THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE LOCATION OF MICHIGAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

John P. McGoff

1956

THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE LOCATION OF MICHIGAN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

By

John P. McGoff

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

1956

THESIS

ABSTRACT

Shortly before 1850, the State of Michigan became the scene of serious discussion over the development of agricultural education. Very little had been done in this field in the way of formal education anywhere in the United States, let alone in the State of Michigan.

The Michigan State Agricultural Society was probably the most effective organization then in existence in fostering and developing this idea of a formal education for the farmer.

It was the Society along with a sympathetic Governor and Lieutenant Governor and influential members of the Legislature who launched the campaign to establish a form of agricultural education.

Quite naturally, one of the first items that arose was where should such courses be taught, who should teach them, and how were they to be taught. These questions and many more that came along set off a controversy that continued for almost twenty years. The controversy involved not so much the idea of the development of agricultural education, but more so the establishment of such an institution for these teachings. There were those who felt that agriculture should be taught at the University at Ann Arbor and there were others who felt that a separate institution should be established solely for the teaching of agriculture. There were several reasons for this idea of a separate institution: Some believed that should

agriculture be taught at the University it would be secondary to the many other pursuits in education that it offered; others felt that it was unwise to concentrate all forms of education in one section of the State; still others believed that there was not enough land available in the Ann Arbor area to establish the experimental farms necessary to carry out the program in the proper manner.

For these and many other reasons, the Agricultural College was established near Lansing as a separate institution rather than at Ann Arbor or as a branch of the University. This was an aggravating situation for many of the friends of the University and it immediately caused these forces to begin work on the task of bringing this newly established institution under the control of the University.

Toward the close of the 1850's the University supporters eased the pressure and remained quiet until the passing of the Morrill Land Grant Act, which was to make large tracts of land available to institutions teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts. The realization on the part of University supporters of such a bonanza once again spurred them on to further efforts of transferring the Agricultural College to the University.

The loyal support and diligent efforts of such people as John C. Holmes and Hezekiah G. Wells and the sympathetic interest of many of the newspapers in the State, in addition to a few periodicals, convinced the State Legislature that perhaps the small Agricultural College established in 1855 on the banks of the Red Cedar should remain as a separate entity to grow and to develop as one of the

pioneer land grant colleges to further foster and develop agriculture and the mechanic arts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the helpful guidance and many constructive criticisms of Dr. Madison Kuhn, Dr. Harry Brown and Dr. Harold Fields. Without their help, time and patience, this would have been an impossible task.

I should also like to express my thanks to Ruth R. McKinley and the many other members of the Michigan State University Library for their efforts and many helpful suggestions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.

The Beginning

In the backwoods of Michigan about the middle of the nineteenth century, a movement to establish a system of agricultural education was begun.

Many believed it was a significant move in the right direction if America was to develop and expand in the years to come. Until 1849 there was little organized effort to educate the farmer in the ways of his chosen field but few realized that the pursuit of such a desire would stir the ire of some and the imagination and enthusiasm of others. However, not many months passed before agricultural education became secondary in the pending controversy and more important was where this type of education would be taught. The debates, the discussions and controversy waged for nearly twenty years before a definite decision was reached. For many, the location of an Agricultural College in the heart of the State as a separate and independent institution meant the opening of a new area of the State to development as well as the establishment of an institution designed exclusively for farmers. But for others it was a mockery of the educational system already in operation at Ann Arbor.

The Michigan Agricultural Society, which had a significant part in this move to better the interests of the farmer played an important

role in bringing about the establishment of an agricultural college at Lansing in 1855.

But the founding did not terminate the debates that had been waged since 1849. After 1855 there was less discussion of the wisdom of a farmers' college, but in the twenty years stretching from 1849 to 1869 there was a running controversy over its proper location, even among those who professed to believe in its value.

The debates concerning the necessity for agricultural education were apparently touched off by Lt. Governor William M. Fenton in March of 1849 when he addressed the Michigan State Agricultural Society at its first formal meeting.

Because of a deep-rooted belief that the educated farmer would better serve the needs of the state, Fenton firmly stated that the time had come to begin educating the farmer. He believed that the arts and the professions had received more than their share of the attention, interest, and money of the people of the State.[1] Quite obviously because of the low social and economic status of many farmers, the sons of these men were either being pushed or encouraged to enter into other spheres of life by their families. Some of them were even ill adapted to the professions they had chosen. Fenton was of the firm belief that the era of the scientific farmer was fast approaching and that it was time the people of the State began preparing for it in some way.[2]

---

[1](Michigan) State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1849, p. 23.

[2]Ibid., p. 24.

There were others with this same foresight. The development of State and County Fairs gave political and farm leaders an opportunity to voice their opinions on this subject to the general public. E. H. Lothrop made a strong appeal for the education of the farmer in an address at the first Michigan State Fair in September, 1849.[3] Lothrop was another far-sighted individual who felt that there must be some practical remedy for the difficulties which retarded agricultural improvements. There was no doubt in his mind that if these workers of the soil were surrounded with books that would unwrap the many mysteries of the science of agriculture, they too could eventually become of the same importance as the men in the professions of law and medicine and theology.

It was Lothrop's belief that the first step necessary to remove this stigma of being considered completely inferior to those in the professions was to increase the school year from three months to nