the Readjusters were afraid of Ruffner and his influence and were definitely planning to oust him from the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Board of Visitors, Gaines added, were of the unanimous opinion that Ruffner was the best qualified man for the

---


25See Chapter VI.

presidency of the college and would back him fully if he accepted. Gaines added that as president, Ruffner would still no doubt have considerable opposition because of his having been elevated to the office from the board itself. Shortly thereafter at the next meeting of the Board of Visitors Ruffner definitely declined the presidency of the college. Ruffner's report of the programs at the land-grant colleges, while pointing up many of the difficulties faced in setting up programs in agricultural education, did not furnish a definite plan of what to do next; consequently the college limped along through the session of 1880-81 without much observable change unless it was one of slow deterioration. In the spring of 1881 the Board of Visitors surprisingly enough reelected John Lee Buchannan as president after they had previously ousted him, and just as surprisingly he accepted and took office on August 15, 1881.

The troubles of the college were not over. In December of this same year the legislature met, and almost immediately the Senate refused to confirm the appointment of the Board of Visitors which had been acting all this time only

27Letter from Richard V. Gaines to W. H. Ruffner September 13, 1880, in Ruffner Papers.

28Diary, William Henry Ruffner, November 18, 1880, Ruffner Papers.

on the basis of the Governor's appointment in April of 1880. This action of course meant that a new Board of Visitors would have to be named. Before the Governor could appoint this new board and get it confirmed by the Senate, his term of office expired, and he was succeeded by William B. Cameron of the Readjuster party. Cameron, upon taking office, almost at once nominated a new Board of Visitors for the college. The board this time was fully confirmed by the Senate on January 17, 1882, in accordance with the act of 1880. This board proceeded at once to remove all officials and faculty of the college appointed by the previous so-called illegal board. With this wholesale removal of officials and faculty accomplished, the board thereupon proceeded to reorganize the hapless college once more and incidentally by this action removed for the second time Dr. John Lee Buchannan from the presidency, both times within a matter of months from the time he assumed office.

For president this time the board selected a Readjuster, Thomas N. Conrad, from the college faculty and instructed him to "take charge of the College at once, ascertain its

30 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1881-82, p. 148.

31 Report of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Virginia for the Year Ending July 11, 1882, p. 5.
condition, and report a plan of reorganization." The conditions of the college as reported by the new president in pursuance of his instructions, even after discounting political bias, present such a vivid portrayal of the college at the end of its first decade of struggling existence that it is given in some detail here.

The condition of the College, as ascertained by a careful examination and close inspection was deplorable. The workshop, the practical part of the Mechanical Department, was closed and its costly engine had slept the sleep of months. The farm, the practical part of the Agricultural Department, was without proper organization and had been for years. The Military, one of the most attractive and useful features of the College, had been shoved into a corner and paralyzed . . . Indeed each distinctive feature of the College had lost its vigor, and the College had become a mere hull.

The condition of the College was astounding in another particular - its want of proper equipment after an existence of ten years. Though the resources of the College have been ample and unfailing [?] yet the College had not been provided with the ordinary equipment of modern Educational Institutions.

Think of a Laboratory without a drop of water!

A Department of Agriculture without even a seed!

A Department of Mineralogy without a mineral!

And of Botany without a plant! and you have the College as we found it.

Think of a State College without a Library, and that after an existence of ten years!

Think of a "model farm" and no dairy; no pigery; no hennery; no vineyard; no nursery; not even a garden, and you have the "College Farm" as we found it.

Think of two large College buildings and three stories high, without a drop of water on the premises!

Think of a $30,000.00 farm, without an ear of corn in the crib, or a bushel of wheat in the bin, or a ton of hay in the barn, and you have the "College Farm," as we found it in February 1882!

Such was the condition of things when we took charge of the College. The only department of the institution in a creditable shape was the academic. This had been efficiently sustained by the professors in their respective Lecture-rooms. But for this, the College would have been a total wreck.

With these surroundings, with the number of matriculates reduced to seventy-eight, with widespread feeling in the State that the College had utterly failed, with a partizan press circulating wilful misrepresentations and seeking in many slanderous ways to blast the future of the College, we began the work of resuscitation and re-organization, determined... to make the College a success.  

Such was the official report on the state of affairs at the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College at the end of its first decade of existence.

The new administration set about reorganizing the school at once. This administration for the first time in

---

33 Report of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Virginia for the Year Ending July 11, 1882, pp. 5-6.
the existence of the college brought it one thing vitally needed - namely, a harmonious faculty and Board of Visitors. At the same time it appears that the new president had a better idea of the nature of the problems involved in setting up a program of agricultural education. As already pointed out, the reorganizations of the college prior to 1882 had attempted to provide for agricultural instruction by assigning agriculture to a "chair" set up according to the usual custom in the conventional literary institution. In 1882 a different approach was made in that a Department of Agriculture was set up instead of a "chair" and organized around four subdivisions with certain specific responsibilities assigned to each subdivision. The plan of reorganization as set forth in the report for 1882 is worth recording here as a definite step toward the modern day curricular organization for agricultural education.

This Department [the agricultural department] has been organized and arranged as follows: A Horticultural department, an Experimental Department, a Farming department and Lectures. The Horticultural department has been subdivided into - Pomological, Botanical, Horticultural. The Pomological department consists of an orchard, vineyard, nursery etc. etc. [sic] The Botanical department consists of a neat green-house, to be well stocked in the early

\[34\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 6. \] This harmonious relationship is not at all surprising considering the practice the Readjusters followed in replacing state personnel not in full agreement with Readjuster policies. For the full story of this Readjuster movement in Virginia see Pearson, The Readjuster Movement in Virginia.
The Horticultural department embraces a large garden.
The Experimental department is under the management of the Professor of Agriculture who is conducting a line of experiments in connection with, and under the direction of, the Agricultural department at Washington. The Lectures upon rotation of crops, breeding and feeding of cattle, fertilizers etc. etc. [sic] find illustration upon the farm.

For a while it seemed that the reorganization at time would succeed in arresting the dissatisfaction of the people. The enrollment jumped from to . Student morale rose to a high level and caused the editor of the official student publication optimistically to predict that "a glorious future awaits our present Alma Mater if left to pursue its present prosperity." The State Superintendent of Public Instruction wrote enthusiastically of the work of the reorganized college and said:

President Conrad seems to be solving the problem of how to mix learning with labor. Visit the College farm and you would think his students were all laborers; look into the College workshops and mill and you would think they were all mechanics; note their military bearing and evolutions on parade and you would think they were all veteran soldiers; notice their gentlemanly deportment and you would be satisfied with the morals and discipline of the institution . . . the College deserves the hearty support

35 Ibid., pp. 6-7.

of the people of Virginia and seems to be receiving it.\textsuperscript{37}

These optimistic statements and evidences of progress were not enough to calm the bitter political passions of the time. The Readjuster regime in as bitter a political fight as probably ever seen in the state of Virginia was losing ground and in 1885 lost control of the state government to the Conservatives, or Democrats, as the Conservatives were now called. With the Senate and the governorship back in the hands of the Democrats it was not long before the Board of Visitors was dominated once more by this party. As the Democrats gained power, the attacks on the Readjuster president of the college increased so rapidly that the Board of Visitors in July, 1886, once more reorganized the college, this time by replacing President Conrad with General L. L. Lomax.\textsuperscript{38}

The reorganization at this time was not so drastic as some of the previous ones; in fact, the chief change seems to have been in administrative personnel with very little change in the organization for agricultural education.

On March 1, 1886, the legislature passed an act establishing an agricultural experiment station at the

\textsuperscript{37}R. R. Farr writing in the \textit{Educational Journal}, XIV (September, 1883), p. 278.

\textsuperscript{38}Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1891-92, Document 26, p. 46; advertisement in the \textit{Industrial South}, VI (July, 1886), p. 331.
college, "the same to be maintained by appropriations made by the Congress of the United States." Since the appropriation from Congress was not available earlier, this station was not actually put into operation until 1888; but even with this new department in operation, criticism continued to be poured forth on the college. By 1890 the great rural population of the state was beginning to recover somewhat from the deadly lethargy it had dropped into following the Civil War. A new sense of rural power and a demand to be heard were developing in the land. This reawakening did not result in any popular demand for an improved college of agriculture, but the Board of Visitors caught the spirit of the new developments and realized that the college needed considerable rejuvenation if it was to serve the state in this new day.

In 1891, therefore, the board reached a decision to reorganize the college once more and thereby "make the college what it should be - a true agricultural and mechanical school that Virginia would be proud of." After considerable debate the board determined not to remove the entire faculty but to remove only those whose removal was deemed necessary in order to accomplish the proposed


40 See Chapter VIII.

reorganization. President Lomax was given an opportunity
to resign and did so, but at the same time three members of
the faculty were removed, somewhat summarily it would seem.\textsuperscript{42}
Following this action, the board elected J. M. McBryde as
president and employed new men to fill the posts left
vacant by the discharged professors.

Two of the dismissed professors felt themselves abused
and preferred charges against the Board of Visitors and de­
manded a legislative investigation of the board's adminis­
tration of the college. Since some of the accusations
involved the charge of illegal use of federal funds, the
legislature once more decided to investigate the college.
A joint committee from the Senate and the House was ap­
pointed to conduct the investigation and report to the
legislature. This committee seems to have done a thorough
job of investigating the entire situation at the college.\textsuperscript{43}
Much political bias bobbed up from time to time in the
investigation, but as a whole the committee seemed sincere
in its effort to get at the root of the trouble at the
college and to arrive at a better understanding of the true
function and role of an agricultural college as a part of
the state-supported system of higher education. In this

\textsuperscript{42Ibid., pp. 27-28.}

\textsuperscript{43Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1891-92,
Document 26, pp. 1-144} gives a full account of this entire
investigation.
latter effort the committee, and subsequently the legislature, was aided tremendously by Charles E. Vawter, a member of the Board of Visitors for the college and at the same time superintendent of the highly successful Miller Manual Labor School in Albemarle County, Virginia. Letters from Justin S. Morrill, the father of the land-grant act, were introduced to show his ideas of the type of school he intended his act to promote, and comparisons of the school in Virginia with similar schools in other states were made.

In general this investigation seemed to reflect the awakening spirit of the times. A new vision of just what the college could mean to the state began to take shape. Much misunderstanding as to the nature, the purposes, the characteristics, and the opportunities of an agricultural college was cleared away. The duties and the responsibilities of the Board of Visitors were clarified somewhat; false state pride which for so long had filled the chief offices at the college with native Virginians of the "Confederate clique"

The Miller Manual Labor School, a privately endowed philanthropic school for children of Albemarle County, was established by a gift of Samuel Miller, who at the same time he endowed this school gave the $100,000 which was used to establish the agricultural professorship at the University of Virginia, to which reference has already been made. In 1892 the endowment of the Miller Manual Labor School amounted to more than $1,300,000, while its annual income was about $73,000. Both of these funds were in excess of the similar funds available for the state agricultural college at the time. Some agriculture was taught in the Miller School, but the major emphasis, as far as boys were concerned, was on vocational training in the non-agricultural trades. For a more detailed report of this school see Virginia School Reports for 1890 through 1893.
was shown to be just what it was; and in general the Board of Visitors was upheld in its management of the institution. A new generation of leaders with a full reverence for the past but at the same time with the ability to recognize the needs of the present and plan for the future was developing in the state. This group in the legislature to which the investigating committee reported rejected practically every political, reactionary, or nonconstructive proposal concerning the college and in their place adopted a full report designed to uphold and encourage the Board of Visitors to move ahead in the further development of the school. The concluding lines of the report adopted by the Senate as a result of this investigation are worthy of note here and are as follows:

The undersigned further state that they are of the opinion that the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College is now on a good basis for usefulness, especially in the schools or branches of education for which the college was established; its facilities are better (and improving) than ever before, and special care should be given this college to make it an institution of high standing among agricultural and mechanical colleges throughout the country.\textsuperscript{45}

With this assurance of support the Board of Visitors proceeded with its plans for the college and with the invaluable assistance of the new president, J. M. McBryde, and the newly organized faculty, succeeded in perfecting a reorganization of the college which at long last put the

\textsuperscript{45}Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1891-92, Document 26, p. 7.
school on the road to true usefulness and service to the state.

The reorganization and the thinking of the board at the time were later described by this same body as follows:

In the summer of 1891 the unsatisfactory condition of the college compelled a reorganization at once radical and revolutionary. Everything was changed from the foundation up. Careful study of the educational outlook in the State forced the conviction that the field of technical instruction was practically unoccupied. It was also realized that the intent of the United States acts of endowment, and of the State act of acceptance, demanded this kind of work of the school, and that it was, besides, a line more and more called for by the scientific and industrial activity of our day. It was determined, therefore, to make the institution strictly a school of technology, and to hold it closely to this special field of effort.

This decision to set up a school of technology was followed by a curricular organization which departed radically from the tendency of all previous organizations to shape the program around the traditional literary subjects. The sciences, especially those related to agriculture and to the mechanic arts, were given the foremost place, while large provision was "made for instruction in

---

46 The Present Condition and Outlook at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the Necessity for the Appropriations Asked for Buildings and Equipment and for an Increased Annuity, p. 3.
their principles and applications to the industries of life.\textsuperscript{147}

Nine distinct courses of study were offered - seven courses of four years each led to the degree of Bachelor of Science, while two courses of two years each led to a certificate. In the field of agriculture, degrees were offered in agriculture, horticulture, applied chemistry, and general science; and a certificate was offered for the shorter two-year course in agriculture. The courses for the freshman year were nearly the same and included the fundamental studies of mathematics, history, English, and inorganic chemistry, as well as physiology and bookkeeping. The courses began to diverge toward the area of specialization in the sophomore year.\textsuperscript{48}

The literary studies were not entirely excluded. In the words of the president:

\begin{quote}
Every course contains a certain element of general or liberal culture in addition to the special or technical studies appropriate to it, . . . he [the student] is made to study the constitutional history of his country and the general questions affecting its material interests, and is taught the correct and ready use of his mother tongue. The general or liberal studies required in every course are mathematics, English, French, German, general and constitutional history, psychology, political economy and ethics.\textsuperscript{49}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[147]Virginia School Report, 1892 and 1893, p. 432.
\item[48]Ibid., p. 433.
\item[49]Loc. cit.
\end{footnotes}
For applicants unable to meet the requirements for admission to the freshman class a course of preparatory or sub-collegiate study was offered. Laboratory work in shop or field was set up as a requirement in all the agricultural courses and was used as a substitute for the manual labor feature which had been thought of as a part of agricultural education for nearly three-quarters of a century in Virginia. All student work in the field not definitely instructive was to be paid for at the prevailing rate for labor.

With this reorganization the school soon became a college in fact as well as in name. Favorable attention was soon attracted from the press, especially the Southern Planter, which to this day has remained a strong supporter of the work of the institution. Graduates from the college returning to the farms during the next two decades were soon reported as making the farm do things the "old man never dreamed of."

As the program became stronger and began to attract more favorable attention from the people of the state and the legislature, the realization began to grow that "book learning" had definite values for the farmers. At the same time, however, it was realized more and more that much of the program at the college was of college grade and therefore inaccessible to large groups of the people.

---

50 Editorial, Richmond Times Dispatch, March 11, 1909.
This realization, along with the slowly accumulating proof of the benefits to be derived from "book learned agriculture," helped to create in the minds of some leaders the desire to extend the benefits of this type of learning to the non-college group of the rural population. The realization of this desire, though, had to await the development of the public high school which, as already related, was a twentieth-century development in Virginia.

The reorganization of the college in 1891 was the last one of any great magnitude that the school has had to face to the present time. Although considerable modification of the curricula and numerous expansions have been undertaken since that date, none of these later changes has shaken the school to the very foundations as did the reorganizations during the first two decades of the life of the college. In 1896 the legislature added the words "and polytechnic institute" to the official title of the school, thereby making its name the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute. \(^{51}\) Virginia Polytechnic Institute being easier to pronounce, shorter, and "catchy," it was not long before the school came to be known as the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, or simply as the V.P.I. In 1944 the legislature dropped the Agricultural and Mechanical

College designation in the name and accepted the Virginia Polytechnic Institute as the school's official name.  

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute had weathered the storm of an almost incredible number of reorganizations and was at last definitely on the road which was even then beginning to lead to the fruition of a large part of the agitation for agricultural education which had been so vigorously conducted during the first half of the nineteenth century. It is beyond the scope of this study to trace this fruition any further in so far as the Virginia Polytechnic Institute is concerned. The effort of nearly a century on behalf of agricultural education had produced an agricultural college. It remained now to extend the effort downward to the secondary school level. The effort to accomplish this downward extension will be treated more fully in Part II.

---
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The last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth saw a reawakening in Virginia. The end of the Civil War had marked the end of the old regime and the beginning of the new. It marked a complete upheaval of cherished traditions, the transformation of habits of life and of institutions, and to some extent of social, political, and economic points of view. The old hereditary aristocracy based on slavery gave way to a political and semi-industrial democracy. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation freed not only the blacks but also the whites from slavery to the old caste system. This once submerged class was thrust into a freer life with greater opportunities. "Worth, not birth" began to assume greater importance in determining place. Slowly and painfully the "new Dominion" began to find herself and to rebuild from the wreckage of the war. Young
men by this time without losing respect for the past were beginning to look more and more to the future.

The poverty caused by the war and by the misrule of reconstruction was giving way to a condition of prosperity which in contrast to the decade after the war was stimulating and exciting. Land booms became prevalent, and a sense of optimism about the future developed.¹

Political realignments brought new forces and stirred new hopes and demands.² Politicians were beginning to spend more time looking to the present and the future and less to the past. A rejuvenating sense of power, of strength, and of optimism was definitely in the making. Fortunately there were forces and leaders present who channeled this new energy into building up institutions and developing the state's educational system. As a result of this renewed and awakened effort, the public school system was almost completely rejuvenated in all its aspects. The elementary schools were greatly strengthened; a public high school program was inaugurated; and a system of secondary school agricultural education was undertaken. In this chapter it is planned to present a brief review of this twentieth-century educational

¹See especially Richmond Dispatch, August 28, 1890; J. P. Folinsbee, "Virginia's Ghost Hotel," Coronet, XXXI (November, 1951), p. 64; Moger, op. cit., pp. 50 ff.

²See especially W. D. Sheldon, Populism in the Old Dominion, Virginia Farm Politics 1885-1900.
revival and then to center attention on one of the outcomes of this revival - namely, the congressional district agricultural high schools.

It may be well at this time to repeat the statement made at the outset to the effect that all the chapters to be included in Part II, in contrast to Part I, will be sharply restricted to a consideration of factors and developments that either directly affected or were actually a part of the secondary school program of agricultural education.

The Early Twentieth-Century Educational Revival in Virginia

The agency which perhaps did more than any other to focus the awakening forces of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century on education was the Conference for Education in the South\(^3\) which grew out of a conference of men and women of the North and the South at Capon Springs, West Virginia, in the summer of 1898.\(^4\) This meeting was small in attendance, but increasing interest was manifested at the conferences held for the first three years at Capon Springs and then at various centers over the South. In 1901 at the conference held at Winston-Salem, North Carolina, plans

\(^3\)This movement was also known as the Southern Conference Movement, the Southern Educational Movement, the Odgen Movement, and the Educational Movement in the South.

were adopted which led to the formation in New York in the fall of the same year of the Southern Education Board of the Conference for Education in the South. About the same time the General Education Board was also organized in New York in such a way as to secure wide co-operation in carrying on the program of both boards. The Southern Education Board stressed local initiative in the improvement of public education. To this end the board took as its initial aim the creation of public sentiment for better schools by using local agencies already in the field or available to go into the field. One of the men very active in this phase of the board's program and having particular significance for the later developments in Virginia was J. D. Eggleston, Jr. later to become State Superintendent of Public Instruction and

5Ibid., pp. 378-379. Confusion frequently prevails as to the work of these two boards. The former was organized to conduct an educational campaign for public schools in the South, while the latter was organized to administer funds for educational purposes. To secure co-operation of the two boards seven men were appointed to membership in each. The boards of the Peabody and the Slater funds were also represented on the two new boards. Dickman in Report of U. S. Commissioner of Education, 1907, p. 291, says, "The General Education Board was organized in New York with the purpose of a wise cooperation with the Southern Board in its work. The general board is here named as one outcome of the wide movement, though in its development it has no organic connection with the Southern Board and directs its operation to other parts of the country as well as to the South."

6Ibid., p. 380.
later still president of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.\footnote{Dabney, op. cit., II, p. 74 ff.; Virginia, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1912-1913, p. 455. See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of J. D. Eggleston, Jr.}

To carry forward the program in Virginia the Southern Education Board appointed Henry St. George Tucker, former congressman and an eloquent speaker, and Robert Frazer, president of Virginia State Normal School, as field agents for the state. These men set to work at once to canvass the state on behalf of better school facilities. At the same time they contacted and supplied with educational literature the members-elect of the constitutional convention which had been called to assemble in Richmond, on June 12, 1901, for the purpose of rewriting the state constitution to bring it into closer harmony with the newer conditions of the day.

The people of the state seemingly were in a receptive frame of mind for better schools; in fact, sentiment grew to such proportions that the Superintendent of Public Instruction reported that "the sentiment in favor of improving the educational facilities of the commonwealth is a healthy and auspicious omen . . . there are voices in the air . . . and the servants of the people will do well to
The constitutional convention, whether because of the "voices in the air" or as more likely because of the genuine desire for improvement, having duly assembled, set up a very able committee on education to draft proposals for the new constitution. Numerous persons appeared before this committee to urge industrial and manual schools, but the committee preferred to continue a permissive rather than a compulsory policy toward this type of school and in the midst of the growing discussion adopted the following proposal advanced by Carter Glass: "The General Assembly may establish agricultural, normal, manual and technical schools and such grades of schools as shall be for the public good." This proposal was later adopted by the convention as a part of the state constitution and became the legal basis for subsequent legislative action to be related later.

Other provisions of the constitution were more far-reaching in effect. In general these provisions tended par-

8Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1901-1902 and 1902-1903, p. XLIX.


10The Constitution of the State of Virginia - Adopted by the Convention of 1901-02, Article IX, Section 137, p. 37.
tially to remove the school system from political "machine" control and put its direction into the hands of trained educators and at the same time brought it closer to the people; in short, the constitution revolutionized the administration of the schools.\footnote{See especially Dabney, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 322; The Constitution of the State of Virginia Adopted, 1902, Article IX, Sections 129-142, pp. 35-40. It is not to be inferred that the school system was completely removed from politics nor brought into complete control of the people.}

With the constitution an accomplished fact, Governor Montague in 1903 called a small group together to consider what might be done under it and "to discover a way to get in line with the Conference for Education in the South."\footnote{Dabney, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 323.} As a result of this meeting it was decided to perfect an organization in the state to co-operate with the Southern Education Board in its program for improved education.\footnote{Heatwole, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 314.}

This organization was perfected in the spring of 1904 under the name of the Co-operative Education Association and adopted as its objectives to be achieved for Virginia (1) nine months of schooling for every child, (2) high schools within reasonable distance of every child, (3) well-trained teachers, (4) agricultural and industrial training, (5) efficient supervision, (6) promotion of libraries, (7) schools for defectives and dependents, (8) citizens'
educational associations in every county and city. The first great task which this organization undertook was a state-wide educational campaign which began in May, 1905, and continued throughout the year and to this day is still referred to as the "May campaign." This campaign came at the most opportune moment. Mention has already been made of the awakening forces. The reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the years 1900 to 1905 make numerous references to this awakening interest in schools manifested by the people, the press, organizations, and even the politicians. The following excerpt is given as typical of the ideas expressed by the superintendent on the eve of the great May campaign:

Never before has there been such general interest manifested in the improvement of public schools. The newspapers are discussing school problems with an earnestness and intelligence never before exhibited; public educational meetings are held in every part of the state; educational associations are forming; and the people are waking up to the fact that our public schools form the basis of our social and governmental systems.

The things that lie nearest their doors... the improvement of public highways and public schools, advanced methods of agriculture... are attracting more

---

14 A Successful State-Wide Project in Community Cooperation Over a Period of Nearly a Quarter of a Century 1904-1926 Under the Cooperative Education Association of Virginia, State Council of Rural Agencies, p. 3.
attention than the policy of the National Government in ruling the Philippines or in securing a canal route across the Isthmus of Panama.\textsuperscript{15}

This last condition is indeed evidence of a new day, in view of Virginia's ante bellum preoccupation with national issues to the detriment of local affairs.\textsuperscript{16}

In preparation for this May campaign some of the state's ablest speakers were secured to stump the state on behalf of better education, and numerous pamphlets and bulletins were printed. The actual campaign, launched amidst the favorable atmosphere just indicated, coincided with the election campaign of a senator, a governor, and other officials. At first the politicians were decidedly cool toward the idea of including educational topics in their campaign addresses; but when they saw the growing interest and large crowds attracted to the meetings on behalf of better schools, they too soon joined in and began to make speeches on behalf of public education.\textsuperscript{17} This campaign reached the remotest corners of the state. In the words of Heatwole:

\begin{quote}
Never was a state so bombarded in the interest of any cause. Men spoke in the remotest communities. Candidates of both
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15}Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1901-1902 and 1902-1903, p. XLIX.

\textsuperscript{16}See Chapters I, II, and III.

\textsuperscript{17}Joseph D. Eggleston, Jr., Memorandum to C. W. Dabney quoted in Dabney, Universal Education in the South, II, p. 237.
political parties and for all offices turned aside from national questions to an earnest advocacy of an adequate school system for the state. Preachers found a fresh application of the principles of religion. Editors gave their editorial and news columns for the dissemination of knowledge and inspiration of the people. College presidents and professors found new fields for useful labor. On political hustings, in places where camp meetings were wont to take place at cross-roads' stores, and 'old field' schoolhouses meetings were held in the interest of public education . . . one hundred of the ablest speakers of the state including the governor delivered three hundred addresses in ninety-four counties at one hundred different meetings. Two hundred thousand pages of educational literature were issued, and fifty citizen school associations were organized. All this was done in thirty days.18

The campaign was a prodigious success. It assured the enactment of laws for bettering and extending the schools authorized by the new constitution and marked the beginning of a new era in public education in Virginia.

In 1906 Joseph D. Eggleston, Jr., a man of wide educational experience, who had been closely associated with the southern education movement from its beginning and who had participated in the May campaign, was elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction. He at once presented to the people and the legislature the program of improvements in the school system which had been stressed during the May

18 Heatwole, op. cit., p. 315.
campaign.19 When some of the key politicians appeared about to balk at enacting constructive educational legislation in the session of 1906, Eggleston and Bruce R. Payne threatened to republish newspaper clippings of the May campaign, showing that these same men had publicly supported the proposals at that time.20 Whether this pressure was necessary or not, the fact remains that much valuable legislative action ensued. Of particular interest is the so-called Mann high school act, passed in the session of 1906, providing for the establishment of high schools throughout the state and appropriating $50,000 to the State Board of Education to be used for the purpose of promoting such schools.21 Up to this time there had been no legislative action creating a system of public free high schools.

This act providing for the establishment of high schools had far-reaching effect. The money made available through the State Department of Education by the provisions of the act was used in such a way as to encourage local initiative in raising money for high school purposes. As a result, communities all over the state set to work building

19Dabney, op. cit., II, p. 329.


21Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1906, Chapter 211, pp. 350-52. See Appendix H for a copy of this act.
high schools. As one elderly person expressed it to the writer, "No village or small town felt respectable unless it had its own high school." By 1908 the aggregate sum raised by the localities for new high schools amounted to $1,000,000, while by 1909 the sum was considerably higher. 22

Eggleston in commenting on this bill said:

No educational movement in recent years has accomplished greater results than the high school development which has followed the enactment of the high school statute of 1906. During the session of 1906-07 one hundred forty-nine new high schools were established. These schools were more widely distributed and have accomplished greater results than even the most sanguine friends of the high school movement dared hope... It [the high school act] has put new vigor into the system from bottom to the top. 23

The popularity of the new high schools and the resounding praise heaped upon this legislature by the press all over the state 24 made it easier to enact subsequent legislation. By 1912 some twenty-two separate acts concerning education had been passed; but, as Overton expressed it, "The General Assembly of 1906 really laid the legislative foundation for


the development of the public school system of Virginia."\(^{25}\)

It is not necessary within the scope of this study to trace the educational revival of this period much further. In 1905 largely through the financial aid of John D. Rockefeller and of the General Education Board the Curry Memorial School of Education was founded at the University of Virginia with Bruce R. Payne as professor of secondary education in charge.\(^{26}\) The first work of this school was conducted largely through a summer school program. The efforts on behalf of this program were so successful that the summer school was soon accepted as a part of the permanent program of instruction in the university.\(^{27}\) This establishment of a professorship of secondary education and the provision for the training of teachers for the high schools just as the high school program was getting under way in Virginia was a significant contribution to the promotion of secondary education in the state. Bruce Payne as professor of secondary education "did an outstanding piece of work in promoting secondary education and putting on a permanent basis the summer session at the University."\(^{28}\)

\(^{25}\)Ibid., p. 245.

\(^{26}\)The Curry Memorial Department of Education, Announcements, 1934-1935," University of Virginia Record, (n.s) XV, No. 7, (March 1, 1934), p. 4; Dabney, op. cit., II, p. 328.

\(^{27}\)Dabney, op. cit., II, p. 329.

J. D. Eggleston, Jr., the first really qualified State Superintendent of Public Instruction since Ruffner, was successful in translating much of the new enthusiasm of the day into a program of procedure which resulted in a remarkable series of educational accomplishments. These accomplishments which in reality represent many of the results of the educational revival of the early twentieth century were admirably summarized by Heatwole as follows:

(1) the State Department of Education was systematized so that its influence was strong and effective as an educational force in the state; (2) the various educational activities of the state were unified and coalesced into one great educational effort, directed toward the goal of popular education; (3) a series of constructive legislative acts [was passed] providing for, (a) a state system of high schools, (b) a loan fund . . . [to encourage] the erecting of school buildings, (c) the control by the State Board of Education of the systems of heating, lighting, and ventilating of school buildings, (d) a scheme by which the division superintendents' salaries could be increased so as to secure expert supervision of schools, (e) an appropriation to encourage the consolidation of one-room schools into two or three-room schools, (f) the establishing and maintaining of normal training high schools and agricultural high schools,29 (g) compulsory education, (h) retirement fund for teachers, (i) establishment of three state normal schools for women, (j) the control of the sanitary and health conditions about schools, (k) a system of medical inspection of the school children;

29This development will be discussed more fully later on.
(4) a system of demonstration and extension work [was established for the teaching of agriculture].

It was amidst all this background of enthusiasm and growth of public school sentiment and developments that efforts were once more started to get a system of agricultural education of less than college grade into operation. This movement on behalf of agricultural education was definitely a part of the educational revival of the day and is treated here as a separate topic only for the sake of clarity and emphasis.

The Launching of the Congressional District High Schools

The Grange, the Populist Movement, and the Farmers' Alliance all played a part in the awakening which took place at the end of the nineteenth century. These three movements had a particularly strong effect in arousing the rural population to increased activity for improved conditions. Since Virginia at the time was populated to such a great extent by rural folk, it is not likely that the educational revival which has just been briefly described would have taken place if these people had not been aroused. There is very little evidence to indicate that this great

---


rural population was particularly interested in a specific program of agricultural education, but at the same time the rural people were definitely restless and in a state of readiness for better things. It would seem that this restlessness, though inarticulate and inactive as to agricultural education, merely awaited the appearance of leaders capable of pointing the way to a program of agricultural education before this restlessness should become active on behalf of such a program.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, writing in 1901, urged that "intelligent, scientific farming . . . should not be beneath the dignity of any school system that pretends to prepare young people for the duties of active life." Under this stimulus a few schools began to introduce agriculture into their curricula, although it was of a most elementary sort. In 1904 Andrew H. Soule, dean of agriculture at the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, was invited to lecture to the State Teachers Association on Agriculture. The results seem to have been mutually beneficial, for the teachers reported a "most

---

32Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1899-1900 and 1900-1901, p. XLIV.

33Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1903-1904 and 1904-1905, p. XLIV.
favorable impression"; and Soule for the next several years wrote numerous articles for the press, advocating agricultural education in the public schools.

During this same year of 1904 Governor Montague threw his great influence back of agricultural education and urged that "our people should be educated for the skilful pursuit of...farming."

In March, 1905, Joseph D. Eggleston, Jr. in announcing his candidacy for the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction publicly declared that "agriculture and manual training should be provided for those pupils who needed and wanted such training." In Virginia was not alone at this time in working for the establishment of schools for agricultural education. Other states, notably Alabama and Georgia, during this same period established congressional district agricultural high schools. The organization and the work of these schools

---

34 Ibid., XLVI.


36 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1904, p. 17.

37 Overton, op. cit., p. 215.

were brought before the people of Virginia by speakers, by
travelers, and especially by a series of articles in the
Southern Planter, written by A. H. Soule, who during this
period had moved from Virginia to assume the presidency of
Georgia State College of Agriculture. 39

These efforts along with those of the Co-operative
Education Association began to pay some small dividends,
for by the school session of 1907-08 forty-seven counties
reported instruction of some sort in agriculture. 40

As already pointed out, J. D. Eggleston, Jr. was
elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction and
assumed office in 1906. His previous work in the publicity
department of the Southern Education Board and as a teacher
and superintendent of schools 41 gave him an insight into
public education and the working of the public mind on
educational matters such as possessed by few men of his
day. He early realized the sad condition of and need for
improvement in the rural schools. In a letter to R. C.
Stearnes as early as 1904, in speaking of the country
schools, he wrote:

39 See especially the Southern Planter from 1906 through
1910 for references to agricultural education in Georgia and
Alabama.

40 Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of
Public Instruction, 1907-1908 and 1908-1909, Table No. 4,

41 E. W. Knight, Public Education in the South, p. 430.
... we need a leader who will appreciate present conditions; who sees the unspeakable conditions of our country schools and who can remedy this condition; and who will so shape our courses of study as to form perfect steps from the primary schools to the Normal, the V.P.I., and the University. Our greatest problem is the country school. Our country schools are a reflection upon our good people...

everything these days caters to the city schools and city conditions. Books are made for the city; teachers are trained for the city; summer schools fit the city; grades are formed on the method employed in the city; courses of study encourage the pupils to leave the country and go to the city. Our children are largely 'booked' and little 'educated.'

With his background of training and his interest in rural schools, it is small wonder that Eggleston upon assumption of the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction soon directed his attention to the improvement of rural schools. Early in 1907 he announced that part of the work of the recently established office of rural supervision was to "arouse people to the necessity of better school buildings and to the importance of introducing vocational education to go hand in hand with cultural education." During this same year of 1907 he made a recommendation to the General Assembly that was to have so much

---

42 Letter from J. D. Eggleston, Jr. to R. C. Stearnes, November 17, 1904. Quoted by Overton, op. cit., p. 210

43 Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1907-1908 and 1908-1909, p. 27.
influence on agricultural education for the next decade that it is given in its entirety here:

I recommend that the General assembly enlarge this appropriation [the annual $50,000 appropriation included in the Mann high school act of 1906] and add to the present act a feature permitting the State Board of Education under proper restrictions to establish, in not exceeding six of the public high schools, agricultural education, manual training, and domestic economy. These subjects should be introduced in only a few schools at the start in order that the work may be carefully supervised and nurtured. When they have taken root in our educational soil and have demonstrated their great possibilities for usefulness it will need no argument to convince the people of the benefits to accrue from a rapid introduction of these subjects in every county of the state.\(^4\)

Eggleston followed up this recommendation to the legislature with articles to the press, especially the Virginia Journal of Education, apparently in an effort to enlist the support of the educational workers on behalf of his proposal. The arguments were essentially the same in all cases, with emphasis put on the necessity of starting out with a few schools to lead the way in the hope that the success of these schools would create a demand for similar programs all over the state.\(^5\)


The ensuing developments within the legislature as a result of this agitation reveal a rather interesting attitude of this body toward agricultural education. A bill making direct provision for the teaching of agriculture in the public schools was introduced into the House. This bill merely used the term public school without designating either high schools or elementary schools, but as a bill embodying direct provisions for agricultural education it was overwhelmingly defeated in February, 1908.46

As indicated, however, the high school movement inaugurated by the Mann Act of 1906 had proved to be highly popular. The legislature determined, therefore, to increase the state appropriation for the high schools to $100,000 and made such provision in the proposed appropriation bill. Direct legislation for agricultural education having failed, Senator Mann introduced a short amendment into the section of this appropriations bill providing for the increased high school appropriation, this amendment having been worded to read as follows:

Twenty thousand dollars [of the proposed $100,000] shall be devoted to the establishment of departments of agriculture, domestic economy, and manual training in at least one high school in each congressional district of the state, to be conducted under such rules and regulations.

as the State Board of Education and the president of the Virginia College of Agriculture and Polytechnic Institute may prescribe.\(^7\)

The appropriations bill with this partially hidden amendment passed both houses\(^8\) in March, 1908, thereby making this amendment the first legislative action taken toward putting agricultural education into the public high schools of the state. The very obscurity of this short amendment, buried as it was in the Appropriations Act, has tended to cause subsequent writers and workers in the field of agricultural education to lose sight of this piece of legislation as the legal basis for the beginning of the program in agricultural education on the secondary school level. The tendency to overlook this amendment as the real legal basis for the beginning of such a program is further increased by the fact that in 1910 the legislature passed a separate and independent act specifically designed to promote the congressional district agricultural high schools. Since this latter act stands alone and is the first one indexed in any of the Acts of the Assembly as an act to aid agricultural instruction, there is a somewhat natural


\(^8\)Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1908, p. 420
tendency to accept this legislation as the first for agricultural education in the secondary schools.49

The act itself got somewhat surprising results. Before it even went into effect, delegations appeared before the State Board of Education to "advocate the claims . . . for the location of one of the high school departments of agriculture, etc. [sic]."50 In at least four of the congressional districts there ensued a quick rush to raise money locally to secure the location of the high school to receive the state aid.51

It is probable that local pride had as much to do with this rush as any interest in agricultural education, for although considerable money and land and several buildings were made immediately available for the schools, most of the donations seem to have been the results of the efforts of a few wealthy individuals.52

49Interestingly enough Overton in his excellent study on the "Life and Work of Joseph Dupuy Eggleston, Jr." (the State Superintendent of Public Instruction at the time of the passage of the several acts mentioned) fell into the error of concluding that the first of these subsequent acts appropriating money for agricultural schools was in reality the first legislative action concerning such instruction. See p. 294 of Overton's study.


52Loc. cit.
As a result of the legislative action and these early efforts, the State Board of Education in session on May 19, 1908, "decided to express its determination to establish departments of agriculture, domestic economy, and manual training in the high schools located at Burkeville, Nottoway County, Middletown, Frederick County, Manassas, Prince William County, and Appomattox, Appomattox County."^53

In June of the same year this just-related action was confirmed by the state board, and additional departments of agriculture were located in the high schools at Hampton and Lebanon. At the same time, since the Fifth Congressional District was so large geographically, it was decided to locate two departments of agriculture in this district; thus one department was located at Chatham and one at Elk Creek.\(^54\) No doubt some political eyebrows were lifted over this decision, since the Fifth District was also Governor Swanson's home district and Chatham his home town; but the board went ahead with its declared intentions and put the two schools in the one district. In November, 1908, two additional departments were located, one in Courtland for the Second Congressional District and one in Chester for the Third Congressional District.\(^55\) On June 17, 1909, the final

\(^{53}\) Minutes of the Meeting of the Virginia State Board of Education, May 19, 1908," p. 344.

\(^{54}\) Ibid., June 26, pp. 353, 357.

\(^{55}\) Ibid., November 10, p. 374.
department was established in the remaining district, the
Sixth Congressional District, at New London in Bedford
County. Thus was the system of congressional district
high school agricultural departments brought into existence.

By the session of 1909-1910 one high school in each of the
nine congressional districts had established a department of
agriculture, while the remaining district got its department
underway in 1910.

The legislative act authorizing these departments of
agriculture was neither very specific nor very clear as to
procedure to be followed in setting up the new departments,
while neither the president of the state agricultural
college nor the representatives of the State Board of Edu-
cation seemed to know just what to do or how to go about
getting the new departments underway. The president of the
college and the representatives of the state board spent
considerable time meeting and planning with the representatives
of the schools in which the departments had been located, but
the planning meetings seemed to meet with indifferent success.
Since no one seemed to have any specific suggestions or ideas
as to the best methods of procedure, each school was left to

56 "Minutes of the meeting of the Virginia State Board of

57 Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of
a great extent to go its own way.\textsuperscript{58}

Fortunately the sentiment in the state by this time was highly favorable for agricultural education. The graduates from the state agricultural college were returning to communities and making farms do things the "old man never dreamed of,"\textsuperscript{59} while newspapers all over the state were beginning to praise "booklearning" as applied to agriculture.\textsuperscript{60}

A series of articles was contributed to state papers and to the \textit{Southern Planter}, discussing various aspects of agricultural education from its organization and administration to its social implications.\textsuperscript{61} The Rural Life Conference held at the University of Virginia in July, 1909, dealt with practical aspects of rural education and helped promote enthusiasm for agricultural education\textsuperscript{62}; moreover, perhaps as important as anything in this early trial stage was the fact that W. H. Mann, who had sponsored so much of the important


\textsuperscript{60}Loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{61}See \textit{Richmond Times Dispatch}, January 23, March 27, 28, April 25, May 2, 1909; \textit{Southern Planter}, LXX (December, 1909) passim.

\textsuperscript{62}Proceedings, Rural Life Conference, University of Virginia, July 13 to 16, 1909, pp. 5-98.
educational legislation, was elected Governor of the state and assumed office in 1910.

With all these influences bearing on it, together with the fact that once more the communities had far more than matched the state appropriation, this time for agricultural education, the legislature of 1910 enacted yet more favorable legislation.

The first act of importance approved on March 15, 1910, authorized the boards of supervisors in the several counties to appropriate money for the agricultural schools; and interestingly enough, since several boards of supervisors had already appropriated such money, the act was so worded as to become retroactive in a way that all such previous appropriations were legally validated and ratified.63

The next act of particular importance was approved on March 16, 1910. This act represents such a big step forward in the evolution of legislative aid to agricultural education in the state that its major features are herewith presented:

Chapter 253 An Act to provide for instruction in agriculture, domestic arts and sciences and the manual training in public high schools.

1. Be it enacted by the general assembly of Virginia That in at least one public high school to be selected by the State board of education in each congressional district of the State, a thorough course in agriculture,

the domestic arts and sciences and manual training shall be given in addition to the academic courses prescribed for such high schools and at least one-fourth of the school time shall be devoted to these subjects.

2. Not less than five acres of land convenient to each of said schools, shall be acquired by lease, purchase, or donation for the purpose of providing practical demonstration in agricultural science. The cultivation of these lands, as far as practicable shall be done by the students themselves. A careful account shall be kept of the product of each student's labor, showing how it is disposed of and the prices received on the products which are sold. The proceeds of such sales shall be applied or used under general regulations adopted by the district school board of the county in which the agricultural school is located, which regulations must be approved by the State board of education.

3. Suitable buildings shall be provided and properly equipped for the purposes of said schools, including workshops ... applicable to rural life.

4. [This section provided that females might attend the schools and be instructed in domestic arts and sciences and the agricultural course if they so desired.]

5. The agricultural high schools established under this act may be used as centers for directing the demonstration farm work and other extension work throughout the bounds of the several congressional districts and shall be conducted under such rules and regulations as the State Board of Education and the president of the Virginia College of Agriculture and Polytechnic Institute may prescribe.

6. [This section provided $30,000 for the coming year to be expended by the State Board of Education in promoting these schools.]

7. For the fiscal year ending the twenty-eighth day of February nineteen hundred and twelve and annually thereafter the sum of thirty thousand dollars is hereby appropriated . . . [This section further
appropriated $25,000 to be used for buildings and equipment for these schools, while $10,000 was specifically set aside to provide for the traveling, demonstration and extension work to be connected with the said high school.  

An examination of this act reveals considerable advance beyond the short amendment to the Appropriations Act of 1908. The beginnings of many of the features later to be included in the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture are clearly discernible. Manual labor of a sort was to be carried out; accurate records were to be kept; a definite time allotment for agricultural instruction was made mandatory; and suitable buildings and shops were to be provided and equipped. Since it was to be carried out in a public high school, the work was brought under the control of the regularly constituted public school officials at the local level and the State Board of Education and the president of the state agricultural college at the state level.

Section 5 of the just-mentioned act, indicating that the agricultural high schools "may be used for directing the demonstration farm work and other extension work," caused some misunderstanding in that some apparently were led to believe that the State Experiment Station should establish field experiments at these schools and started agitation to this end. The fact that these schools were located by

---

political divisions of the state, however, instead of by agricultural divisions made it difficult to use all the schools for this purpose, although some experimental work was carried on at several of them. 65

Improved legislation, important though it was, could not solve all the problems. These schools had been established to serve entire congressional districts of approximately ten counties each. Since such a large area and great distances prohibited many children from attending the schools, it was soon proposed that dormitories be erected to serve non-local students. Establishing a physical plant on behalf of education was something the people could see and understand and were at the time doing on a rather large scale; consequently it was not long until dormitories were built at nearly all the centers not having sufficient local boarding facilities. 66

On the instructional side, however, it was a different matter. The people then as all too frequently now could not see and understand the technical difficulties involved in agricultural instruction; furthermore they could neither see nor understand the need for professional supervision of this work from a person especially trained in agriculture.

65Annual Report of the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station for the Years 1909 and 1910, p. 13.

As a result the legislature steadfastly refused to provide funds or legislation for special supervision of this work in spite of the fact that "year after year the Department of Public Instruction asked for an expert to decide upon the course of study in the agricultural high schools and to coordinate their work with that of the State Agricultural College. 67

Both the act of 1908 and that of 1910 provided that the state agricultural college should co-operate in the administration of these schools, but the college does not seem to have provided very effective help during the first eight years of the existence of these schools, leaving the schools thereby to get along as best they could with what the state superintendent called "non-expert supervision in the central [State Department of Education] office." 68 It may be a bit puzzling today, since the agricultural college is known all over the state as ready, eager, and willing, to use its full resources to help meet any problem of agriculture or agricultural instruction, to understand the lack of aggressiveness it showed toward helping these agricultural high schools at this time.

The best explanation probably stems from several factors. In the first place the college itself at the beginning of the

---


68 Ibid., p. 29.
agricultural high school development had experienced a change of administration. This administration unfortunately ran into considerable internal dissension and external criticism, with the result that several of the faculty left the institution. Perhaps another cause for lack of all-out support for the new schools grew from a fear of competition for students. The college, as related, had on its reorganization in 1891 established a sub-collegiate two-year course in agricultural instruction. Although this sub-collegiate school had never grown to any great size, it did at least bring from forty to seventy-five boys to the campus each year. It was fully realized on the part of some of the key officials at the college that the success of these newly established agricultural high schools would spell the end to this school for agricultural apprentices, as the two-year course was called. Perhaps most surprising of all, however, was the fact that the authorities at the college did not see the great possibilities of the farm demonstration work which was being developed as a part of and on a parallel with the agricultural high schools, with the support of the State Board of Education. Eggleston in speaking of this

---

69 Charges Preferred Against Paul D. Barringer, President Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia by the Welfare Committee of the Alumni Association, Before the Board of Visitors at a Special Meeting, January 13, 1910.

lack of vision on the part of the college authorities says, "It is not out of place to say that the authorities at this institution [V.P.I.] were given ample opportunity - were indeed urged - to accept the 'Knapp way' [demonstration work] and take charge of it in Virginia, and refused to do so. 71

Another early difficulty faced by the agricultural schools arose from the lack of centralized control. The act creating the schools divided this control among the State Board of Education, the state agricultural college, and the local school boards of the counties in which the high schools were located, thus dispersing control and at the same time in most of the districts leaving at least nine counties with no representation on the governing board. This situation tended to weaken the schools both within the district and in the legislature and tended to create competition between the agricultural schools and the other public school agencies for state funds, a competition which the State Superintendent of Public Instruction unhesitatingly branded as undesirable. 72

These conditions also led the superintendent to warn that the services of the agricultural schools were remaining too local, that the schools were in danger of devoting too much time to improving the physical plant instead of improving instruction

---

71 From a speech by J. D. Eggleston, Jr., reported in The Tobacco Grower, VII (July, 1939), p. 2.

and services to the district. Continuing, he reported that the schools must be relieved of their divided control and that "they must have expert supervision and work under centralized control." His plea, however, met little success at this time.

The actual course of study and practices in agriculture set up by these schools varied from school to school but taken as a whole represent a decade of effort and experimenting toward a satisfactory system of agricultural education. The following three courses of study are presented as indicative of the changes which took place in the agricultural curriculum during this time.

For the session of 1909-1910 the agricultural course of Driver High School in Nansemond County was listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First year</th>
<th>Second year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics I</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English I</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin I</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science I</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History I</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic I</td>
<td>3 periods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the session of 1910-1911 the agricultural course of Driver High School in Nansemond County was listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First year</th>
<th>Second year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics II</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin II</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science II</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History II</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>5 periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Arithmetic I</td>
<td>3 periods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

73 Loc. cit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third year</th>
<th>Fourth year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics III</td>
<td>Mathematics IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science III</td>
<td>English IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History III</td>
<td>Science IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book-keeping</td>
<td>History IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect one</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French I</td>
<td>Disease of Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German I</td>
<td>Elect one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>French II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not much agriculture, perhaps, but even this much provision was confessed to be "something of an innovation in the educational work of Nansemond County." With the publication of this course of study, a promise which seemed to embody the spirit of all these schools was made to seek ways to make the work practical in the hope that "every year [the work would be] more successful in fulfilling the purpose for which it was arranged."

By the session of 1912-1913 the course of study had undergone considerable change as the following listing will show:

74Catalog of Driver High and Graded Schools, Driver, Virginia, Session 1909-1910, p. 50.

75Ibid., p. 59.

76Ibid., p. 59.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First year</th>
<th>Second year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 3 periods</td>
<td>Soils and Fertilizers 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Geography 4 periods</td>
<td>Chemistry 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History 4</td>
<td>Chemistry Laboratory 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology 3</td>
<td>Medieval and Modern History 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spelling 5</td>
<td>English and Spelling 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic 2</td>
<td>Algebra and Geometry 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third year</th>
<th>Fourth year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Breeding 3</td>
<td>Plant Diseases 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Breeds 3</td>
<td>Botany 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeds and Feeding 3</td>
<td>Botany Laboratory 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 5</td>
<td>English and Spelling 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Laboratory 2</td>
<td>Geometry and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spelling 5</td>
<td>Trigonometry 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra and Geometry 5</td>
<td>American History and Citizenship 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English History 3</td>
<td>Surveying 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course, while still heavily "bookish," certainly represents an advance as far as agricultural content is concerned.

By the session of 1917-18 some consolidation and grouping of agricultural content had taken place as revealed by the following listing:

---

77Agricultural High School - Second Congressional District of Virginia, Bulletin, Driver, Virginia and List of Prizes and Catalog for School Fair of Second Congressional District to be Held at Suffolk, Virginia, December 2 to 7, 1912, p. 19.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First year</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Second year</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Science II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mathematics II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Training</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Manual Training</td>
<td>(3-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History I</td>
<td></td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third year</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>Fourth year</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Science IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>History IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mathematics IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work</td>
<td>75 [sic, Field Work I]</td>
<td>Field Work II</td>
<td>(3-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a penciled correction reads 75]</td>
<td></td>
<td>German I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These just-listed courses in agriculture are further described as follows:

Number of periods a week

Agriculture I. (5) Agronomy; Soils and Soil Improvement.

Agriculture II. (5) Soils; Types and Breeds of Livestock.

Agriculture III. (5) Horticulture; Commercial Fertilizers.

Agriculture IV. (5) Animal Husbandry; Feeds and Feeding; Diseases of Livestock.

Field Work I. Practical Exercises in Agricultural Course I and Stock Judging.

Field Work II. Practical Exercises in Agricultural Course II and Stock Judging.

Agriculture I. Laboratory Exercises in Connection with Agricultural Course I.

---

\[78\] Elk Creek Training School, Circular of Information, *Fifth Congressional District Agricultural High School Elk Creek, Grayson County, Virginia Term of 1917-1918*, p. 17.
Agriculture II. Soil Testing.

Agriculture III. Experimental and Microscopic Work on Diseases of Plants - Blights, Rusts, and other Fungus Diseases.

Agriculture IV. Seed Testing.

Manual Training I. (3) (a) Tools - names of parts, use, adjustment, and care of tools.
(b) Elementary exercises in bench work.

Manual Training II. (2) Exercises in wood work, bench and lath. [sic] (Continuation of Course I)

Science I. (5) Physiography [Physical Geography].

Science II. (5) (a) Botany, (b) Zoology.

Science III. Physics, Laboratory Exercises, four periods a week.

Science IV. (5) Chemistry, Laboratory Exercises, four periods a week.79

The influence of organized agricultural content as developed in agricultural colleges is clearly evident in the previously pictured evolution of agricultural instruction which, though progressing toward a practical presentation of agriculture, was still heavily academic and in the words of the O'Shea Commission written in 1928, was not strictly vocational, although the students were required to do some work on the school farm in addition to their class work. The classroom work was not 'tied up' with the farm problems of the students. There was too much work with test tubes and trip scales and too

79 Ibid., p. 11.
little ploughing, pruning, feeding and the like.  

The leaders of the day were well aware of the lack of tie-up with the home farm and advanced a variety of practices and proposals to meet this difficulty. Although none of the practices was completely successful, they represent Virginia's contribution to the development of the supervised home-project plan so successfully used later in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture and as such deserve some consideration.

As early as 1908 Superintendent Eggleston urged that "it is now high time that we should be doing something besides talking . . . with our agricultural and domestic science schools already established in different sections of the state, we should gradually extend this agricultural work for the boys . . . so as to train these boys by actual practice on their fathers' farms."  

In 1910 W. E. Garnett, writing in the Southern Planter, urged that the work of the agricultural schools be carried a step further and that "one teacher of the school . . . devote at least a part of his time to visiting the former students and to advising and aiding them in any way possible."  

---

Efforts were made to make the school farm a small replica of the types of farms in the community; but it was never intended, as is sometimes asserted today, to rely entirely on these farms for practical application. Speaking before the Rural Life Conference at Charlottesville, in 1909, Superintendent Eggleston said, "Our plan is to have not only the agricultural plots on the school grounds, but . . . to have plots for the boys on their fathers' farms; these plots to be big enough to bring pecuniary returns that are worth while."

Even as Eggleston was speaking these words, an opportunity to use home farm plots was developing in the form of the Boys' Corn Clubs which developed as a part of the farm demonstration work in the state.

Since a part of this farm demonstration work became so closely tied up with the agricultural high schools, it seems necessary at this time to turn aside and very briefly to indicate the early development and nature of this work in Virginia. This work in Virginia seems to have started officially on January 15, 1907, as a result of a conference held by Seman A. Knapp, J. D. Eggleston, Jr., Governor Swanson,


84 Proceedings, Rural Life Conference, University of Virginia, July 13 to 16, 1909, p. 13.

85 T. O. Sandy, "Demonstration Farm Work in Virginia," Southern Planter, LXIX (January, 1908), p. 34.
T. O. Sandy, and others in Superintendent Eggleston’s office in the fall of 1906. At this meeting it was decided to commence the demonstration work in two or three counties, with T. O. Sandy as state agent. The General Education Board agreed to furnish the necessary money through the United States Department of Agriculture on the condition that the work would be supervised by this latter agency, and on the further condition that if the work proved successful an effort would be made to get the state to finance the program. This work originated primarily as a program for adult farmers. In actual practice it was rather simple. A farmer in the community would agree to follow or demonstrate on his farm certain agricultural practices or principles to be recommended and supervised by the demonstration agent. A record of practices and of production was to be kept by these demonstrators, as these farmers came to be called, and could be used by the demonstration agent for educational or publicity purposes. The nature and essential quality and spirit of this demonstration work was vividly, if somewhat humorously, portrayed by Eggleston in the following way:

---

86 Extension Work in Virginia, A Brief History, 1907-1940, p. 9.


The strength of this demonstration work . . . lies in the recognition of the absolute necessity of the agricultural agent's going on to the farm at regular intervals to advise the farmer and to show him how to carry out the advice given; . . . in the agent's seeing that to be of any practical help to the average farmer he must start with that farmer exactly where that farmer is, and not where he ought to be - in other words, if the farmer has a four-room cabin, one wife, nine children, one twenty-two-year-old mule, one plow, one wagon, ten acres of rented land, one large, unpaid bill at the store, one heart full of despair, one set of harness consisting of three parts leather, two parts string and one part cotton rope, then the agent is not to tell this farmer how well the farmer could do if only he had a large income, but he is to show the farmer how, with the farmer's present assets at home and liability at the store, he, the farmer, can make a crop from fifty to two hundred per cent larger, and thus gradually lift himself out of grinding poverty. 89

This demonstration idea worked so well with adults that it was not long until the plan was being extended to include the boys on the farm. Out of this extension of the demonstration idea to boys on the farm grew the movement known as the Boys' Corn Clubs. In 1908 at the request of Superintendent Eggleston an agreement was made with Dr. Knapp of the United States Department of Agriculture to make this extension of the demonstration work to include the boys on the farms in Virginia. 90 On the basis of this agreement the Boys' Corn


90 Ibid., p. 15.
Clubs were started in Virginia under the direction of Southall Farrar in the spring\textsuperscript{91} of 1909. The essential idea of these clubs was to have the boy grow one acre of corn on his father's farm under the supervision of the demonstration agent. The results were highly successful, in some cases giving almost sensational yields of corn.\textsuperscript{92} Eggleston was delighted and at once set about trying to expand these clubs by means of the rural high schools, especially the district agricultural high schools. Speaking before a meeting of the Virginia Bankers' Convention, he related an instance of a boy in Appomattox County who produced 154 bushels of corn on one acre at a cost of twenty-four cents per bushel and then in a humorous manner dear to Virginians continued:

\begin{quote}
We have for fifty years been thinking of Appomattox County as the place where Lee had to surrender after his army had worn itself out whipping the bluecoats, but now we have a fourteen-year-old boy making 154 bushels of corn on an acre in that county, and we have at Appomattox Courthouse an agricultural school with a large boys' corn club in it, and 400
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{91}Extension Work in Virginia, A Brief History, 1907-1940, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{92}Editorial, Richmond Times Dispatch, February 25, 1910.
Enthusiasm for the clubs grew. Edwin Osgood Grover, of New York, wrote *The Country Boys' Creed* and dedicated it to the Boys' Corn Clubs of Virginia. Governor Mann in his inaugural address in 1910 gave unstinted praise to the clubs. Other politicians quickly joined and, as Eggleston later said, "climbed on the band-wagon and sought the opportunity to declare their long standing interest in scientific agriculture." Continuing, Eggleston said, "We gave them every opportunity to do this, for they wished the credit and we wished the results, so everybody was happy."

Movements for agricultural education in Virginia were unfolding with great rapidity at this particular time, for just as the agricultural schools, the demonstration work, and the corn clubs were developing, the community or school fair program conceived by the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs during the winter of 1907-08 began to attract much favorable attention.

---


94 Ibid., p. 15.

95 Extension Work in Virginia, A Brief History, 1907-1940, p. 12.

With the co-operation of the Van Dyke League of Lynchburg and the superintendent of schools of Campbell County, the first school fair was held at Rustburg, on October 28, 1908. The general idea of the fair was to provide an opportunity for the people of the community, especially the boys and the girls, to exhibit the products which they had grown or made. The plan as carried out at Rustburg was so successful that the county school board became interested and gave financial support to the fair the next year.

Superintendent Eggleston, who as early as 1906 had urged that the annual county, regional, and state fairs arrange to give prizes to the boys for the best corn and other farm products they produced, quickly grasped the possibilities of these newly developing school fairs as a means of promoting agricultural and other rural area educational programs; consequently he threw the full support of the State Department of Education behind the movement and tried to get such fairs started in every county of the state.

The corn club and the school fair blended together ideally. The club idea made a strong psychological appeal to the social desire of the boys to band together as a group. At the same time the fairs gave the boys an opportunity to win individual attention and recognition.

---

98 Settle, op. cit.
Perhaps the most significant contribution the fairs and the corn clubs made, aside from being the fore-runners of much of the present day 4-H Club and F.F.A. programs, was in helping to nurture the idea that at least a part of the program in agricultural education could be carried out on the boy's home farm, for, as will be shown, some of the district agricultural high schools soon embraced both the fairs and the home-project idea of the corn clubs. Undoubtedly these fairs, working in close conjunction with the Boys' Corn Clubs and exhibiting as they did the products produced by the boys at home in out-of-school hours or during vacation, under the supervision either of a teacher or of a person paid in part through the school officials, helped advertise and pave the way for the later acceptance of the idea that a part of the agricultural instruction could be carried out on the boy's home farm.

By 1910 that part of the spirit for educational revival which had been channeled off into support of agricultural education had produced so many overlapping programs sponsored by such diverse organizations as the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the State Board of Agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, the General Education Board, the State Board of Education, and the Co-operative Education Association99 that the resulting confusion was threatening

the entire movement. To help remedy this situation and at the same time provide an agency for receiving and disbursing the money being given the state by the General Education Board through the United States Department of Agriculture, the legislature in 1910 created the United Agricultural Board. The act\textsuperscript{100} creating this board allocated definite parts of the developing program in agricultural education and set up certain responsibilities to be met by the agencies involved. In general the work of the Boys' Corn Clubs, by now coming to be called boys' demonstration work or boys' extension work, was, along with the already established agricultural schools, allocated to the State Department of Education for expansion and development. It should be noted, however, that the act did not make any provision for supervision of this work in the public schools beyond that already existing or being developed by the schools.

Beyond co-ordinating the total program in agricultural education the United Agricultural Board does not seem to have aided the newly established schools to any great extent. In 1914 when the Agricultural Extension Service was set up at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the extension demonstration work for both adults and boys was transferred to this new agency and has remained there.

\textsuperscript{100}Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1910, Chapter 350, p. 573.
Left largely to their own initiative, the teachers in the agricultural schools explored and tried out many different combinations of the school farm and the boys' clubs in an effort to make the agricultural instruction practical and related to the home farm. In so far as the use of the school farm itself was concerned, the teachers seem to have had no greater success than the teachers in the manual labor schools of three-quarters of a century earlier. Sanders summarized the usages to which the farms were put as follows:

Teachers of agriculture left to their own devices utilized the farms in various ways. Some conducted experiments to show the effects of liming, fertilizing, or other practices on the production of crops; others used the land for the purpose of demonstrating the adaptability of varieties of certain crops; while some raised one or two staple crops on the land allowing boys to make casual observations of practices or at most do some of the routine work. In a few cases group projects, such as poultry, were conducted, but the boys were relieved of all managerial and financial responsibilities and the meager records that were kept were the products of the teacher... some of the teachers apportioned a small part of the school farm to interested boys who grew a garden crop to supply the family needs...

In several of the schools the teacher of agriculture in addition to his work at school helped supervise the

101 See Chapter IV.

Boys' Corn Club project on the home farm. In at least one school the teacher of agriculture was also employed as an extension demonstrator on a twelve months' basis and in this dual capacity of teacher of agriculture and demonstrator supervised the boys' club projects on the home farms. By the session of 1912-13 this same school required all students enrolled in agriculture to be actively engaged in a club project. This home-project work was thus described in the school's bulletin:

Beginning with the session of 1912-13 each pupil in the industrial course will be required to be actively engaged in the demonstration work. The director of agriculture will teach the class room work and explain the demonstrations on the school farm, but his work does not stop here. At the boy's home instruction advice and assistance follow him from school. Every boy is expected to secure an acre of ground from his father. This he cultivates in truck crops, forage crops, corn or as he desires, under the direct supervision and instruction of Mr. Blanford, the agricultural teacher and with the advice and assistance of the home folks. A careful account is required of all expenditures for labor, cultivation, seed, fertilizer etc. and the net profit, a very considerable sum is the boy's own. Boarding pupils can secure land adjoining the farm for a nominal sum.


104 Agricultural High School, Second Congressional District of Virginia, Bulletin, Driver, Virginia, 1912, p. 15.
The home-project work as revealed by a careful perusal of this description, along with the twelve months' employment of the teacher, indicates that in one school at least, Virginia in 1912 was well on the way toward the development of the supervised home project as a part of the high school instructional program in agriculture. There is no evidence to indicate, however, that the in-school activities were selected or organized as an integral part of the home project. It appears, in fact, that the instruction offered was really of a two-fold nature; namely, instruction in the school as indicated by the outlines already given and instruction on the farm according to the project selected.

Considerable progress seems to have been made in removing this dichotomy at the Manassas school, where each student studying agriculture was expected to select a home project related to the subject he was studying at school. For example, the school bulletin for 1917 states:

Each student who enters the agricultural course is expected to carry on at home some phase of agriculture which is related to the subject he is studying at school. In the first year when he is taking a course in soils and crops, he is expected to grow an acre of corn or some other crop, or to have a garden where he may apply what he learns at school; in the second year in connection with his course in animal husbandry, he will have the care of a pig, a calf or a flock of poultry on his own account at home. Such work is made a part of the course taken and school credit is given for the same. Practical work during
the summer will be accepted from students who live away from home during the school year.105

Slowly but surely the foundations were being laid for the supervised home project as a part of the agricultural instruction, but as indicated lack of expert supervision handicapped the work and prevented a co-ordinated attack. This lack of supervision and co-ordination was probably the greatest stumbling block in the way of these schools. It led to considerable conflicting pressure on the legislature and resulted in the passage of a series of statutes "difficult to understand and impossible to execute in a broad and liberal sense."106 One act of particular significance as the forerunner of much to be incorporated later in the state plan for the Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture was approved on March 13, 1914, and reads in part as follows:

1. Be it enacted by the general assembly of Virginia, that the State Board of Education is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and to assist in the introduction of industrial, agricultural, household arts and commercial education; to aid local school authorities to initiate and superintend the establishment and maintenance of such schools and


departments of schools or other agencies for the aforesaid forms of education; to inspect such schools, departments, and agencies and to allow such schools and departments as are approved by said board, the moneys to which such schools and departments may be entitled from time to time out of funds appropriated by the general assembly for the benefit of such forms of education.

2. Any school district may, through the district school board thereof, establish all-day, part-time, or continuation or evening classes giving industrial, agricultural, household arts or commercial education and provide for the support thereof in the same manner as for the regular schools of said district. Such education shall be of less than college grade and shall be designed to meet the vocational needs of persons over fourteen years of age who are able to profit by the instruction offered. 107

It would certainly seem that Virginia, legislatively at least, was laying the foundation for much to come in the Smith-Hughes program later on, but legislation was not enough; there still remained the problem of getting the instructional program co-ordinated and supervised by someone especially trained for this work. An appeal for funds to employ such a supervisor for the agricultural high schools was made to the legislature in 1914 and again in 1916 but to no avail. 108


The State Board of Education, unable to secure a special supervisor for the work, made an effort to get more assistance from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, where J.D. Eggleston, Jr., who by now had relinquished his post as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, had become president. In 1914, as related, the demonstration work of the state had been transferred to the newly established Extension Division of the college. A co-operative plan was soon thereafter entered into among the college, the State Department of Education, and the United States Department of Agriculture to prepare a series of lessons and studies in agriculture particularly suited to Virginia conditions and so written as to be "carefully correlated with the other studies of the curriculum." While these lessons were prepared primarily for the elementary school level, it was not long before specialists in agriculture in the Extension Division at the college were assisting the high schools to set up courses of study which embodied many of the principles and suggestions contained in the material prepared for the elementary schools.

This co-operative undertaking resulted in a unique plan for extending and promoting agricultural education throughout the state.
the state and at the same time for securing supervision of the home project selected by the students. The plan as described in the Extension Division report is as follows:

The Department [State Department of Education] has made provisions whereby rural High Schools located in Counties with demonstration agents may introduce a course of study for agriculture, dividing the year's work into three parts, first term, second term, and vacation period. The fall or first term is devoted to a general course in agriculture, which was outlined with the assistance of representatives of the Extension Division. For the second term the principal of the school in consultation with the [agriculture] teacher and the county agent selects for the class four . . . projects to be studied. Each pupil selects one project to work out during school and summer. A minimum of twenty lessons has been prepared by the Extension Division in each club project . . . One unit of credit is allowed for satisfactory work in the school room and an additional unit of credit is given for satisfactory work on a club project during the summer.\textsuperscript{110}

This co-operative plan obviously made it possible for all the high schools within any county having a demonstration agent to offer a course in agriculture; but as to be related later, this program did not prove to be very successful.

\textsuperscript{110} Three Years of Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics in Virginia, A report of the Activities and Accomplishments of the Extension Division of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute from July 1, 1916 to May 15, 1919, p. 18.
Even though the co-operation of specialists on the Agricultural Extension Division staff at the college had been secured to help with the agricultural schools, it was felt that yet more help was needed in this direction. On June 27, 1916, the State Board of Education authorized the Superintendent of Public Instruction to "pay the salary and expenses of Mr. John R. Hutcheson, specialist in animal husbandry at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, as inspector of agricultural high schools for two month in each year."

Hutcheson, who in addition to his work at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, had formerly served as principal of an agricultural high school in Virginia and in Mississippi and had taught nature courses in the summer sessions at the University of Virginia, was well qualified for this work. Unfortunately press of other duties kept him from devoting as much time to the schools as he desired. His report dated May 9, 1917, on the inspection of the schools is so revealing as to the condition of the work and the difficulties being faced by the district agricultural schools nearly a decade after their establishment that it is given in some detail here:

From my work with these schools, it seems to me that their greatest need is closer and more adequate supervision. At the present

time there seems to be no uniformity in aims or methods. The schools are governed by local boards, and in some cases are merely local schools receiving state appropriations. In very few cases are the schools reaching the entire district, as was contemplated in the act creating them... Up until the present there has been very little uniformity in the course of study used by the different schools. The course has been changed so many times that the principals don't seem to know exactly what course they are supposed to follow. Another question which has given trouble in nearly all the agricultural high schools is the proper use of the school farm. In many instances the school farm has been a detriment rather than a help. This is because the land in most cases has been poor, the agriculture teacher has not been given enough time for supervision, and the school was not equipped with the proper team and farming implements. Perhaps the most serious handicap to the success of the school farm has been the crowded schedule of the teacher of agriculture. Too often he has every period of the day taken up with indoor work... The school farm was created primarily with the idea that it should be the means of giving the boys practical work in agriculture... but in this state the school farms are too small, and the course is so arranged that neither the pupils nor the teacher have time to make the practical work of the school farm serve this purpose. To my mind a better way to give the practical agriculture is by means of some well planned project at home, under the supervision of the agriculture teacher... These projects should be made to correlate as nearly as possible with the classroom work. For instance the first year's project should be in agronomy, the second year's in animal husbandry, the third year's in the special subject, and the fourth year's in farm management. I suggest that these projects be required and that
one-fourth unit's credit per year be given for the proper carrying out of the same.\textsuperscript{112}

In terms of present day standards of vocational agriculture these congressional district schools had not been particularly successful. In terms of pioneering in a new field for Virginia and laying many of the foundation stones for the later success of the Smith-Hughes work in vocational agriculture, they do seem to have been successful. Much remained to be done to secure a practical program of agricultural instruction, but certainly these schools had discovered many of the basic factors and principles upon which such a successful program was eventually to be built. Before an opportunity was had, nevertheless, to do much more than make a start at incorporating these basic factors and principles into the instructional program, the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture was launched in the state. Almost at once the congressional district agricultural high schools were converted into schools with departments of vocational agriculture which will be more fully discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IX

THE INAUGURATION OF SMITH-HUGHES VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN VIRGINIA

If thought of in terms of practices in modern agricultural education in the secondary schools, it is quite obvious that one congressional district agricultural school attempting to serve approximately ten counties could not meet the needs of all the people of the district. These district schools, however, both by what they did succeed in doing and by what they failed to do helped prepare the way for the acceptance of federally aided agricultural education as provided in the Smith-Hughes Act. It is to the inauguration of this latter program in Virginia that attention will be directed in this chapter. In an attempt to organize a logical sequence, the events incident to the inauguration of the program in Virginia will be presented under the following headings: (1) the national Smith-Hughes Act, (2) the state legislative provisions for Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture, (3) the state plan for Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture, and (4) the first schools establishing departments of vocational agriculture.
The National Smith-Hughes Act

The passage of the Morrill Act and subsequent acts to which reference has been made\(^1\) in connection with the establishment of the state agricultural college, became a precedent for numerous attempts on the national level to extend federal aid to agricultural education. According to True the movement in Congress which resulted in the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act began\(^2\) in 1906. By 1910 the movement had gained such headway that a bill was introduced into Congress by Senator Dolliver to provide federal aid for instruction in agriculture in secondary schools.\(^3\)

Some confusion arose as to the purposes of the proposed legislation, with the result that interest and effort became centered on securing aid for college extension work instead of vocational education.\(^4\) This agitation led to the passage in 1914 of the Smith-Lever Act providing federal aid for extension work in agriculture and home economics. With the establishment of this extension service, effort

\(^{1}\)See Chapter VI.


\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 363.

was again resumed to secure a federal subsidy for vocati-
onal education in the secondary schools. In the forefront
of the movement was the National Society for Industrial Edu-
cation. Largely as a result of this organization's efforts
a commission was appointed by the President of the United
States to consider the subject of federal aid for vocati-
onal education and to report their conclusions. Five of the
nine members of this commission were members of the Nation-
al Society for Industrial Education. The report given by
this commission, therefore, was heavily weighted with the
philosophy and the thinking of the National Society for
Industrial Education. Much of this report in turn became
embodied in the Smith-Hughes bill, which after consider-
able debate and some amending was passed by Congress and
signed by the President on February 23, 1917. It is quite
likely that having much of the philosophy of the National
Society embodied in it helped pave the way for the ready
acceptance of the Smith-Hughes Act when this act reached
the state level.

Virginia had followed the progress of the efforts
culminating in the Smith-Hughes bill with considerable
interest. In December of 1914 the National Society for

---

5A. C. True, History of Agricultural Education in
the United States, 1785-1925, p. 362.

6Ibid., p. 370.
Industrial Education had met in Richmond, Virginia, and among other things had resolved to continue pressing for federal aid for agricultural education. In March, 1915, the Virginia state legislature passed a joint resolution by nearly unanimous vote, requesting the Virginia delegation to the Senate and the House of the United States Congress to support the movement then in Congress to provide aid for the promotion of vocational education. The entire state, in fact, with the public high school system only a decade old, seemed to be thinking in terms of a more practical education. The Superintendent of Public Instruction became somewhat concerned and warned:

Vocational training has threatened to destroy the overlordship of cultural training. As might have been expected, this popular movement has not escaped a natural tendency to go to extremes, and I state but the sober truth when I say that too much has been expected of the schools. Vocational education has not proven the money maker that was expected and boys who have enjoyed all of the benefits of modern education do not take hold of the real problems of life with any more zeal and intelligence, in many cases, than some of the boys who are trained in a classical atmosphere.

7 Ibid., p. 362.
8 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1915, p. 943.
On the national stage, however, the movement for improved vocational education continued and, as indicated, culminated in the Smith-Hughes Act providing federal aid for vocational education. This act provided for a scheme of co-operation between the federal government and the several states to promote vocational education in agriculture, trade, home economics, and industry. Since this act set up certain provisions within which the individual states had to operate if they wished to participate in the proposed program, those parts of the federal act which directly affected subsequent state legislation in Virginia will be briefly reviewed. No attempt will be made, however, to give either a complete summary or an exhaustive interpretation of the act such as has been done elsewhere.10

Section 6 of the act provided for the creation of a Federal Board for Vocational Education and gave it power to co-operate with the states in carrying out the provisions included in the act itself. Section 5 required that a state in order to secure the benefits provided in the legislation must accept the provisions of the act by specific legislative action. This specific legislative action not only had to accept the provisions of the act but also had to create

10See especially Statement of Policies, Federal Board for Vocational Education, Bulletin 1917, No. 1, pp. 1-70. The complete text of the Smith-Hughes Act may be found in Appendix A, pp. 49-56, of this bulletin.
or designate a state board or a state agency and give it necessary powers to co-operate with the Federal Board for Vocational Education. In addition to co-operating with the federal board the properly designated state body was to be given powers to administer the program of vocational education in the state. A concession was made in this requirement for legislative action, however, for those states in which the legislature was not in session or would not be in session during the year of 1917. For these states the act provided that the governor of each state could accept the provisions of the act and could also designate a board to co-operate with the federal board. This board appointed by the governor was to be recognized by the federal board until sixty days after the convening of the next legislature in the state thus operating. If the state wished to continue receiving the federal fund, the legislature within the sixty-day period after convening had to pass the appropriate legislation as previously indicated. This latter provision for accepting the terms of the act by the action of the governor, although of little importance in the total development of agricultural education, as will be shown later, has been the cause of considerable misunderstanding and friendly dispute in Virginia relative to the exact legal date of the establishment of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the secondary schools of the state.
Section 5, in addition to requiring the state to set up administrative machinery necessary to carry out the program, required that after June 30, 1920, the state must take advantage of at least the minimum amount appropriated for the training of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects.

Section 8 provided that in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations specified in the act the state board had to prepare plans showing in considerable detail how the state planned to spend the federally appropriated money. This plan had to show the following information: the kinds of schools and equipment; the courses of study to be followed; the methods of instruction; the qualifications of teachers; for agriculture, the qualifications of supervisors or directors; the plans for the training of teachers; and the plans for supervision of the teaching of agriculture in the schools.

Section 9 required the state or local community or both to match dollar for dollar all federal money spent for agricultural instruction.

Section 10 required that all agricultural instruction subsidized by federal funds should be of less than college grade, should be under public supervision or control, should be adapted to the needs of persons fourteen years of age or over, and should be strictly vocational in nature. In
addition to these requirements this section further pro-
vided that the schools receiving aid for agricultural pur-
poses should provide for directed or supervised practice
in agriculture either on a farm provided by the school or
some other farm for at least six months each year.

This federal Smith-Hughes Act included other provisions
of both an explanatory and a directive nature; but when Vir-
ginia drew up her own legislation accepting the conditions
of the federal act, it was the just-mentioned specific
provisions which exercised the greatest influence in shaping
the provisions and the wording of the Virginia act.

The State Legislative Provisions for Smith-
Hughes Vocational Agriculture

There was no difficulty at all encountered in taking
the legal steps necessary in order to secure the state's
share of the federal appropriation. The work of the con-
gressional district agricultural high schools, the boys'
club work, the school fairs, the farm demonstration work,
and the results from the participation in the work of the
National Society for Industrial Education had successfully
paved the way for an expansion of agricultural education
when an opportunity to do so presented itself. The Smith-
Hughes Act seemed to present just such an opportunity.
Certainly there were no radically new ideas for Virginia in
the act itself in so far as agricultural education was concerned; in fact, many of the ideas in the act had been advanced in one form or another and in many instances actually tried out in the state within the decade just prior to the actual passage of the act. It remained only for the state to set up proper legislative and administrative machinery to get a minimum program under way.

The first step in Virginia toward creating the legal machinery necessary to accept the conditions of the act was taken by the Governor who by authority of section five of the Smith-Hughes Act accepted the provisions of the said act by a proclamation dated March 28, 1917. At the same time the Governor designated the State Board of Education as the agency to co-operate with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in administering the provisions of the act in Virginia. At the next regular session of the legislature beginning in January, 1918, a bill providing for the acceptance of the proffered aid and complying fully with the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act was introduced and passed in both houses of the legislature without a

11 Supra.

dissenting vote. This unanimous support on the part of the legislature of a federal aid program for vocational education is really noteworthy in a state as traditionally conservative as Virginia. The unanimity of the act is even more noteworthy when Virginia's nearly century-long fight against federal aid for internal improvements, on the grounds that such aid was an infringement of states' rights, is recalled. Of equal noteworthiness is the fact that in a state where the academic emphasis in secondary education had reigned supreme for more than two centuries, vocational agriculture by unanimous consent of the legislature was accorded full recognition as a part of the secondary school curriculum.

This legislative action of 1918 supplanted, of course, the Governor's proclamation of 1917 and became the permanent legal basis for all subsequent instruction in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the state. Before proceeding to an examination of the provisions of this act, it might be well to clear up a point of some confusion and mild controversy which frequently arises with regard to the exact date of beginning Smith-Hughes vocational education in the state. As will be shown later, the State Board

---

13Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1918, Chapter 73, pp. 131-32; Virginia, House Journal and Documents, 1918, p. 356; Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents, 1918, p. 354; See appendix F for a copy of this act.
of Education, acting on the basis of the Governor's proclamation issued on March 28, 1917, proceeded to organize departments of vocational agriculture in several of the high schools of the state. These schools accordingly opened in the fall of 1917. In February of 1918, as recorded, the legislature met and passed the bill accepting the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act. Today some confusion and questions frequently arise when one may read that Smith-Hughes agricultural instruction began in the state in 1917 and then perhaps in the very same article read that the legislative act authorizing such work was passed in 1918. If it is recalled that all Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture started prior to February, 1918, was started and conducted under the authority of the Governor's proclamation, and was continued under the legislative act of 1918 which superceded the Governor's proclamation, the seeming conflict of dates may be quickly understood.

The state legislative act of 1918 which became the legal basis for the subsequent development of vocational agriculture in the secondary schools of the state was drawn up within the framework of the requirements set up by the federal act. At the same time the state act delegated authority and responsibility for the work in such a manner that the State Board of Education which had already had a decade of experience in trying to promote agricultural
education had to assume responsibility for the new work.

In general the act in so far as agriculture was concerned provided:

1. that the State Board of Education should also serve as the State Board for Vocational Education with full authority to co-operate and work with the Federal Board for Vocational Education;

2. that the treasurer of Virginia be custodian of the federal funds appropriated to the state for the promotion of vocational education and that he disburse this money on properly issued warrants drawn by the State Board of Education;

3. that the State Board of Education should have authority to use appropriations made by the federal government for the training of teachers, supervisors, or directors of agricultural subjects, and for the pay of the salaries of teachers, supervisors, or directors, of agricultural subjects;

4. that the State Board of Education should have the authority to establish a department of vocational education for the state, the purpose of such department to be to study the problems of vocational education, to systematize the work in the state, and to promote and supervise the teaching of such subjects in the schools of the Commonwealth as would lead to useful and productive employment in rural or urban communities; and

5. that the State Board of Education should have the authority to provide proper supervision and management of the schools to receive financial aid under the act for maintenance, supervision, equipment, or establishment of agricultural or vocational schools.

As a final step the act provided for an appropriation of $48,155 for the year ending February 28, 1919, and the sum of $63,460 for the year ending February 29, 1920. All money so appropriated was to be used specifically for the promotion of vocational education . . . under rules and
regulations to be adopted by the State Board of Education."

This act as mentioned passed both branches of the legislature without a dissenting vote. At the same time it would appear that this same legislature did not understand fully the nature of the newly developing program or the role to be played by the old district agricultural schools under the new program, for in the Appropriations Act of 1918 the sum of $25,000 was set aside for dormitories, equipment, and extension work such as had been carried out in agriculture at the district schools. Further complications were injected into the situation by the fact that this money was to be expended, not under the State Board of Education, but under the supervision of the Extension Division of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. 

This legislative action included in the Appropriations Act on the one hand and the act providing for acceptance of the federal Smith-Hughes aid on the other hand, dividing responsibility as indicated, posed what might have become a real threat to the harmonious development of Smith-Hughes and agricultural extension work in some counties. Not only was there a similarity and some overlapping between the work of the agricultural teacher and the work of the county agri-

14Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1918, p. 133.

15Ibid., p. 696.
cultural agent, but in addition the district agricultural schools to be aided financially by the act had been converted into regular high schools with departments of Smith-Hughes agriculture by the State Board of Education upon the acceptance of Smith-Hughes aid. Fortunately for the state, however, the leaders of the two programs were men of broad vision, sincerely interested in agricultural education. Following the pattern of co-operative agreement set up at the national level, the director of extension and the chief executive officer of the State Board for Vocational Education in Virginia met and drew up an agreement to govern the work of the teachers of vocational agriculture and the county agents. Copies of this agreement were made on July 17, 1918, and mailed to all the teachers of vocational agriculture and to all the county demonstration agents in the state. This agreement, or a modification of it, has served as a basis for avoiding conflicts between the program of vocational agriculture and the county extension work in agriculture in the state to this day.

In 1920 the legislature increased the appropriation

---


for equipment of the departments of agriculture from $25,000 to $45,000 and at the same time removed the supervision of the expenditure of this sum from the Extension Division of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and made such supervision the responsibility of the State Board of Education. The wording of this part of the Appropriations Act kept separate from the section providing money to match the federal Smith-Hughes funds is interesting in that it seemingly reflected the influence of the district agricultural schools even after they had been absorbed into the Smith-Hughes program. The money was to be used for

... maintenance and equipment of agricultural high schools in Virginia and for additional dormitory space in such schools and for extension work in agriculture, gardening, canning, and domestic science as may be needed to be expended...

Interestingly enough this wording was followed for the entire first decade of existence of the Smith-Hughes agricultural schools, being changed in 1928 to read simply, "for maintenance of agricultural and other vocational departments in high schools." In 1920 the legislation of 1918 accepting the provisions


20Loc. cit.

21Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1928, p. 396. See the Acts for the intervening years for the wording of the other appropriations.
of the Smith-Hughes Act was re-enacted in its entirety, after being slightly improved for ease of reference and at the same time amended so as to permit the boards of supervisors of the several counties to appropriate money for departments of vocational education in the high schools.\(^{22}\) This latter provision, interestingly enough, was an almost exact parallel of the legislation passed exactly a decade earlier in regard to the district agricultural schools\(^{23}\) and tended to have the same effect in that it stimulated local effort toward supporting agricultural instruction.

---

**The State Plan for Smith-Hughes Vocational Agriculture**

Legislation is merely one of the beginning steps in any educational program. Legislative action in behalf of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in Virginia passed the responsibility for this program on to the State Board of Education which was authorized to act as the State Board for Vocational Education. One requirement of the federal Smith-Hughes Act was that each state must submit a plan showing how it contemplated spending the federal money. The development of such a plan, therefore, became one of the first responsibilities of the State Board for Vocational Education.

---


\(^{23}\)See Chapter VIII.
Education. Those parts of this plan which affected agricultural education will be discussed here.

The federal plan to which the Virginia plan for vocational education necessarily had to conform was -- and is -- a remarkable plan for providing aid to all the states in terms of the particular conditions and needs of each state. As pointed out, the federal government dealt with each state only through an official state board set up by legislative machinery within the state. In its relationships with each state the federal board was concerned with (a) standards and policies rather than with institutions or personalities and (b) conditions within the particular state rather than with conditions in the entire United States. 214 The state plan which was evolved in Virginia caught the spirit of the federal plan and with it as a guide provided for state level co-operation with local communities in establishing, administering, supervising, and developing vocational agriculture in the secondary schools.

Almost immediately following the Governor's proclamation designating the State Board of Education to act as the State Board for Vocational Education the board met and appointed two of its own membership, namely B. E. Copenhaver and J. A. C. Chandler, to draft a state plan for the use of

\[214\text{See especially Second Annual Report of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, 1918, p. 11.}\]
the Smith-Hughes vocational fund. This committee after considerable study drew up a plan which was approved by the state board on September 18, 1917, and with some modification and one important reservation, by the federal board on November 9, 1917.

This first plan for vocational education submitted by the State Board of Education to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, as far as the writer can determine, has never been published in its entirety in Virginia. It has, however, some provisions in it probably never widely known in Virginia and in addition is very interesting as the basic plan from which all subsequent state plans have developed. For these reasons excerpts of the plan significant for agricultural education, as the plan was originally recorded in the minutes of the State Board of Education for September 18, 1917, are presented here in some detail:


26 Ibid., p. 447. Note: Although the State Board of Education was legally constituted as the State Board for Vocational Education, the official action of this latter board is recorded in the minutes of the State Board of Education with little or no separation. In other words, as far as the State Board of Education was concerned, administration of the program of vocational education went along hand in hand with administering the rest of the school program.

The State Board of Education of Virginia presents the following plan for your approval:

I Acceptance of the Act
A. The Board has decided with your approval to accept the following appropriations:
   1. Salaries for teachers, directors, and supervisors of agricultural subjects
   2. [This division deals with trade, home economics, and industrial subjects.]
   3. Maintenance of teacher training
      (a) Teachers, directors, and supervisors of agricultural subjects
      (b) [This division deals with trades and industries.]
      (c) [This division deals with home economics.]

II Administration and Supervision
A. The administration and supervision shall be made under the general direction of the State Board of Education.
B. It is planned to have a director of agriculture who shall devote his entire time to the supervision of agricultural work.
C. [This division deals with trades and home economics.]

III Agricultural Education
A. 1. The appropriation from the Federal Government shall be matched by local appropriations or appropriations by the State Board.
   2. The schools must be under public supervision and control.
   3. The controlling purpose must be to fit for useful employment.
   4. The curriculum must be less than college grade.
   5. must [sic] be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who have entered upon or expect to enter upon the work of a farm or a farm home.
6. Money to be spent only for
   (a) salaries of teachers,
       supervisors, or directors
       of agriculture
   (b) maintenance of teacher
       training for teachers,
       supervisors, and directors
       of agriculture.

B. It is planned to have a supervisor
   of agriculture half of whose salary
   shall be paid out of federal funds.
   He shall devote his full time to
   this work, and shall encourage the
   extension of the work in localities
   which do not have it. He shall see
   that all schools using Federal
   money fulfill all conditions imposed
   upon them by the acceptance of this
   money and he shall give information
   regarding equipment and courses of
   study to any who may desire it.

C. Three hours per day shall be given
   to subjects of instruction which
   will broaden the pupil or supple­
   ment the work in agriculture.
   The remaining time which shall
   be not less than fifteen hours per
   week, shall be given to the study
   of agriculture -- theoretical and
   practical.

D. Every school must have a farm of
   at least five acres owned or leased
   by the school, and the equipment
   necessary for a well rounded course
   of study and to do efficient work.

E. The minimum of maintenance shall
   equal the amount fixed by the
   State Board . . .

F. The course of study will be arranged
   briefly as follows:
       English, History, Civics, Mathe­
       matics, Science and other related
       work, three hours per day.
       Theoretical and practical agricul­
       ture with at least six months of
       practical work on a farm each year,
       averaging three hours per day.
       The subjects in agriculture shall
       include the following:
       Plant production, animal production,
horticulture, rural engineering, farm mechanics, rural economics, farm management, dairying, poultry, vegetable gardening and forestry.

G. Efforts will be made to standardize as far as possible the agricultural courses and to have efficient supervision. The academic work will be taught in such a way as to stimulate a love for country, knowledge of civics, good citizenship and home reading but many subjects will be correlated with agriculture in the making of plow beams, whiffle trees, boxes for testing seed, and general repair work. Forge work will be given so that the principles of welding and horseshoeing, tempering and sharpening of tools may be learned. Drawing will also be taught incidentally including the making of plans for barns, tools, models of chicken houses, etc. [sic] Carpentry will be taught incidentally in the building of pig sties, poultry houses, hay mows, farm gates, repairing of farm buildings, etc. . [sic]

The boys will be encouraged to have definite crops at home which will be under the supervision of the director or teacher of agriculture. In other words the whole desire of the school will be to broaden the pupil but at the same time make him a thorough-going farmer.

H. For the present directors and teachers of agriculture shall be graduates of the Agricultural Department of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute or a school of equal standing . . .

I. All schools receiving Federal money shall make provisions for supervised practical work on the school farm or other farms for at least six months each year. All farm work whether at school or at home shall be supervised by the director or teacher of agriculture who shall be employed for twelve months of the year.
J. 1. The training of supervisors, directors and teachers of agriculture shall be under the supervision of the State Board of Education.

2. For the training of supervisors, directors, and teachers (male) of agriculture the Board recommends a cooperative plan agreed upon by the University of Virginia -- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and William and Mary, the degree to be conferred by the institution last attended, or jointly as may hereafter be agreed upon . . . .

It is proposed . . . that every student spend two years at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute studying technical subjects mostly agriculture and two years either at the University of Virginia or the College of William and Mary.

It is also recommended that women be trained to teach agriculture and that the State Normal School Board be required to establish at one of the normal schools a course of study representing four years over and above high school graduation of equal rank and standard with the training given men. 28

The essential features of this plan with the exception of the provision for training teachers of agriculture were approved by the federal board and became the plan under which vocational agriculture was launched. On February 1, 1918, Thomas D. Eason was appointed as supervisor of the

28"Minutes of the Meeting of the Virginia State Board of Education, September 17, 1918," p. 187. The teacher-training provision will be treated in subsequent chapters of this study.
agricultural schools. One of the earliest jobs he undertook was to revise the just-presented first state plan and prepare it for publication and distribution throughout the state. This revised and enlarged plan was issued as a bulletin of the State Board of Education in July and again with slight modification in September of 1918. The plan as reported in these two bulletins is almost universally referred to in the state today as the plan under which the program of Smith-Hughes vocational education got under way. It is quite true that this plan of 1918 was the first widely publicized one, but in actuality it was, as just indicated, a revision of the first plan. A more specific discussion of this plan of 1918 for vocational agriculture is justified at this time.

Under the plan for administration the State Board of Education was constituted as the State Board for Vocational Education with the president of the state board acting as the chief executive officer of the State Board for Vocational Education. This provision precluded the possibility of any administrative conflict at state level at least between the interests of vocational education and the interests

---

29"Minutes of the Meeting of the Virginia State Board of Education, February 1, 1918," p. 45.

30Unless otherwise indicated all the specific provisions of the state plan as presented here are drawn from Plan of the State Board for Vocational Education, Virginia State Board of Education, Bulletin II, No. 2, Supplement No. 4 (September, 1919), pp. 1-40.
of the more academic education, for by this provision the
responsibility for both programs was placed squarely on
the same individuals. Probably the gravest danger to vo-
cational agriculture from this provision was the danger
of indifference or lukewarm support from the board.
Fortunately, however, such indifference or lukewarmness
seems to have been at a minimum, although some scepticism
as to the real educational value of vocational education
as contrasted with a rigorous academic training did seem
to exist on the part of some of the board members.\(^{31}\)

The county school board was designated as the local
authority with which the state board would deal. The
officers of such boards were given responsibility for the
proper local administration and supervision of funds for
vocational education. This provision had an unusual impact
on the state as the following discussion will show.

In Virginia at this time each county was divided into
magisterial districts. Each district had its own school
board. The chairman of each one of these district boards
along with the county superintendent made up the county
school board. The county superintendent of schools worked
with the county board and in addition worked with the State
Department of Education. Under the provision whereby the

\(^{31}\)Such an opinion was definitely and somewhat force-
fully expressed to the writer at a later date by a member
of the state board.
State Board for Vocational Education or its representative worked with the county board, any high school qualifying for Smith-Hughes agricultural funds, although serving a magisterial district or even one section of a magisterial district as was usually the case, had to be approved by the county board. This approval, because of the county level educational organizations as just related, was tantamount to approval by the chairmen of the several district boards. This situation produced different results in different counties. In some places it stimulated attempts to get departments of agriculture in each district within a county. In other counties district jealousy tended to hinder the movement, while in some counties public meetings were held to determine which district would have the honor of getting the first agricultural school. In these latter cases considerable educational work was undertaken by the county superintendent of schools and often by the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education to explain the full nature of the proposed work and the requirements to be met by the local board and the community in which the school was to be established. It seems likely that these educational meetings helped spread the philosophy of the new work, but it is also quite likely that local pride and local politics played a significant part in the final location of a school within some counties.
Cumbersome as this local level machinery was, the state board by using it helped scatter abroad information about vocational agriculture and, as on the state level, made the board at the county level responsible for agricultural as well as academic education. Although the state plan designated the local board as being responsible for controlling the expenditure of vocational funds at the local level, it specifically provided that no local board could claim by right an appropriation from state or federal funds. The state board promised to give a careful and sympathetic hearing and attention to all local appeals but reserved the right to grant such appeals within the limits of available funds to those schools which gave promise of the highest vocational efficiency.

Throughout the entire decade of existence of the congressional district agricultural schools the need for adequate supervision was fully recognized but never adequately realized. Upon acceptance of the federal aid, the state board almost immediately appointed a supervisor of agricultural education and for his work devised a plan, the chief features of which are subsequently given.

Agricultural education was to be under the special supervision of a state supervisor. This supervisor was, among other things, to visit all departments of agriculture in the high schools, advise teachers as to best methods of
instruction, examine equipment, study project work, and make reports and recommendations to the state board for the improvement of the work. Since this phase of the work was comparatively new and yet thought to be of such vital importance in the new program, it was presented to school officials in some detail as follows:

The plan of supervision shall include:
A. Improvement of teachers in service.
   (a) Systematic visitation of teachers or local supervisors for individual help.
   (b) Definite reports from teachers or local supervisors on work done and methods of instruction used. In order to have these reports result in benefit to the teacher, the State supervisor shall provide for careful criticism and reports on the same to be sent back to the teacher or supervisor.
   (c) State and sectional meetings of the teachers at which the supervisor may himself give instruction or provide other instruction.
   (d) A period of professional improvement for teachers.
   (e) Cooperation between teacher-training institutions and the State supervisory staff so that all teacher-training may be co-ordinated.
B. Inspection of schools.
C. Assistance in the establishment of new schools and classes.
D. Preparation of bulletins and other special literature.32

The philosophy of supervision as a co-operative undertaking among the persons concerned with the improvement of the program was a very happy one and met with considerable success. This co-operative idea of supervision expressed here, nevertheless, should not be claimed, as is sometimes done, as a "first" or as a contribution of the program of vocational agriculture to Virginia, for at exactly the same time this plan was produced with this philosophy in it, a diligent effort was being made to bring the entire high school program of the state under an almost identical concept of co-operative supervision.33

Specific requirements and conditions laid down by the federal act and deemed of sufficient importance to be clearly understood by all officials were reproduced in the Virginia plan as requirements for participating in the use of federal and state aid. Among the requirements were these given forthwith.

1. Education had to be under public supervision or control.
2. The controlling purpose of the education had to be to fit the boy for useful employment.
3. The education had to be of less than college grade.
4. The education had to be designed to meet the needs of persons over fourteen years of age who had entered upon,

or were preparing to enter upon, useful employment.

5. Every dollar of federal funds for agriculture had to be matched by a dollar of state funds.

6. Federal and state funds had to be used exclusively for the following purposes: (a) salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural, trade, industrial, and home economics subjects and (b) maintenance of teacher-training for vocational teachers.

The state plan provided that local school boards were to carry on the program in vocational agriculture as an integral part of the regular county educational program, with state aid to come to the local board in the form of reimbursements for money already spent. In addition to requirements as just listed the local board to qualify for reimbursement had to meet certain other requirements as given here:

1. The local board had to submit quarterly reports on forms furnished by the state board. These reports were to show precisely how and for what purpose the money had been spent.

2. The local board had to employ as teachers of vocational agriculture persons who met the minimum requirement for such teachers as set up by the state board. These teachers were to be elected and paid by the local board in exactly the same manner as other teachers were elected
and paid.

3. The local board had to employ teachers of agriculture on a twelve months' basis at a stated minimum salary. (In the plan of 1918 this annual minimum was set at $1500.)

The Virginia plan provided for three kinds, or types, of instruction:

1. agricultural instruction as a department in a regular high school;
2. agricultural instruction in part-time schools for those not regularly enrolled in schools;
3. agricultural instruction in evening schools usually offered for adults.

Local school boards were required to provide certain facilities before vocational agriculture could be offered in a local school. Chief of these requirements were

1. a separate room or building suitable for instruction in agriculture, an innovation at this time being the requirement that such a room be equipped with non-stationary furniture in order that such rooms could be adapted to a variety of instructional practices and to group meetings and demonstrations;
2. a minimum of $350 worth of laboratory equipment especially selected for agricultural laboratory work;
3. suitable cabinets and storage space for all equipment
and specimens;
4. a collection of thirty-five or more reference books
   and one hundred or more bulletins;
5. a farm shop equipped for teaching wood work, forge,
   and cement work, the cost of such equipment to be not
   less than $750;
6. five acres of land adjacent to or near the school;
7. a minimum of five dollars per pupil per year for re­
   placement of equipment.

In the light of present day practices these require­
ments may appear quite elementary; but when one recalls
that in so far as Virginia was concerned publicly supported
high schools were just beginning their second decade of
existence, that science laboratory work was in its infancy,
that an individual classroom library was almost unheard of,
and that flexible teaching procedures awaited the future,
the real wisdom of these requirements becomes more apparent.

A course of study, to be discussed more fully later,
was outlined. This course set forth a four-year program
with one-half the time to be devoted to vocational agricul­
ture and one-half to academic or non-vocational subjects.
A minimum of three hours a day for nine months was required
for vocational agriculture; nevertheless only eighty minutes
of consecutive instruction a day were required in school,
with the remaining time to be put in on the supervised home
project and further agricultural instruction, such as shop, woodwork, and forge work, at school.

It was perhaps in methods of instruction proposed in the state plan that the greatest break with traditional classroom efforts to teach agriculture occurred. These methods were not accomplished over night; in fact, it seems safe to say that they never have been accomplished in their entirety but that they certainly represent an early effort in Virginia, where most instruction was heavily dominated by the lecture method, to make instruction more flexible and functional. The section of the plan dealing with instruction, though written more than thirty years ago, is still worthy of careful study by teachers in any field. It is as follows:

Practical work, laboratory work, and theoretical instruction should be required, and methods of instruction in these various lines should be such as to best prepare the pupils for the occupation of farming. The instruction should be carried on with the primary aim of production rather than scientific investigation. This does not mean that either the principles or the methods of science should be ignored. Laboratory and recitation work should not be separated into distinct phases. That is, a certain time each day should be set aside for agricultural instruction and the question whether this instruction is to consist of discussion, recitation, or laboratory work, or a combination of two or more of these should depend not on the fact that it is a certain day of the week, but upon whether the particular subject under consideration lends itself
to that kind of treatment. The work of a single day might comprise some demonstration work, some recitation work, and some laboratory work. The sequence of topics should not necessarily be that of the text-book, but should follow the growing season, and the stress given to a particular topic should depend upon the importance of the topic to the farmers of the community rather than upon the number of pages which the text-book devotes to the topic. The amount of material available for concrete instruction should have some influence upon the selection of and emphasis given to topics. Instruction should be planned for out-of-doors, as well as for indoors. The pupils should be brought into contact with those who are following good principles and practices in agriculture. 

This proposed plan of instruction indicates that classroom practices were still largely built around day-to-day selection of subject matter, but certainly the beginning of the selection of functional subject matter around a larger topic is also clearly evidenced. That this trend toward more functional subject matter selected around one large topic or central idea was helped by the requirement that all students enrolled in vocational agriculture also carry on a supervised home project there can be no doubt. The evolution of the home project from a practice looked to to supplement and strengthen classroom instruction to a practice occupying a position of central

---

importance in which much of the classroom instruction was to supplement and enrich the home project is a significant one to be treated more fully later on, but the beginning of the evolution is clearly discernible here.

The idea of the supervised home project was not at all new in Virginia, since, as pointed out, it had been tried in several forms in the district agricultural schools. It did remain, nevertheless, for the schools of vocational agriculture to make the idea workable on a large scale. As far as the Virginia plan was concerned, it was provided that

1. each pupil enrolled in vocational agriculture should carry on at least six months of practical agriculture, preferably on his home farm but on the school farm if necessary;

2. the home project was to be an enterprise undertaken by the pupil with full responsibility on his part for financing the project, doing the work or providing for its being done, and keeping all books and records and reports.

It seems evident from this rather brief treatment of the home project that the early planners for vocational agriculture in Virginia did not realize the full significance this phase of the program would assume in a very few years.

Probably one of the greatest factors contributing to
the growth of vocational agriculture in the state was the high qualification requirement set up for teachers, together with the fact that provisions were made whereby these qualifications could be met. As to the qualifications themselves the plan provided that teachers of vocational agriculture should

1. be graduates of a four-year college course in agriculture,
2. be graduates of a standard four-year high school course or its equivalent, and
3. have had two years' practical experience on the farm.

In addition to these specific requirements it was urged that the teachers have the type of personality and the background of experience which would command the respect of farmers and other rural workers.

To meet these qualifications, it was planned to establish a Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and assign to this department, in co-operation with the State Board of Education, the responsibility of setting up and administering a curriculum in technical agriculture and professional subjects suitable for the preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture. This department was established in 1918 and successfully helped in inaugurating vocational agriculture in the state.35

As pointed out, the Virginia plan for vocational

---

35 This phase of the program is discussed more fully in Chapter XIII.
agriculture placed heavy reliance on supervision of the program. Qualifications for the supervisors were accordingly set up as given here.

1. The supervisors were to have at least the qualifications of the teachers of agriculture.

2. The supervisors were to have at least two years of successful experience in teaching or supervising agriculture.

This plan, the essential features of which have just been outlined, became the basis upon which Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture moved ahead in the secondary schools of Virginia. As a plan, or guide, it clearly established certain basic principles which influenced subsequent developments in the field. The chief principles to be established are given here.

1. Vocational agricultural education was to develop as an integral part of the state public school system.

2. Vocational agricultural education should develop as a horizontal extension of the secondary school program rather than as a separate new type of education in a separate type of school.

3. Vocational agricultural education should be administered on the state and local levels by the same boards responsible for administering the public school system.

4. Special supervision and special teacher-training should
be provided for the program of vocational agriculture in the secondary schools.

5. Vocational agricultural instruction should be practical, flexible, and closely related to the community needs.

6. The establishment of a department of vocational agriculture should depend upon the efforts of the community as well as the efforts of the state board.

Even as this aforementioned plan was being developed, Smith-Hughes vocational agricultural schools were getting under way, as will be recounted forthwith.

First High Schools Establishing Departments of Vocational Agriculture

It does not appear that the first high schools to establish departments of vocational agriculture had any particular significance in influencing the future development of agricultural education in Virginia other than to demonstrate its feasibility. It is true that these first schools pioneered with vocational agriculture, but the first year of effort seems to have been one largely of adaptation of the program and practices developed within the district agricultural high schools to the more specific requirements of the Smith-Hughes Act. Many problems, of course, had to be met and solved, but the Superintendent of Public Instruction certainly seems to have been correct when in discussing the introduction of Smith-Hughes work
into the state he rather cautiously observed, "I suppose that the field has been as well prepared in Virginia as in the majority of the states for the broader and more definite effort to introduce agricultural . . . education . . . under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes law . . . ." 36

The same sentiment was expressed at a later date by Thomas D. Eason, at the time State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, when in speaking of the congressional district agricultural high school he said, "They paved the way . . . for a more practical type of education." 37

There was no fanfare in the state press or in the agricultural press when the schools opened. It would seem that the people had reached the stage of readiness for agricultural education but awaited proof that such a type of education would work. It was just such proof that the pioneer schools establishing departments of vocational agriculture proceeded to give, and for this reason, if not for the sheer interest in being first in a great program, deserve to be noted. No attempt will be made to present the establishment of these pioneer schools in other than a general way as revealed by the actual records. It may be

36 Virginia, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1916-1917, p. 44.

well at this time to acknowledge the fact that tradition has already contributed some conflicting reports on this period of vocational agriculture in Virginia. One of these reports has been given wide publicity in publications of national circulation and is generally accepted in the state as reasonably exact. This report, because of its intensely interesting aspects, will be the only one given attention at this time.

Soon after the Governor had accepted by proclamation the provisions of the federal Smith-Hughes Act, E. E. Worrell, serving as one of the rural school supervisors in the state, was made acting State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. With a supervisor appointed, the next job was to set up the schools to be supervised. Apparently the state board was just a bit puzzled as to the best procedure to follow in locating these schools. On June 26, 1917, meeting in Richmond, the board adopted the following resolution which in actual fact appears to have been the beginning of the first state plan for vocational agriculture.

The board resolved:

That every agriculture high school that employs a teacher of agriculture giving his entire time to the teaching of agriculture and enrolling pupils above fourteen years of age be permitted to share in the distribution of the Smith-Hughes funds to the amount equal to one half of the salary of the said teacher of agriculture, that the said

38 Sanders, op. cit., p. 33.
teacher must be employed for the whole year and that students studying agriculture during vacation will be required to do it under the supervision of the teacher so employed; that the schools applying for participation in this fund be requested to prepare and submit a full four-year plan of course of study which they propose to follow and that they must have either by ownership or through lease a school farm.

The board evidently considered this plan as a temporary provision, for on the same day that the foregoing plan was adopted a statement was entered into the minutes to the effect that this plan was subject to revision. On the afternoon of the same day on which the preceding plan was adopted, the board met and "entered upon hearing applications for participation in the distribution of the Smith-Hughes Fund." Applications for the fund were made at this time for the high schools at Turbeville, Appomattox, Burkeville, Williamsburg, Chase City, Claremont, Columbia, Culpeper, Richmond, and Fredericksburg. It is particularly interesting to note that A. T. Lewark, later to be connected with the teacher-training center for vocational agriculture at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, was one of the claimants for the Claremont School.


40 Ibid., p. 424.

41 Ibid., p. 423.
Shortly after this hearing the board decided to withdraw its special appropriation to the congressional district high schools but at the same time permit these same schools to reorganize and open departments of vocational agriculture. In addition to these congressional district high schools, seven more had met the requirements laid down by the state board in time for the 1917-1918 session opening, thus making a total of eighteen schools with departments of vocational agriculture in actual operation before the state legislature had an opportunity to accept the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act.

The following report has been rather generally accepted in Virginia as being an account of the establishment of the first department of vocational agriculture in the state. This account, though seemingly in error in one or two instances, as to be shown subsequently, is well worth recording as a part of the story of the early struggle for vocational agriculture in the state.

---


\[43\] Loc. cit. See Appendix M for map showing location of these schools.

\[44\] Credit for this story must be given to H. W. Sanders who got it firsthand from two of the individuals concerned and although not claiming it to be accurate had the story typed. Incidents related here are taken from Sander's typewritten "History of Agricultural Education in Virginia", unless otherwise credited.
J. Lee Cox, Superintendent of Schools in Carroll County, in the spring of 1917 saw in the Congressional Record that the Smith-Hughes bill had passed Congress. He knew that the State Board of Education was scheduled to meet in Richmond the same week, and he surmised correctly that the question of meeting the provisions of the Smith-Hughes bill would come up for action. Without consulting anyone he went to Richmond and after waiting for hours in the hall was successful in getting a hearing before the board. Immediately he asked for a department of vocational agriculture for the Woodlawn High School in Carroll County. The board had already taken favorable action to accept the provisions of the federal act, but this request by Superintendent Cox seemed to be going ahead just a little too fast under the circumstances. A heated discussion ensued in which Cox's request seemed to be losing ground. Finally he was requested to leave the room; but before he did so, he turned to the Governor who at that time was a member of the State Board of Education, and made a final plea for a department of vocational agriculture. There follows a continuation of the story as collected by Sanders:

The Governor impressed by the applicant's earnestness and persistence, turned a sympathetic ear. After some consultation with his associates he turned to Mr. Cox and said, 'As Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I understand that I have the power to select one of the High Schools and designate it by acclamation. I,
therefore, grant your request and authorize you to proceed to organize a department of vocational agriculture in the Woodlawn High School.\footnote{45}{Sanders, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.}

Superintendent Cox's problems were not over, however, with the securing of a department of vocational agriculture for his county. He next had to secure a teacher. His choice fell upon Fred R. Kirby, a graduate of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and a former teacher of agriculture in the Elk Creek Congressional District Agricultural High School.\footnote{46}{Elk Creek Training School, \textit{Fifth Congressional District Agricultural High School, Circular of Information, 1917-1918}, p. 5.}

Once he had secured Kirby's acceptance of the position as teacher, his next problem was to get the approval of E. E. Worrell, the newly appointed acting State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. The story in Sanders' words is continued here:

Worrell, a native of Carroll County happened to be at home on a short vacation. In company with Kirby, the superintendent set out to find the Supervisor. Learning that he had gone squirrel hunting, the two men started on foot to the woods to locate him. They had not gone far when Kirby stopped. 'There he is now,' he said, 'I heard a gun shot.' By aid of additional reports of the gun, the Supervisor was located and the situation was explained. After listening to a statement as to Kirby's training and experiences, Worrell said briefly, 'He's qualified.' If Fred Kirby is not the first teacher of Vocational Ag-

\footnote{45}{Sanders, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.}

\footnote{46}{Elk Creek Training School, \textit{Fifth Congressional District Agricultural High School, Circular of Information, 1917-1918}, p. 5.}
riculture in the United States under
the Smith-Hughes Act, he runs somebody
a close second.47

This story has been reprinted in the History of Agri-
cultural Education of Less Than College Grade in the United
States, compiled by R. W. Stimson and F. W. Lathrop.48 Substantially the same story with the exception of the trip
into the woods to find Worrell is told by Ben Hibbs in the
Country Gentleman for October, 1937.49 Undoubtedly the
events took place, since this story was common knowledge
long before the chief characters involved had passed from
the stage. Had the events not occurred somewhat as related,
it seems reasonable to assume that some of these people
concerned would have refuted the story long ago. At the
same time, however, it does not seem likely that the story
is accurate in its claim that Woodlawn was the first school
in the state to establish a Smith-Hughes department of
vocational agriculture and in the claim that Fred Kirby was
the first teacher of vocational agriculture to be employed
in the United States. Doubt is cast on these two claims
for the following reasons. In the first place, the official

47Sanders, op. cit., p. 15.

48History of Agricultural Education of Less Than College
Grade in the United States, U. S. Office of Education, Vo-
cational Division Bulletin No. 217, Agricultural Series No.

49Ben Hibbs, "By Governor's Proclamation," Country
minutes of the State Board of Education reveal that J. Lee Cox was elected superintendent of Carroll County schools on March 21, 1917, to take office on July 1, 1917. It does not seem likely that Cox before ever assuming office as superintendent would be in Richmond in the spring of 1917, arguing for a department of vocational agriculture. Even more conclusive evidence that Woodlawn was not the first department to be established is to be found in the minutes of the same board meeting at a later date when it is stated: "Your committee [B. E. Copenhaver and J. A. C. Chandler] has placed upon the list [of schools approved for Smith-Hughes funds] in addition to the high schools formerly recognized by the Board, Chase City and Woodlawn." Then follows this statement: "This step was taken under the resolutions passed by your Board in September." A careful checking of the September minutes reveals no mention of Woodlawn or of Superintendent Cox. The resolution referred to simply provided that schools meeting certain conditions would be eligible for Smith-Hughes funds.

It is quite likely that the actual events in the foregoing story took place after July 1, the date Cox took


52Ibid., September 19, 1917, p. 486.
office, and as such represent, not the story of the establish­
ishment of the first department of vocational agriculture 
and the employment of the first teacher of vocational ag­
riculture, but rather the vigorous and determined effort 
of a young superintendent of schools to secure a department 
of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture for his county. 
Since Cox and the Governor were good political friends, it is quite likely that the Governor intervened and re­
quested that the committee, already set up by the board 
to check the qualifications of applicant schools, check 
Woodlawn to see if it met the qualifications. Woodlawn was 
probably established by governor-intervention rather than 
by governor-proclamation. For the present, at least, it 
appears that claims for priority both as to departments 
established and as to teachers employed remain to be 
answered in the future.

The congressional district agricultural high schools 
as soon as they set up departments of vocational agriculture 
lost their identity as district schools and assumed the 
status of any local high school operating a department of 
vocational agriculture. These eleven schools plus the 
seven additional ones qualifying for departments of agri­
culture by the fall of 1917 were as follows:

School | County
--- | ---
Appomattox High School | Appomattox
Burkeville High School | Nottoway
Chester High School | Chesterfield
Driver High School | Nansemond
Elk Creek High School | Grayson
Hampton High School | Elizabeth City
Lebanon High School | Russell
Manassas High School | Prince William
Middletown High School | Frederick
New London Academy | Bedford
Turbeville High School | Halifax

The seven additional schools and their counties are the following:

Charlotte Court House High School | Charlotte
Chase City High School | Mecklenburg
Claremont High School | Surry
Culpeper High School | Culpeper
Wakefield High School | Sussex
Williamsburg High School | James City
Woodlawn High School | Carroll

An examination of the distribution of these schools in relation to the great geographic divisions of the state such as was discussed in the opening chapter of this study reveals the following number of schools for each division:

Tidewater division | 5 Schools
Piedmont division | 9 Schools
 Shenandoah Valley division | 1 School
Southwest Virginia division | 3 Schools

---


\[55\] See Appendix M for map showing location of these schools.
During the session of 1918-1919 five additional departments of vocational agriculture were established, and by the session of 1919-1920 twenty new departments had been established. By this latter date the previously discussed state plan for schools of vocational agriculture had been printed and given wide distribution over the state; a teacher-training department which will be discussed more fully later on had been established and was functioning; and the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education had launched a sound program of supervision of the agricultural departments in the schools. At least one Smith-Hughes department of agriculture had been established in every great agricultural division of the state. In the contemplation of all these achievements, it seems safe to assert that the session of 1919-1920 marked the end of the pioneering or launching stage of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the secondary schools of Virginia. The successful development and expansion of this program was the task yet remaining before the staff that had chosen to work with these pioneer departments of agriculture. It is this development and expansion to which attention will be directed in succeeding chapters of this study.

CHAPTER X

EFFORTS TO DEVELOP AND EXPAND A PRACTICAL COURSE OF STUDY FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Fortunately for the cause of vocational agriculture in Virginia nearly all the organized efforts in the first two decades of the twentieth century in behalf of agricultural education for the secondary school age group were in some way closely identified with the public school system. This close identification tended to shorten the period of time necessary to get vocational agriculture launched and accepted by school administrators and made it possible for those concerned with the program of agricultural education early to devote their energies to developing a suitable, practical curriculum for vocational agriculture throughout the secondary schools of the state.

It is to the efforts carried out in the state to develop and expand such a practical, suitable course of study for vocational agriculture in the high schools of the state that attention will be directed in this chapter. No attempt will be made to consider the efforts to develop courses for those parts of the Smith-Hughes program of education in vocational
agriculture more directly concerned with adult than with secondary school age groups. Specifically to be omitted from consideration will be the attempts to set up courses for evening schools, veterans' training programs, food processing classes, farm machinery repair classes, and all other forms of adult training programs.

In order to secure a basis for an organization of the developments and at the same time present a rather complete story of the major efforts leading to the establishment of a suitable course of study, the following divisions will be used in the chapter: (1) the struggle to move from an academic, book-type instruction to a practical, functional type of instruction, (2) the development of the supervised practice program, (3) the development of day-unit instruction, and (4) the efforts to develop instruction in agriculture as a science.

The Struggle to Move from an Academic Book-Type Instruction to a Practical, Functional Type of Instruction

Critics of vocational agriculture may possibly claim that such a transition as indicated in this caption has never taken place in Virginia. If it is true that such a transition has not fully taken place, it certainly is not because attention and effort have not been given to securing practical instruction. A review of the nineteenth century developments will reveal numerous pleas and plans for securing practical instruction, but in spite of all this
earnest desire and effort such instruction in agriculture was still largely in the future as far as Virginia was concerned when Smith Hughes agriculture was started.

The course of study set up for early Smith-Hughes agricultural schools drew heavily on the older agricultural district high schools. These schools, as indicated, had reached the stage of grouping subject matter and instruction around rather broad divisions in the field of agriculture, such as agronomy, livestock, and horticulture.

The new Smith-Hughes course of study in agriculture for high schools, as can readily be seen, closely resembled the course of study of the older district agricultural schools with the exception of the time allotments and the provisions for the supervised project. The first widely publicized course of study for these Smith-Hughes schools was as follows:

First Year (8th Grade)

Non-vocational:
- English 5 40 minute periods 1 unit
- Algebra 5 40 minute periods 1 unit
- General Science 3 40 minute periods and 2 80 minute periods 1 unit

Vocational:
- Plant Production (Agronomy) 5 80 minute periods 1 unit
- Farm Shop Work 2 80 minute periods ½ unit
- Supervised Project Average of 5 hours and 40 minutes for 9 months

1See Chapter IX.
### Second Year (9th Grade)

**Non-vocational:**
- English: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit
- Plane Geometry: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit
- Economic Geography: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit

**Vocational:**
- Animal Production (Animal Husbandry): 5 units, 80 minute periods, 1 unit
- Farm Shop Work: 2 units, 80 minute periods
- Supervised Project: Average of 5 hours and 1/2 unit, 40 minutes for 9 months

### Third Year (10th Grade)

**Non-vocational:**
- English: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit
- Farm Arithmetic and Elementary Bookkeeping: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit
- Human Biology: 3 units, 40 minute periods and 2 units, 80 minute periods

**Vocational:**
- Horticulture and Field Crops: 5 units, 80 minute periods, 1 unit
- Farm Shop Work: 2 units, 80 minute periods
- Supervised Project: Average of 5 hours and 1/2 unit, 40 minutes for 9 months

### Fourth Year (11th Grade)

**Non-vocational:**
- English: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit
- History and Civics: 5 units, 40 minute periods, 1 unit
- Chemistry and Physics: 3 units, 40 minute periods and 2 units, 80 minute periods
Vocational:
Rural Engineering,
Farm Mechanics, Farm Management and
Rural Economics 5 80 minute periods 1 unit
Farm Shop Work 2 80 minute periods Supervised Project Average of 5 hours and 1/2 unit
40 minutes for 9 months

The continuing influence of the district agricultural schools is quite obvious in this organization as is the college preparatory influence indicated by the non-vocational courses. The intent to move toward one school with a comprehensive offering rather than in the direction of a separate school is also evident. It was definitely planned, in fact, that the students electing agriculture would take their non-vocational courses right along with the non-vocational students, a plan which proved to be sound and which is still followed to a large extent in the rural schools of the state.

The records available indicate that classroom methods of instruction during the first few years of instruction in

---


3Ibid., p. 9.
agriculture were closely related to what may be called the lecture-study-copy-the-answer-from-the-book technique. Pupils were given prepared study outlines consisting chiefly of questions on agricultural topics so arranged that space was provided for the student's answers to the questions asked. An examination of several study guide outlines successfully completed by the students revealed what one would probably expect; namely, that the answers to the questions were heavily weighted with academic definitions and undigested reproductions of textbooks. As the program began to be better organized, a determined attempt was made to improve this condition and to make instruction more practical. Enterprising and resourceful teachers began to try different approaches and innovations. As H. W. Sanders, one of these pioneer teachers of vocational agriculture, expressed it:

... the more progressive teachers appropriated the practices that seemed suited to the new order and discarded many that were obviously unsuited. Revision of the curriculum after a tryout of several years became a necessity and the problem was attacked in various ways by many of the teachers.  

---

4See samples of Teacher's Monthly Report of Class Instruction and Extension Activities, Form ag. 10-2 M b, and Project Study Outlines, for 1918-19, on file in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

5H. W. Sanders, "History of Agricultural Education in the United States - Virginia," p. 18. For a biographical sketch of H. W. Sanders, the author of this manuscript, see Appendix L.
It is impossible with the available records to trace all these individual pioneering efforts toward a more practical type of instruction, but perhaps the most significant results of these early efforts grew from the early attempts to modify instruction and select content on the basis of the farm survey.

The idea of basing some aspects of the instruction on the individual farm conditions was not a new one in Virginia at the time. As pointed out, the plan was being advocated and tried out in the district agricultural high school at Driver as early as 1912, but the attempt had never become widespread nor particularly successful. In the fall of 1919 E. C. Magill at Blacksburg and H. C. Groseclose at Buckingham began introducing the idea into their programs. The latter with the aid of the boys in his agricultural class surveyed one hundred farms in the area served by his school and then used much of the data thus secured in his class work and in setting up his program of instruction. At the request of T. D. Eason, the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture,

6See Chapter IX.

7Notes on Lesson Planning at Blacksburg High School, 1919. Typewritten manuscript on file in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of E. C. Magill.


9Loc. cit.
Groseclose wrote a careful statement of his methods and procedure in conducting and using the survey, and the results were mimeographed and made available to the teachers of the state. 10

In early 1920 the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture made it perfectly clear that the teachers were expected to make an effort to adapt their instruction to meet local conditions. His statement concerning the need for such adaptation to local situations is all the more remarkable because of the strong trend in the state at the time to make detailed subject-matter outlines for every course taught in the high schools. At the same time, this statement is such an excellent one, typifying the philosophy which guided many further efforts toward practicality, that it is given in full here:

In planning this course of study for vocational agriculture no attempt has been made to organize a detailed course of study, but simply to indicate in a general way the major topics which should be treated by teachers of agriculture in all parts of the State. So varied are the agricultural pursuits of the state that each locality presents a separate problem. Such condition forces upon the instructor in each school the problem of organizing a course of study which will meet the specific needs of his pupils of vocational agriculture.

10 Letter from Henry C. Groseclose to Thomas D. Eason, on file in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
It is possible, in sections of the state where farming is highly specialized, two or three crops engaging the time of the farmers, that a two-year course of study may suffice.

In planning a course of study teachers of agriculture should begin by making a rather detailed survey of agricultural conditions in their communities to determine the prevailing farm practices, the chief agricultural problems, the availability to teaching materials and the agricultural needs of the pupils.\textsuperscript{11}

While this statement put the problem of developing a practical course squarely up to the teachers, it certainly did not solve the problem for them. Very little of the material available for teaching lent itself to practical usage, and at this time almost no material had been prepared expressly for classes in vocational agriculture. In some cases there was no teaching material of any sort available for some of the less common farming enterprises. Efforts toward selection of more practical content continued, however, with particular attention given to the use of the farm survey and the supervised home project as the best means for achieving a practical instruction. Forms for conducting the farm survey were experimented with while plans for utilizing the data collected by means of the survey slowly took shape.\textsuperscript{12} These lesson plans seem to have given


\textsuperscript{12}See especially the Minutes of Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia from 1921 to 1925 and the Virginia Agricultural Instructor for the same period.
some of the teachers difficulty then even as they so often do now. A lack of completeness and difficulty with terminology seemed to be the greatest offenders. Writing in 1924, the state supervisor listed the following as among the outstanding deficiencies of the teaching plans:

1. Incomplete references. It is not enough to say books and bulletins will be used. Detailed references should have been decided upon and secured by the time school opened.

2. Listing as 'farmers' jobs' to be studied certain subjects that are not farmers' jobs - for example, 'The efficiency of the hog in handling feed,' or 'Processes of digestion.'

Even with the slowly developing farm-survey technique as an aid in selecting useful subject matter, for some time there continued the practices of organizing the course of study into the framework of the established curriculum of plant production the first year, animal production the second year, and so on for each year of work as indicated in the course of study outlined previously. Writing in 1925, E. G. Smith said,

Ever since vocational agriculture has been established in high schools of Virginia it has been the set rule to teach agriculture as follows: Plant Production and Animal Production alternating between the first and second year; Horticulture and Farm Engineering and Farm Management alternating in the third

---

"Teaching Plans," Virginia Agricultural Instructor, October 1, 1924, p. 3.
and fourth years.\textsuperscript{14}

The farm-survey technique was helping secure more practical, functional subject matter; but the organization of this material into a functional program continued to be a problem. Perhaps the most significant change in organization of the courses grew from the idea of combining the crop and livestock enterprises in a given year rather than presenting them in separate years. The teachers were beginning to realize that farmers did not operate on the basis of all crops one year and all livestock the next.\textsuperscript{15} The major credit for this combination of crop and livestock enterprises is given by Sanders to W.S. Newman, teacher-trainer at the time.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1924 N.E. Fitzgerald, of the University of Tennessee, met with the teachers at the annual conference in Blacksburg and discussed with them the topic, "The Instructor's Annual Plan of Work."\textsuperscript{17} In this talk Fitzgerald urged that the results of the farm survey be used to indicate the important enterprises to be taught during the year. This idea had been


\textsuperscript{15}\textit{loc. cit.}


\textsuperscript{17} "Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session 1924-25," p. 4.
slowly developing in Virginia, but Fitzgerald in this talk not only boosted the idea but also advanced the following definite steps for putting it into practice:

1. Survey the community.
2. Select the enterprise to be taught on the basis of this survey.
3. Determine the relative emphasis to give each enterprise.
4. Group the enterprises where possible into courses.
5. Analyze the enterprises into jobs.
6. Determine the knowledge and skills needed for each job.
7. Set up standards for the development of skills.
8. Select methods of teaching skills.
9. Estimate the approximate time for teaching each job, skill, or knowledge.
10. Place the job or skill in the course seasonally by months.
11. Remember the supervised practice as an opportunity to teach skills.

These suggestions came at just the right time and further helped encourage the teachers in the selection of functional material and helped encourage them to modify their programs in the direction of the practical. An interesting transitional course of study embodying much of the older course already given but at the same time indicating much of the new trends is given here, those parts of the course other than agriculture being omitted.

---

16 N. E. Fitzgerald, "Analysis of Teaching Plan for Vocational Agriculture," as reported in the Virginia Agricultural Instructor, August 1, 1924, Part III, p. 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Enterprises</th>
<th>Minor Enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Major Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Corn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Small Fruits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Raspberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Swine Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Potato Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Second Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Major Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Beef Cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Wheat and Oats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Growing Legumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Soybeans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Clovers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Vetch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dairying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Third Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Major Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Orcharding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Apples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Peaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Gardening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Growing Bird Eye Beans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Growing Ensilage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Home Ground Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fourth Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Major Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Soil Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Green Manure Crop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Stable Manures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Rotation of Crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Minor Enterprises</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Corn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Wheat - oats - Rye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hay and Pasture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Farm Management and Farm Engineering will be taught in each year of the course of study in correlation with the jobs under each enterprise named above. A Home Project of at least two enterprises must be carried."19

A comparison of this course of study with the one given on page 374 will reveal considerable progress toward the inclusion of more functional subject matter in agriculture organized in a more practical manner.

During the session of 1924-25 another development having particular significance for Virginia's effort to set up a practical program of vocational education took place. Arthur

P. Williams, agent for agricultural education in the North Atlantic Region, in co-operation with H. W. Sanders, district supervisor, J. P. Pullen, teacher of agriculture, both of Virginia, conducted classroom experiments at the Manassas High School and collected materials for the bulletin, *Methods of Teaching as Applied to Vocational Education in Agriculture*, which was issued by the Federal Board for Vocational Education in June, 1925. This bulletin which attempted to show the use of the job-analysis technique in the selection and the organization of agricultural material into teaching units suitable for teaching agriculture came at just the right time for acceptance in so far as Virginia was concerned. Many of the ideas included were quickly recognized as similar to the ones already being used in the farm surveys getting under way, and the possibilities of having many of the new ideas adapted to Virginia conditions were readily recognized.

Sanders and Pullen took an active part in the state conference of teachers of agriculture in July, following the issuance of the bulletin, and at this time presented discussions and lesson plans illustrating the job-analysis technique.
technique applied to agriculture. The lively discussions recorded as following these presentations indicated that many teachers were already familiar with the job-analysis process and were seemingly willing to try it out. One teacher stressed the idea "... that the advent of job analysis was no more than one more step in the right direction and that proper application of this method to all activities would bring about excellent results." This optimism seems to have been at least partially fulfilled, for reporting on the 1925-26 session following the conference, the state supervisor commented on the big improvement in instruction and claimed the credit was due almost entirely to the stress put on job analysis in teaching.

With job-analysis techniques available for use, the workers in vocational agriculture now turned with renewed vigor to the farm survey as a means for securing functional teaching data to be used in their instructional programs. An examination of the copies of the *Virginia Agricultural Instructor* and of the Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Teachers of Agriculture for 1926 and the next several

---

21 "Lesson Plans," *Virginia Agricultural Instructor*, (August 1, 1925), p. 11.


23 "Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session 1920-1921."
years immediately following reveal a variety of plans, programs, procedures, and statistics relating to farm surveys and analyses thereof. In 1927 the teachers at their annual conference voted to accept as one of the objectives for the session of 1927-1928 the "completion of the summarizing, analyzing, utilizing and filing of 4500 farm surveys - average of 50 per instructor." It is a bit difficult today in reviewing the events of this development of the farm survey between 1925 and 1930 to escape a feeling that the boy on the farm and in the classroom was being neglected at the expense of a method and a technique. Even so, it seems safe to say that systematic job analysis applied to farming enterprises removed many of the difficulties of course organization and gave a method of securing well-organized factual data as a basis upon which to build a functional course of study in terms of real farm situations. The farm survey helped determine the important farm enterprises for the community, while the job-analysis technique helped break down, or analyze, these enterprises into teachable units which soon came to be

24 Minutes of the Tenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, July 18-23, 1927, p. 23.

25 The farm enterprise is the term used to indicate a group of related jobs carried out in the production and marketing of a farm commodity, together with its by-products, if any. Enterprises are usually stated in terms of the principal commodity produced, as corn for grain, pigs for pork, laying hens, broilers, and so on.
called "farm jobs" or simply "jobs." Thus the job gradually became the unit of teaching in vocational agriculture and replaced the older topical approach. This development of breaking agriculture up into enterprises and enterprises into teaching-unit jobs also made it easier to shuffle the content around into a much more functional sequence whether the desired sequence was on the yearly, seasonal, or logical basis. Once the enterprises most important to the community had been selected, they were analyzed into jobs and these jobs organized in a logical and seasonal sequence by months and days of the school year. Thus began the development of the teaching calendar still used by the teachers of agriculture in Virginia.

With the development of the farm survey and the application of the job analysis to the survey results, in an effort to determine suitable teaching units, the older project-study outline to which reference has been made was completely abandoned and in its place the job became the unit in teaching vocational agriculture. Agriculture itself as a subject of study began to emerge, not as an academic subject, but as a series of farm jobs or problems, each having meaning and content of its own, but related to the larger farm enterprise.

26 "The farm job is a natural unit of farm work that is distinct from other units by its definite purpose and particular setting," Suggested Teaching Units in Vocational Agriculture, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Agricultural Education Bulletin No. 17, p. 3.

27 See page 377 ff.
and to the farm as a whole. The net result was a movement in which practical importance on the farm, not abstract logic, tended to determine the selection of content and the areas into which instruction was organized.

In spite of all this very definite progress there was still some feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of many of the teachers. Many apparently felt that too much emphasis was going into method and that not enough was being put on the boys. As one teacher expressed it, "We are teaching corn and hogs and not the boys." Many felt that the boys themselves were increasingly apathetic. Partly in an effort to meet this difficulty and partly as a result of continuous effort to improve vocational agriculture in the state, three approaches began to be tried out. The first one - clubs for boys enrolled in vocational agriculture which eventually merged into the F.F.A. Clubs - will be discussed in the next chapter. The second effort - namely, the attempt to individualize the boy's supervised home project on the basis of his home-farm conditions, had been slowly developing ever since the introduction of the farm-survey movement. This development which will be treated much more fully in the latter part of this chapter was brought into sharp focus by Robert Maltby,


29 Loc. cit.
then Regional Agent for the Southern States, at a two-day conference with the supervisory and teacher-training staff in 1928. As a result of this conference the movement toward individualizing the processes relative to the boy's home project was greatly accelerated and discussed by the teachers. This discussion in turn tended to bring the ideas involved in individualizing instruction to the forefront in the thinking of the teachers. Although started originally as an effort to individualize and improve the boy's home-project program, it was almost inevitable that the idea of individualizing instruction should soon spread to include not only the instruction relative to the home project but also all other classroom instruction as well. Following the inception of the idea, considerable effort, as will be related, was made to set up a curriculum based on the ideas of individualized instruction and thereby led to the third effort toward improvement of instruction - namely, individualized instruction.

In 1929 W. S. Newman, then State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, in an address to the teachers of agriculture at their annual conference stressed the necessity of the teachers' altering their teaching activities to fit the needs of the individual in his particular job. The

---

30 See Appendix L for a biographical sketch of W. S. Neuman.

31 Minutes of the Twelfth Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, July 1-4, 1929, p. 4.
next day at this same conference H. W. Sanders and J. P. Pullen presented a rather detailed paper and discussion on "Individual vs. Group Instruction as a Means of Improving Instruction in Vocational Agriculture." This paper was well received - so well received, in fact, that twelve instructors, three in each of the four supervisory districts of the state, were selected to try out methods of individualizing instruction in vocational agriculture during the session 1929-30. Copies of *Education on the Dalton Plan* by Parkhurst and sample job sheets, or contracts, were supplied these teachers, with the suggestion that job sheets, or contracts of a similar nature, be prepared for the jobs the pupil would have in his individual project. For various reasons most of these plans were only partially successful, although considerable publicity and attention were given to a demonstration class on individualized instruction held at a sectional conference of agricultural teachers in Dinwiddie County, in the fall of 1929. Numerous efforts and experiments continued to be made for the next several years to

32Ibid., pp. 11-13.

33H. C. Groseclose, "A Plan for Individualized Instruction in Vocational Agriculture Using Twelve Virginia Schools as Experimental Schools," mimeographed, October 14, 1929, pp. 1, 2.


perfect techniques for individualizing instruction. In February of 1933 E. C. Magill, professor of agricultural education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and T. V. Downing, district supervisor of agricultural education, collaborated in preparing a mimeographed bulletin entitled Some Suggestions for Individualizing Instruction in Vocational Education in Agriculture for Virginia. This bulletin set forth plans and techniques whereby classroom instruction relative to the boy's supervised home project could be carried out on the individualized instruction basis. It should be noted, perhaps, that the term "individualized instruction" as advocated in this bulletin and as advocated in general in vocational agriculture in the state had by this time largely reverted to the supervised practice program rather than to all the teacher's classroom activities. Teachers, in fact, were cautioned by this time not to give up group instruction in its entirety.

The study and the effort given to individualized instruction, especially focused as it was on helping the boy with his supervised home program, helped hasten the establishment of this very program in the classroom as a vital functional part of the teacher's instructional activities. In the words

---

36 E. C. Magill and T. V. Downing, Some Suggestions for Individualizing Instruction in Vocational Education in Agriculture for Virginia, Mimeographed by the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, February, 1939.

37 Ibid., p. 4.
of Magill writing in 1933:

The supervised practice program of the individual student in Virginia has finally become the backbone of vocational education in agriculture. In the past classroom instruction was one thing, supervised farming was another thing. They are now so successfully welded together under some of our teachers that they are in reality, one and the same. Instruction begins with the supervised practice program and it ends there. 38

Interestingly enough these words written in 1933 represent not only an important step in the development of a practical type of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture but also the culmination of almost exactly one century of longing and effort for a practical system of agricultural instruction closely tied up with actual farming conditions, for, as will be recalled, it was during the period from 1830-1835 that the first struggling efforts to establish agricultural instruction on the farm took place in Virginia. 39

Although emphasis on individualized instruction helped bring the supervised home program into the very heart of the instructional program, individualized instruction itself was never very popular and, in the eyes of some, never greatly successful; consequently it was not long before it was modified toward a combination of group and individualized instruction. By this time, however, after two decades of

38 Ibid., cover page.

39 See Chapter IV.
effort, the course of study - or more accurately the courses of study, since each teacher was supposed to develop his own - had reached a high degree of practicality. Thanks to the farm survey, the job-analysis technique, the supervised home project, and efforts at individualized instruction the courses were by the end of the first two decades now based on individual needs which in turn reflected the needs of the community.

All the efforts such as related resulted in a great deal of information relative to the organization of courses and to the content for courses; but most of this information existed in a highly unorganized and often-time unrecognized state, in many instances unavailable to all the teachers. Perhaps the most significant development in the third decade of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in Virginia with respect to the secondary school course of study of agricultural education was the organizing of this body of material into a functional, useful form.

The teacher-training staff of the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute took the professional lead in organizing this material but in all cases recognized their obligations to their fellow workers for ideas and help.

It was pointed out previously that the agricultural teacher's calendar had originated from the practice of selecting enterprises and analyzing and organizing them into teaching jobs.
These calendars were in reality forms of a course of study and, in some form or another, had been in use ever since the inception of instruction in vocational agriculture. In October, 1938, a mimeographed bulletin entitled *The Study Calendar and the Teaching Calendar* was prepared by C. E. Richard and H. W. Sanders and distributed to the teachers of agriculture. This bulletin drew upon the wealth of accumulated information and presented acceptable examples of teaching calendars set up on a four-year basis for an actual department of agriculture in one of the high schools of the state.  

In addition to the illustrations of teaching calendars, it contained "Some suggestions for preparing teaching calendars . . . for classes in vocational agriculture." In 1939 it was followed by another bulletin, *Organizing and Using Factual Data in Teaching - For the Use of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia*, prepared by H. W. Sanders. This bulletin, as did the one previously named, drew heavily upon the experiences of the teachers but at the same time focused the thinking rather sharply on selecting, organizing, and using for teaching purposes the factual material such as

*C. E. Richard and H. W. Sanders, The Study Calendar and the Teaching Calendar, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 40 (October, 1938).*

*Ibid., p. 1.*
supplied by agricultural experiment station bulletins.  

By January, 1943, another bulletin by Sanders, this one entitled Organizing a Course of Study in Vocational Agriculture, was distributed to the teachers. As the title suggests, the purpose this time was to organize some guiding principles and suggestions for teachers to follow in setting up a satisfactory course of study. This particular bulletin was followed in June, 1944, by one prepared by C. E. Richard entitled The Long Time Teaching Calendar, in which the idea of setting up a calendar or course of study to cover the four years the boy was to be in school was demonstrated. As expressed by Sanders in the introduction, it presented "... an old idea in a slightly new form."

The aforementioned bulletins as indicated dealt mostly with suggestions and techniques for organizing the course of study, although considerable content was included as illustrative material. By 1945 attention began to be given to both the

---

42 H. W. Sanders, Organizing and Using Factual Data in Teaching - For Use of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 43, (October, 1939).

43 H. W. Sanders, Organizing a Course of Study in Vocational Agriculture, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 56 (January, 1943).

44 C. E. Richard, The Long Time Teaching Calendar, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 59 (June, 1944), p. 1.
process of crystallizing the best practices in organizing the course of study and to the nature of the content going into the course of study. Most of the agricultural course content used throughout the state had been divided into or organized under the various enterprises. These enterprises had in turn been analyzed into numerous jobs, some of them being very appropriate and others quite inappropriate for instructional purposes. In October, 1945, C. E. Richard prepared a bulletin entitled *Suggested List of Jobs in Farm Enterprises*. This bulletin was exactly what the title indicated, a list of suggested jobs organized under each separate enterprise.\(^45\) So popular was this bulletin that it was revised and improved and published in April, 1948, as a printed bulletin under the title *Suggested Teaching Units in Vocational Agriculture*. This bulletin in reality presented instructional material, much of it collected over a period of years, and organized it under the several enterprises likewise found to be most widely used over the state.\(^46\)

To aid in the proper organization of this material a companion bulletin which revised and consolidated all the

\(^{45}\)C. E. Richard, *Suggested List of Jobs in Farm Enterprises*, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 60 (October, 1945)

mimeographed bulletins already listed as dealing with the
teaching calendar was issued in May, 1948, as a printed
bulletin under the title Preparing Teaching Calendars for
Vocational Agriculture Classes. Thus by these two bulletins
was reached the present course of study in vocational agri-
culture for the state in so far as printed material is con-
cerned, for in practice the teacher is expected to adapt the
material and suggestions in these bulletins to his local
situation. This usage of the two bulletins is clearly in-
dicated and stressed by Sanders in the following paragraph
written as a foreword for both bulletins:

The teacher is cautioned not to attempt to
use this publication as a standard. It is
intended primarily for use as a guide. The
agricultural needs and practices of the
State and of different communities even in the
same county are too varied to permit the use
of any specific calendar on a State-wide basis.
Moreover the needs of different groups in the
same school vary from year to year, making
constant revisions and adaptations necessary.
Unless each teacher who uses this publication assumes
this responsibility for revision and adaptation to
local needs and conditions, it will fail to serve
its purpose.

Truly the course of study as represented by these two
bulletins, if used in the light of the previously stated

47 J. C. Love, and C. E. Richard, Preparing Teaching
Calendars for Vocational Agriculture Classes, Department of
Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute,

48 J. C. Love, and C. E. Richard, op. cit. Foreword by
H. W. Sanders.
philosophy, represented a workable answer and solution to
the challenge laid down by the State Supervisor of Vocational
Agriculture nearly three decades before when in issuing
the first course of study for vocational agriculture he said:

So varied are the agricultural pursuits of
the state that each locality presents a
separate problem. Such condition forces upon
the instructor in each school the problem of
organizing a course of study which will meet
the specific needs of his pupils of vocational
agriculture.

In planning a course of study teachers of
agriculture should begin by making a detailed
survey of agricultural conditions in their
community, to determine the prevailing farm
practices, the chief agricultural problems,
the availability of teaching materials, and
the agricultural needs of the pupils.49

Nearly three decades of effort and practice found this
philosophy still in force but with the difference that now
both the tools and the knowledge were available for develop-
ing such an individual practical curriculum, whereas three
decades before each teacher had to chart his own way, largely
unassisted. If the teacher of vocational agriculture in
Virginia today does not have a practical, functional course
of study for his boys, it certainly is not because he does
not have effective tools and a body of well-organized content
with which to construct one.

49 Vocational Agriculture in the Secondary Schools of
Virginia, Virginia State Board of Education, Bulletin II,
The Development of the Supervised Practice Program

In presenting the efforts to move from a theoretical to a more practical course of instruction, numerous references have been made to the home-project or supervised farming program. This term is used to designate the training program of the boy on the farm.

It will be recalled in reviewing the developments of the nineteenth century that the idea of some kind of practical farm work to go along with other agricultural instruction was advanced on numerous occasions and even tried out in a few instances. While there seems to be a thin thread of continuity between some of these earlier proposals and the later developments, it was nearly a century from the time the idea was first proposed in Virginia until it was successfully incorporated in agricultural education in the state. Some attention will be given at this time to the development of the home project, or, as it is more commonly called now, the supervised practice program, as a part of education in vocational agriculture. The emphasis will be on the historical development of the home project in the state with very little attempt to analyze or evaluate the developments.

As early as 1908 the Boys' Corn Clubs sponsored by the State Department of Education began developing the idea of

50 See Chapter VIII.
practical work on the farm as a part of agricultural education. By 1912, as related, some of the congressional district agricultural schools were definitely trying to develop home projects as a part of their instructional programs. With the establishment of the Smith-Lever extension work in 1914, the work of the Boys' Corn Club was taken over by this agency, but several of the district agricultural schools continued their efforts to develop practical home experiences as a part of their agricultural instruction. So firmly fixed was the belief in the value of the home project in teaching agriculture that even as Virginia was preparing to launch the Smith-Hughes program, a co-operative plan was developed whereby the high school teacher of non-vocational agriculture and the county agent could co-operate in setting up a home project for the student in non-vocational agriculture. 51

In compliance with the federal Smith-Hughes Act, the state in its plan for vocational agriculture set up requirements for supervised project work and to make such projects doubly sure required all the Smith-Hughes agricultural schools to be equipped with five acres of land. 52 Permission was granted, nevertheless, for the students to carry out the project on the home farms or on the school farm. This provision proved to be a fortunate one, for as the program developed the advantages

51See Chapter VIII.
52See Chapter IX.
of the home-farm project over the school-farm project so outweighed the latter that school farms were eventually abandoned.

In terms of time, each student was required to spend an average of five hours and forty minutes per week for nine months on the projects. This time was to be in addition to the daily eighty-minute period per day of classroom instruction. Legislation alone seldom solves the problems of education, and this case is no exception. The teachers of agriculture found themselves required to supervise home projects but with little information or understanding of just what constituted a project or how one should be supervised. But it must be related that to the credit of the pioneer teachers in vocational agriculture they experimented, studied, and strove to incorporate the home project into the program until they at last succeeded.

From the very first it was recognized that without project study and preparation the project work would become more or less a series of physical operations which might or might not have relationships to the classroom instruction. To ensure some preparation for the project and some relationship between the project and the classroom, study outlines on farming activities most likely to be undertaken as projects were prepared by the Department of Agricultural Education of

See Chapter IX.
the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and distributed to the teachers. By 1920 outlines had been prepared on such topics as corn, pork, poultry, baby beef, potatoes, wheat, and forage crops. These outlines consisted chiefly of logically organized questions and references relating to the different aspects of the topic in question. In use the student was expected with the teacher's help to find the answers to the questions on the outline and write out the answers particularly as they might apply to his own home situation. An examination of several project-study outlines as filled in by students in agriculture at the Blacksburg High School in 1919 does not reveal much progress beyond the question-and-answer method applicable to any regular academic type of course. The following sample questions taken from the Project Study Outline for Corn Production are typical of the type of questions used before 1920:

Introduction

1. What is the relative importance of corn as compared with other crops in the world's agriculture?
2. How does Virginia rank as a corn producing state?
3. What are the principal types into which corn may be divided?
4. What is the composition of corn?

Seed Corn

1. What are the standard varieties of corn for Virginia conditions?

2. What is the "rag doll" method of testing seed corn?
3. What points will you consider in selecting ears for seed corn?

Preparation of the Land

1. What implements will be needed in the preparation of the land?
2. When should the preparation of the land for corn begin?

The remaining questions were organized under the headings of Fertilizers for Corn Planting, Pests, Cultivation, Field Selection of Seed Corn, Harvesting, and Storing Corn; but in no case were they any more closely related to the boy's home condition than the ones just listed. In 1920, however, the outlines were revised, this time with a definite slant toward the boy's home situation, as the following questions from the revised Study Outline for Corn Production will show:

I. My Reasons for Choosing Corn as My Project.
1. What has been the yield per acre on my home farm?
2. Is my land well adapted to corn growing?
3. What financial outlay will be necessary for land, fertilizers, labor etc.?

The remaining headings on the revised form were like those of the older form, but all the questions were similar to the ones just listed in that they tried to focus the thinking...

---

55. Project Study Outlines for Corn Production, Virginia State Board for Vocational Education. Sample outlines filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia.

56. Ibid., revised form.
on the home situation.

In May, 1920, W. B. Coggin, one of the early strong advocates of the home project, prepared a bulletin outlining a suggested plan for home projects. Unfortunately most of his ideas were too advanced for the times and were not incorporated into the program until a later date. He advocated a larger and longer term project covering the boy's entire four years of school attendance but integrated to make up a complete farm operation, such as a four-year rotation of crops. He proposed that crop-production projects be supplemented with animal production, with emphasis being given to the production of feed crops and to the general observance of good farm management practices.

More experience, however, was needed by the teachers and perhaps by the public as well before such a far-reaching type of project could be undertaken successfully. The state supervisor and the teacher-training staff apparently recognized this condition and set about the problem of helping the teachers develop larger enterprises. By the session of 1923-24 one of the major activities of the supervisory staff was recognized as to help in the "improvement of supervised practice activities


58 Ibid., pp. 3-11.
both in scope and number of enterprises.\textsuperscript{59} It should be noted that this quotation uses the term "supervised practice activities" rather than the term "supervised project," which, according to Todd, was gradually discarded in Virginia because of its rather varied meaning.\textsuperscript{60} Since the official publications from this date onward rather consistently discarded the term "supervised project" in favor of the terms "supervised farm practice" or "supervised farming program," these latter terms will be used throughout the remaining portion of this study.

Two district supervisors were appointed in August, 1924, and assigned areas out in the state.\textsuperscript{61} These supervisors in co-operation with the teacher-training staff and the state supervisor continued the efforts to improve the nature and quality of the supervised farm program. By the end of the session of 1924-25 the state supervisor reported that "perhaps the most marked advance in agricultural education during the past year has been in the supervised practice work of students on home farms. Nearly all students are conducting two or more farm enterprises, and these enterprises are becoming more and more the actual basis for practical instruction in farming."\textsuperscript{62}


\textsuperscript{61}See Chapter XII.

At the annual conference of the teachers of vocational agriculture in August, 1925, after some discussion and consideration, the teachers agreed to put special emphasis on increasing the scope of the supervised practice work of the students during the session of 1925-26. The results as happily reported by the state supervisor showed an increase of 1971.71 acres to be under cultivation and 522 more animals and 38,504 more chickens to be cared for in 1925-26 than in 1924-25. In summarizing the year's work the supervisor again commented on the progress made in improving the supervised home programs. He said, "Perhaps one of the most outstanding advances made in the vocational program in Virginia for this year is the increase in scope of the supervised practice program. Considerable increase was made last year but the outlook for this year is even brighter."

The development of the farm-survey movement already mentioned contributed enormously to the development of a more functional type of supervised home program and helped further to tie up the classroom instruction with the home program. The advent of the job-analysis technique and its application to the farming enterprises common to the community led to the development of a body of subject matter which could be easily used in planning and developing most of the supervised home programs. By 1927, in fact, all teachers were being advised

---

64 Ibid., p. 22.
that "when Supervised Practice Enterprises have been selected ... all enterprises should be analyzed into jobs. This can be done with the entire class at the same time. The boys then have a record of all jobs to be performed and as the teaching progresses can [study and] supply information as to how the different jobs will be carried out." By 1928 the scheme of survey and analysis had been so well developed that, with the boys participating, the teachers had agreed to survey and analyze all supervised home projects being taught for the year.

At this stage of development in 1928 Robert D. Maltby, then Regional Agent for the Southern States, held a two-day conference with the supervisory and teacher-training staffs. This conference in the words of Sanders

... was far-reaching in its effects on the supervised practice program. He introduced the ideas of basing the [supervised practice] program on an analysis of the business of the home farm, of having the boy select a farming type for which he desired to receive training, and of setting up a supervised-practice program that would prepare the boy for the type of farming selected.

The conditions in Virginia were ideal for the acceptance of this idea which was gradually developed until the boy's entire

65"Minutes of the Tenth Annual Conference of the Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, July 18-23, 1927," p. 16.

66Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, July 31-August 1, 1928, p. 21.

four-year supervised practice program came to be controlled by this purpose.68

As the supervised practice program began to assume an increasingly important place in the instructional program, it was soon realized that more attention would have to be given to the planning of this program both by the teachers and by the students. Some planning for this feature had of course been practiced from its very inception, with the project outlines previously discussed being the first form of planning. With the development of project record books some provision was made for the student to record his plans in more detail, but even so this phase of the program continued to be weak. The following supervised practice plans copied from a student's record book by H. C. Groseclose, itinerant teacher-trainer in 1925, while extreme and certainly not typical of all student planning of supervised programs at the time, does reveal in a humorous manner at least one student's idea of program planning. This student was carrying one acre of corn for grain and one pig for pork as his supervised program.

Plan for Corn Enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>Pick out land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Plow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Get land in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Working on land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Plant and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Thin and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Lay by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Gather blade fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Cut top fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Gather corn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan for Pig Enterprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>Get pig. Build pen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Feed pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Kill pig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groseclose facetiously suggested that the plan would be improved if it included a provision to keep the pig in a poke while the pen was being built. Perhaps the following plan, also copied from a student's record book, this time by H. W. Sanders, teacher-trainer in vocational agriculture at the time, reveals some progress toward more comprehensive planning but at the same time also reveals that teaching a student how to record his plans required more than a knowledge of agriculture. The student's plan was as follows:

**Job:** Procuring Seed

Plan. I will buy my seed from a company which has been tested and shows a high yield, no disease and true to type.

It is to be hoped that the following student, a member in the same class with the student making plans to procure seed, had a better knowledge of raising pigs than he had of showing a plan for acquiring them. His plan was as follows:

---

69 Letter from H. C. Groseclose to Walter S. Newman, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. Letter dated October 6, 1925, and filed in the Department of Vocational Education of Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

70 Copy from original record book furnished the writer by H. W. Sanders, 1952.
Job: Looking for pigs.
Plan: I will expect pigs about March 8.71

Faced with difficulties in student planning somewhat similar though not as extreme as these throughout the state, the teacher-training staff and the supervisory staff made a decision in 1930 to develop plans for improving the planning of the supervised home program.72

Suggestions whereby the teachers could help the boys to make more effective plans for their supervised home programs were mimeographed and distributed to the teachers throughout the state. This simple, unpretentious four-page compilation of suggestions was issued as "Dept. Mimeo. 15" with a simple note added on the first page that "this mimeograph represents the viewpoint of the supervisory and teacher-training staffs and is to be used by all instructors of vocational agriculture in Virginia as a guide in securing more useful plans in supervised farm practice."73 This brief mimeograph represented the beginning of a movement which in one form or another has continued to this day in an effort to improve the student's planning of his individual home program.

71 Ibid.

72 H. W. Sanders, Record Book for Supervised Home Practice in Agriculture, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 16 (June, 1931), Foreword.

73 Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 15 (1930), p. 1.
During the school session of 1931-32 a scheme for further improvements in the planning phase of the program was tried out on an experimental basis in several departments of agriculture in the state. This experimental work, described as a "Field Training Project," was under the supervision of M. W. Sanders of the teacher-training staff and of F. B. Cale of the supervisory staff.\textsuperscript{74} The results of this project were organized into a mimeographed bulletin entitled \textit{Record Book for Supervised Home Practice in Agriculture} and were made available to all the teachers of agriculture in the state. This bulletin was organized in such a way as to show the actual planning done by a boy in carrying out his supervised home program under close supervision. In this practical form, presenting as it did a record of the actual planning as truly carried on by the boy, the bulletin proved to be very popular and helpful. In addition to these bona fide home program plans included in the bulletin, plans for smaller, or minor, enterprises were also included, thereby assuring that this one bulletin would illustrate the essential steps then recognized as acceptable in planning a boy's program, whatever his type of supervised home activities might be.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{74}"Annual Report of the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session 1931-1932", p. 22.

\textsuperscript{75}H. W. Sanders, \textit{Record Book for Supervised Home Practice in Agriculture}, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 18, (June, 1931).
Following the publication of this bulletin, attention was concentrated on making the supervised practice program even more effective and functional. Again the field training project plan was used with some seventeen teachers, arranged into four groups for supervisory purposes, co-operating with H. W. Sanders and F. B. Cale. The results of this experimental try-out were prepared by Sanders in a bulletin entitled *Supervised Farm Practice Planning*. This publication consisted of suggested lesson units, or teaching jobs, which could be used by the teachers in teaching or developing the supervised farm programs. In January, 1935, a third mimeographed bulletin dealing with the supervised home project was prepared by Sanders from material he gathered through the co-operation of the teachers and the supervisory staff. This bulletin entitled *Supervised Farm Practice - Keeping and Using Records* was designed to supplement the bulletin, *Supervised Farm Practice - Planning*. As with the other bulletins, this one was designed to show the teachers how to do a better job in one aspect of the supervised home program. This bulletin was followed in

---

76 H. W. Sanders, *Supervised Farm Practice Planning*, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 22 (July, 1932), p. 2.

77 H. W. Sanders, *Supervised Farm Practice - Keeping and Using Records*, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 32 (January, 1935)
October of the same year by yet another publication prepared by Sanders and entitled *Supervised Farm Practice - A Handbook for Students of Vocational Agriculture in Keeping and Using Records*. This bulletin was designed primarily, as the title indicated, to be used by the students themselves and was intended as a supplement to the bulletin *Supervised Farm Practice - Planning*.\(^7\)

These four publications pointed the way to the procedures gradually accepted by the teachers throughout the state for initiating, planning, conducting, recording, and analyzing supervised practice programs. In general it may be said that the procedures initiated or stressed by these bulletins are the ones generally followed by the teachers in the state today in their supervised practice programs,\(^7\) although the bulletins themselves have been revised and brought up to date from time to time with new information.

The procedures encouraged by these bulletins helped develop the supervised home program until in most cases it assumed its present day characteristics of an individual farming program planned and executed by the student under the teacher's supervision as a means of establishing himself in

---

\(^7\)W. Sanders, *Supervised Farm Practice - A Handbook for Students of Vocational Agriculture*, Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 36 (October, 1935).

farming. In its present form the supervised home program represents the culmination of more than three decades of actual experience and effort to provide practical, educational work experiences in agriculture to go along with the classroom instruction in this subject. In a broader sense the supervised home program represents the successful culmination of nearly a century and a half of continuous struggle in Virginia to utilize manual labor as an instructional technique in agricultural education.

As pointed out, the efforts to move from an academic type of instruction in agriculture to a more practical type went along concurrently with most of the efforts to develop the supervised home program. By 1950 the accomplishments in these two areas, while certainly not perfect, none the less were such as to justify the conviction that if the teacher of vocational agriculture were not offering a practical functional program of agricultural education to the boys enrolled in his class in the secondary school, it was his own fault and not the fault of the tools at hand, developed in an effort to accomplish a practical purpose.

The Development of Day-Unit Instruction

At the same time the efforts were being made to develop a practical type of instruction and to carry it to the boys' home farm, other efforts in the form of the day-unit schools were being made to extend this practical program to reach more
boys in the small high schools of the state. By 1920 Virginia, especially in the rural areas, was rather well covered with small high schools. By 1918 the State High School Supervisor had warned that "... Virginia has entirely too many schools attempting high school work." By 1920 the rapid expansion of these small rural high schools was definitely impeding the development of a thorough secondary school program. The high school supervisor once more warned that "the feeling that high schools can be established and maintained at almost every crossroads has seriously handicapped real high school development." When attempts were made to consolidate some of these small schools, sectional pride and dirt roads tended to combine to prevent, or at least to slow down, such efforts. As a result there were left over the state large numbers of small rural high schools, unable to provide more than the barest minimum of offerings in their curricula. The number of rural schools was so great that it was impossible even with combined local, state, and federal funds to establish a department of agriculture in each one. In other cases the smallness of many schools in which the


work was offered tended to make the classes in agriculture unusually small. This small enrollment, of course, tended to increase the per capita cost of instruction, which was unusually high for this type of service. By 1922 many people were beginning to feel that the program of vocational agriculture was not only failing to serve enough boys but was also costing too much. In an attempt to improve this situation, efforts were begun along the lines of part-time instruction, evening-class instruction, and day-unit instruction. While the two former types of instruction soon became a vital part of the program of education in vocational agriculture in the state, demanding much effort and planning by the workers in the field, they were developed primarily for adults or older out-of-school youth and hence lie without the scope of this study.

Day-unit instruction as developed in Virginia began during the session of 1922-23. Essentially it was an effort to extend instruction in agriculture from the high schools with departments of vocational agriculture to the nearby high schools without such facilities. Instead of meeting every day

---

82 Lecture notes in Day-Unit Folder, filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

of the week the classes would meet from two to four days per week or the entire session. This setting up of the instruction on the basis of a certain number of days per week gave rise to the term "day-unit" instruction.\textsuperscript{84} Essentially this instruction was little different from the regular all-day instruction given in the full-time departments, and in its development followed the same pattern of growth already traced for these departments. Naturally, because of the time element some modifications of content were necessary. These modifications, as the program developed, were in the direction of eliminating most theoretical study and emphasizing the more evident vocational aspect of agricultural education.\textsuperscript{85} One interesting variant of the day-unit plan was a scheme whereby classes would be offered during the day for those students of high school age who had dropped out of school. Such instruction was tried at the all-day and the day-unit centers but with small success. Such instruction, probably more correctly called part-time instruction, was never very popular with the out-of-school youth, who, as the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education with keen insight reported "... having quit school... hesitate through either pride or embarrassment to return to the classes in which

\textsuperscript{84}Lecture Notes in Day-Unit Folder filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

\textsuperscript{85}\textit{Ibid.}
boys are taught; though they do not hesitate to receive the same instruction given the boys provided the instructor meets them in company with the older farmers of the community, at night.  

Various schemes for conducting the day-unit work were advanced and tried out all over the state. By 1926 plans had been advanced, and classes were being offered on the basis of two, three, and four times per week for eighty-or-ninety-minute periods, with credit ranging from one to one and a half units.

In Russell County the school officials became so dissatisfied with the small number of boys being served by the one department of vocational agriculture in the county that they set up their entire program of agricultural education on a day-unit basis, with one teacher serving five schools. In this case the classes met twice a week for a period of eighty minutes for nine months. L. B. Connely, the teacher in this rather unusual situation, in discussing this plan for Russell County, said:

---


87 Lecture Notes in the Day-Unit Folder filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

88 Letter from L. B. Connely, to Henry C. Groseclose, January 28, 1925, filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
The policy of the Russell County School Board is to give boys all over the county an equal advantage and to serve as many as desire for the least expenditure of funds. The four-year course in agriculture offered in the Lebanon school seemed . . . not interesting to the county at large. The work was serving a small number of boys in one section in a very complete and satisfactory way . . . . However, with a reorganization of work a greater number of boys were served, the cost was not noticeably increased, and the work took a long step toward entrenching itself in the minds of a number of people heretofore not interested.89

Considerable discussion was aroused over the state concerning this type of instruction. Many teachers seemed to doubt that a person could supervise sixty-five home programs. Connely agreed that this was a large number to supervise; but at the same time he argued that when the teacher of vocational agriculture could give up coaching basketball in the fall and baseball in the spring and devote full time to his work, he could by careful planning supervise many more programs than customarily supervised.90 It is quite likely that this work in Russell County acted as a stimulus to teachers in other sections of the state to get more boys into the program of vocational agriculture.

The day-unit classes frequently called for considerable shifting of the classes at the central or all-day school. This shifting usually consisted in putting more of the classes in


90 Loc. cit.
agriculture into the morning schedule and thereby leaving more free time for afternoons to be spent in the outlying schools.\(^{91}\)

As pointed out, the class content of this work followed closely the pattern of development toward practical instruction already traced for the all-day program, hence need not be reproduced here. This type of instruction reached its peak enrollment in the session of 1932-33. By this time considerable consolidation of the small high schools had taken place, and public roads had been greatly improved. Many of the day-unit centers grew into all-day centers, or the children were transported to a consolidated center where vocational agriculture was offered. By 1950 there were no day-unit schools in operation anywhere in the state. This type of instruction as it rose and declined in Virginia affords an excellent illustration of an educational practice that was brought into existence to meet a particular need and then slowly passed out of existence as the need declined. Certainly the day-unit class met a need in its day; but then as conditions changed, it was abandoned or merged into departments better fitted to serve the newer conditions. As Sanders said in speaking of the end of the day-unit system, "This is in reality a healthy sign, as many of the day-unit classes were

\[^{91}\text{"Classes in Outlying High Schools as Possibilities,"}\]
converted into full-time departments."^92

Efforts to Develop Instruction in Agriculture as a Science

Before leaving the story of the efforts to develop and extend a program of practical instruction in agriculture, one more series of events should be related - namely, the efforts to teach agriculture to students not enrolled in Smith-Hughes program of courses. This series of events in the strictest sense was not a part of the development of vocational agriculture, but the events took place during the same period as did the ones which have just been related and in many instances engaged the attention and energy of the personnel engaged in the program of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture.

Mention was made in Chapter VIII of the beginning agitation during the first decade of the twentieth century for instruction in agriculture. As the high school program began to develop in the rural areas, more and more attention began to be given to the idea of including agriculture as a part of the regular instructional program. By 1915 the State Superintendent of Public Instruction reported: "In an effort to redirect the work of rural schools an additional emphasis has been placed on agriculture, which has been made a required subject."^93 The agriculture for this course required in all


^93State Course of Study for High Schools in Virginia, 1915-1916, p. 4.
rural schools was to be classified as a science and offered as a one-year course of class lectures and laboratory.94 A detailed outline of topics to be taught was provided in the course of study prepared for the teachers in 1915, but in using this detailed course the teachers were urged to bring "book agriculture into contact and articulation with the farm laboratory"95 and to emphasize those parts of the text bearing directly upon the agricultural activities of the particular communities in which the schools were located. In addition to the rather detailed suggestions for classroom work, provisions were made whereby the boys could get one-half unit credit for agricultural work done at home after school and during vacation, provided such work was done under the supervision of the local agricultural demonstrator.96 This idea of using the local agricultural demonstrator in the program of agricultural education was a popular one. As related in Chapter VIII, a co-operative plan was developed whereby the demonstration agent in agriculture could assume responsibility for a definite part of the school's instructional program in agriculture. This program, representing as it did the last official connection between the public schools and the boys' club work now commonly referred to as

94 Ibid., p. 30 ff.
95 Loc. cit.
96 Loc. cit.
the 4-H Club work, is worthy of recording in some detail:

In counties with demonstration agents in agriculture, the year's work in agriculture should be divided as follows into three parts:

Part I. The fall or first term should be devoted to a general course in agriculture, using as a basal text Warren's Elements of Agriculture, organized according to the general principles suggested above.

Part II. Before the end of the first term, the principal of the school, in consultation with the teacher and the county demonstration agent, should select for the class four projects to be worked out by the pupils during the term and during the summer vacation. Each pupil will select one of these projects as his individual project to work out. A minimum of one month's instruction, or twenty lessons, will be devoted to instruction and laboratory work for each of the four projects selected by the school during the second term.

Part III. During out of school hours, while pursuing the course, and in the vacation period, each pupil will work out, under the direction of the county demonstration agent, the project which he selects. During the working-out of his project, each pupil will be required to meet in conference groups with the county agent whenever he meets with any member of the class group for a conference, thus enabling each student to get the benefit of all four projects worked out by the class. The suggested number of such conferences is three to each project.

Each pupil will be required to devote approximately 120 hours of out-of-school time to the completion of his project.

The Extension Department at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute has prepared a series of bulletins containing a series of outlined lessons and projects to be used as text material for project work and class instruction during the spring term.

At the end of the summer's project work, the principal of the high school, the county agent, and the division superintendent of schools
shall constitute a committee of three to pass upon the projects completed by the pupils. [The teacher of agriculture in the school was not included in the evaluating committee!]

When the above committee has certified that a pupil has completed . . . his project he shall receive one unit of high school credit for the project work in addition to the one unit credit received for his regular one year's work in Agriculture.97

With these plans for instruction in agriculture, Virginia, on the opening of the schools in the fall of 1917, had virtually three systems of instruction in agriculture in the secondary schools: (1) the just-beginning instruction in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture, (2) the instruction in general agriculture as a part of the science course, and (3) the instruction in vocational agriculture in co-operation with the county agricultural agent. This latter program, dividing as it did the responsibility for instruction in agriculture between the public school authorities and the local representative of the State Agricultural Extension Service, soon encountered difficulties in proper co-ordination and supervision. As the state extension program in agriculture became better established and the 4-H Club work began to be strengthened, the high schools gradually abandoned this joint type of program and, where there was no Smith-Hughes program introduced, left this home-project field of instructing youth.

---

in vocational agriculture to the 4-H Clubs under the direction of the county agents. The end of this program marked the conclusion of the official connection of the Virginia public schools with the boys' club work, encouraged during the first decade of the twentieth century by the school authorities as a means of promoting agricultural education. Although no longer officially connected with the public schools, this early home-project idea has been absorbed into the modern 4-H Club program which in turn continues to serve Virginia youth as an educational agency in agriculture.

The efforts to teach non-vocational agriculture as a part of the science program, although tried out in a variety of ways, never met with great success in Virginia. In spite of the pleas for practicality and "articulation with the farm laboratory," such an outcome does not seem to have been achieved. A rather detailed outline was prepared for this course in 1915, but seemingly the teachers followed this outline too rigidly. The course of study for 1919 went to the other extreme and gave rather general directions.

98 See Chapter VIII.
99 Supra.
100 State Course of Study for High Schools of Virginia, 1915-1916, p. 37.
101 Memorandum filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
for teaching the course. This lack of specificity apparently gave the teachers too much latitude. The writer remembers full well how he as a student in one of these so-called classes in agriculture, conducted in a high school in the great agricultural section of the Valley of Virginia, spent long tedious hours in studying dry farming in Oregon, citrus growing in California, and cotton raising in Texas. Not once did the teacher, a graduate of one of the outstanding colleges in the state, permit local problems to be discussed, feeling, no doubt, a greater security in dealing with distant problems. No doubt this was an extreme situation, but teachers (mostly women) poorly trained in agricultural background seem to have been the chief stumbling block to the success of this particular effort to teach agriculture.103

By 1924 this program of non-vocational agriculture was dropped from the list of required subjects, although sample schedules showing how the course could be scheduled were

103"Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session 1917-1918," p. 3. In the rough copy of this annual report filed in the state office, the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education rather pointedly stated that one of the greatest drawbacks to sound instruction in general agriculture was poorly trained women trying to teach it. Evidently feeling that this was a dangerous statement, he drew a line through the word women and substituted the word persons, thereby making the drawback poorly trained persons instead of poorly trained women.
included in the Manual of Administration.\textsuperscript{104} By 1928 even less consideration was given to the course in the Manual of Administration and seemingly it had been rather generally abandoned by this time,\textsuperscript{105} thereby leaving the Smith-Hughes program as the only one in which instruction was given in agriculture. During the decade between 1930-1940 Virginia undertook a rather thoroughgoing state-wide program of curriculum revision and once more tried to get instruction in general agriculture into the school curriculum. This time the plan for rural schools was to include instruction in general agriculture in the proposed science experiences to be provided in the course of study for the first year of high school work. At the same time the instruction in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture was to be offered during the last three years of the high school instead of for four years.\textsuperscript{106} Adapting the instructional program to meet the needs of the students was one of the basic principles strongly advocated in the revised curriculum. It was not long, therefore, before the just-mentioned policy of no vocational agriculture before the second year was modified to a policy of starting the program


\textsuperscript{105}Memorandum filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

\textsuperscript{106}Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, June 26-29, 1933, p. 7.
in vocational agriculture the first year if the boys "needed" it during the first year. Since no definite criteria were available for determining needs, it was not long before the schools were doing just about as they pleased in scheduling the classes in agriculture. Under this revised curriculum numerous attempts were made between the teachers of vocational agriculture and the teachers of the academic subjects to develop and teach broad units of instructional work on a co-operative basis. It seems reasonable to conclude that these co-operative undertakings carried on over the entire state were mutually beneficial to both the academic program and to the vocational agricultural program, although considerable confusion often arose when the teachers of agriculture insisted that teachers of social studies and teachers of language arts use the job-analysis technique when attempting to develop a unit around pupil purposes. Likewise much confusion arose when the teachers of the academic subjects insisted that the teachers of vocational agriculture do less job analysis outside of the classroom and do more of it in the classroom with

the pupils as participants.\textsuperscript{108}

The provision for including basic functional agriculture as a part of the general science program is still included in the \textit{Manual of Administration} for the High Schools of Virginia; but as nearly as the writer can determine, almost no effort is made to include basic principles of agriculture in the first-year science program.

Shortly after the close of World War II many school divisions in the state began to establish twelve-year schools in place of the more traditional eleven-year system. In the great majority of instances the additional year has been developed as an eighth grade which is the first year of the five-year high school.\textsuperscript{109} Most of the schools with this eighth grade place heavy emphasis on exploratory courses in one way or another. In many instances the teachers of vocational agriculture have been asked to offer short unit non-vocational courses in agriculture as a part of this exploratory program. It is too early to appraise this last effort to teach non-vocational agriculture, but to date the results have been

\textsuperscript{108}The writer as chairman of one of the county committees working on revising the curriculum was caught between these two groups. He feels that one of the greatest benefits growing out of the entire program of curriculum revision was the opportunity it afforded the teachers of the several subject fields to work together. It is true, however, that much local misunderstanding often developed among the teaching staff.

\textsuperscript{109}Virginia, \textit{Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the School Year 1949-50}, p. 29.
rather disappointing, a disappointment, it would seem, caused by the fact that the teachers are unable to see the essential differences between vocational agriculture and agriculture as an exploratory subject.

As Virginia passed the mid-century mark, then, it would appear that although she had made satisfactory progress, as already related, in developing a practical course of study for vocational agriculture in the secondary school, her efforts to provide practical instruction in agriculture for students not enrolled in Smith-Hughes agricultural programs had not met with similar success. The reason for this situation is perhaps to be found in the fact that no adequate provision was made for the preparation of teachers for non-vocational agriculture, nor for the supervision of such a program after it was launched, while for the Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture both teacher-training and supervisory provisions, to be discussed subsequently, were provided from the very beginning of the program.
By 1920 the Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the secondary schools had passed through the critical pioneering stage. The efforts put forth during this stage and of the three decades following to establish and expand a practical, functional program of agricultural education have just been traced. At the time these efforts were underway, still other efforts were being made to expand the influence and the effectiveness of instruction in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the secondary school by building up an improved morale, or esprit de corps, among the pupils enrolled in classes in vocational agriculture. This effort led to the development of the Virginia Association of Future Farmers of America (F.F.A.) to which attention will now be directed. In considering the development of this organization emphasis will be centered largely on the historical evolution rather than on a critical appraisal of the events in the story.

As pointed out, one of the first organized attempts to promote agricultural education in Virginia was made through the agricultural societies. The idea of these societies
persisted very strongly throughout the entire nineteenth century in one form or another and was projected into the twentieth century. Nearly all these older organizations were made up of adults; but as agricultural education for boys began to develop, it was almost inevitable that attempts should be made to use the society or club idea for this age group as well as for the adults. It is interesting to recall, as previously noted, that the first proposals for a boys' club to promote agricultural education in the state occurred almost simultaneously with the establishment of the first state-supported high schools. These boys' clubs, usually known as corn clubs, were intended by the Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop programs in conjunction with the fast developing high schools. Considerable success met the efforts of these clubs; but, as pointed out, this corn club program was taken over by the Agricultural Extension Division upon the passage of the Smith-Lever Act.

Shortly after the beginning of the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture various types of clubs and organizations for the boys enrolled in agriculture began to be formed. Among the first was one called the Junior Farm Bureau,

1See Chapter VIII.


3See Chapter VIII.
organized at Burkes Garden, in 1921, by F. X. Credle. The next clubs seem to have been the Alpha Gamma Club at Massawadox, the Thrift Club at Gloucester, and the Manassas Co-operative Poultry Association at Manassas. This latter club is worthy of note as one organized to meet a growing demand for such organizations. Writing in the Virginia Agricultural Instructor, the club's student secretary said:

For the past two or three years, the need of some sort of agricultural club has been felt in the agricultural department, and to satisfy this need the Manassas Cooperative Poultry Association was organized by the students January 15, 1924.

The demand for the services of the club was not confined to its members, but spread rapidly to the community at large and the need for a club of broader scope was soon felt.

To answer this need the To-Morrow's Farmer's Club was organized with a poultry department... a dairying and farm animals department... and an Agronomy and horticulture department... The officers [of these departments] with the president and the secretary-treasurer, form a civic service department.

It is interesting to note the name and the idea of Tomorrow's Farmer's Club. In this form the name was but one


5Ibid., p. 6.

step removed from the name Future Farmers Club, which was to be advanced at a later date. It is also worth noting that the teacher of agriculture at Manassas at the time was H. W. Sanders who, as will be related shortly, was one of the members of the conference which in 1925 formulated the idea of a state-wide organization for boys enrolled in vocational agriculture.

Several other local clubs were formed about this time in widely scattered sections of the state. In each case it seems that a club was formed to promote some particular aspect or to achieve some particular objective of the program of education in vocational agriculture. The experiences of these local clubs proved invaluable in laying the foundation for the acceptance of the idea of a state-wide organization and in providing a background of experience from which to draw in setting up worthwhile activities or objectives for such an organization on a state-wide level.

In September, 1925, at a conference in the office of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, attended by W. S. Newman, then State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, and E. C. Magill, H. C. Groseclose and H. W. Sanders, of the Department of Agricultural Education, the idea of a definite state-wide

---

organization for the boys enrolled in vocational agriculture was advanced and strongly supported by Newman. "In my opinion," he said, "the farm boys of Virginia who are enrolled in vocational agriculture are equal to any other group of boys in the State . . . . Let's form an organization that will give them a greater opportunity for self-expression and for the development of leadership. In this way they will develop their confidence in their own ability and pride in the fact that they are farm boys." This historic conference is now commemorated in the Department of Vocational Education by a table bearing a brass plate with the following Inscription:

AT THIS TABLE IN SEPTEMBER, 1925
IT WAS DETERMINED THAT BOYS
STUDYING AGRICULTURE SHOULD HAVE
THEIR OWN ORGANIZATION - NOW
THE F.F.A.


As a result of this conference it was determined "that an organization was not only needed, but such an organization was going to be made a reality during the year." To H.C. Groseclose was assigned the responsibility for developing a plan for the proposed organization; but before he could take any definite

---


action, he became ill and was removed to a hospital in November, 1925, where he was confined for a period of approximately six months. While convalescing, he found himself needing something to do to pass away the time. Newman suggested that he resume work on developing a plan for the proposed state organization. This suggestion was taken up; and many of the instructors in agriculture, the supervisors, and teacher-trainers sent him their suggestions for such an association. With these suggestions and many other ideas for which he himself was responsible, Groseclose, after about two months of study and contemplation, developed a tentative constitution and set of by-laws for a boys' organization for students in vocational agriculture in Virginia.

In the meantime, however, while Groseclose was still working on the constitution, Newman went ahead with the idea of a state association and at the state-wide "rally," or gathering of boys and teachers of vocational agriculture, in Blacksburg, in April, 1926, presented to them the possibility of a state-wide organization of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture. This first official public action for a state-wide organization received, in the words of Magill,


11 *Loc. cit.*
"enthusiastic support." The official report of this important occasion reads as follows:

The annual vocational rally held at the State College April 22-24 [1926] was the best of its kind ever held in this State. The total attendance of instructors and contestants was in the neighborhood of four hundred. One of the main features of the two-day program was the assembly of all contestants on Saturday night when the idea of the formation of a State organization of vocational students was advanced. This suggestion met with good response from the boys, and the development of this association will receive considerable emphasis during the coming months.

In the meantime Groseclose, while still in the hospital, finished his draft of a tentative constitution for this organization. Upon his return to duty a copy of this constitution was mailed on June 14, 1926, to every instructor of vocational agriculture in the state. At the same time a request was sent to the instructors to study the constitution and to send their suggestions for its improvement to Groseclose or to bring their suggestions with them when they came to Blacksburg for the annual summer conference of teachers of vocational agriculture. Many suggestions as to the desirable nature of


the proposed organization were mailed in as a result of this request. Later at the conference, held July 20-27, 1926, Groseclose presented a talk on "A State Organization of Students Enrolled in Agriculture." In this talk the point was stressed that such an organization would represent pioneer effort, with little help to be secured from other sources.\(^{15}\) In general, Groseclose's talk was well received. His presentation was followed by a lively discussion concerning the proposed constitution and the proposed state organization. J. O. Hoge, a teacher of agriculture, joined in the discussion and raised the question, "And why not a national fraternity to be known as the Future Farmers of America?"\(^{16}\)

All the previous activities thus far recounted had indeed prepared the way for a state-wide organization. As a result of this sentiment, most of which was indigenous to the conditions in vocational agriculture in the state at the time but a part of which seems to have been the result of careful and intelligent leadership, this conference determined to establish a state organization along the lines proposed by Groseclose.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\)H. C. Groseclose, "A State Organization of Students Enrolled in Vocational Agriculture," The Virginia Agricultural Instructor, (September 1, 1926), p. 22.


\(^{17}\)Minutes of the Ninth Annual Conference of Agricultural Instructors in Virginia, July 20-27, 1926, p. 22.
As so frequently happens in cases of this kind, the subsequent success of the organization agreed upon at this conference gave rise to conflicting reports as to the origin of many of the features included in the plan of organization. Certainly the instructors of vocational agriculture in the state had been given every opportunity to make suggestions as to the nature of the organization they thought best for the boys in vocational agriculture. Many of these suggestions, as well as many of the features of the older local clubs, were incorporated into the plan which Groseclose proposed for the new state-wide organization. It would have been remarkable indeed if under such circumstances numerous arguments had not been advanced by some, claiming credit for this or that feature of the plan for the organization. Unfortunately the available records do not help much in singling out individuals deserving credit for their contributions to the new organization in its formative stages; in fact, the minutes of that part of the conference relating to the formation of the new group are quite unpretentious and in no way indicate that the participants knew they were launching an organization many parts of which would soon be included in a national organization. The very simplicity of the minutes which launched a movement that was to make such an impact on the formation of the national organization makes them worth recording here as written:
A State Organization of Students Enrolled in Agriculture

H. C. Groseclose, Itinerant Teacher-Trainer

The attempt to organize the boys of the State is pioneer work and little information can be secured from other sources for our guidance. All of the instructors of the State have been supplied with copies of the suggested Constitution and by-laws of the proposed boys' organization. The comments and suggestions contained in the letters [from the agricultural teachers] bearing on the plan have been summarized and are presented for further consideration. [This last statement probably explains the source of a lot of the different claims for being the originator of certain features of the plan for the organization.]

Motions that the State Organization be adopted and that the objectives of the organization as set up by Mr. Groseclose be accepted were passed.

Motion carried that a committee of one man from each district of the State, with Mr. Groseclose as chairman, be appointed to draft the final copy of the Constitution and by-laws.

For the guidance of the committee the following changes in the tentative constitution were suggested:
[then followed six suggested revisions of the constitution, only one of which will be quoted here]

The name of the organization and the selection of a suitable emblem will be left to the committee.

Note: The revised copy of the Constitution and by-laws with detailed plans and instructions for perfecting the organization will be contained in a handbook that will be prepared and distributed to all instructors at an early date.18

18 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
The committee appointed to assist Groseclose with the revision of the constitution and by-laws was made up of the following men: H. M. Love, Ernest Hambrick, W. L. Creasy, G. C. Frazier, J. W. Miller, J. P. Pullen, Johnson Gwaltney, and J. O. Hoge.19

As indicated by the minutes, the conference adjourned without deciding upon a name for the new club. Henry Groseclose is generally credited with originating the name Future Farmers of Virginia which later became the accepted name of the new organization. Here too, as in setting up the constitution for the organization by synthesizing the best features of many loosely knit clubs and organizations in the state and elsewhere, it seems that what Groseclose really did was to capture the central ideas of many names and terms involving the idea that the boys in vocational agriculture were the farmers of the future and to combine these ideas into a catchy popular name. The term "future farmers" had been used several times in the state with reference to the boys enrolled in agriculture. In February, 1926, the term had been used by one of the boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in an original poem, the title and first two lines of the poem being as follows:

The Agriculture Class

We are all future farmers
And for that we feel no shame. 20

19 Ibid., p. 35.
This student's literary effort was given wide publicity before the teachers of agriculture when the poem was published in the April, 1926, issue of the Virginia Agricultural Instructor. Undoubtedly this usage of the term "future farmers" helped pave the way for its later acceptance as a part of the name for the new organization.

As to the actual events surrounding the birth of the name, E. C. Magill, at the time head of the Department of Agricultural Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, writing in 1932 said of the birth of the organization and the origin of the name:

"... it might have been during a three day period when two [of the staff members] sat in on a conference in October, 1928, with Henry Groseclose. ... The writer can well remember the struggle for a name. A large number had been listed, but none seemed satisfactory. On the morning of the second day, in came Henry Groseclose, smiling and happy. 'It will be F.F.V. - Future Farmers of Virginia.' While being in a hot bath the night before the name had been born at the sudden realization that Washington, Jefferson, and other Virginians had been not only farmers, but represented the First Families of Virginia."21

Undoubtedly the date of October, 1928, given by Magill as the time of this conference, is a mistake, for the name Future Farmers of Virginia was in common usage long before

---

that time, as an official report written by Magill himself shows.\textsuperscript{22} The \textit{Virginia Agricultural Instructor} for September, 1926, issued one month after the July conference just discussed, carried on its cover page the statement of an objective to be achieved by each department of vocational agriculture; namely, the establishment of "one local chapter of the state F.F.V. (Future Farmers of Virginia)."\textsuperscript{23} This same publication also designated the committee previously named as the one set up to help Groseclose with perfecting the constitution and by-laws as the committee for "Revision of F.F.V. Constitution and By-Laws."\textsuperscript{24} This date of October, 1928, probably is a typographical error, for even the title of the article from which the foregoing quotation was taken indicated a date prior to 1928 as the time of the origin of the name. It is indeed unfortunate that this error occurred in the article, particularly so since the article itself was reproduced by mimeograph and given wide distribution over the United States and several foreign countries in response to requests for information concerning the early days of


\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Virginia Agricultural Instructor, (September, 1926), cover page.}

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., p. 35.

\textsuperscript{25}See correspondence relating to these requests on file in the Department of Vocational Education Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
the Virginia organization which gave so much to the national organization of students in vocational agriculture.

Following the adjournment of the conference of teachers of vocational agriculture in July, the teacher-training staff at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute applied the job-analysis technique then so popular to the proposed organization and arranged the results in the form of a lesson plan which set forth in detail the steps and procedures a teacher should follow in organizing his local chapter. This plan was made available to the teachers in September of 1926, and the drive was on to organize a local chapter of the Future Farmers of Virginia in every high school offering vocational agriculture. The first local chapter of Future Farmers of Virginia was organized at the Rural Retreat High School in time to apply for its charter on September 28, 1926. Dublin High School ran Rural Retreat a close second by organizing and then applying for its charter on October 7, 1926. It is worth noting at this time, however, that the charters were not ready for distribution by the time these schools had organized. When the charters were finally ready for distribution, they seemingly were not mailed out in the same order in which the applications from the schools had been received.

---

26 Virginia Agricultural Instructor, (October, 1926), pp.3-4.


28 Noblin, op. cit., p. 7.
As a result of this action the charter numbers issued to some of the schools did not agree with the chronology in which the schools had organized their local chapters. This discrepancy between the order in which the organization of local chapters took place and the order in which the charters were issued is still the cause of considerable friendly, though at times heated, dispute as to the first or oldest F.F.V. chapter in the state. To add to the confusion involved in the question of who was first, many schools organized local chapters but for one reason or another did not apply for charters until a later date. By December 3, 1926, for example, fourteen schools had officially applied for state charters, and at the same time local chapters were known to be operating in at least forty-three schools over the state. Undoubtedly Rural Retreat with the date of September 28, 1926, as the date of completed organization, seems to deserve the credit for being the first chapter of the F.F.V. Beyond this cautious assertion it seems best, in considering the question of who was first, to leave it a question for endless discussion at future gatherings of workers in vocational agriculture in the state.

29 Loc. cit.

Throughout the entire school year of 1926-27 a determined drive was kept up for more chapters throughout the state. In the words of Noblin: "Walter Newman and his supervisors visited school after school, forming chapters and invariably leaving behind a set of worth-while objectives." By April of 1927, the number of local chapters formed had, as later enthusiastically reported by both Magill and Noblin, reached an "even 100 chapters." Evidently all these local chapters had not applied for charters at this time, for the state supervisor's annual report for this date gives only eighty-eight as the number of local chapters established during the session of 1926-27.

The first state meeting of the representatives of the local chapters of the F.F.V. was held in Blacksburg, on April 28, 1927, during the customary annual rally, or statewide meeting, of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture. At this meeting a slate of state officers made up of students was elected and the constitution formally adopted by the students in attendance. The next day, April 29, 1927, the first meeting of the state organization of Future Farmers

---

31 Noblin, op. cit., p. 7.


of Virginia was called to order by Joseph Turner, its first president."

The organization, or F.F.V. as it was called, proved to be successful from the very first. Newman in his annual report for 1926-27 said, "... We feel that we are correct in saying that the inauguration of the state organization of Future Farmers of Virginia has secured for the program [of vocational agriculture] 100% more support and backing than the work had a year ago."35

Robert D. Maltby, Southern Regional Agent for Vocational Agriculture at the time, after a tour through Virginia, visiting local F.F.V. chapters,36 was so elated with the success of the organization that he made arrangements to have the idea of the program presented and explained to the Southern Regional Conference, meeting at San Antonio, Texas, March 28 - April 2, 1927. W. S. Newman, in preparation for this presentation, collected reports on the activities and results of the local F.F.V. chapters and incorporated them into his report at San Antonio.37 This report of Newman's was well received - so well

34"Minutes of State Meeting Future Farmers of Virginia," Unpublished. The original minutes are on file in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.


37Loc. cit.
received, in fact, that the conference went on record as favoring a state organization of students in agriculture in each southern state similar to the F.F.V. organization and urged, furthermore, that efforts be made to secure a regional or national organization known as the Future Farmers of America.\(^\text{38}\)

Conditions were ideal for the spread of enthusiasm for a national organization, since many states by this time had already started some type of organization either on the local or the state level. The Virginia plan received much highly favorable publicity not only in the Southern Region as indicated but also in the North Atlantic Region and the Pacific Region as well. At a conference in the latter region an idea for a national organization patterned largely after the Virginia plan but to be called the Future Farmers of America was proposed and received favorable comment.\(^\text{39}\)

As a result of the increasing agitation for a national organization, a temporary constitution for the Future Farmers of America, patterned closely after that of the Future Farmers of Virginia,\(^\text{40}\) was with the assistance of W. S. Newman and


\(^{40}\)Ibid., p. 540.
H. C. Groseclose of Virginia drafted by members of the agricultural education service of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in Washington during the summer of 1928. Following the completion of this temporary constitution, H. C. Groseclose on September 5, 1928, with proper authorization, had the newly formed organization incorporated under the laws of Virginia as the Future Farmers of America. With preliminary planning having been completed, a copy of the temporary constitution was mailed to all the states in the fall of 1928, along with a call for the first national convention of the Future Farmers of America. This convention met in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 20, 1928, and adopted the constitution with a few minor changes and formally set up the National Association of the Future Farmers of America.

The formation of the national organization found Virginia more than ready for it. Her supervisory and teacher-training staff had whole heartedly supported the movement as indeed had the teachers of vocational agriculture themselves. This latter group at their annual conference July 31 - August 1, 1928, 

---


42 Ross, op. cit., pp. 540, 541.

43 For the full story of Virginia's part in the formation of the national organization see especially the article by Magill in Chapter Chats, IV, (March, 1931), p. 1.
had adopted a report endorsing the establishment of the
national organization to be known as the Future Farmers of
America. At the same time in full faith that such a national
organization would be set up, the conference set up the necessary
machinery to provide for the appointment of delegates to the
first national convention, if and when it should be called.
As if this action did not show sufficient faith in the
possibility of a national organization, the conference set
up an objective to the effect that each instructor during the
session of 1928-29 would work to further the program of the
"Virginia Branch of the Future Farmers of America."\(^4\)

With this favorable sentiment as a background, Virginia,
on the formation of the national organization, applied for
membership and was granted Charter Number One in recognition
of her efforts on behalf of the national group.\(^5\) By this
action on the part of Virginia and the national organization
the development from a local, to a state, to a branch of the
national organization for boys enrolled in vocational agri-
culture in Virginia was complete. The name Future Farmers of
Virginia continued to be used for a short time in designating
the Virginia association of the Future Farmers of America, but
the name gradually gave way in favor of Future Farmers of
America, so that now this latter term is used almost exclusively.

\(^{4}\)Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Conference of Agricul-

\(^{5}\)Ross, op. cit., p. 547; Noblin, op. cit., p. 10.
The part played by Virginia in helping bring about the transition from a state to a national association seemed to give added vigor to the Virginia Association of the F.F.A. The state supervisory staff, the teacher-training staff, and the teachers themselves set to work to make the organization an integral part of the program in vocational agriculture, and to this end they succeeded remarkably well. The teacher-training staff prepared plans, bulletins, and other printed material to be used by the teachers in developing various aspects of the program.\textsuperscript{46} Committees of teachers and supervisors were set up to study the different parts of the program and to make recommendations for improvements, while a great deal of attention was given to the state and local chapters of the F.F.A. at the annual conferences of teachers of vocational agriculture.\textsuperscript{47}

In 1926 the first official publication for the old F.F.V. had appeared in December as a nameless mimeograph, carrying an offer of five dollars to the person suggesting the best name for it. Sidney Williams of the Powhatan Chapter suggested Chapter Chats, which became the winning title.\textsuperscript{48} This
\textsuperscript{46}Noblin, \textit{op. cit.}, foreword, et passim.

\textsuperscript{47}See especially the Minutes of the Annual Conferences of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia for 1928 and the next several years.

publication continued for a short time in mimeographed form and then was changed over to a printed publication. With the transition of the F.F.V. into the F.F.A., **Chapter Chats** was continued as a bi-monthly publication of this organization. **Chapter Chats** perhaps is best described as a bi-monthly newspaper, carrying official notices pertaining to F.F.A. programs and news of the activities of the various state chapters. It has been financed by the organization, although its publication and printing have always been supervised by the state supervisory staff.

On several occasions thus far mention has been made of the annual rally of the students in vocational agriculture at Blacksburg. This rally while definitely not the most important aspect of the modern day F.F.A. program in Virginia at the same time has developed into one of the annual highlights of the year's work. Previous mention has been made of the school fairs as a part of the Boys' Corn Club work. With the expansion of these fairs it was inevitable that the occasion should be seized upon as an opportunity to instruct the boys in the "whys" and the "wherefores" back of the judges' decisions in picking the best in the exhibits of agricultural products. This somewhat informal instruction soon led to organized teams of judges made up of the boys themselves who would pit their judgment against that of the professional judges. Shortly after the inauguration of the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture in the state,
a scheme was devised whereby teams of judges made up of boys from the departments of vocational agriculture in the high schools of the state would be sent to the state fair in Richmond to compete in judging the agricultural products exhibited there.

The first of these contests called the State Judging Contest for High Schools was held in conjunction with the state fair in Richmond, in the fall of 1919. In preparation for the second contest the teachers were urged to hold local contests in judging, following intensive training of all the students enrolled in agriculture. The winners of the local contests were then to enter the judging contests at the state fair. This plan was followed for several years, but by the fall of 1923 considerable dissatisfaction arose in connection with holding the contest at the state fair. As a result of this dissatisfaction it was decided to move the contest to the campus of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, where the agricultural training facilities of the college could be used for judging purposes. The program of contests was expanded to include athletic events and the name State


50 "Special Notice," Virginia Agricultural Instructor, (Fall, 1923), pp. 1-4. This mimeographed issue gives neither month nor date of issue, but it contains an excellent discussion of the objections to holding the judging contest at the state fair.
Agricultural Rally was applied to the gathering which met for the first time on the Virginia Polytechnic Institute campus, on April 23, 24, 25, 1925. By way of interpolation it may be said that the state fair mentioned here as abandoned by the schools for instructional purposes traces back directly to the state fair first started by the Virginia State Agricultural Society in the decade just prior to the Civil War.

With the establishment of the F.F.V. plans were made whereby the annual rally would be used as a time for the meeting of the F.F.V. group as well. Within a very short time these rallies came to be known as F.F.V. rallies. After the organization of the F.F.A. the name F.F.V. gradually gave way to the newer name, so that today the term "rally" as used in Virginia means the annual meeting of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in the secondary schools.

The F.F.A. in Virginia following its organization was developed by and for boys as an association which was intracurricular in nature and had its roots in the program of vocational agriculture. From the very first this organization of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in the high schools of the state moved in the direction of fulfilling W. S. Newman's wish to have an organization that would give rural


52See Chapter II.
boys an opportunity for self-expression and the development of qualities of leadership. The wisdom in organizing the original F.F.V. "from the bottom up" instead of "from the top down" was quickly shown by the enthusiasm with which the boys themselves entered into the process of setting up local chapters and engaging in chapter activities. The early issues of Chapter Chats, the official publication of the F.F.V., are filled with letters, reports, and articles written by the boys themselves in describing their work, their fun, and their common efforts. The two following excerpts while definitely not representing all the activities of the local chapters are given as typical of the spirit and enthusiasm reflected by the youthful correspondents as they recorded that which in reality was the boys' response to the efforts to broaden the influence of education in vocational agriculture:

The F.F.V.'s at Rural Retreat

The Rural Retreat Aggies, the local chapter of the F.F.V.'s, at their regular meeting on Dec. 14, 1926 organized a Thrift Bank. . . We have also been participating in other activities such as School Ground Improvement, a Father-Son Banquet, Putting on Demonstrations at the local and District Fairs. We have taken part in debates and talks on agricultural topics, and have conducted home demonstrations, led by members of the class. The Bulletin Boards are ready for the Farmers. We have also been sending in monthly letters to the local newspapers telling of the F.F.V.'s and the purpose.

There are twenty-five (25) members in the organization all of whom are interested in the F.F.V.'s and are meeting the requirements of the Association.
We think this is a good organization.
Sumpter Grubb, Secretary
Rural Retreat Aggies (F.F.V.'s) 53

One boy became so enraptured over the new organization
that he undertook to translate his emotion into verse with
the following result:

Battle Cry of Our Vocation

As I toil o'er rock and rill
My heart enraptures with a thrill
that I am among the many
Future Farmers of Virginia.

Our thoughts upon our work are bent
our motto is ACCOMPLISHMENT,
To show the world our work unveiled
To stive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

It makes us shudder at the thought
That we cannot do what we ought,
But be our labor great or small
Let's do it well or not at all.

Let's each aspire to be a PLANTER
And help our chapter carry the banner,
Though we may not rank with the rest,
We'll never regret we did our best. 54

One of the favorite activities urged upon the F.F.V.
chapters was the father-and-son banquet. Many of the reports
of these banquets reflect a growing attitude among the teachers,
the district supervisors, and the boys of that comradeship and
informality of approach so necessary in working successfully

53 "The F.F.V.'s at Rural Retreat," Chapter Chats, (January,
1927), p. 11.

54 "Battle Cry of Our Vocation," Chapter Chats, (March,
with rural youth. These banquets, as did most of the F.F.V. and F.F.A. activities, furnished excellent material for the local newspapers which in turn seem to have co-operated wonderfully well in publicizing the activities of the new organization. In one year it was estimated that more than ninety newspapers and magazines having circulation in Virginia published nearly a thousand articles dealing with F.F.A. activities.

After the F.F.A. was organized, a large part of the activities of students in vocational agriculture in the secondary schools became a part of the F.F.A. program of work. In some instances the tendency to use the F.F.A. as a means of accomplishing all the objectives of vocational agriculture in the secondary school seems to have developed. The State Supervisor of Agricultural Education found it necessary on several occasions to warn the teachers against this practice. These warnings may have been heeded by the teachers of agriculture, but this tendency to include so many of the regular instructional activities in the F.F.A. program

55 See especially, "Grose close Uses Saucer (instead of cup) - Father-and-Son Banquet at Boyce, Huddle System used; Plate by Plate account of the Event," as given in Chapter Chats, (March, 1927), p. 14.


of work has caused many laymen and educational workers in fields other than vocational ones to consider the F.F.A. as synonymous with Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the secondary schools. The writer has talked with numerous high school principals in Virginia who, without consulting their files, could not explain the difference between that which was done as a part of the F.F.A. program and that which was done as a part of the regular instructional program in agriculture in their own school! Truly the F.F.A. is a part of the program of education in vocational agriculture in Virginia today.

Before concluding the story of the development of the F.F.V. and the F.F.A. in Virginia, it seems well to make a slight digression for the sake of insuring clarity and accuracy concerning the part played by the state leaders in the formation of these organizations. In the first place, it was Walter Newman, not Henry Groseclose, who conceived the idea of an organization designed to build up the morale and act as an inspiration to the boys enrolled in vocational agriculture in Virginia. Wheeler in his Two Hundred Years of Agricultural Education in Georgia misses this point entirely and without mentioning Newman gives Groseclose full credit for the idea. It was Newman who first proposed the idea of such an organization to the boys and their teachers,

58 John T. Wheeler, Two Hundred Years of Agricultural Education in Georgia, pp. 353 ff.
and it was Newman as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education and Magill as head teacher-trainer who recognized the peculiar talents possessed by Groseclose and assigned to him the job of developing a plan, or constitution, for the proposed organization. Furthermore it was Newman and Magill who in a manner possessed only by these two men, furnished the inspiration which kept Groseclose's talents centered on the idea of a state organization until he succeeded in developing the constitution which, as already related, became the basis for the plan of organization of the state F.F.V. and of the national F.F.A.

The foregoing statement of the responsibility shared by these men in the formation of the F.F.V. and the F.F.A. is in no way intended to detract from the contribution made by Groseclose in setting up the new organization. While it is true that many of the ideas he incorporated into the new constitution may be pointed out as having been in existence in other organizations, it is equally true that he was the first person to isolate these ideas and recombine them in the form of a constitution which essentially has served the F.F.A. in Virginia and the nation for nearly a quarter of a century.

As already related, it was J. O. Hoge who in Virginia first advanced the idea of a national organization to be called the Future Farmers of America, and it was Walter Newman who carried the idea outside the state to the Southern Regional Conference at San Antonio, Texas. As the idea spread, however,
and more and more states wanted to know about the F.F.V. plan, it was Groseclose who was usually sent to explain the organization. The sending of Groseclose to these several states was quite logical, since he had formulated the constitution, and as itinerant teacher-trainer had visited more schools and seen the plan in operation in more circumstances, perhaps, than any one else in Virginia at the time. As an ambassador of the F.F.V. Groseclose was at his very best. His magnificent physique, his pleasing personality, and his unassuming manner soon made him a well-known and welcome figure at gatherings of workers in vocational agriculture. His activities in visiting states and in helping set up the national F.F.A. organization and his subsequent work as the first executive secretary and as the treasurer of this organization earned for him a well-deserved reputation as one of the founders of the national F.F.A. This richly deserved reputation and the valuable work he did on the state level have caused many writers out of the state to give Groseclose credit for originating the idea of the older F.F.V. as well as originating the plan of organization. As far as the F.F.A. in Virginia is concerned, Newman originated the idea of a state-wide organization and presented it to his fellow workers. Groseclose took the idea and organized a highly successful plan for making it work. So successful has been the idea and the plan that the words of Newman are as true today as they were two decades ago when he said, "Students in vocational agriculture in Virginia under the Future Farmer
idea are accomplishing much more than when instructors were working with each boy as a separate individual. 59

CHAPTER XII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PROVISIONS FOR SMITH-HUGHES VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

By the time of the passage of the federal Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 the sentiment in Virginia was highly favorable to agricultural instruction in the secondary schools. At the same time the organization for administering and supervising such a program which had been developing in the state for nearly a decade was quite inadequate to meet the demands of the administrative and supervisory requirements of the Smith-Hughes Act as passed by Congress. It was necessary, therefore, that Virginia, in order to participate in the benefits of the federal appropriation under the act, should set up administrative and supervisory machinery which would meet the federal requirements and at the same time serve Virginia conditions. In this chapter it is planned to trace the story of the development of the administrative and supervisory provisions made to carry out the program of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the state. No attempt will be made to present an analysis of the techniques developed within these two areas except where such a presentation may be necessary to portray the administrative or supervisory provisions in a clearer light. It is very difficult to make any sharp distinction
between the manner in which the administrative and the supervisory provisions developed in the state. Rather than attempt to make any such distinction the administrative and the supervisory provisions will be treated simultaneously whenever it appears that such treatment will simplify relating the story of the development of these provisions. These developments for vocational agriculture in the state will be traced under the following headings: (1) establishment of an administrative and supervisory organization at the state level, (2) development of provisions for district supervision, (3) reorganizations of the State Department of Education affecting vocational agriculture, (4) provisions for local administration and supervision of agricultural education, (5) changes in administrative and supervisory personnel.

It was indicated in the introduction that the program of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture would be treated more intensively than any other of the attempts to teach agriculture in Virginia. So far in this study the procedure has been to present broad developments rather than details. As the presentation goes further into the developments of the Smith-Hughes program, it will be necessary from time to time to present somewhat specific details. In the next two chapters, therefore, there will be found numerous instances in contrast to the foregoing chapters, where considerable detail from the story of agricultural education will be related.
Establishment of an Administrative and Supervisory Organization at the State Level

On March 28, 1917, the Governor of Virginia by proclamation accepted the provisions of the federal Smith-Hughes Act and designated the State Board of Education as the agency to co-operate with the Federal Board for Vocational Education. The legislature was not in session at the time hence could not appropriate any money with which to match the federal funds. This situation was solved however, when the State Board of Education converted the existing congressional district high schools into schools with departments of vocational agriculture. Since money was at hand to operate the congressional district schools, this move on the part of the board enabled the state to start a limited number of Smith-Hughes vocational agricultural schools upon the opening of the session of 1917-1918.

In February, 1918, the legislature passed a bill accepting the provisions of the federal Smith-Hughes Act and at the same time appropriated $48,155 with which to match the federal funds. This act of 1918 became the legal basis for Virginia's participation in the benefits of the Smith-Hughes Act as well as the legal basis for the administrative and supervisory program which has developed in the state since that time. The

essential features of this act have been presented in Chapter IX, hence need not be repeated here in any detail. In so far as administration and supervision of vocational agriculture were concerned, the act\textsuperscript{2} may be summarized as follows: The State Board of Education was designated as the State Board for Vocational Education and was authorized and directed to co-operate with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the administration and enforcement of the provisions of the federal Smith-Hughes Act. The State Board for Vocational Education was given authority to prepare, adopt, and submit a state plan for vocational education (which of course would include a plan for agricultural education) to the Federal Board for Vocational Education for its approval.

The State Board for Vocational Education was given power to represent the state in all matters in reference to the distribution and disbursement of Smith-Hughes funds received from the federal government and to appropriate and use this money in any way that in its discretion would best serve the interests of the state and at the same time comply with the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act. The state treasurer was appointed as custodian of the Smith-Hughes money.

The State Board for Vocational Education was given full authority to select, employ, and discharge all administrative

\textsuperscript{2}Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1918, Chapter 73, pp. 131-133. See Appendix F for a copy of the act.
and supervisory state personnel.

By this action of the legislature the administration and supervision of vocational agriculture were placed squarely in the hands of the State Board of Education. As mentioned, this action proved to be quite wise in that it facilitated the co-ordination of the agricultural instruction program with the more strictly academic program in the secondary schools of the state. In Virginia at the time of the inauguration of the program of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture the public school system, to which vocational agriculture was to be added, was administered through centralized state agencies which included the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Department of Education.

The State Board of Education was composed of eight members as follows: the Governor; the Attorney General; the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; two division superintendents of schools - one from a city system and one from a county system; and three members elected by the Senate from a list consisting of one person from each of the faculties of the University of Virginia, the Virginia Military Institute, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the State Female Normal School at Farmville, the School for the Deaf and the Blind, and the College of William and Mary.\(^3\)

The Superintendent of Public Instruction was by law ex officio president of this board and was elected by popular vote.

The State Department of Education, excluding the State Board of Education, consisted of professionally trained personnel, selected and organized on a functional basis in harmony with the educational program being promoted in the state. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction was the senior official of the State Department of Education. Essentially this line of authority from the State Board to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the State Department of Education has prevailed until the present time, although as the program of public education in the state has expanded it has been necessary from time to time for the State Superintendent to reorganize and regroup the personnel of the State Department and to establish definite channels through which his administrative and supervisory authority could flow to this department. In the remaining portion of this study only the reorganizations which directly affected the administrative and the supervisory provisions for agricultural education will be noted.

Shortly after the Governor had accepted the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act, the State Board of Education in meeting appointed B. E. Copenhaver and J. A. C. Chandler as a committee to draw up a plan for the use of the federal

\[4\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 248.\]
money to come to Virginia. Parenthetically, it is interesting to note that the State Board of Education, although officially designated as the State Board for Vocational Education, made no attempt to set as a separate board when considering matters relating to Smith-Hughes vocational education. All the minutes concerning Smith-Hughes work are mixed in with the minutes pertaining to non-vocational work.

Pending a more nearly complete development of the plan for vocational agricultural education, E. E. Worrel, State Supervisor of Rural Education, was assigned the duties of State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. Apparently it was never intended that he serve other than on a temporary basis in this capacity. The first detailed state plan for vocational education was completed by the Virginia State Board and approved by the Federal Board for Vocational Education by September, 1917. Since this plan as it related to agriculture has been given in full in Chapter IX, it will not be reproduced here. On the basis of proposals contemplated in this state plan, Thomas D. Eason was on February 1, 1918, added to the staff of the State Department of Education as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. On March 19, 1918, Harris Hart, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, was made the executive officer of the State Board.


6"Minutes of the Meeting of the Virginia State Board of Education, February 1, 1918," p. 45.
for Vocational Education in Virginia. Thomas D. Eason, although officially designated as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, was by virtue of the state plan assigned both administrative and supervisory duties in agricultural education. Eason's appointment rounded out the organization at the state level of the administrative machinery which, for vocational agriculture was to prevail for the next several years. With the designation of Harris Hart as executive officer of the State Board for Vocational Education, the line of administrative authority which flowed from the State Board for Vocational Education (which was in reality the State Board of Education) to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education was clearly established.

In order to promote the program of vocational education and at the same time insure harmonious co-operation with the county and city boards of education in the state, the State Board of Education deemed it necessary to make a careful explanation of the state plan for vocational education. Accordingly a bulletin setting forth in some detail the state plan was prepared and issued in July, 1918. This plan which

7Ibid., March 19, 1918. p. 70.
8Ibid., September 18, 1917, pp. 435-436.
has been presented in some detail in Chapter IX clearly extended the line of administrative authority and responsibility to the local county school board by the following statement: "The county or city school board is the local authority with which the State Board will deal, and the officers of such boards are the responsible agents for the proper local administration of the funds for vocational education." The teachers of vocational agriculture were made responsible to the county school boards in the same manner as any of the academic teachers and were to be appointed in the same manner by the local boards, provided the teachers met certain requirements set up by the State Board of Education. The teachers of agriculture were to be paid by the local board which would in turn be reimbursed by the State Board of Education on a quarterly basis.

By the fall of 1918-1919, then, in time for the opening of the school session, the following administrative and supervisory provisions, which in turn became the framework around which the present administrative and supervisory program developed, had been established to take care of the program of education in vocational agriculture: the State Board of Education had been designated as the State Board for Vocational Education and within the framework of

10Ibid., p. 3.

11Ibid., pp. 6-7.
the federal act had been given full authority for the program. This board exercised its authority through the State Superintendent of Public Instruction who had been designated as the executive officer of the State Board for Vocational Education. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in turn worked through the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education who in turn worked directly with the county school boards. The county school boards were in turn responsible for the local administration and supervision of the program. This local board in turn worked through the local school principal or the teacher of vocational agriculture, both of whom were considered to have the same professional status with the local board as the principal or the teacher in any school not offering vocational work.

Interestingly enough many of the essential features of this administrative pattern have remained intact to this day, although, as the program of agricultural education developed, the state supervisor of this program found it necessary to increase his staff from time to time and to delegate much of his supervisory and some of his administrative powers to the members of this increased staff. These administrative and supervisory changes will be mentioned in more detail throughout the remainder of this chapter.

With the establishment of the teacher-training staff at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Eason began to delegate
some supervisory work to this group of workers.\textsuperscript{12} This move was the beginning of a well-knit, co-operative program which has continued to this day between the state supervisory office and the teacher-training staff. In 1922 Eason resigned as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education to accept the position of secretary to the State Board of Education.\textsuperscript{13} He was succeeded by D. S. Lancaster,\textsuperscript{14} head of the teacher-training work at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Lancaster while serving as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education also continued as head of the teacher-training department at the college. In this dual capacity he further strengthened the foundation already laid by Eason for the development of the closely knit, well-co-ordinated teacher-education and state-supervisory program which has since developed between these two services in the state.\textsuperscript{15}

With Lancaster's assumption of the dual office of State Supervisor of Agricultural Education and head teacher-trainer, the initial period of establishing administrative and

\textsuperscript{12}``Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session of 1920-1921,'' pp. 4, 19, 21.

\textsuperscript{13}H. W. Sanders, ''History of Agricultural Education in the United States - Virginia,'' p. 15.

\textsuperscript{14}See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of D. S. Lancaster.

\textsuperscript{15}``Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session 1923-1924,'' p. 5; E. C. Magill, ''Lest the New Men May Not Know,'' Virginia Agricultural Instructor Anniversary Number (October, 1929), p. 1.
supervisory provisions for agricultural education may be said to have been completed. From this time onward the problem of securing adequate administrative and supervisory provisions was shared jointly by the state supervisory office and the teacher-training department with the state supervisory office, of course, assuming the lead and the final responsibility for decisions.

The Development of Provisions for District Supervision

By 1924 the number of schools with departments of vocational agriculture had grown to such an extent that this increase taken in conjunction with the efforts to strengthen the total program necessitated additional help for the state supervisor. A plan was accordingly made to appoint two men to assist the state supervisor in his work with the departments of agriculture in the high schools. Two sections of the state were selected and organized as districts and an experienced teacher of vocational agriculture placed in each one to supervise the program of vocational agriculture in the area. Since the area in which the supervisor worked was known as a district, the supervisor came to be known as the district supervisor of agricultural education. In the words of M. M. Lewis:

---

The district supervisor of vocational agriculture in the State of Virginia is a trained man, who is employed by the State Department of Education to supervise the work of the agriculture teacher within a designated area. This area is referred to as a district which derives its name from its location within the state. The district supervisor is responsible to the state supervisor who coordinates all efforts in helping to guide the program of vocational agriculture.17

The two men appointed to this new work, H. W. Sanders in the Northern Virginia District and T. V. Downing in the Eastern Virginia District, were so successful with their supervisory program that district supervision became a permanent part of the state supervisory program.18

With the establishment of the itinerant teacher-training work at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute as a part of the in-service training program for teachers of agriculture, some supervision was extended to the schools not located in the northern and eastern districts. It was soon felt, however, that the supervision the itinerant teacher-trainer could give these schools was inadequate to meet their needs; hence it was not long before agitation was begun for more district supervisors. In an effort to secure adequate data on which

17M. M. Lewis, "An Analysis of the Responsibilities of the District Supervisor in the Field of Vocational Education in Agriculture, 1946-47," p. 1. Unpublished Master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1947. In 1949, as will be explained later, the term district supervisor was changed to that of area supervisor.

to base a decision as to whether or not supervision should be extended. H. C. Groseclose, the itinerant teacher-trainer, made a study of the effectiveness of district supervision in the two areas of the state where it had been provided. In terms of improved agricultural practices on the part of the boys and in terms of the teachers' attitudes toward the value of supervision in the areas provided with supervision, the results were highly favorable for an extension of such a service. Since the need for supervision seemed to be particularly acute in the southwestern area of the state, J. O. Hoge, a successful teacher of vocational agriculture, was on July 1, 1928, made district supervisor for vocational agriculture in this area.

The establishment of district supervision in Southwest Virginia made it possible for H. C. Groseclose, the itinerant teacher-trainer at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, to rearrange his program and devote more time to the middle part of

---

19 H. C. Groseclose, "Some Results of District Supervision in Virginia," Department of Agricultural Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mimeograph No. 10, (February, 1928).


21 Ibid., p. 5.
the state where no permanent local supervision had been established. Before the supervisory program was well established in this section, however, Groseclose was transferred to the position of acting Supervisor of Secondary Education for the state, thus leaving Middle Virginia, or Southside Virginia as it was frequently called, once more without supervision. Since the need was so great for such assistance, W. S. Green was appointed on January 1, 1929, as acting supervisor for Middle Virginia until Groseclose would return to his work as itinerant teacher-trainer. Before Groseclose returned to his teacher-trainer work on July 1, 1929, however, an arrangement had been made whereby he would give one-half time to his teacher-training duties and one-half time to the promotion of the national F.F.A. This arrangement, of course, meant that he would once more be limited in his ability to supervise the Middle Virginia area.

When this situation became known, the State Board of Education appointed W. S. Green as permanent district supervisor for Middle Virginia. Green served only a short time until he

22 Ibid., p. 18.
24 Ibid., p. 4.
26 Loc. cit.
was given a leave to work with the Federal Farm Board. F. B. Cale was appointed as acting supervisor in Green's place. 27 When Green decided not to return to the supervisory work, Cale was appointed as permanent district supervisor in his place. Cale's subsequent outstandingly successful work and long tenure as district supervisor of vocational agriculture in Middle Virginia tended to cause many to overlook the fact that he succeeded Green. Thus Lewis in his study of district supervision in Virginia completely overlooked the fact that Green, not Cale, was the first district supervisor of the Middle Virginia District. 28

These four divisions; namely, the Northern, the Eastern, the Southwestern, and the Middle continued to be the units for district supervision until 1942 when the Central District was formed and J. C. Green, a successful teacher of vocational agriculture, was made district supervisor. 29 These five districts continue as the field supervisory areas for the program of education in vocational agriculture as carried on in the public high schools of the state at the present time.

---

27 Minutes of the Thirteenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, June 30 - July 3, 1930, p. 3. See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of F. B. Cale.

28 Lewis, op. cit., p. 2.

Reorganizations of the State Department of Education Affecting Vocational Agriculture

As pointed out, the basic line of administrative authority for vocational agriculture set up in 1918 continues to this day. There have been at the same time certain changes within the original organization which have been significant for agricultural education. In September, 1925, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was made Director of Vocational Education for the state. This action helped relieve the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education of many previously assumed administrative duties and enabled him to devote more time and attention to the supervision and improvement of the program of agricultural education. The supervision resulting from this change was successful enough within the next few years to draw favorable comment from the Educational Commission of Virginia in the Commission's report on the public educational system of the state. 31

In 1931 Sidney B. Hall, who had succeeded Harris Hart as Superintendent of Public Instruction, reorganized the State Department of Education by a more functional grouping


of the several divisions. Of particular interest for this study was the fact that he created a Division of Vocational Education with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as director. This move brought all the vocational services and agencies in the department into one division. No new line of administrative or supervisory authority was created, but the move did help to secure a better coordination of vocational agriculture with the other vocational areas and had the effect of bringing state level personnel in agricultural education into even closer contact with the personnel in other educational areas.

On September 1, 1941, D. S. Lancaster, former teacher-trainer and State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, succeeded Sidney B. Hall as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Lancaster established the position of Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and on March 1, 1942, appointed W. S. Newman, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, to the office. The chief effect of this appointment was a shuffling of personnel rather than the establishment of any new supervisory or administrative provisions.

\[32^{\text{Virginia, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1930-1931, p. 14.}}\]

\[33^{\text{Virginia, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1941-1942, p. 8.}}\]
D. J. Howard was moved up from the dual post of Assistant Supervisor of Agricultural Education and district supervisor for Northern Virginia to the position of State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, while W. R. Legge was appointed to succeed Howard as district supervisor.

D. S. Lancaster was succeeded as Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1946 by G. T. Miller who set up a rather elaborate reorganization of the State Department of Education. Among other changes provision was made for the appointment of a director of the Division of Vocational Education. This director was brought directly under the supervision of the First Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This reorganization, although leaving the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in charge of agricultural education, had the effect of inserting two additional offices, that of the First Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction and that of the Director of the Division Vocational Education, into the line of administrative authority between the State Superintendent of Public

---

34 See Appendix L for a brief biographical sketch of D. J. Howard.

35 Loc. cit.


Instruction and the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. At the same time the reorganization made it possible for the Director of the Division of Vocational Education to devote full time rather than part time as heretofore to the interests of vocational education in the state.

On September 1, 1949, Miller was succeeded as Superintendent of Public Instruction by D. J. Howard who, at the time, held the office of First Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction. To date (1952) no public announcement has been made of any reorganization of the State Department of Education which would have any effect on the administration or supervision of vocational agriculture in the state. It is true that there have been some changes of personnel and a slight rearrangement of responsibilities within the supervisory staff of the agricultural education service, but these changes will be noted in some detail later in this chapter.

Provision for the Local Administration and Supervision of Agricultural Education

Group conferences in different sections of the state had been used from the very beginning of the Smith-Hughes

---

Ibid., p. 19. A chart showing the complete reorganization effected in the State Department of Education at this time is found opposite page 19 in the Superintendent's annual report for 1948-1949.
program in agricultural education as a means of supervising
and improving the instructional program. In 1924 steps were
taken at the annual conference of teachers of vocational
agriculture meeting in Blacksburg, July 22-26, to set up
these conferences on a state-wide basis. The entire state
was divided into districts and a chairman elected for each
division. During the fall a conference was called by the
chairman in each district. In the words of the state
supervisor:

An average of eight instructors attended these
conferences. The supervisor, the itinerant
teacher-trainer, or one or more district
supervisors were present at each conference.
The conferences were held from Thursday
evening until Saturday afternoon in each
case. No program was prepared in advance.
Vital problems were proposed by the members
of the groups and these problems were
analyzed and solutions reached through the
pooling of experiences and roundtable dis-
cussions. Two additional group conferences
were held in June in Eastern Virginia for
the purpose of planning programs for the
coming year.39

This type of local co-operative supervision for the
purpose of improving instruction in agriculture became very
popular in the state;40 but as the program of agricultural

39"Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural

40A summary of the Solutions of Problems of Vocational
Agricultural Instructors as Developed at the District
Conferences in Virginia in 1924 and 1925. Department of Agri-
cultural Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute,
education expanded, the district type of conference grew to be large and expensive. The idea, however, was worked over into a smaller type of group conference which in turn proved to be popular.\footnote{41} This co-operative supervisory type of conference between the supervisory staff and the teachers continues to be a dominant feature of the provisions for supervision of agricultural education in the state to this day.

As the program of agricultural education became better established, the teaching staff out in the field began to fill up with experienced teachers of unusual ability. An interesting scheme was hit upon whereby much of this valuable talent could be used in local supervision. This scheme was described as follows:

It is contemplated that in counties where there are three or more teachers of vocational agriculture, one of these individuals may be designated as local supervisor and a part of his time will be devoted to assisting the other teachers in strengthening their programs and increasing the efficiency of their activities.

(a) The qualifications of such a local supervisor shall be the same as other supervisors with the exception that he need not hold a master's degree.

(b) The duties of a local Supervisor shall be that of a helping teacher to the other teachers of vocational agriculture in his area.\footnote{42}

\footnote{41} H. W. Sanders, "Virginia Holds a New Type Group Conference," \textit{Agricultural Education}, IV (April, 1932), p. 164.

This plan was never popular with the local teachers and although included in the present state plan has never been tried very extensively in the state.

It has been pointed out that the original state plan for vocational agriculture left local administration and supervision largely in the hands of the local school board which in turn tended to delegate the actual administration and supervision of the program in the local school to the principal or to the local teacher. Although the line of local administrative authority was clearly implied to be the same for the teacher of agriculture as for any other teachers in the regular instructional program, the failure in the first state plan to state in specific terms the responsibility of the teacher of agriculture to the principal and the other supervisory and administrative personnel caused some local difficulty in administering and supervising the program of vocational agriculture. In many cases, no doubt, this difficulty of local administration and supervision was aggravated by the very conditions under which the teachers of agriculture worked. Many school boards over the state in an attempt to meet the requirements for a suitable room and equipment for agricultural instruction erected separate buildings near the regular high school buildings. This separation of the agricultural building from the rest of the plant, in conjunction with the practical nature of the instruction as contrasted with the typical academic instruction,
tended to make of agriculture "a thing apart" from the total school program. No doubt this feeling of being "apart" was intensified in the thinking of the teachers of agriculture themselves, since most of them for years got their practice-teaching at the Blacksburg High School center which taught its classes in agriculture in a building completely separate from the rest of the plant. Under these circumstances the student trainees seldom had any real life contact with the total educational program of the high school. As a result of this feeling of being a separate part of the educational program, considerable difficulty was encountered in numerous instances in establishing harmonious administrative and supervisory relationships between the high school principal and the teacher of agriculture. The teacher-training department at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the state supervisory staff early recognized this difficulty and prepared numerous memoranda explaining the relationships which should exist between the instructor of agriculture and the high school principal. As a further measure it may be

43 The writer worked in the Blacksburg High School as a supervisor of science teaching for five years. During this entire time he never saw an agricultural trainee participate in any school activity not directly connected with agricultural instruction. Happily this condition no longer exists as will be shown in the next chapter.

44 Memoranda filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
added parenthetically that the faculty of the Department of vocational Education concerned with the training of teachers of agriculture has put so much stress on better administrative relationships between the teachers of agriculture and the high school principals that it is quite likely that where misunderstanding develops today it is caused by the principal's lack of understanding of the nature of agricultural education rather than the lack of understanding of administrative processes on the part of the teacher of agriculture.

Perhaps the greatest local-level difficulty involved in administering vocational agriculture grew from the state requirement that classroom agricultural instruction be offered in five eighty-minute periods with two eighty-minute periods additional per week for shop work. This requirement was set up by the state as the most suitable state-wide basis for meeting the federal Smith-Hughes requirement in time per week, although it should be understood that the federal requirement only stipulated the total amount of time per week. It did not, as frequently believed today, designate any particular combination of time per day to be allotted to instruction in agriculture. In order to meet this time combination set up

---


by the state, most schools offering instruction in vocational agriculture organized on the forty-minute period. Manuals of administration for the high schools were modified, and sample schedules showing possible combinations of classes for different size schools offering vocational agriculture were prepared. In spite of this assistance the double period feature with the added period for shop increased the difficulties encountered in setting up satisfactory class schedules which would do more than allow the students to get the minimum required subjects. In many instances this requirement made it extremely difficult to schedule even the minimum courses in such a way that all pupils could enroll in them. Many high school principals began to object openly to vocational agriculture on the grounds that the difficulties growing from the time allotment interfered with what they often referred to as the more important academic subjects. By 1927 the difficulties encountered in scheduling vocational agriculture had become so acute that the State Board of Education decided to inaugurate the forty-five minute period in all schools with departments of vocational agriculture.  

48 Memoranda filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. See especially memorandum for E. C. Magill to Thomas D. Eason apropos this complaint.  
D. S. Lancaster of the State Department of Education appeared on the program of the annual conference of teachers of agriculture held in July, 1927, and discussed the topic "Reorganization of High School Courses and Schedules in Their Relationships to the Vocational Agriculture Program." In this discussion he stressed the need for better co-ordination of instruction in agriculture with the total school program. At the same time sample schedules showing different combinations of offerings for different size schools were distributed and explained to the teachers who in turn were urged to cooperate with the school principals in helping set up the daily class schedule for the school.  

By this change to the forty-five minute period the extra shop period could be eliminated and thus greatly simplify the process of scheduling. The State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in commenting on the change optimistically reported that "it is anticipated that this reorganization of the high school schedule will result in increased efficiency in vocational work, and it will certainly win us many backers among school officials who have so much difficulty in scheduling vocational work."  

50 Minutes of the Tenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, July 18-23, 1927, p. 1.

in his prediction, but hardly had the change been inaugurated when sentiment favoring the sixty-minute period began to assume unusual strength and soon led to another scheduling difficulty. The Manual of Administration for High Schools of Virginia, issued in 1928, had the following regulation concerning the length of the class period:

> The length of the class period shall be sixty minutes in all schools except those having four full years of vocational work under the Smith-Hughes regulations. In these schools the forty-five minute period is permissible, provided permission is obtained from the Supervisor of Education.  

This permissive rather than mandatory provision left the door open for further experimentation in an effort to find a suitable arrangement for administering the schedule containing vocational agriculture. By 1930, according to R. C. Bowton, most of the schools, in so far as the length of the class period was concerned, could be divided into two classes:

"Schools that were operating as Smith-Hughes schools and those which did not have Smith-Hughes help.  

Of the Smith-Hughes schools included in Bowton's study none was using the hour period for agriculture, but all were attempting to use the double forty-five minute period. By 1931, however, the

---


picture was becoming more confused. According to D. J. Howard, reporting at the annual conference of teachers of agriculture, the following conditions prevailed among the schools of the state offering vocational agriculture:

Eighty-three schools were organized on the forty-five minute period basis.

Nineteen schools were organized on the sixty-minute period basis.

Nineteen schools were attempting both the sixty and the forty-five minute period.

Two schools were trying the fifty-minute period.

As to the actual time allowed agricultural instruction in these same schools the picture was even more confused.

One school allowed one hundred twenty minutes per day.

One school allowed one hundred ninety minutes per day for first and second year groups and one hundred minutes per day for advanced classes.

Two schools allowed seventy-five minutes per day.

One hundred eighteen schools allowed ninety minutes per day.54

The swing toward the longer class period continued to

54D. J. Howard, "Facts Concerning Vocational Agriculture," Minutes of the Fourteenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Agriculture in Virginia, June 29 - July 2, 1931, pp. 9-10.
gain in popularity, and numerous combinations of time allotments for classes in agriculture continued to be made. This trend toward trying out various time schedules for agriculture was greatly accelerated in Virginia as a result of the various experimental administrative plans advanced for scheduling the core curriculum program which was being developed in the state after 1932. The traditional schedule which divided the day into periods of set length was modified in such a way that principals and teachers working together could set up almost any conceivable schedule they desired if they could demonstrate to representatives of the State Department of Education that such a schedule was adapted to the needs of the community and the facilities of the school. Even more encouragement to find the best combination of time allotment for agriculture was given by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction who, in addressing the teachers of vocational agriculture, gently chided them for not more successfully blending their program with the rest of the school program. At the same time he urged that less concern be given to time allotment, which he held was not important, and more attention be given to mastery of the subject, which he held was important. In the future, he stressed, agriculture must blend in better with the total program. The response to this none-too-subtle challenge was as interesting as it was typical of the corps.

55Sidney B. Hall, "The Place of Vocational Agriculture in the New Deal," Minutes of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia, June 26-29, 1933, p. 6.
of teachers of agriculture in the state. Since the longer period seemed to be the thing wanted, experiments and observations were set up at once to determine effective practices and procedures for the classes in agriculture in schools using these new combinations. The net result of all this experimenting and consideration of possible time combinations for scheduling classes in agriculture was the development of an unusually flexible administrative plan for daily and weekly schedules arranged according to one of the following plans which in turn depended upon the length of period used for the academic classes:

(1) Five periods of 90 minutes (two consecutive 45-minute periods daily) each week for four years.

(2) Five periods per week of 60 minutes each for the first and second years, and five periods per week of 120 minutes each for the third and fourth years. (This order may be reversed if necessary and desirable, and 120 minutes of instruction per day may be given to the first and second year boys and 60 minutes to third and fourth year boys).

(3) Seven periods per week of 60 minutes each for four consecutive years. None of these periods need necessarily be consecutive, though two consecutive 60-minute periods each week would obviously be desirable.

(4) Two periods of 55 minutes and three periods of 110 minutes each week for the first and second years. Three periods of 55 minutes

---

56 See especially "The 60 - 120 Minute Period" by W.R. Crabill in Minutes of the Seventeenth Annual Conference of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia, July 2-7, 1934, and other reports included in the minutes of the conferences for 1935 and 1936.
and two periods of 110 minutes each week during the third and fourth years.\textsuperscript{57}

With such a plan as the foregoing a school could schedule vocational agriculture whether it preferred to operate on the forty-five, fifty-five, or sixty-minute class period.

By 1947 the provisions for scheduling classes had undergone yet more changes. This time the provisions, though flexible enough, were at the same time more specific and directive as the following excerpt will show:

The length of the course should be four years of vocational agriculture in high school providing for not less than thirty clock hours of agricultural instruction during each school month, including farm mechanics.

[The] length of daily sessions in minutes may be sixty to one hundred twenty as shown in Plan below.

... Weekly class schedule for vocational agriculture may be arranged according to one of the following:

(a) Two consecutive 60-minute periods of instruction two days per week and one 60-minute period three days per week for each class.

(b) Two consecutive 60-minute periods of instruction five days per week for two years and one 60-minute period of instruction five days per week for the other two years.

(c) Two consecutive 45-minute periods five days per week for each class.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{57}"Virginia Plan for Vocational Agricultural Education, July 1, 1937 to June 30, 1942," Mimeographed, prepared under the direction of the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, 1937.

This plan which is still in operation represents the culmination of nearly three decades of evolutionary development of efforts to schedule vocational agriculture in such a way as to meet the total time requirements set up in the federal act and at the same time keep pace with the changing high school program of the state. The plan as it now stands permits any standard high school of the state to fit vocational agriculture into its schedule if it wants to do so.

Changes in Administrative and Supervisory Personnel

Throughout this entire discussion of the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture, mention has been made from time to time of the changes in the personnel charged with carrying out the program. It seems fitting to include in this discussion of provisions for administering and supervising the program of vocational agriculture a record of the changes involved in the personnel charged with administering and supervising the program.

At the time of the Governor's proclamation accepting the provisions of the federal Smith-Hughes Act and designating the State Board of Education as the agency to co-operate with the federal board, A.M. Stearnes was State Superintendent of Public Instruction. By the time the legislature met in 1918 and passed the act accepting the provisions of the federal act, Stearnes had been succeeded as superintendent by Harris
Hart.  The fact that Stearnes was Superintendent of Public Instruction when the first Smith-Hughes vocational agricultural schools opened is almost completely overlooked today in favor of Harris Hart who assumed the state superintendency on February 1, 1918, and, as executive officer of the Board for Vocational Education and as State Director of Vocational Education, successfully directed the program of education in vocational agriculture for more than a decade of its earliest existence in the state. E. E. Worrel, as pointed out, served as acting State Supervisor of Agricultural Education until Thomas D. Eason was appointed State Supervisor of Agricultural Education on February 1, 1918. Eason remained as state supervisor until 1922 when he resigned to become secretary to the State Board of Education. He was succeeded by Dabney S. Lancaster who at the time was serving as head of the recently established teacher-training department at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Lancaster served as state supervisor until August 1, 1925, when he too resigned to

---

60 "Minutes of the Meeting of the Virginia State Board of Education, February 1, 1918," p. 45.
become the secretary of the State Board of Education to succeed Eason who had been appointed to another position in the State Department of Education. It is interesting to note that this move placed two men, both former State Supervisors of Agricultural Education, in positions of importance in the non-vocational area of the official state educational family. This move also touched off a series of personnel changes which proved to be very significant for the future development of vocational agriculture. Walter S. Newman of the teacher-training staff at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute was appointed to succeed Lancaster as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, while Edmund C. Magill was transferred from itinerant teacher-trainer to the headship of the teacher-training work at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Henry C. Groseclose was made itinerant teacher-trainer, and H. W. Sanders was transferred from the position of district supervisor for Northern Virginia to the college to fill the place left vacant by Groseclose. D. J. Howard, the teacher of agriculture at the Blacksburg High School teacher-training center, was transferred to Northern Virginia to become district supervisor to succeed H. W. Sanders.

---


64 Loc. cit.
It is worth noting that in all these changes of personnel, the policy of promoting men already in the program was followed. This policy whether intentional or not has since been followed rather consistently in all changes of personnel, whether the changes have been in the administrative, in the teacher-training, or in the supervisory areas.

In 1931 Harris Hart was succeeded as State Superintendent of Public Instruction by Sidney B. Hall who, as already indicated, created a Division of Vocational Education with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as director. Hall in turn was succeeded on September 1, 1941, by Dabney S. Lancaster as Superintendent of Public Instruction. This change, of course, brought a former head of the teacher-training department and a former State Supervisor of Agricultural Education to the head of the state's public school system.

Lancaster appointed W. S. Newman to the newly created position of Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction, thereby vacating the position of State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. D. J. Howard was thereupon appointed to this latter position on March 1, 1942. At the same time he continued to serve as district supervisor for Northern Virginia.

---


until July 1, 1942, when W. R. Legge was appointed to succeed
him.67

On June 15, 1946, D. S. Lancaster resigned as Superintendent of Public Instruction68 to accept the presidency
of Farmville State Teachers College (now Longwood College). In the meantime W. S. Newman had resigned69 as Assistant
State Superintendent of Public Instruction to accept the vice-
presidency of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Lancaster
was succeeded by G. T. Miller who served as State Superintendent
of Public Instruction until August 31, 1949, when he resigned70
to accept the presidency of Madison College. While in office
as state superintendent, Miller reorganized the State Depart-
ment of Education. Among other changes he appointed a full-
time Director of the Division of Vocational Education, thus
removing the directorship of this division from the person
of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. At the same
time he placed the Director of the Division of Vocational
Education under the Assistant Superintendent of Public

67 Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Edu-
cation in Virginia for the Session 1941-1942, p. 17; Same
for session 1942-43, p. 18.

68 Virginia, Annual Report of the Superintendent of
Public Instruction, 1945-1946, p. 10.

69 Loc. cit.

70 Virginia, Annual Report of the Superintendent of
In the summer of 1924 T. V. Downing and H. W. Sanders, both successful teachers of agriculture in the state, were appointed as the first district supervisors of agriculture in the state. Sanders was to serve the northern part of the state, while Downing was to serve the eastern part. On July 1, 1928, J. O. Hoge was appointed to serve as district supervisor for Southwestern Virginia, and W. S. Green was appointed on January 1, 1929, to serve as district supervisor for Middle Virginia. Green was succeeded in 1930 by F. B. Cale who served this area in this capacity from this date until he was

71See page 481.


73Loc. cit.
appointed as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education.\textsuperscript{74} In 1942 a new supervisory district known as Central Virginia was formed, and J. C. Green was appointed on August 15 as district supervisor to serve this area.\textsuperscript{75} On August 1, 1946, T. V. Downing in the Eastern Virginia District was granted a leave of absence. W. R. Emmons was appointed as acting district supervisor in his place. When Downing returned to duty the next year, Emmons was retained on the supervisory staff as a district supervisor, and Downing was made assistant supervisor in charge of the program in forestry education being conducted by the teachers of vocational agriculture.\textsuperscript{76}

Before proceeding to record the changes in personnel of the administrative and supervisory staff for agricultural education beyond the year 1945, it should be pointed out that many of these changes, especially the addition of new men, between the years 1945 and 1951 were the result of the tremendously expanded agricultural education services, especially the institutional on-farm training program set up primarily for World War II veterans. This latter program was so administered in Virginia as to make it an integral part of

\textsuperscript{74}See page 476 for a more complete discussion of these changes.

\textsuperscript{75}Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Virginia for the Session 1942-1943, p. 18.

the total program of agricultural education conducted by the
departments of agriculture in the high schools of the state. 77
As a result of the necessity for supervising the institutional
on-farm training program the practice of designating special
areas of responsibility to the supervisors began to grow.
The extent to which this tendency to employ men to supervise
special areas of the total vocational education program will
grow remains to be seen, but the seed for the development of
such specialized supervision has been sown, at least.

The first special program supervisor added to the staff
was T. J. Horn, who was appointed assistant supervisor in charge
of veterans' training in agriculture in 1946.78 This ap­
pointment was followed, as mentioned, by the designation of
T. V. Downing as assistant supervisor in charge of forestry.
Horn was granted a leave of absence in 1947 and was succeeded
by W. H. McCann who served a short time and then re-entered
the United States armed forces. 79

During the session of 1947-1948 it became necessary to
get a more definite supervisory organization set up to carry
on the expanded veterans' training program. While this
organization as set up did not directly affect the actual

77 Ibid., p. 10; Same for the Session 1949-1950, p. 10.

78 "Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Edu­

79 "Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Edu­
instruction in the secondary school program, it did affect the personnel program, hence will be described here as an essential part of the background necessary to understand the rapid increase in the supervisory staff at this time. In the words of the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education:

One assistant supervisor of agricultural education is responsible to the State Supervisor for developing the institutional on-farm training program on the State level. Assistant district supervisors have been added to the staff and are located in the offices of the district supervisors and are directly responsible to them in developing this program. . . .

In 1947-1948 under this plan of supervision W. R. Crabill and B. C. Bass were added to the staff as supervisors of institutional on-farm training programs, while H. M. Davis and J. M. Campbell were added to the staff as assistant district supervisors for institutional on-farm training programs. At the same time J. A. Hardy was added to the staff as district supervisor.

During the session of 1948-1949 certain changes were made in the titles assigned the members of the supervisory staff. The old title of "district supervisor" was changed to that of "area supervisor," and the designation of "assistant district supervisor" was changed to "district supervisor."
This last step, while certainly moving in the direction of ultimate simplification, seemingly caused considerable confusion and uncertainty in the minds of many as to just how the supervisory staff was organized for work.83

During this same year of 1948-1949, J. O. Hoge was given a year's sick leave, and J. C. Love was appointed acting area supervisor in his place. B. C. Bass was transferred from the State supervisory staff to the teacher-training department at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, while J. M. Campbell was changed from district supervisor to assistant supervisor of the institutional on-farm training program. At the same time R. W. Sparks and O. L. Waddell were appointed district supervisors of the institutional on-farm training programs.84

Before the state-wide personnel in agricultural education had a chance to do much more than get started under the just-mentioned changes, G. T. Miller resigned as State Superintendent of Public Instruction on September 1, 1949, and was succeeded by D. J. Howard.85 Early in 1952 R. E. Reid was appointed First Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, and

83 The writer in the summer of 1950 polled approximately twenty-five teachers of agriculture, five high school principals, and one supervisor of secondary education in the state as to the state administrative and supervisory set-up for vocational agriculture. Not one of these people could give the correct organization.


R. N. Anderson resigned as Director of the Division of Vocational Education, to be succeeded by F. B. Cale, R. E. Bass was appointed as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, succeeding Cale; and K. W. Lindsay was appointed acting Assistant State Supervisor of Agricultural Education.

As a result of these promotions and changes the administrative and supervisory personnel below the State Board of Education, responsible for the program of vocational agriculture in the state, is at the time of this writing organized and made up as follows:

D. J. Howard, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
R. E. Reid, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction.
F. B. Cale, Director, Division of Vocational Education.
R. E. Bass, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. (T. V. Downing is serving in this capacity while Bass is on leave of absence.)
K. W. Lindsay, acting Assistant State Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
W. R. Crabill, Assistant Supervisor of Agricultural Education (in charge of veterans' training)
T. V. Downing, Assistant Supervisor of Agricultural Education (now acting State Supervisor)
W. C. Dudley, Area Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
W. R. Emmons, Area Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
J. C. Green, Area Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
J. A. Hardy, Area Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
J. O. Hoge, Area Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
W. R. Legge, Area Supervisor of Agricultural Education.
H. M. Davis, District Supervisor (Veterans' Training in Agriculture)
R. E. Sparks, District Supervisor (Veterans' Training in Agriculture)
O. L. Waddell, District Supervisor (Veterans' Training in Agriculture)

86 No official publication is available as this is written showing this administrative and supervisory organization. The writer is indebted to Professor T. J. Horn for assistance in preparing this list.
It is interesting indeed to study this administrative and supervisory organization in existence today for agricultural education and then to recall the long but fruitless struggle carried on by State Superintendent Stearnes (under whom vocational agriculture got its start in Virginia) to secure legislative permission to employ just one person to supervise the program of agricultural instruction in the old congressional district agricultural high schools. It would seem that on the basis of provision of administrative and supervisory personnel, at least, Virginia had definitely accepted vocational agriculture as a worthy undertaking for the state.  

In glancing over the provisions made in the state for the supervision and administration of vocational agriculture since 1917 and then in noting the present day administrative and supervisory organization and assignment of responsibilities, it certainly appears that Virginia's provisions for administration and supervision of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture have kept pace with the development of the program in the state.

---

87 It is quite likely that this administrative and supervisory staff will be reduced if and when the veterans' training program in agriculture is terminated.
CHAPTER XIII

SETTING UP PROVISIONS FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Since the federal Smith-Hughes Act required that all states accepting aid under the provisions of this act must provide an adequate teacher-training program for the areas in which aid was accepted, Virginia upon accepting the Smith-Hughes aid found it necessary to set about making provisions for the training of teachers of vocational agriculture. It is planned in this chapter to tell the story of the establishment of the provisions which Virginia set up for the training of personnel to teach vocational agriculture in the secondary schools of the state. No analysis or evaluation of the teacher-training provisions will be presented unless such an analysis or evaluation is necessary to explain the provisions established. This story of the establishment of provisions for teacher-training will be told under the following divisions: (1) the first state plan for training teachers of vocational agriculture, (2) the establishment of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, (3) the
curricula for the preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture, (4) the expansion of the practice-teaching facilities, (5) the in-service teacher-training program, and (6) the personnel having engaged in teacher-training in agriculture.

The First State Plan for Training Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

One of the first proposals advanced in Virginia for an agricultural school recognized the need of a specially trained person for such an undertaking. It was more than three-quarters of a century later, though, before Virginia made any serious effort to provide any specific training for the teaching of agriculture. With the revival of interest in education in general and with agricultural education in particular which took place during the first decade of the twentieth century, some agitation began to develop for the training of teachers in nature study and in agriculture for the elementary schools. With the establishment of the congressional district agricultural high schools, this agitation began to increase appreciably. By the time of the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 the state had

2See Chapter VIII.
the beginning of a weak program of teacher-training in agricultural education in operation. All four of the teacher-training normal schools in the state were offering some work in nature study and agriculture for the elementary school teachers, and the University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary were offering six weeks' summer courses preparing for the teaching of agriculture in the high school. This instruction was very ineffective in preparing teachers for teaching agriculture, but undoubtedly it played its part in paving the way for the acceptance of the teacher-training program for vocational agriculture when this program got under way.

When Virginia accepted the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act, not a single state-supported educational institution had facilities for offering a complete teacher-training program in agriculture. The University of Virginia and the College of William and Mary enrolled men and offered teacher-preparatory courses but did not offer technical agriculture. The state agricultural college (by this time referred to nearly always as the Virginia Polytechnic Institute) offered a full program of agricultural courses but no teacher-training work as such. To complicate the

---


situation further, these three institutions were operated by three separate boards of control and were located in widely separated sections of the state. In spite of these obvious handicaps the first plan advanced for a teacher-training program for vocational agriculture in Virginia proposed the use of all three of these institutions. This proposed plan, almost unknown and unheard of or else forgotten even by the older workers in vocational agriculture in Virginia today, is interesting both as an attempt to utilize in one co-operative plan three of the chief state educational institutions for men and as a reflection of the early Virginia concept of teacher-training necessary for vocational agriculture. Because of its unique features and historic interest the plan will be presented rather completely here as it is recorded in the minutes of the State Board of Education:

For the training of supervisors, directors and teachers (male) of agriculture the Board recommends a cooperative plan agreed upon by the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and William and Mary, the degree to be conferred by the institution last attended or jointly as may hereafter be agreed upon. This course shall cover four years of college work above high school graduation and in content consist of at least thirty hours of technical agriculture and thirty hours of academic and professional work, not less than one-tenth nor more than one-eighth of which shall be in pedagogy. The course of study agreed upon by the three institutions conforms
very closely with the four-year course of study for the preparation of teachers of agriculture worked out by C. H. Lane, Chief Specialist of Agricultural Education of the United States Department of Agriculture. In addition to the four-year course not less than one year nor more than two of practical experience on a farm, at least six months of which shall be continuous, shall be required for graduation.

It is proposed that thirty hours or one half of this course shall be given at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and thirty hours given both at the University of Virginia and William and Mary and that every student therefore will spend two years at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and two years either at the University of Virginia or the College of William and Mary.6

With the male teachers to be taken care of in the manner indicated by the foregoing plan, the board then turned to the matter of female teachers. Whether the board expected women to teach vocational agriculture or agriculture as one of the sciences is not entirely clear, but certainly the following provision in this plan would indicate that the board expected women to engage in teaching some kind of agriculture, vocational or otherwise. The plan for women was as follows:

It is also recommended that women be trained to teach agriculture and that the State Normal School Board be required to establish at one of the Normal Schools a course of study repre-

senting four years over and above high school graduation of equal rank and standard with the training given men. 7

This latter proposal that one of the normal schools be selected represents a slight change in attitude, for in the June preceding, the board had tentatively agreed to give $1,000 to each of the four normal schools to be used for the training of teachers of agriculture. 8

The State Board of Education approved the foregoing plan and submitted it to the Federal Board for Vocational Education. After some delay and several conferences with representatives from the state board the plan was rejected by the federal board as a suitable one chiefly on the grounds that such a three-way teacher-training program would be impractical, hard to supervise, and of doubtful value in providing the thorough training needed to teach agriculture. A committee was appointed from the State Board for Vocational Education to appear before the federal board and urge the approval of the plan, but the federal board refused approval. 9

Following the action of the federal board in rejecting the foregoing proposal the State Board for Vocational Education on September 17, 1918, approved the Virginia Polytechnic Institute as the only training center for white teachers of

7loc. cit.

8Ibid., June 26, 1917, p. 424.

9Ibid., September 17, 1918, p. 187.
vocational agriculture. T. D. Eason and Harris Hart working with the authorities of this latter institution prepared a plan for the training of teachers of agriculture at this institution. This plan was submitted by Hart to the state board and received this board's approval on November 19, 1918. With this approval the way was clear to proceed with the establishment of a teacher-training department at the college.

The Establishment of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute

The Smith-Hughes Act placed the responsibility for administering all federal money appropriated under the provisions of this act squarely in the hands of the State Board for Vocational Education. This authority could not be delegated; hence an attempt to set up a teacher-training division at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute created an unusual situation wherein the State Board for Vocational Education, an authority without the institution, had to co-operate in the establishment of an agency within the institution. Fortunately at this time an excellent spirit of co-operation existed among all people concerned with the establishment of the teacher-training service. J. D.

---

10 Ibid., p. 188.

11 Ibid., November 19, 1918, p. 206.
Eggleston, Jr., the president of the college at the time, was the former State Superintendent of Public Instruction under whom agricultural education had received its start;\textsuperscript{12} while a member of the State Board of Vocational Education, J. E. Williams, was also a member of the college faculty. Under the guidance of these two men, working with T. D. Eason and Harris Hart, a co-operative plan was worked out in the fall of 1918 whereby there was established at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute a Department of Agricultural Education\textsuperscript{13} whose chief purpose was to be "the training of teachers of vocational agriculture for Smith-Hughes Schools."\textsuperscript{14}

This department was established in the School of Agriculture, with its head directly responsible to the Dean of the School of Agriculture and through this dean responsible to the president of the institution. This establishment of the Department of Agricultural Education in the School of Agriculture made it a part of the technical subject-matter division from which could be drawn the technical agricultural information the prospective teacher of agriculture

\textsuperscript{12}See Chapter VIII.

\textsuperscript{13}Report of the President of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute for the Year Ending July 1, 1919, p. 2.

would need. At the same time by being in the School of Agriculture the materials and equipment for the instruction in the various areas of agriculture were made available to the department.

Dabney S. Lancaster, a graduate of both the University of Virginia and of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and at the time instructor in animal husbandry at the latter institution, was appointed professor of agricultural education and made head of the new department. To assist with the program, especially in professional education, W. B. Coggin, a graduate of William and Mary College and of the George Peabody College for teachers, an experienced educator and a former farm demonstrator, was added to the staff of the department as professor of education. Coggin was eminently qualified for this position, but the idea of there being in the School of Agriculture a professor of education seems not to have been very popular. Even President Eggleston felt it necessary to defend the appointment with the statement that "the Federal Board insisted that such a professor be appointed." When an agreement was entered into with the Montgomery County School Board whereby the classes in vocational agriculture at the Blacksburg High School could be used for teacher-training purposes, E. C. Magill, a

---

15Report of the President of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute For the Year Ending July 1, 1919, p. 2.

16Ibid., p. 4.
graduate of Kansas State College, was employed for the
session of 1919-1920 as associate professor\(^{17}\) and placed
in charge of the department of vocational agriculture in
the high school. With the establishment of the practice-
teaching center at the Blacksburg High School under the
supervision of Magill, the initial organization of the
Department of Agricultural Education was complete.

The preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture
was, by necessity of the requirements in the Smith-Hughes
Act and the interpretations of this act by the Federal
Board for Vocational Education, undertaken as a joint respons-
sibility of the State Board for Vocational Education and the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute. While the teacher-training
work was by law definitely placed under the supervision of
the State Board for Vocational Education, the actual execu-
tion of this co-operative plan was from the very first
carried out by the staff of the Department of Agricultural
Education at the college and by the State Supervisor of
Agricultural Education and his staff. It is impossible to
read the official reports and records concerning the develop-
ment of this co-operative teacher-training program without
becoming aware of the excellent spirit of co-operation and
teamwork which developed almost at once between the teacher-

\(^{17}\)Catalogue of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The
State Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1920, Virginia
Polytechnic Institute, Bulletin XIII, No. 2 (February, 1920),
p. 11.
training staff and the state supervisory staff as they worked together in preparing teachers of vocational agriculture. Happily for the cause of vocational agricultural education, this excellent co-operative spirit has continued to the present time.

Curricula for the Preparation of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture

No organized instruction in agricultural education was given by the teacher-training staff during the session of 1918-1919, since the department had been organized too late to enroll students. Most of the time was spent by the staff in visiting teachers in the field, in getting the department organized, and in planning a complete curriculum for the training of teachers. By the session of 1919-1920, not one, but three curricula had been planned for the preparation of teachers of agriculture. The college catalogue, under the heading of "Agricultural Education," gave the following interesting information about this course, the first of its kind ever offered in Virginia:

This course in the School of Agriculture is designed primarily for the training of agricultural teachers. It

is a broad course embracing the fundamental sciences, technical agriculture, cultural and humanistic subjects, and professional courses. The graduate of such a course is not only equipped for his profession, but is trained in a manner that should enable him to assume a position of leadership in any community. 19

Curriculum Number I consisted of a four-year college course leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Education. Curriculum Number II also led to a degree of Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Education but consisted of a one-year course offered for men who were graduates of standard academic colleges, who had farm experience, and who wished to prepare themselves for teaching agriculture. Curriculum Number III provided a year of graduate work for men who had completed a four-year college course in agriculture and who wished special training in preparation for teaching. Completion of this curriculum led to the degree of Master of Science in Agricultural Education. 20 With these three curricula available the prospects of recruiting students were greatly enhanced, since the door was thus opened to the prospective four-year college student, the standard academic degree student, and the standard agricultural college graduate student. Curriculum Number I is

19 Catalogue of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The State Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1919, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Bulletin XII, No. 2 (February, 1919), p. 32.

20 Courses of Study in the Department of Agricultural Education, Session 1919-1920. Leaflet prepared by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, p. 3.
of particular interest as the first four-year college course offered in Virginia for the preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture. Both foreign language and mathematics were required for a total of eighteen quarter hours each. The mathematics was prescribed, but the student could meet the eighteen hours of foreign language by electing either German, French, or Spanish. In addition to mathematics and languages a very heavy emphasis was placed on chemistry and physics. No contact whatever with agricultural subjects was provided for the students until the second year of work, while professional education subjects were introduced in the third year. Observation of teaching was required as a non-credit course during the third year, and six quarter hours of practice-teaching were required during the fourth year of work.

Curriculum Number II, since it was provided for the academic college graduate, provided, as would be expected, a heavy concentration in basic agriculture and courses in educational methods. Curriculum Number III, being for graduates in technical agriculture, provided for heavy concentration in education and methods of teaching.

---

21See appendix G for a complete copy of this first curriculum.

22Courses of Study in the Department of Agricultural Education, Session 1919-1920, p. 5.

23Ibid., pp. 6-7.
These three curricula were followed during the session of 1919-1920. For the session of 1920-1921, however, both of the one-year curricula as such were dropped, and provisions were made for writing individual schedules for the students normally served by these curricula. At the same time the curriculum for the first year of the four-year program was modified and reorganized to make it conform to one standard course set up for all freshmen entering the School of Agriculture. This revised curriculum aimed at a balance among the various scientific, humanistic, technical, and professional branches in the approximate proportion of thirty-three per cent of the credits in science, thirty-three percent in agriculture, sixteen per cent in professional courses, and eighteen per cent in the humanistic branches. No claims were advanced that this balance was ideal, however. In fact, it was openly admitted that "to secure the proper balance between the various scientific, humanistic, technical subject matter, and professional branches is no easy task." In general the policy set up at this time of having all first-year students in agricultural education pursue the


25Ibid., p. 21.

26The Virginia Plan for the Training of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Bulletin XVI, No. 2 (January, 1923), pp. 10 ff.

27Ibid., p. 10.
same studies as the other students in the School of Agriculture has been continued to this day, although there has been one or two exceptions in terms of specific courses.

At the very outset of the establishment of the teacher-preparation curriculum at the college, efforts were made to make this training a practical preparation for the specific job of teaching agriculture. One major objective desired to be achieved by means of the curriculum was stated as "actual practice [italics in original] for the prospective teacher under conditions that are as similar as possible to those that will be encountered after graduation."²⁸ It is not likely that the actual conditions to be met after graduation were ever reproduced in the training situation, but certainly no effort seems to have been spared by the teacher-training department to foresee the job to be done by the teacher of agriculture and to prepare him to perform it adequately. By 1923 the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education was complimenting the teacher-training staff for the extent to which it had extended its curriculum to include the training of the teachers in the supervision of the home project and in the conducting of evening schools.²⁹

This policy of attempting to adapt the curricula and methods of teaching to the developments within the field

²⁸Ibid., p. 5.

of vocational agriculture, clearly evident by the session of 1923-1924, is reflected in the reports of the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, the minutes of the annual conferences of the teachers of vocational agriculture, the reports of the teacher-training department, and the official publications of the Department of Agricultural Education from that day to this. This adaptability was secured, not so much by adding or dropping courses, although this practice was followed, as by altering or changing the content of the professional courses taught within the department. 30 As can be easily imagined, it was not always easy to keep up with the ever expanding job of the teacher of vocational agriculture and to provide specific training for each skill required. As Magill expressed it:

The problems in vocational agriculture seem to be multiplying to such an extent that the big training problem becomes one of covering, yet covering satisfactorily . . . the entire scope of responsibility of the instructor. Several years ago the training was largely that of preparing teachers for a class of high school boys. Then supervision of farm practice was added. Later there came the farm survey. Now there is the addition of evening school instruction with the challenge of group instruction and follow-up for adult farmers. There

30See especially the course outlines filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute under such headings as "Day-Unit Instruction," Evening-School Instruction, "Supervised Farming," "F.F.V. Teaching Units," and "The Development of the Program."
has always been the problem of assur-
ing a sound understanding of the ag-
riculture involved on the part of the
trainee for his teaching and follow-up.31

In spite of the ever increasing size of the job to be
done by the instructor of vocational agriculture, zeal for
direct, specific training for doing the job continued to
dominate most of the curricular organization and nearly
all the teaching methods employed by the staff of the De-
partment of Agricultural Education in its preparation of
teachers. The development of the job-analysis technique
and its application to the field of vocational agricul-
ture32 strengthened this type of teacher-training and
soon led to the determination to rewrite on the job-
analysis basis all curricular courses assigned to the staff
of the Department of Agricultural Education.33 By 1931
specific training for the job of teaching agriculture
permeated all courses taught by the staff as indicated by
the following statement:

All of the important jobs of the
teacher of agriculture were listed,
classified as to their importance
in training and allotted the time
necessary for the proper training.
These jobs were then distributed

31"Annual Report of the Supervisor of Agricultural Edu-

32See Chapter X.

33Memorandum by E. C. Magill filed in the Department of
Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
through all of the courses of the department of agricultural education according to logical sequence. This process is to be repeated annually. The calendar has proven valuable as a check list for members of the staff...34

This emphasis on teacher-training rather than on teacher-education did not develop without its critics. The impact of the program of the revised curriculum which Virginia developed between 1931-1940 brought out rather clearly the fact that many of the teachers of agriculture were highly trained persons but somewhat deficient in broad social understanding and in ability to meet new situations for which they had not had specific training in their preparatory programs. As one high school administrator in Virginia rather sarcastically summed it up to the writer: "Many public school people reached the conclusion that the agricultural teachers in Virginia could not meet a new situation until you folks up in Blacksburg [the members of the teacher-training staff] ran a job-analysis of the situation for them and then mailed to them a specific step-by-step lesson plan on how to meet the situation." The State Superintendent of Public Instruction recognized the weakness in the program and urged that more attention in the teacher-training curriculum be given to the development of basic

understandings and philosophy of the total educational program. Some efforts were undertaken to meet these suggestions by adding more electives in general education and by devoting more time to consideration of agricultural education as a part of the total educational program, but at the same time, the definite suggestions for meeting specific problems were retained. The solution was none too successful, and the problem of the proper balance between specific and general training needed in the curriculum set up to prepare teachers for the field of vocational agriculture continues to receive a great deal of consideration from the teacher-training staff at the college today.

It was mentioned earlier in this chapter that in addition to the somewhat uniform four-year curriculum established leading to the Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Education, a provision was made whereby individual schedules could be written for certain students having done college work in areas other than in agricultural education. This provision has been used from time to time, especially during shortages of teachers of agriculture, to help secure properly qualified men. This practice has helped to in-

---

35 Memorandum from J. A. Burruss, President of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to E. C. Magill, filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
crease the supply of teachers each year, with the result that the Virginia Polytechnic Institute has trained nearly all the teachers of vocational agriculture in the state. 

Expansion of the Practice-Teaching Facilities

To insure that the student-trainees would get some actual practice in a real school situation, a co-operative arrangement was made with the Montgomery County School Board whereby the classes in vocational agriculture at the Blacksburg High School could be used by the Department of Agricultural Education in its teacher-preparation program. E. C. Magill, as related, was employed as associate professor of agricultural education and placed in charge of the department of vocational agriculture at the Blacksburg High School to teach the classes and supervise the practice-teaching program. This high school continued to be used as the only practice-teaching training center for a number of years until the number of trainees became so large that additional training centers had to be

36 See Appendix J, Table 2 for a year-by-year list of the number of persons prepared at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to teach agriculture in Virginia.

37 The Virginia Plan for the Training of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Bulletin XVII, No. 2 (January, 1923), p. 15.
established. Before considering these new centers, more attention should be given to an examination of the practice-teaching facilities for vocational agriculture set up around the Blacksburg school, since these facilities represent the first ever established in the state for the training of teachers of agriculture. At the same time these facilities served as the chief center at which the great majority of the teachers of agriculture in the state got their first experience in teaching.

The Blacksburg High School was located in the small rural town of Blacksburg. Considerable difficulty was experienced from time to time in keeping the enrollment in vocational agriculture at a reasonable level without enrolling non-farm boys, but in general the classes in agriculture were made up of farm boys.\textsuperscript{38} The high school plant itself was less than a hundred yards from the Virginia Polytechnic Institute campus and no more than three hundred yards from the building which housed the Department of Agricultural Education. This close proximity to the teacher-training department made supervision of the student-teaching work at the high school very easy as far as accessibility was concerned. In 1921 a building some twenty yards removed from the main high school building was erected to

\textsuperscript{38}Memoranda filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
serve as the high school agricultural building. This "ag building," as it came to be known to hundreds of graduates of the high school and college alike, served as the central point for practice-teaching in vocational agriculture for the next three decades until a new building was erected in 1951 on a new location. The building itself consisted of three classrooms on the second floor and a large ground floor room which was designed to be used as the farm shop.

In 1921 W. B. Coggin, the professor of education in the Department of Agricultural Education, rearranged his schedule in such a way that while retaining his professorship in the department he also assumed the principalship of the high school. This move, of course, assured the full support and co-operation of the high school administration in relation to the program of vocational agriculture, since as already related the classes in agriculture were being taught by the members of the department staff.

No better statement, perhaps, can be found setting the Virginia Plan for the Training of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Bulletin XVI, No. 2 (January, 1923), p. 7. 

Ibid., p. 7.

forth the guiding principle under which the practice-teaching was conducted than the following statement which can be found in numerous memoranda filed in the Department of Agricultural Education:

Actual practice is the foundation for transforming a senior trainee into an instructor of vocational agriculture. The department is convinced that there is no surety that anything has been completely taught -- professionally or technically -- until the trainee has performed or practiced the thing that is taught. Therefore the aim has been to give practice in everything.\textsuperscript{42}

As for the actual operation of the program itself the seniors engaged in practice-teaching were rotated from group to group in such a way that each man had the opportunity to teach in a variety of situations closely akin to the work done by the teacher in the field. While each man was teaching his class, the other seniors were required to be in the room as observers. At the end of each day's work in teaching a member of the teacher-training staff, the members of the class who had been observing, and the practicing student-teacher held a conference in which the methods employed by the student-teacher were studied and criticised and suggestions were made for future improvement. Under this plan each prospective teacher got five days a

\textsuperscript{42}Memoranda and notes filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
week of actual teaching and observation for a minimum of six weeks. As the program expanded and the number of trainees increased, it became impossible to devote as much individual attention to each man; but in general the practice of providing a variety of practice-teaching experiences continued, and in all cases the use of the follow-up conference after the daily teaching was retained.

As the number of students in the teacher-training classes increased, the need for expanded teacher-training facilities grew apace. On July 1, 1924, a department of vocational agriculture was established in the Riner High School in Montgomery County, some fifteen miles from Blacksburg. Beginning with the fall of 1924, this center was used for teacher-training purposes, especially for evening-class work. In one way or another this center has been used for teacher-training since that date. By 1930-1931 the need for additional facilities became so great that a day-unit school was established in Pembroke, a small rural community in Giles County, sixteen miles

---

43 The Virginia Plan for the Training of Teachers of Vocational Agriculture, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Bulletin XVI, No. 2 (January, 1923), p. 15.

44 See Appendix J Table 2 showing the number of persons, by years, trained at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to teach vocational agriculture.

from the campus. At the same time a part-time school was established at Newport, also in Giles County, some seven miles from the campus. The Pembroke school was soon discontinued as a training center, but the Newport school has been used intermittently for such purposes to the present time. In 1941 the department of vocational agriculture in the Christiansburg High School, located ten miles from the college campus, was utilized as an additional training center. These five centers served as the practice-teaching centers for prospective teachers of agriculture until 1950. At that time a program was worked out whereby the student-trainees spent one full quarter of the senior year of college preparation out in the field, working full time with regularly employed teachers of vocational agriculture in public high schools of the state. These high school centers, twenty in number, at which the students were expected to get their practice-teaching, were selected to represent every supervisory area within the state and to represent the different types of farming peculiar to the sections of the state. In this latter connection it is interesting indeed to go back to Edmund Ruffin's proposal of almost exactly one century ago, in which he urged that students in agricultural education be required as a part of their training in agriculture to spend a period as off-campus apprentices, learning the different types of
The first actual instruction for the improvement of teachers of vocational agriculture in Virginia took place during the summer of 1918 when the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education assisted by the State Supervisor of High Schools held a short course at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute for the benefit of teachers already engaged in teaching agriculture. The following summer the first well-organized systematic program of summer instruction for teachers in service was offered with one course in secondary education, one course in vocational agriculture, and five courses distributed in shop work and technical agriculture. The state supervisor assisted with this course, although the chief responsibility was assumed by the teacher-training staff. From that day until the present, the summer has been utilized as a period for providing college courses, conferences, field visitation, and other special study opportunities for providing in-service training for teachers of agriculture. This in-service program has always been a

---


co-operative undertaking between the teacher-training staff and the state supervisory staff. It was planned to be that way, in fact, as the following statement written in 1919 will show:

The present State Supervisor of agricultural education will continue his efforts in improving the teachers in service, and will be assisted by the professor of agricultural education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the director of the training school of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.48

During the session of 1920-1921 a plan was worked out whereby the professor of agricultural education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute was subject to the call of the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education for the purpose of visiting the departments of agriculture in the high schools and helping the instructors with their programs.49 D. S. Lancaster, the professor of agricultural education at the time, responded to many of these calls and spent considerable time in the field, working with the teachers.50 In 1923 when Lancaster became State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, he had secured enough experience in visiting the teachers in the field to see and appreciate the value of this type of in-service training. He therefore

---

48 Loc. cit.


50 Loc. cit.
set about making plans to put this service on a more definite basis and in 1924 established in the Department of Agricultural Education at the college the position of itinerant teacher-trainer with E. C. Magill as incumbent. Some idea of the nature of this pioneer work as far as Virginia is concerned may be gleaned from the objectives which the state supervisor reported as having been the aim of the itinerant teacher:

1. That more personal assistance be given those departments in which serious weaknesses existed or inexperienced instructors were serving.
2. That a specialist be available for assisting instructors in new undertakings.
3. That someone be given the time and opportunity to study individual situations in detail and the working of the vocational program in the State at large in order to allow of more rapid improvement.
4. To conduct any experiments or demonstrations under proper supervision in cooperation with the supervisory staff.
5. To keep the teacher-training department better informed of the actual conditions in the field.

Perhaps an even better picture of the itinerant teacher's work, now taken over in a modified form by the entire teacher-training staff and the supervisory staff, may be secured from the following description of it given in 1925:


52Loc. cit.
The supervisory staff at the occasional conferences or by correspondence usually request the attention of the itinerant teacher-trainer to certain departments in need of attention. Original visits are made only on such requests. The problems existing and their causes, past history and other information necessary to the determination of existing conditions, are secured during these conferences along with information gleaned from previous visitations reports and the reports submitted by agricultural instructors, to the State Supervisor. Copies of all reports are now placed in the files of the teacher-training department. Carefully made observations have been found to be the foundation for efficient service to instructors. If improvement of instruction is one of the purposes of a visit the entire first day is given over to observation. The itinerant teacher-trainer is not invested with any authority. He therefore does not attempt to demand certain changes, but works out in full cooperation with the instructors a plan for improvement, a typewritten copy being furnished the instructor. Visits are followed up at later dates by correspondence and a day's visit when possible to check on results, to encourage further effort and to show an appreciation of any improvement made.

Magill, who was serving quite successfully in the capacity of itinerant teacher, resigned in 1925 to become the head of the Department of Agricultural Education at the college. He was succeeded by H. C. Groseclose who served


in this capacity until 1928 when he was granted a leave to serve as Supervisor of Secondary Education with the State Department of Education. He returned to the staff as professor of agricultural education in 1929, but with the development of district supervision⁵⁵ and the increase of the pre-service training program, the need for itinerant teacher service in the state was reduced while the need for pre-service work was increased. In 1930 the official designation of itinerant teacher-trainer was dropped and this type of service assumed by both the teacher-training staff and the supervisory staff. Although the official designation of itinerant teacher-training was dropped in 1930, in-service teacher-training continued as a recognized responsibility of the teacher-training staff. This part of the program in vocational agriculture in the state developed as a co-operative program of the supervisory staff and the teacher-training staff. In reading the official records of the development of vocational agriculture in the state, it is exceedingly difficult to isolate the contributions of the teacher-training staff from the contributions of the state supervisory staff when in-service training is considered; in fact, this close interrelationship exists in nearly all parts of the teacher-education and supervisory programs. Even E. C. Magill who had served as supervising

⁵⁵See Chapter XII.
teacher at the high school training center, as itinerant teacher, and as head of the Department of Agricultural Education found it difficult to separate the story of the teacher-training program from the story of the total state program. Writing in 1929 he said:

The original intent of this issue [of the Virginia Agricultural Instructor] was to recognize ten years of development in teacher-training in agriculture at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute . . . yet a peculiar thing happened in preparing the issue. The training work is so closely intertwined with that of the state program that the two could not be separated. The training work is not an end in itself. Instead, it is a means to an end. The measurement of results in teacher-training are the same as for the state program.  

56

Today the in-service training program which prevails in the state continues as it originated, a co-operative undertaking by the supervisory and the teacher-training staff.

The Personnel Having Engaged in Teacher Training in Vocational Agriculture

From time to time the names of persons having taken part in the training of teachers of vocational agriculture have been mentioned in this study. It seems fitting,

therefore, at this time to record the names of all those people who at one time or another as resident members of the teacher-training staff at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute have contributed to the development of the provisions for the training of teachers of vocational agriculture in Virginia since the inception of the teacher-training program to the present time.

With the establishment of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1918, D. S. Lancaster was made professor of agricultural education and head of the newly established department. In 1919 W. B. Coggin was added to the staff as professor of education, and E. C. Magill was added to the staff as associate professor of agricultural education in charge of the agricultural department at the high school training center. In 1923 Lancaster succeeded T. D. Eason as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. At the same time he continued as head of the Department of Agricultural Education at the college, thereby becoming the only man ever to serve as

57 The documentations of all the appointments to be listed in this section, unless otherwise indicated, are to be found in the annual catalogues of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the annual reports of the State Supervisors of Agricultural Education and/or the annual reports of the presidents of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to the Board of Visitors.

head of the teacher-training service in the state and as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education at the same time. Since in this dual capacity Lancaster was not able to devote so much time to teacher-education work as usual, W. S. Newman, a successful teacher of agriculture in the state, was added to the agricultural education staff in 1923 to assist with this work. In 1924 when E. C. Magill was, as mentioned, made itinerant teacher-trainer, H. C. Groseclose, the teacher of agriculture at Buckingham High School, was appointed to the staff to succeed Magill. In the summer of 1925 D. S. Lancaster resigned as head of the Department of Agricultural Education and as State Supervisor of Agricultural Education. This resignation led to one of the most complete readjustments of teacher-training personnel which have occurred in the entire history of the Department of Agricultural Education. W. S. Newman was made State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, and E. C. Magill gave up itinerant teacher-training work to become the head of the teacher-training staff at the college. H. C. Groseclose succeeded Magill as itinerant teacher-trainer, and H. W. Sanders was moved from the position of district supervisor and was added to the staff to succeed Groseclose. D. J. Howard who had been serving as teacher of agriculture in the Blacksburg High School became district supervisor to succeed Sanders, and A. T. Lewark was
moved from the Salem High School to succeed Howard at the Blacksburg High School. This change in personnel and reassignment of responsibilities proved to be a most fortunate one. With Newman as state supervisor, charged with the overall direction, and Magill, Groseclose, and Sanders directly responsible for on-and off-campus teacher-training, Virginia had indeed produced what turned out to be a well-balanced "four-horse" team which carried forward the preparation of teachers for an increasingly vigorous program of vocational agriculture for the next decade and a half.

All four of these men had been pioneer instructors in vocational agriculture: Newman at Windsor High School in Eastern Virginia, Groseclose at Buckingham High School in Central Virginia, Magill at Blacksburg High School in Southwest Virginia, and Sanders at Manassas High School in Northern Virginia. This group remained intact as a group in the same work they entered into in 1925 until the death of E. C. Magill in 1940. In 1945 H. C. Groseclose retired because of ill health, and in 1942 W. S. Newman left the office of state supervisor to become Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In 1945 he was elected vice-president and in 1948, president of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the office which he holds today.

In September, 1940, H. W. Sanders was appointed head of the

Department of Vocational Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and in this capacity became head of the teacher-training service for vocational agriculture in Virginia.

In 1928 W. B. Coggin who had been serving jointly as professor of education and as principal of the Blacksburg High School returned to the department for full-time teaching in general education and psychology. He served in this capacity until his retirement in 1944. In 1932 H. W. Sanders was granted a leave of absence to go to Puerto Rico to assist in establishing a teacher-training program in agriculture. While he was away, H. M. Love served in his place on the staff at the college.

In 1935 the name of the Department of Agricultural Education was changed to that of the Department of Vocational Education in anticipation of eventually expanding the teacher-training work to include other vocational areas. During the fall of this same year D. L. Kinnear was added to the staff to assist with the program in general education. In 1937 C. E. Richard was added to the staff as instructor in agricultural education. In 1938 Miss Olive Salem joined the staff as research assistant. In September, 1940, E. Y. Noblin was added to the staff as assistant professor of agricultural education. He continued to serve...
in this capacity until his death in 1946. More recent additions to the staff were C. S. McLearen as assistant professor of agricultural education in 1946, E. G. Thompson as assistant professor of agricultural education in 1947, B. C. Bass as assistant professor of agricultural education in 1948, and T. J. Horn as professor of agricultural education in 1949.

In 1946 a division of industrial arts was added to the Department of Vocational Education in order to meet the growing demand for teachers of industrial arts in the secondary schools of the state. It was recognized that industrial arts was not a vocational area (nor is it considered so today), but it was believed to be a good plan to keep all teacher-training work within one department. At the same time this addition, it was believed, would enable the department to strengthen its work in general education courses. J. A. Schad, R. G. Louis, and W. L. Griggs were added to the staff to take care of this newly added industrial arts program.

In 1948 a division of teacher-training in business education and a division of graduate teacher-training in home economics were added to the department. Harry Huffman and R. T. Hall were added to the staff to direct the business education program; and Martha Creighton, former State Supervisor of Home Economics Education, was added to the
staff to direct the graduate program in home economics. In 1949 A. S. Culbertson was added to the staff to assist with the program in general education.

In order to co-ordinate the work of these several departments, in 1949 H. W. Sanders was continued as head of the Department of Vocational Education; T. J. Horn was made head of the agricultural education division; Harry Huffman came in as head of the business education division; Martha Creighton was put in charge of home economics education; J. A. Schad continued as head of the industrial arts division; and D. L. Kinnear continued as head of the general education division.

While it is too early to evaluate the results of this expansion and reorganization, the hope has been expressed that the outcome will be a well-co-ordinated teacher-education program with the personnel in the several areas uniting to develop a sound program of teacher-training in vocational education.
CHAPTER XIV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study attention has been directed to the events which tell the story of the long struggle to establish a system of agricultural education in Virginia. Emphasis has been placed on the events leading up to or contributing to the development of agricultural education on the secondary school level. Limitations have been imposed throughout the study in that events and agencies even though a part of the story of agricultural education in the state have not been included or considered unless it could be demonstrated that these events or agencies contributed to or laid the foundation for agricultural education on the secondary school level.

This study has been divided into two parts. Part I has dealt with a presentation of the agitation and the developments for agricultural education which occurred prior to the twentieth century. In a sense Part I was further subdivided in that the geographical, the political, the educational, and the agricultural developments which occurred prior to the nineteenth century but whose influence clearly extended over into that century were briefly reviewed and summarized in the first chapter. Following this summary, attention was turned to the
nineteenth-century developments. For the period between 1800 and the Civil War attention was directed to the efforts, the developments, and the agitation for agricultural education which helped lay the foundation and helped prepare the way for agricultural education as a part of the state's organized educational program. Following the period of the Civil War, attention was restricted almost entirely to the efforts to establish and promote the state agricultural college. In Part II attention was restricted almost entirely to the efforts to inaugurate and develop agricultural education as a definite part of the secondary school program of the state.

Throughout the entire study more effort was made to trace the story of the development of agricultural education than was made to give a critical appraisal or evaluation of the events in the story itself.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century certain geographic, economic, and agricultural factors had combined in such a manner as to exercise a visible influence on the development of the state for the next century. The section of the state east of the Blue Ridge Mountains, settled largely by a non-agricultural people, none the less developed an agricultural life which was completely dominated by the production and sale of tobacco. The early prosperity of the planter prompted a life of ease, independence, and leisure. The numerous rivers furnished easy outlet to the sea and enabled foreign vessels loaded with a variety of merchandise to
navigate far inland and exchange their goods for tobacco. The huge profits from this tobacco tended to discourage manufacturing enterprises other than those which could be carried on at home by surplus labor. Tobacco production required large holdings and a continuous supply of fresh ground to be cleared annually. This requirement was met by the development of the huge plantation which with its full retinue of slaves and servants became a unit largely sufficient unto itself and fostered a tendency toward individualism and seclusion.

The method of producing tobacco by clearing, planting, and then abandoning the land soon led to a condition of soil depletion. To survive, the planters had to have yet more land. Expansion was looked to as the only solution. The larger landowners tended to swallow up the smaller ones. Many of these smaller landowners in turn not content to remain and compete against slave labor migrated in great numbers to the West, with the result that there tended to develop in the section of the state a preponderance of the wealthy aristocratic upper class and the "poor white" lower class. The aristocratic upper class early took over control of the affairs of the colony and later the state and as to be expected set up laws and promoted customs designed to protect the two-class social system. This aristocratic two-class system was clearly reflected in the provisions for education in that a system of private literary type schools was promoted for the wealthier
upper class and a publicly supported system of the basic fundamentals and vocational education (apprenticeship) was promoted for the poor and the unfortunate.

West of the Blue Ridge Mountains the state was almost entirely unlike the eastern part. It had been settled principally by the middle class Germans and the Scotch-Irish from the farming regions of Europe. These people, not having ready access to markets and not finding one staple crop, had early turned to a highly diversified type of farming. The hardships of frontier life and the common need of such things as markets and roads leading to the markets tended to bind the people together into small communities rather than disperse them over large plantations. The type of farming practiced tended, in contrast to that of eastern Virginia, to conserve the already high natural fertility of the soil rather than to deplete it; hence when eastern Virginia, where soil depletion had by 1800 begun to be severe, began to agitate for agricultural education as basis of relief, the western part of the state not feeling the need for such relief not only did not support the movement but frequently opposed it.

By 1800 the lines along which the two sections were to develop for the next half a century had been fairly well laid out. The east was to continue its development as an older aristocratic, conservative society in which the plantation system of agriculture was to dominate. The west, on the other hand, was to continue developing as a newer, more democratic
society based upon a more diversified agriculture and an ever increasing dependence upon manufacturing and the development of natural resources. The great Valley of Virginia, lying west of the Blue Ridge Mountains and east of the Alleghanies, had by the Civil War become closely enough identified with the interests of the east to throw in its lot with this section when the Civil War broke out. Prior to this particular time, however, the major role of the Valley in those state affairs which affected education, agriculture, and agricultural education had been chiefly that of a section in opposition to the aristocratic east. By the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century the interests, the needs, and the aspirations of the east and of the west had, if the Alleghany Mountains are used as the dividing line, developed along such divergent lines that the state was a state in name only, held together by a thin thread of political association. Under such conditions it became extremely difficult to get united effort for any internal program of improvement or development. Chief among the proposals for improvement within the state to suffer from this difference of sectional interests were the proposals for a public school system and the proposals for state aid for agricultural education and for agriculture advanced prior to 1860.

Mention has been made of the fact that as soil depletion became more and more acute in eastern Virginia the leaders of
the state began to seek remedies. One of the earliest and most
significant remedies tried out was the agricultural society.
This rather loosely knit organization which operated on the
local level and eventually the state level laid down the
fundamental lines of endeavor which today are embodied in the
agricultural education program of research, extension, and
teaching. The agricultural society in Virginia originated as
a semi-literary and social type of organization, made up of the
prominent men of the area. Numerous attempts were made to
organize these local societies into a state-wide organization;
but all such attempts prior to the second half of the nine-
teenth century soon met with failure because of several factors,
it would seem, such as a program too narrowly conceived and the
lack of transportation facilities.

The agricultural press played a very significant part in
promoting the work of the societies and in stimulating agricu-
lultural reform in general. When the societies began to hold
agricultural fairs as a part of their annual program, the
press quickly joined in and co-operated in securing support
of the fair. In addition to arousing and promoting interest
in the fairs the agricultural press in Virginia disseminated
agricultural information, agitated long and vigorously for
agricultural education, and in general kept the idea and the
possibility of agricultural improvement before the people.
The agricultural societies, the fairs, and the agricultural
press succeeded in carrying on a remarkably well co-ordinated
program for agricultural improvement in Virginia.

The agricultural fairs represent the first program of agricultural improvement which had increasing popular appeal. This increasing popular appeal of the fairs in turn began to affect the make-up of the sponsoring societies and changed them from a semi-formal, literary, and aristocratic organization to one of greater informality in which the common farmer could participate to a greater extent. Some of the leaders of the agricultural press, noting, no doubt, the popular appeal of the fair, undertook to publish popular editions of certain parts of the more scholarly agricultural works.

Thus Edmund Huffin, probably the greatest agricultural educator ever to live in Virginia, being unwilling to change his scholarly Farmers' Register, attempted to publish a more popular edition. The venture was not successful financially, but it is interesting to note that almost a century later the Agricultural Extension Service in the state discovered that technical bulletins to be read by the farmers had to be presented in condensed, simplified form. Although there was great interest in agriculture, the scholarly Farmers' Register as an agricultural journal had a struggle to survive. This hard struggle convinced C. T. Botts that there was a place for a well-organized farm paper with a more popular appeal than the Farmers' Register. Acting on this basis, Botts in 1841 launched the Southern Planter which with the exception of a short period during the Civil War, has been in continuous
publication since that date.

By the middle of the nineteenth century the co-ordinated program of the press had brought the agitation for some kind of agricultural education to a high intensity. The first important agitation for agricultural education in the state had occurred on behalf of an agricultural professorship at the University of Virginia before the university had even opened its doors. This particular proposal was not successful, but the idea for such a professorship had been planted. As a result several attempts were made until the Civil War to set up a professorship in agriculture at the state university. All these moves which reached the legislature were defeated, usually by overwhelming opposition from the western delegates and scattered opposition from the eastern delegates, although on the eve of the Civil War, this western opposition to state aid for agricultural education was beginning to weaken.

Much agitation developed in the state for direct agricultural education. The Richmond Baptist Seminary and Emory and Henry College experimented with manual labor programs on the school-owned and school-operated farm. Both ventures were found to be impractical, but in spite of this lesson from the past Virginia during the first two decades of the twentieth century tried teaching agriculture on the school farm and had to learn all over again that the plan was not practicable. The agitation prior to the Civil War for state aid for agricultural education was not successful in the sense of actually
getting such a system in operation, but apparently it did succeed in paving the way for the more ready acceptance of the land-grant college program after the war. At the same time this continuous prewar agitation had definitely succeeded by the eve of the Civil War in getting agricultural education included in the proposals being advanced for a state system of public free schools and had successfully established a professorship of agriculture at the Virginia Military Institute.

The movement for public free schools with which the agitation for agricultural education became intermingled started slowly in Virginia but was gaining tremendous headway when checked by the Civil War. The class and sectional struggle which went on within the borders of ante bellum Virginia and the geographical conditions which shaped her efforts to keep political and economic peace within her own house tended to influence and retard the development of the public free school movement and with it the agricultural education movement. Following the Civil War, a "Reconstruction" convention gave Virginia a constitution which made a system of public free schools mandatory and the establishment of agricultural schools permissive. In 1870 the legislature acting on the mandate of the constitution established the first state system of public free elementary schools. Very shortly thereafter permission was granted to the localities to provide high school instruction, but the upset political and economic conditions were such that very few public high schools other than those
in the cities were established before the first decade of the twentieth century. The lack of rural public high schools plus the apathy and despair which followed the Civil War for some two decades or more just about extinguished the prewar enthusiasm for agricultural education of less than college grade; but with the rejuvenation of the spirit of progress and the reawakening which developed on the part of the great rural masses around the turn of the twentieth century, it was not long before interest, on the part of the leaders at least, was rekindled for the cause of agricultural education of less than college grade.

On the college level an agricultural professorship had been established, by the use of private endowments, in the Virginia Military Institute prior to the Civil War. The plan of organization set up for this institution just prior to the Civil War closely resembled the ultimate plan of organization finally reached by the state agricultural and mechanical college after repeated reorganizations. It seems quite likely, therefore, that had not the war intervened, Virginia would have developed her own agricultural college, whether she received federal aid or not.

At the conclusion of the Civil War Virginia early turned to a consideration of the disposal of her share of the federal land-grant fund resulting from the passage of the so-called Morrill Act. Nearly all the colleges in the state put forward strong claims for a share of the fund, thereby precipitating a
long and bitter legislative fight as to the best disposition
to be made of the money. The conservative element in the
legislature seemed to favor donating the fund to the Virginia
Military Institute, the University of Virginia, and the Hampton
Normal and Agricultural Institute for the colored; but they were
unable to rally enough support to get a bill passed donating
the funds to any of these institutions.

Following the adoption of the new state constitution in
1869, a new legislature was elected. This legislature saw
many faces and names totally new to Virginia politics given
the major responsibility for determining the disposal of the
fund. As debate on the question was resumed, no one plan could
be agreed upon. Sectional animosities were aroused once more,
and the old ante bellum prejudices of the great middle classes
against the University of Virginia and the Virginia Military
Institute were awakened once more. As the debate continued,
the older ante bellum fear that an agricultural professorship
at one of the literary colleges would not be practical began
to become more and more noticeable. The chief leader in arousing
this fear of impracticality seems to have been W. T. Sutherland,
a self-educated, influential agricultural leader and state
legislator from Danville. Finally after much debate an agree-
ment was reached whereby the money would be divided, with two-
thirds going to the Preston and Olin Institute in Montgomery
County in the southwestern part of the state and one-third
going to the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute for the
colored. As a condition for receiving the grant the Preston and Olin Institute agreed to change its name to the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. The establishment of this school in the southwestern part of the state appears to be somewhat ironical in light of efforts prior to the Civil War for an agricultural professorship when it is recalled that for nearly four decades the east had struggled long and hard for an agricultural professorship at the state university while the west had just as consistently opposed the idea.

Now with almost no effort on its own part the southwestern part of the state which had not been strongly identified at all with any of the prewar effort for agricultural education got the agricultural college. It is small wonder that some of the friends of other institutions in view of these circumstances have hinted that the college was placed at its present location by a shrewd deal between the blacks and the western whites. No documentary evidence supporting this belief, however, has ever been produced.

The vigorous prewar agitation for an agricultural school had caused the people to expect too much of the college. When these expectations did not materialize, many people began a campaign of criticism. Internal dissension within the college staff itself played into the hands of the critics. The politicians stepped in and started a series of organizations and reorganizations which for a time threatened the very existence of the college. Fortunately not all the state's
leaders became critical of the college when it was found unable to live up to the too rosy expectations. If the pre-war agitation for agricultural education aroused so much enthusiasm that some of it turned to criticism, it is also true that this same prewar agitation gave a few such a vision of the possible benefits to be derived from an agricultural school that they were willing to stand by the college even in its darkest days. The college struggled along, offering a program of agricultural education not much better than that offered in a good rural high school of today. With the establishment of the agricultural experiment station and the reawakening of the great rural masses toward the end of the nineteenth century, new demands began to be made of the college. Fortunately enough younger men were available with sufficient reverence for the past and visions of the future to be accepted as the leaders of the day. Under these men's guidance the college was set on the path toward a truly technical institution. To meet the needs of that large group of rural boys who wanted and needed a practical education in agriculture but who did not care for or need the highly technical training, a system of special two-year and other short courses were offered. It is quite likely that a partial explanation of the college's somewhat tardy support of extension work and of instruction in secondary school agriculture is to be found in the fear of what these programs would do to the two-year practical course. Insofar as the life of these two-year courses was concerned the fears were well founded, for
with the development of extension work and agricultural education in the secondary schools these two-year courses were finally abandoned. The effect on the college as a whole was beneficial, however, since it was soon found that large numbers of the graduates from the high school agricultural courses were attending the college for further technical training.

At the outbreak of the Civil War conditions were highly favorable for agriculture and agricultural education in Virginia. Proposals for agricultural schools had passed beyond the visionary stage of a few reformers and were engaging the attention and the interest of lawmakers, college faculties, and farmers' conventions. While only one state-supported school was actually teaching agriculture, plans remarkably modern had been produced and widely circulated for agricultural schools at both the college and the secondary school level. Not only had unusually modern plans for agricultural schools been produced but considerable attention had been given to the problem of the best kinds of text books to be used for such schools. In fact, one text book strikingly modern in its method of combining agricultural facts with related interpretative scientific principles had actually been produced by a native Virginian for use in high schools and colleges. Not only had ideas been advanced for agricultural schools but the ideas involved in a great many of the other present day agencies used in promoting agricultural
education had been advanced as well. Especially prominent among such ideas were proposals for demonstration and experimental farms, extension agents, a simplified press to relate the results of the experiments, soil-survey work, and a State Board of Agriculture. Chief among the modern day methods of agricultural education which had been proposed by the Civil War were the use of community advisory committee to aid agricultural education, supervised farm projects, apprenticeship training in agricultural work following a period of college training, the activity method of instruction, farm fairs, judging contests, competition between individuals and between groups, demonstrations of farm machinery, prizes for original essays, special training for persons to teach agriculture, traveling exhibitions, and farm tours. The list could be extended, but such an extension is unnecessary at this time. It is not intended to convey the idea that all these proposals had been put into usage. At the same time, a careful examination of the available records would definitely indicate that, contrary to the modern opinion, enough of these proposals had been put into practice by the Civil War to put Virginia's agriculture on the threshold of sound scientific and prosperous development. Unfortunately much of this scientific spirit and most of the prosperity were lost as a result of the war and had to be rebuilt once more.

By the end of the nineteenth century the state was
beginning to recover from the more serious, disastrous effects of the war, and a new spirit of progress was in the making. This new spirit of progress led to the revival of demands for agricultural education, and this time the demands would not be silenced.

The last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth saw a reawakening in Virginia. A rejuvenated sense of power, of strength, of optimism began to pervade the state. Fortunately there were leaders who channeled much of this new energy into the movement for the development of the state's educational system. The Conference for Education in the South did much to focus the thinking of the people on the necessity of improving educational facilities. Largely as a result of the work of this conference the Co-operative Education Association was organized in the state. This organization did a superior piece of work in arousing the people of the state on behalf of education, including agricultural education. Their most intensive campaign, conducted in May, 1905, is still known as the "May campaign." In 1906 Joseph D. Eggleston, Jr., the first professionally qualified Superintendent of Public Instruction to take office since W. H. Kuffner in 1870, was elected to head the state public school system. He at once set about translating the promises and the interest aroused in the "May campaign" into a specific program of education. The conditions of the time were indeed ideal for the success of his efforts. In 1906 legislation
was passed providing for the first state-wide system of public high schools in the state. The legislation setting up this system was so worded as both to require and to encourage local initiative in establishing high schools. The action of the localities in quickly matching all available state funds to erect high schools encouraged the legislature to do even more for these schools at the next session in 1908. An effort was made to get outright legislation for agricultural schools at this time, but the effort failed to secure approval. The same legislature, however, included a provision in the section of its appropriations bill setting aside money for the high schools, whereby one agricultural high school was to be established in each congressional district in the state. The response of the communities in which these schools were located was so great that the legislature was encouraged to pass definite legislation at its next session in 1910 and to provide specific funds for this type of school.

The congressional district agricultural high schools truly pioneered in the teaching of agriculture in the secondary schools of the state. With almost no expert supervision or unified plan of operation each school was largely left to work out its own program. Some thought was given to tying up the school farms at these schools to the Agricultural Experiment Station program at the college. This plan fell through, however, largely because the schools were located in
political subdivisions of the state rather than in geographic or agricultural subdivisions. Left to their own resourcefulness, the teachers of agriculture in these schools resorted to a variety of plans for using the school farm for instructional purposes. In nearly all instances, however, the plans met with the same failure experienced nearly three-quarters of a century earlier in Virginia's manual labor schools. With the increasing realization that the school farm was not adapted to the practical type of instruction desired, many of the teachers, influenced no doubt by the success of the Boys' Corn Clubs which were developing in the state at the time, began to experiment with plans for using the boys' home farms for instructional purposes. In these early experiments the paths which later led to the boy's supervised home project are clearly discernible.

The Boys' Corn Clubs in Virginia were started largely at the insistence of Superintendent Eggleston. Hardly had these clubs become well established, before they were combined with the school fair. This combination of corn club and school fair proved to be immensely popular with the boys and the adults and probably did more than any one agency to arouse enthusiasm for agricultural education. An examination of the organization and of the program of these Boys' Corn Clubs in Virginia reveals the beginning of numerous features to be found today in the 4-H Clubs and in the F.F.A. organizations as they are conducted in the state. Undoubtedly these
Boys' Corn Clubs deserve to be listed as one of the fore-runners of the F.F.V. and therefore of the F.F.A. organization.

The program of agricultural education on the secondary school level which was conducted in Virginia from 1908 until the inauguration of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in 1917 did not pass on to this latter program many completed patterns or techniques of instruction. It did, however, arouse support for agricultural education and paved the way for the more ready acceptance into the total school program of vocational agriculture when the state accepted the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act.

The state was more than ready to accept the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act. Since the legislature was not in session the year the federal Smith-Hughes Act was passed, the Governor accepted the provisions of the act by proclamation. The congressional district agricultural high schools were converted into high schools with departments of vocational agriculture, and other schools meeting the qualifications set up by the State Board of Education were added to the list. A state plan for administration and supervision was adopted which put the program of vocational agriculture under the control of the State Board of Education and at the same time made it a definite part of the secondary school program. A specialist was added to the State Department of Education to supervise the work, and a teacher-training department was set
up in the School of Agriculture at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to train teachers of vocational agriculture. As the Smith-Hughes instruction in agriculture developed, it was necessary from time to time to expand this supervisory and teacher-training staff, but in its essential details the lines of administrative and supervisory authority and responsibilities set up for the program at its beginning have remained in operation.

Throughout the major portion of the nineteenth century, plea after plea had been made for practical instruction in agriculture. No solution had been found to meet this plea by the time of the introduction of the Smith-Hughes program, although considerable progress had been made toward this goal and the need for supervision in order to accomplish a more practical instruction had been recognized and advocated for nearly a decade before Smith-Hughes work was begun. With the inauguration of provisions for supervision and for teacher-training in agriculture, an immediate effort was made to develop a practical type of instruction. Successful progress was made in this effort through the development and the use of the farm survey, the job-analysis technique for analyzing and organizing teaching content, and the boy's supervised home program. It is worth emphasizing that the progress which took place in weaving together a practical program by the means of these three tools developed as a co-operative program among the supervisory staff, the teacher-training staff, and the teachers
in the field. The official reports and records concerning the development of vocational agriculture during its first two decades or so of development clearly reflect an unusually high esprit de corps perhaps never equalled by any other group of educational workers in the state. Undoubtedly the co-operative techniques developed for administering and supervising the program had a lot to do with the development of this admirable spirit. Whether such a spirit can be maintained under the tremendously expanded program and its necessarily expanded supervisory and teacher-training staff remains as a challenge to be answered within the next few years.

While work was going on to set up a practical program of education in agriculture, efforts were also begun to expand the work to reach more boys and at the same time to build up a greater spirit of unity and enthusiasm on the part of the boys for vocational agriculture. In order to accomplish the first objective the day-unit schools were started. This type of instruction, in which the teacher in a regularly established high school department of vocational agriculture organized day classes in vocational agriculture in outlying schools surrounding the regular department, proved to be quite popular and effective in meeting the situation in areas where small rural high schools predominated. As good roads increased and school consolidation took place, these day-unit schools having served their day were gradually absorbed into more permanently established full-time departments of vocational agriculture.
The effort to build up a better morale among the boys enrolled in vocational agriculture started with an effort to develop an organization to which these boys could belong. This movement toward a state-wide organization for these boys in vocational agriculture had its roots in the successful local boys' organizations which individual teachers had been developing from time to time following the inception of the Smith-Hughes work. It is quite likely that the movement was also aided by the success of the Boys' Corn Clubs which preceded the Smith-Hughes organizations by more than a decade. Any attempt to assign credit for the development of this boys' organization, or F.F.V. as it came to be called before merging into the F.P.A., is almost certain to slight someone, since this organization developed, as did most of the vocational agricultural program in Virginia, as a co-operative project among the teachers, the teacher-training staff, and the supervisory staff. Certain names, however, do stand out as taking the lead in the movement. W. S. Newman, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education at the time, suggested the idea of a boys' organization to the members of the teacher-training staff and carried the idea before the teachers and the boys themselves. H. C. Groseclose as itinerant teacher-trainer, having close contact with the teachers in the field, was assigned the responsibility of developing a plan for the organization. Again it is difficult to assign definite credit for all the ideas which Groseclose assembled into the
constitution and plan around which the F.F.V. was organized, for here too he worked co-operatively with the teachers, the supervisory staff, and the other members of the teacher-training staff. It is certainly fair, however, to say that Groseclose succeeded in taking all the ideas available and in welding them together into a practical, workable, highly effective plan for a boys' organization to be known as the F.F.V.'s (Future Farmers of Virginia).

The success of the F.F.V. organization soon attracted considerable attention first in the Southern Regional Area and then in the nation. The movement for similar organizations grew from state to state and was so successful that plans were begun for a national organization. A proposed constitution patterned very closely after the Virginia constitution was drawn up and adopted in Kansas City in November, 1928, as the constitution for the national F.F.A. organization of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture. While it would not be accurate to say that Virginia was responsible for the formation of the national F.F.A., it certainly is accurate to say that Virginia furnished some early inspired leadership which made some outstandingly significant contributions toward the formation of the national F.F.A.

As soon as the national organization was formed, the state F.F.V. changed its name to become the Virginia Association of the F.F.A. This intra-curricular organization has succeeded so well in Virginia that today in the minds of many people the
F.F.A. and vocational agriculture in the secondary schools are one and the same.

While the administration of the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture was made a responsibility of the State Board of Education, the actual execution and supervision of the program were delegated to a specialist designated as the State Supervisor of Agricultural Education and located in the State Department of Education. The teacher-training program for vocational agriculture was located in the School of Agriculture at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. These two services in the state soon developed an unusually well-coordinated, co-operative program of pre-service and in-service teacher-training which in conjunction with the district and area supervision developed a sound, effective program of education in vocational agriculture accepted today by school administrators and the public alike as a worthy part of the secondary school program in Virginia.

The long struggle for a system of agricultural education in Virginia began in the first decade of the nineteenth century and continued almost unrelentingly for a century and a half. An examination of the struggle during this long period reveals that it may be summarized by dividing it into three natural periods of accomplishment - namely, the period from 1800 to 1860, the period from 1860 to 1900, and the period from 1900 to 1950. What then, it may be asked, are some of the specific accomplishments toward agricultural education for each period?
The accomplishments for the period from 1800 to 1860 may be summarized in part as follows:

1. The foundations were laid for the acceptance of the idea of state aid for agricultural education.
2. Agricultural education on both the college and the secondary school level was given a place in numerous proposed plans for a state system of public education.
3. A School of Agriculture with two professors had been established in the Virginia Military Institute.
4. The value of "book learning" for agriculture was beginning to be accepted.
5. The idea that the state should help subsidize demonstration and experimental farms had been widely, though not universally, accepted.
6. The idea of a person employed to gather agricultural information from reports, demonstrations, and experiments and then to travel over the state, imparting this information to the farmers, had been widely discussed and advocated.
7. The idea of simplified agricultural papers and pamphlets in simple, easy language had been advanced and tried out.
8. The value of soil surveys had been demonstrated and widely accepted.
9. The idea of a community advisory committee to help the teacher of agriculture had been proposed.
10. Special training for persons planning to teach agriculture had been proposed.

11. Competition as a means of promoting educational activities had been developed.

12. Farm tours and traveling exhibitions had been rather widely used, especially in eastern Virginia.

13. Prizes for original essays on agricultural topics had become rather commonplace.

14. A program of apprenticeship training to follow college training in agriculture had been proposed.

15. Perhaps most surprising of all, if not the most significant, enough of the just-listed developments and others not listed here had been applied to agriculture to establish it upon a new prosperity far removed from the days when the exhausted soil was limiting agriculture and sending Virginia's sons fleeing to the West. The good farmer of Virginia in the decade from 1850 to 1860 was applying scientific principles to his agriculture in a manner to compare favorably with practices of many of the farmers in the state today.

Since in this study the developments between 1860 and 1900 were largely concerned with a consideration of the establishment of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, the summary of developments within this period will necessarily be restricted.
In general the accomplishments and events between 1860 and 1900 of importance for agricultural education were as follows:

1. The prewar vigor and enthusiasm for agricultural education and scientific agriculture in general was a Civil War casualty not to be revived to any appreciable extent until the twentieth century.

2. In 1869 Virginia adopted a new constitution which made a state system of public free schools mandatory and a system of agricultural schools permissive.

3. In 1872 Virginia with the aid of the federal land-grant fund established the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College at Blacksburg, in Montgomery County. After numerous reorganizations, caused mostly by politics, the college was in 1891 reorganized and put on the road to becoming a really technical institution.

4. The last decade of the nineteenth century saw the beginning of a reawakening of the great mass of people in Virginia. This reawakening continued into the twentieth century.

The period of 1900 to 1950 saw the real beginning of agricultural education in the secondary schools. The major accomplishments contributing to agricultural education during this period may be listed as follows:

1. The "May campaign" of 1905 helped arouse the people of the state to work for better schools.

2. A state system of high schools was inaugurated in 1906.
3. Congressional district agricultural high schools were established in 1908.

4. The congressional district agricultural high schools helped pave the way and laid the foundation for the ready acceptance of the Smith-Hughes program in vocational agriculture.

5. Efforts to teach agriculture after 1917 in other than Smith-Hughes schools were never successful.

6. Smith-Hughes work in vocational agriculture was started in Virginia in 1917.

7. The state plan under which Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture was started in the state proved to be a sound one.

8. The pioneers in Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in Virginia developed an unusually fine spirit of cooperation among the supervisory staff, the teacher-training staff, and the teachers in the field. This spirit still prevails and must be taken into account when considering the development of vocational agriculture in Virginia.

9. The teachers, the teacher-training staff, and the supervisory staff worked together and succeeded in developing a practical, functional course of study which could be adapted to the agricultural conditions in the community served by the school.
10. Under the leadership of Walter S. Newman a state organization of boys enrolled in vocational agriculture was established. The essential features of the constitution written for this organization by Henry C. Groseclose later became the constitution for the national Future Farmers of America.

11. The teacher-training facilities established at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to train teachers of vocational agriculture kept pace with the developing, changing program of vocational agriculture in the state.

The establishment and development of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in Virginia climaxed the more than a century of agitation begun in the first two decades of the nineteenth century for a system of agricultural education, for by the legislative set of 1918 which accepted the provisions of the federal Smith-Hughes Act the state now had legal provisions for a complete system of education in agriculture. In 1872 she had established her Agricultural and Mechanical College; in 1888 she had established her agricultural Experiment Station; in 1914 she had established her Agricultural Extension Division; while in 1918 she had provided for instruction in vocational agriculture in the secondary schools of the state. In each one of these instances Virginia acted in response to federal inducement in the form of financial aid; but in each instance
before accepting federal aid, she had started her own program which, while none too successful, had none the less helped prepare the way for the rapid growth of the federally aided program when it was established.
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"Result of the Petition of the Agricultural Convention," IV (May, 1836), 53-55.
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"Agricultural Convention," X (March, 1850), 78-81.

"Agricultural Fairs," XIX (December, 1859), 774-775.

"Agricultural High Schools in Virginia," LXIX (June, 1908), 536.
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Schermerrhorn, J.F. "Letter to Editor of Southern Planter," V (July, 1845), 149-152.

"Scientific and Practical Departments of Collegiate Education," XXIX (February, 1869), 120-121.
"To the Subscribers of the Southern Planter," XV (January, 1855), 17.
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Published (or mimeographed) irregularly by the Department of Agricultural Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the Virginia State Department of Education. The pagination is inaccurate and incomplete at times, while many issues are unnumbered.
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Magill, E.C. "Lest the New Men May Not Know," (October, 1929), 1.

____. "Tenth Anniversary Number," (October, 1929), 2.


"News Item," (March, 1925), 12.


____. "Regional Conference," (April 15, 1927), 2.
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_____. Course of Study in the Department of Agricultural Education, Session 1919-1920. Blacksburg, 1919.
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Supervised Farm Practice Planning. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Department of Vocational Education, Mimeograph No. 22 (July, 1932).
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APPENDIX A

OBJECTS FOR THE ATTENTION AND ENQUIRY OF THE SOCIETY

By Thomas Jefferson

1st. An principally, the cultivation of our primary staples, Wheat, Tobacco and Hemp for Market.

2d. All subsidiary articles for the support of the Farm, the food, the clothing, and the comfort of the Household, as, Indian Corn, Rye, Oats, Barley, buckwheat, Millet, the families of Peas and Beans, the whole family of grapes, turnips, potatoes, Jerusalem Artichokes and other useful roots, cotton and flax, the garden and orchard.

3. The care and services of useful animals for the saddle or draught, for food or clothing, and the destruction of Noxious Quadrupeds, fowls, Insects and reptiles.

4. Rotation of Crops, and the circumstances which should govern or vary them according to the varieties of soil, climate, and markets of our different counties.

5. Implements of husbandry, and operations with them, amongst which the plough and all its kindred instruments for dividing the soil hold first place, and the threshing machine an important one, the simplification of which is a great desideratum. Successful examples too of improvement in the operations of these instruments would be an excitement to correct the slovenly and unproductive practices too generally prevalent.

6. Calendars of Work, showing how a given number of labourers and of draught animals are to be employed every day in the year, so as to perform within themselves and in their due time according to the usual course of the seasons all the operations of a farm of given size; this being essential to the proportioning of the labour to the size of the Farm.

7. Farm Buildings and conveniences, enclosures, roads, fuel, Timber.

8. Manures, Plaister, green dressings, fallows, and other means of ameliorating the Soil.

9. A succinct report of the different practices of Husbandry in the district inhabited by the members of the Society; including the bad as well as the good, that those who
follow the former may read and see their own condemnation in the same page which offers better examples for their adoption. It is believed that a judicious execution of this article alone might nearly supercede every other duty of the Society, in as much as it would present every good practice which has occurred to the mind of any cultivator of the state for imitation and every bad one for avoidance; and the choicest processes culled from every farm, would compose a course probably near perfection.

10. And finally, such subjects in husbandry and the arts connected with, or subsidiary to it, not theretofore enumerated as the society may hereafter propose for its consideration.

---

1As given by R. H. True in "Early Days of the Albemarle Agricultural Society," Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1918, 1, p. 245.
APPENDIX B

OBJECTIVES OF THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY
OF THE VALLEY OF VIRGINIA

The Society resolved to confine their attention, for
the present, more especially to the following

OBJECTS

1. The cultivation to most advantage of the great staple
of the Valley, Wheat for market.

2. The Grazing System associated with the cultivation of
grain: - how far they interfere, so as to lessen or increase
the interest of the farmer.

3. The Family of Grasses, how far they are best associated,
as it regards contemporaneous bloom and ripening, for the
purpose of grazing, soilng, or making hay.

4. The different tribes of roots, Turnips Potatoes,
Mangle Wurtzel, Jerusalem Artichokes, Etc. how far, as
auxillaries of food, they are profitable.

5. Whether grinding and reserving the offal of our wheat
is not preferable, in point of interest, to selling it in
gross to the merchant or miller.

6. The Improvement of Animals, for the saddle or draught,
as also those for food or raiment.

7. Implements of Husbandry, the best mode of using them,
their care and preservation.

8. Farm Buildings, fences, roads, dry bridges, timber,
fuel, &c.

9. Reports on Practical Experiments, whether successful
or otherwise - the detection or removal of error, while it
teaches us to avoid its repetition, may be recorded (without
a solecism in terms) in agricultural pursuits, as an useful
blunder.

10. The Economy and distribution of Labor on a farm of
given size; calendars of work, embracing the number of hands,
horses, oxen, &c. engaged in any particular work every day in
the year; rotation of crops on different soils, and their
amelioration by manures, plaster, green dressings, &c.
11. And, finally, such other subjects connected with husbandry and the arts, not before enumerated, as the society may hereafter think proper to embrace.
APPENDIX C

AGRICULTURAL PERIODICALS PUBLISHED
IN VIRGINIA PRIOR TO 1861

Made up of columns of the monthly Farmer's Register.

June 1833 - Dec. 1842.
Issued also in weekly form Jan.- 1841.
The Countryman's Friend, Weekly, made up from matter in this paper, 1835.

The Farmer's Register, new series. Petersburg, Va.
monthly. V.1. Jan. 1843-

Nov. 1842-

The Southern Farmer. Petersburg, Va. weekly. V.1-6?

Southern Planter. Richmond, Va. monthly. V.1 - 21?
1846 called new series V.1.
Proposed publishing a weekly edition, Jan. 1846.


The Virginia Farm Journal. Richmond, Va. weekly. V.1.
Jan.-Dec. 1859.

Virginia Farmer. Harrisonburg, Va. monthly. V.1. Jan. 1856-
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An Act to Appropriate the Income Arising from the Proceeds of the Land Scrip Accruing to Virginia Under Act of Congress of July 2, 1862, and the Acts Amendatory Thereof

Approved March 19, 1872.

1. Be it enacted by the general assembly, That the annual interest accruing from the proceeds of the land scrip donated to the state of Virginia by act of congress of July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the acts amendatory thereof, shall be appropriated as follows, and on the conditions hereinafter named, that is to say: One-third thereof to the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, in the county of Elizabeth City, and two-thirds thereof to the Preston and Olin Institute, in the county of Montgomery.

2. The said annuity to the Preston and Olin Institute shall be on these express conditions:
   First. The name of the said institute shall be changed to the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.
   Second. The trustees of the said institute shall transfer, by deed or other proper conveyance, the land, buildings, and other property of said institute, to the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.
   Third. The county of Montgomery shall appropriate twenty thousand dollars, to be expended in the erection of additional buildings, or in the purchase of a farm for the use of the said college.
   Fourth. A number of students, equal to the number of members of the house of delegates, to be apportioned in the same manner, shall have the privilege of attending said college without charge for tuition, use of laboratories, or public buildings, to be selected by the school trustees of the respective counties, cities and election districts for said delegates, with reference to the highest proficiency and good character, from the white male students of the free schools of their respective counties, cities and election districts, or, in their discretion, from others than those attending said free schools.
   Fifth. If at any time the said annuity should be withdrawn from the said Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, located at Blacksburg, in the county of Montgomery,
the property, real and personal, conveyed and appropriated to its use and benefit by the trustees of the Preston and Olin Institute, and by the county of Montgomery, shall revert to the said trustees and to the said county, respectively, from which it was conveyed and appropriated.

3. The curriculum of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College shall embrace such branches of learning as relate to agriculture and the mechanic arts, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics.

4. The said students, privileged to attend said college without charge for tuition, use of laboratories, or public buildings, shall be selected as soon as may be after the establishment of the said school, and each second year thereafter: provided, that on the recommendation of the faculty of the said college for more than ordinary diligence and proficiency, any student may be returned by the said trustees for a longer period.

5. As soon after the passage of this act as may be, and on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and seventy-three, and on the same day in every third year thereafter, the governor, by and with the consent of the senate, shall appoint nine persons as visitors of the said college, who shall continue in office until the appointment and acceptance of their successors; and if a vacancy occur in the office of visitor, the governor shall fill the same.

6. If any visitor fail to perform the duties of his office for one year, without good cause shown to the board, the said board shall, at the next meeting after the end of such year, cause the fact of such failure to be recorded in the minutes of their proceedings, and certify the same to the governor, and the office of such visitor shall thereupon be vacant. If so many of such visitors fail to perform their duties that a quorum thereof do not attend for a year, upon a certificate thereof being made to the governor by the rector or any member of the board, or by the chairman of the faculty, the offices of all the visitors failing to attend shall be vacant.

7. The board of visitors shall appoint from their own body a rector, who (or, in his absence, a president pro tempore), shall preside at their meetings. They shall also appoint a clerk to the board.

8. The said board shall meet at Blacksburg, in the county of Montgomery, at least once a year, and at such other times or place as they shall determine, the days of meeting to be fixed by them. Special meetings of the board may be called by the governor, the rector, or any three members. In either of said cases, notice of the time and place of meeting shall be given to every other member.
9. The said board shall be charged with the care and preservation of the property belonging to the college. They shall appoint as many professors as they deem proper, and with the assent of two-thirds of the members of the board, may remove any professor or other officer of the college. They shall prescribe the duties of each professor, and the course and mode of instruction. They shall appoint a president of the college, and may employ such agents or servants as may be necessary; shall regulate the government and discipline of the students; and generally, in respect to the government of the college, may make such regulations as they deem expedient, not contrary to law. Such reasonable expenses as the visitors may incur in the discharge of their duties shall be paid out of the funds of the college.

10. Each professor shall receive a stated salary, to be fixed by the board of visitors; and the board shall fix the fees to be charged for tuition of students other than those allowed under this act to attend the college free of tuition, which shall be a credit to the fund of the college.

11. The trustees of said college shall transfer to the said board of visitors the real estate and buildings, and such other property as they design to be used under this act, with an estimated valuation thereof; and if, in the opinion of the visitors, such valuation should be unjust, appraisers shall be selected and agreed upon by the visitors and the trustees, who shall fix such valuation.

12. A portion of said fund, not exceeding ten per centum of the proportion assigned to the Agricultural and Mechanical College, and the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, may be expended, in the discretion of the boards of visitors of the said respective schools, for the purchase of lands for experimental farms for each of them; and a portion of the accruing interest may be, from time to time, expended by the respective boards of visitors in the purchase of laboratories suitable and appropriate for the said schools.

13. The said appropriation to the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute shall be on the following conditions, namely: That the trustees of the same shall, out of the annual interest accruing, as soon as practicable, institute, support and maintain therein, one or more schools or departments wherein the leading object shall be instruction in such branches of learning as relate especially to agriculture and the mechanic arts, and military tactics; and the governor, as soon after the passage of this act as may be, and on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and seventy-three, and on the same day in every fourth year thereafter, shall appoint five persons, three of whom shall be of African descent, citizens of the commonwealth, to be curators of the fund hereby set apart for the use of the said institute, and without the personal presence of a majority of said curators, after a reasonable notice to all of them to be present, and without the
sanction of a majority of such as are present, recorded in the minutes of the said board of trustees, no action of said board taken under and by virtue of this act shall be valid or lawful.

And the trustees of said college may select not less than one hundred students, with reference to their character and proficiency, from the colored free schools of the state, who shall have the privilege of attending the said institute on the same terms that state students are allowed to attend the Agricultural and Mechanical College under the third section of this act.

14. An annual report shall be made by the proper authorities of each of said institutions, after the close of each collegiate year, of the condition of the institute, and its receipts and disbursements during the preceding year, with the amount of salary paid to each professor, and the amount received in tuition fees from pay students; recording any improvements and experiments made, with their costs and results; and such other matters, including state, industrial and economical statistics, as may be supposed useful - copies of which shall be delivered to the state superintendent of public instruction, to be laid before the general assembly.

15. The general assembly expressly reserves to itself the right and power, at any time, to repeal or alter this act, and to withdraw from either of said institutions the whole or any part of the appropriations herein granted.

16. This act shall be in force from its passage.  

---

4Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1871-'72, Chapter 234, pp. 312-315.
APPENDIX E

THE FIRST CURRICULUM SET UP AT THE VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE

A curriculum has been adopted to which (unless excused by the Faculty for special reasons) every student will be required to confine himself, except that in the Senior year there will be two parallel courses, one for farmers and the other for mechanics. Students who are properly prepared may enter advanced classes. Provision is made for the study of Latin and Greek, though they are not a part of the prescribed curriculum.

JUNIOR YEAR

FIRST HALF SESSION.—Arithmetic, English Grammar, Geography, French or German, Physics, Latin and Greek (optional), Weekly Compositions.
SECOND HALF SESSION.—Algebra, English Grammar, English Composition, French or German, Physics, Latin and Greek (optional), Weekly Compositions.

INTERMEDIATE YEAR

FIRST HALF SESSION.—Synthetic Geometry, Physics, Chemistry, Natural History, Composition and Rhetoric, French or German, Latin and Greek (optional).
SECOND HALF SESSION.—Trigonometry, Surveying, Physics, or German, Latin and Greek (optional through the course).

SECOND YEAR

FIRST HALF SESSION—For Farmers.—Algebra, Conic Sections, Agriculture, History, English Literature, Moral Philosophy, Book-keeping, Astronomy.
For Mechanics.—Algebra, Conic Sections, Mechanics, Mechanical Drawing, History, English Literature, Moral Philosophy, Book-keeping, Astronomy.
SECOND HALF SESSION—For Farmers.—Algebra, Conic Sections, Agriculture, History, English Literature, Moral Philosophy, Astronomy, Book-keeping.
For Mechanics.—Algebra, Conic Sections, Mechanics,
Mechanical Drawing, History, English Literature, Moral Philosophy, Astronomy, Book-keeping.

Students who are properly prepared will have the opportunity to pursue a more advanced course of study.

Instruction in Military Tactics is given throughout the course, from which no student is exempt unless physically disabled; and each student not so exempt is required to provide himself with the prescribed uniform as soon as he enters the college.

Manual labor on the farm or in the workshops is required of the students only in so far as is necessary for their thorough instruction in those technicalities, and it is believed that it will not exceed two hours a week for each student.  

5Address of Gov. Gilbert C. Walker at the Commencement of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, July 9, 1873. Plan of Instruction, Expenses etc., of the College, pp. 15-16.
AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONDITIONS OF THE FEDERAL ACT COMMONLY CALLED THE SMITH-HUGHES BILL (PUBLIC NO. 347, 64TH CONGRESS), AND AUTHORIZING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO ACT AS A STATE BOARD OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR THE COMMONWEALTH, AND AUTHORIZING THE TREASURER OF THE STATE OF VIRGINIA TO ACT AS CUSTODIAN OF SUCH FUNDS AS MAY BE RECEIVED FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AND TO PAY THE SAME OUT ON WARRANT DRAWN BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND AUTHORIZING THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, AND APPROPRIATING MONEY THEREFOR. H B 57

Approved February 23, 1918.

Whereas, an act of congress (public, No. 347, sixty-fourth congress), title of which act reads as follows:
"An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for co-operation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture, in the trades and industries; to provide for co-operation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure," was approved February twenty-third, nineteen hundred and seventeen; and,

Whereas, under the terms of the act, the provisions of said act have been accepted by proclamation of the governor, subject to ratification by the general assembly of Virginia; and,

Whereas, the plan therein proposed for federal aid in co-operation with the State and local communities is, in the judgment of this general assembly, wise and beneficial; therefore,

1. Be it enacted by the general assembly of Virginia, That the State board of education be, and is hereby, delegated to act as the State board for vocational education for the purposes of this act.

2. That the treasurer of Virginia be, and is hereby, appointed custodian for any appropriations allotted by the federal board for the purposes of vocational education in Virginia, and that he be, and is hereby, instructed to disburse said money upon warrant properly issued by the said State board of education.

3. That the State board of education be, and is hereby,
authorized to take advantage of the appropriations made by
the federal government:
(a) For training of teachers or supervisors or
directors of agricultural subjects.
(b) For the training of teachers of the trades,
home economics, and industrial subjects.
(c) For the pay of the salaries of teachers of the
trades, home economics, and industrial subjects.
(d) For the pay of the salaries of teachers, super-
visors, or directors of agricultural subjects.
4. That the State board of education be, and is hereby,
authorized to provide for the proper supervision and management
of such schools as may receive the benefits of said appropri-
ations out of such funds as may be at its disposal, for
maintenance, supervision, equipment or establishment of agri-
cultural or vocational schools, including departments of home
economics and trade work.
5. That the State board of education be, and is hereby
authorized to establish out of such funds as are available, a
department of vocational education for the State, the purpose
of which department shall be to study the problems and promote
and supervise the teaching of such subjects in the schools of
the Commonwealth, as will lead to useful and productive em-
ployment in rural or urban communities.
6. That for the fiscal year ending on the twenty-eighth
day of February, nineteen hundred and nineteen, the sum of
forty-eight thousand one hundred and fifty-five dollars, is
hereby appropriated, and for the fiscal year ending the
twenty-ninth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty,
the sum of sixty-three thousand four hundred and sixty dollars
is hereby appropriated, which sums, or so much thereof, as shall
be necessary, upon the itemized statement of the State board
of education, duly certified and filed with the auditor of
public accounts, shall be turned over by the auditor of public
accounts, to the second auditor, to be disbursed upon warrant
drawn by the State board of education, such sums of money to
be used exclusively for the promotion of vocational education
in agriculture and in the trades, home economics and industries
in high schools and for the preparation of teachers of vocational
subjects, as provided in the said federal act, to be expended
under rules and regulations to be adopted by the State board of
education.

6Virginia, Acts of the Assembly, 1918, Chapter 73,
pp. 131-133.
APPENDIX G

COURSES OF STUDY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, SESSION 1919-1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th>SECOND YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English----</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-----</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra-----</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigonometry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics-----</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry---</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Lab.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Lab.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing-----</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Work---</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military----</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIRD YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Chem.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Crops</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Breeding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frins. Sec. Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of T.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Practice</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Crops Lab.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Chem.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Physics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Histology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Practice Teaching will be required of each student during one term only. Electives will replace Practice Teaching in other term.

One language required.

---

Courses of Study in the Department of Agricultural Education, Session 1919-1920, Descriptive Pamphlet published by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
APPENDIX H

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN A SYSTEM OF PUBLIC
HIGH SCHOOLS AND TO APPROPRIATE MONEY THEREFOR

1. Be it enacted by the general assembly of Virginia,
That it shall be lawful for any district school board or
districts school boards to establish and maintain a public
high school at such place as may be both most convenient
for the pupils who attend and most conducive to the pur­
poses of such school; provided, that the high school may be
conducted either in a suitable building provided for that
purpose, or in the same building with one of the graded
schools of the district, in which said high school is
established, but no State funds shall be appropriated under
this act for high school purposes until provision has been
made to maintain, for a term of at least five months in
each year, the primary and grammar schools of the district
or districts establishing said high school in such county
or counties.

2. Two or more districts in the same or adjoining
counties may unite in establishing and maintaining a joint
high school under the provisions of this act, and under
such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the
State board of education; and the said board shall also
prescribe the requirements for admission to such high school
and the conditions on which properly prepared pupils residing
in other districts may attend said high school.

3. The superintendent or superintendents of any division
in which such high school shall be established shall give due
notice of the same to the State board of education, and before
any State funds shall be appropriated for the support of such
school, the said board shall cause the same to be inspected
by a competent person, to see that suitable arrangements have
been made to enable the school to conform to such standard as
may be prescribed by the State board of education for regularly
organized public high schools in this Commonwealth; and when
the district school board or district school boards shall
appropriate annually as much as two hundred and fifty dollars
for the support of such high school from the local school funds
under the restrictions named in the first section of this act,
or from funds privately subscribed for this purpose, and this
fact shall have been duly certified to the State board of
Education by the superintendent of the division in which such high school is established, then the State board of education shall issue annually a warrant on the second auditor for two hundred and fifty dollars ($250), except as hereinafter provided, in favor of the treasurer of the county in which such high school is located, which money shall be placed to the credit of the high school fund of the district in which such high school is located and paid on the warrant of the district school board exclusively for the support of said high school. The treasurer of each county in which such high school is located shall keep such funds separate and distinct from other public school funds, and shall make a detailed report of receipts and disbursements of said high school fund to the division superintendent of schools at the same time that he makes the annual report of his settlement with the county school board: provided, that not more than one high school in any school district shall have the benefit of the appropriation of State funds provided for in this act, unless in the judgment of the State board of education the area and school population of a district may justify the establishment of more than one high school therein.

4. The sum of fifty thousand dollars ($50,000) is hereby appropriated annually for the purposes of this act, to be paid out of any money in the State treasury not otherwise appropriated, which amount, or so much thereof as shall be necessary, upon the itemized statement of the State Board of education, duly certified and filed with the auditor of public accounts, shall be turned over by the auditor of public accounts to the second auditor, and shall be placed to the credit of the literary fund, and shall be used exclusively for the support of public high schools, established and maintained in accordance with the provisions in this act: provided, that if any district school board, or district school boards, shall appropriate a larger amount the State Board of education shall issue annually a warrant equal to the amount appropriated by said district school board, or district school boards, but said warrant issued by said State board of education shall not exceed four hundred dollars ($400.00) for any one high school in any one year: provided, also, that the State board of education shall have the power to fix such rules and regulations as are necessary for the proper distribution of this fund.¹

## APPENDIX I

### TABLE 1

Growth of All-Day and Day-Unit Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture, White and Negro, - 1917-1950*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>All-Day</th>
<th></th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>All-Day</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Places Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Places Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1918-19</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1920-21</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-22</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1922-23</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-24</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-26</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1926-27</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-28</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1928-29</td>
<td>3,212</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-30</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1930-31</td>
<td>3,698</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-32</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1932-33</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-34</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1936-37</td>
<td>6,556</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-38</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1938-39</td>
<td>8,176</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>9,719</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1940-41</td>
<td>9,519</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-42</td>
<td>9,589</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1942-43</td>
<td>9,284</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-44</td>
<td>9,128</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1944-45</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>7,695</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>7,839</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-48</td>
<td>8,122</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1948-49</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>9,003</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1950-51</td>
<td>9,481</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Persons By Years Prepared at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to Teach Vocational Agriculture in Virginia, 1920-1950. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Prepared</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Teacher-training reports and memoranda filed in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.
TABLE 3

Federal, State, and Local Expenditures for Vocational Agriculture in Virginia By Years from 1918 to 1950 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditure by Source of Fund</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>$10,261.89</td>
<td>$10,261.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>32,119.94</td>
<td>37,930.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>18,277.70</td>
<td>18,277.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>10,119.93</td>
<td>16,056.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>17,716.69</td>
<td>51,654.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>55,669.47</td>
<td>53,903.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>63,622.25</td>
<td>61,903.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>79,527.82</td>
<td>16,036.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>95,433.38</td>
<td>53,433.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>95,433.38</td>
<td>61,284.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>95,433.38</td>
<td>78,764.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>95,433.38</td>
<td>96,796.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>103,818.01</td>
<td>106,647.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>112,262.64</td>
<td>111,233.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>114,489.77</td>
<td>119,932.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>105,370.14</td>
<td>103,981.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>95,927.13</td>
<td>91,917.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>122,251.93</td>
<td>96,356.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>122,251.93</td>
<td>116,347.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>122,251.93</td>
<td>124,514.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>171,549.93</td>
<td>101,913.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>208,928.57</td>
<td>119,921.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>208,928.57</td>
<td>168,169.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>208,928.57</td>
<td>150,140.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>212,539.53</td>
<td>160,074.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>212,539.53</td>
<td>160,074.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>212,539.53</td>
<td>182,021.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>212,539.53</td>
<td>180,264.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>212,539.53</td>
<td>262,125.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>212,539.53</td>
<td>326,833.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>293,926.35</td>
<td>293,867.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>293,926.35</td>
<td>413,581.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>293,926.35</td>
<td>473,393.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Virginia, Annual Report of Superintendent of Public Instruction, for period covered.

Note: The appropriations as listed are for the total program of education in vocational agriculture in the state.
APPENDIX L

BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF SOME OF THE AGRICULTURAL LEADERS MENTIONED IN THIS STUDY

CALE, FRANK BROWNLY, was born in Portsmouth, Virginia in 1895. He was educated at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Cornell University, and the Louisiana State University. In December, 1918 he entered the field of vocational agriculture as a teacher at Sparta, Virginia. He served as teacher of agriculture until 1930 when he was appointed as district supervisor of vocational agriculture in Virginia. In 1946 he was appointed State Supervisor of Agricultural Education for Virginia, while in 1952 he was appointed Director of Vocational Education for Virginia. (As derived from the official records of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia.)

BARBOUR, JAMES, was born in Virginia in 1775 and died in 1842. In 1810 he drew up the bill which established the Virginia Literary Fund and laid the foundation for public education in Virginia. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1815. In 1825 he was appointed to the President's Cabinet. He lost political caste with Virginia, however, because of his close association with the nationalistic administration of Adams. He made a try at a political comeback in Virginia in 1830 but was unsuccessful. It is interesting to note that in 1916, more than a century after Barbour helped create the Literary Fund, a high school building largely financed by the Literary Fund was built at Barboursville close to the site of Barbour's old home. Dictionary of American Biography, I, pp. 590-592; Virginia Journal of Education, X (October, 1916) p. 79.

EGGLESTON, JOSEPH DUPUY, JR. was born in Prince Edward County, Virginia, in 1867. He taught in the public schools of Virginia, Georgia, and North Carolina. From 1891 to 1900 he served as Superintendent of Schools in Asheville, North Carolina. From 1902 to 1903 he was editor and secretary of the bureau of information of the Southern Education Board. After serving as Superintendent of Schools in his native county of Prince Edward from 1903 to 1905, he was elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Virginia, an office he held from 1906 to 1913. He resigned this office to accept
the position of Chief of Field Service, Division of Rural Education, U. S. Bureau of Education. He served in this capacity only a short time, resigning to accept the presidency of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, which office he held from 1913 to 1919. In 1919 he left the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to become president of Hampden-Sidney College. He served in this capacity from 1919 to 1939, when he was made emeritus president. Overton, E.F. "A study of the Life and Work of Joseph Dupuy Eggleston, Junior," (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1943).

GARNETT, JAMES MERCER, was born in Virginia in June, 1770, and died in April, 1843. He was well known as a legislator, an agriculturist, and an educator. He was president of the Fredericksburg Agricultural Society from 1817 to 1837 and in this capacity lectured and wrote widely on topics related to agricultural improvement. He was active in founding the Virginia State Agricultural Society and was chosen as first president of the United States Agricultural Society on its formation. He operated a private school for young ladies and in connection with this work wrote numerous articles on education for women. He took a strong stand for improved education and was among the first to advocate the establishment of a state school system with standard text books, qualified teachers, and a prescribed course of study. Dictionary of American Biography, VII, pp. 156-157.

GROSECLOSE, HENRY CASPER, was born in 1892, at Ceres, Virginia, and died in 1949, at the same place. He was educated at Washington and Lee University and at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He started his professional career as one of the pioneer teachers of vocational agriculture at Buckingham Courthouse, Virginia. In 1925 he joined the staff of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. In 1928 he served as State Supervisor of Secondary Education in Virginia but returned to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1929 as professor of agricultural education and served in this position until 1941. He was one of the founders of the national F.F.A. and served this organization as treasurer during its earlier years of development. Leaders in Education, third edition, 1948, p. 429.

HOWARD, DOWELL JENNINGS, was born in Brookville, Maryland in 1897. He was educated at Maryland State College, the University of Maryland, and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. He was assistant state boys' club agent in Maryland from 1917 to 1919, leaving this position to become the teacher of vocational agriculture at the Boyce, Virginia, high school where he remained until 1925. For the session of 1925-26 he taught in the Blacksburg, Virginia, training school. In 1926 he
LANCASTER, DABNEY STEWART, was born at Richmond, Virginia, in 1889. His entire professional career has been spent in connection with education. After serving as associate master of St. Christopher's School for Boys in Richmond, he became an instructor in foreign language at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Following this position, he served as associate professor of animal biology. Upon the establishment of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, he became head of this department. Since 1923 he has served in the following capacities: Virginia State Supervisor of Agricultural Education; secretary of the Virginia State Board of Education; dean of men, University of Alabama; executive secretary, Board of Overseers, Sweet Briar College; State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia; and president of Longwood College, Farmville, Virginia, presently occupying this last position. Leaders in Education, third edition, 1948, p. 619.

MAGILL, EDMUND CHARLES, was born in Kansas in 1889 and died in Virginia in 1940. He received his education at Kansas State College, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and Cornell University. After teaching agriculture at Wayzata, Minnesota, for three years he moved to Maryland to become a managing partner of a large orchard. Following this activity he served as extension specialist in horticulture in Virginia. He joined the staff of the Department of Agricultural Education at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1919 and spent the rest of his life as a member of this department in one capacity or another being made head of the department in 1925. 'Mr. Mac' as he was affectionately known by the teachers of agriculture was truly one of the pioneers in vocational agricultural education in Virginia, making his greatest contribution perhaps, in the sound establishment of the teacher-training work as an integral part of the program of Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture in the state. Agricultural Education, XIII (August 1940), p. 25; personal information of writer.

NEWMAN, WALTER STEPHENSON, was born at Woodstock, Virginia in 1895. He was educated at Hampden-Sidney College, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and Pennsylvania State College. After serving as an assistant in the Department of Animal Husbandry at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute he became the teacher of vocational agriculture at Windsor, Virginia. He returned to
the Virginia Polytechnic Institute as associate professor of
agricultural education in 1922 but went to Richmond as State
Supervisor of Agricultural Education in 1925. In 1942 he became
Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia.
In 1946 he became Vice-President of the Virginia Polytechnic
institute and in 1947 was elevated to the presidency. Leaders

RUFFIN, EDMUND, was born in Virginia in 1794 and died in
June, 1865. He assumed charge of his Coggins Point Farm at the
age of 19 and here began his agricultural experiments which
gained him fame and did so much to restore his section to
prosperity. His keen interest in politics sometimes interfered with his efforts toward agricultural reform. An ardent
secessionist, he secured and presented one of John Brown's
pikes to the governor of each southern state. When Virginia
was slow in seceding from the Union, he moved to the already
seceded South Carolina where he is reputed to have fired the
first shot from Morris Island against Fort Sumpter. When Vir-
ginia seceded, he rushed back to the state in time to partici-
pate in the first Battle of Manassas. His disappointment over
the collapse of the Confederacy was so great that he ended his
life at "Redmoor", in Amelia County, on June 18, 1865.
Dictionary of American Biography, XVI, pp. 214-216; A. O. Craven,
Edmund Ruffin, Southerner.

RUFFNER, WILLIAM HENRY, was born at Lexington, Virginia,
in 1824, and died at Asheville, North Carolina, in 1908. On
his father's side he was descended from the early German-Swiss
settlers in the Valley of Virginia, while on his mother's side
he was descended from the pioneer Scotch-Irish settlers of the
same region. After graduating from Washington College, he
managed his father's salt works in Kanawha County, Virginia
(now West Virginia) for a short time. He then trained for the
ministry, but because of a throat affliction he had to give up
this work. He served for two years as chaplain at the University
of Virginia where he made many influential friends. For some
sixteen years prior to assuming the office of Superintendent of
Public Instruction he engaged in farming and other business in
Rockingham and Rockbridge counties. He opposed slavery and
secession; but after Lincoln called for troops, he heartily
supported the Southern cause. In 1869 he energetically sought
and gained the office of State Superintendent of Public In-
struction. His work in behalf of public education in Virginia
frequently caused him to be called the "Horace Mann of the
South". C.C. Pearson, "William Henry Ruffner: Reconstruction
Statesman of Virginia", South Atlantic Quarterly, XX (January
and April, 1921), pp. 25-32; 137-151.
TAYLOR, JOHN, was born in Virginia in 1753 and died in 1824. Commonly referred to as John Taylor of Caroline, he is best known for his political writings. He served in the U. S. Senate on three different occasions. In his political life and in his writings he was a great supporter of an agrarian society and was one of the first and clearest spokesmen of state rights, doing much to shape the development of this idea in eastern Virginia. Dictionary of American Biography, XVIII, pp. 331-333.

SANDERS, HARRY WARRINER, was born in Richmond, Virginia, in 1895. He was educated at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and at Harvard University. His professional career was started as a pioneer teacher of vocational agriculture at Manassas, Virginia, where he taught from 1917 to 1924. In 1924-25 he again pioneered in vocational agriculture, this time as one of the first district supervisors for vocational agriculture to be appointed in the state. In 1925 he moved to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute as assistant professor of agricultural education. In 1932-33 he went to Puerto Rico to assist in establishing a Department of Agricultural Education there. In 1940 he was made professor and head of the Department of Vocational Education and continues in this position today. Sanders also pioneered in adapting the job-analysis technique to vocational agriculture in Virginia. The impress of this early work is clearly apparent in most of the publications and bulletins prepared by the Department of Agricultural Education from 1925 to the present. Leaders in Education, third edition, 1948, p. 933, and personal information of the writer.
APPENDIX M

MAPS SHOWING THE GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF THE STATE
AND THE LOCATION OF DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL
AGRICULTURE FOR WHITES IN VIRGINIA

FIGURE 1. Geographic Divisions of Virginia

FIGURE 2. Location of Departments of Vocational Agriculture
for whites in 1918.

FIGURE 3. Location of Departments of Vocational Agriculture
for Whites in 1950.
Note: With reference to Figure 1 it should be recognized that although the Valley of Virginia actually extends from border to border as shown on the map, the topography of the country beginning in the vicinity of Roanoke and Craig counties changes so abruptly that it is customary to refer to the area from these two counties southwestward as southwestern Virginia. This map is valuable principally as a means of showing the relative positions of the large geographic areas to which reference is so frequently made in literature dealing with the early history of Virginia. For more detailed maps of the soils of the different areas see the Physiographic and Soil Parent Material Maps prepared by the workers in the Virginia Soil Survey. For further information on the map as shown here see M.P. Robinson, "Virginia Counties," Virginia State Library, Bulletin IX (1916).
FIGURE 1. GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF VIRGINIA
(See Explanation on Opposite Page)
FIGURE 2. LOCATION OF DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FOR WHITES, 1918.
(Memorandum filed in Vocational Education Department of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute).
FIGURE 3. LOCATION OF DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FOR WHITES, 1950.
(Memorandum filed in Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute).
I, Duncan Lyle Kinnear, was born at Lexington, Virginia, November 29, 1904. I received my secondary school education in the public schools of Rockbridge County, Virginia. I received my undergraduate training at Washington and Lee University and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and received the degree of Bachelor of Science from the latter institution in 1933. In 1938 I received the degree of Master of Science from the same institution. From 1929-32 I was principal of an elementary school in Rockbridge County, Virginia. From 1933-35 I was principal of the Natural Bridge High School at Natural Bridge, Virginia. From 1935-38 I served as supervising teacher in science at Blacksburg High School, Blacksburg, Virginia, and as summer instructor in education in the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. In 1938 I joined the staff of the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute as assistant professor of education. At the present writing I hold the position of associate professor of education and psychology and head of the Division of Education and Psychology in the Department of Vocational Education of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute.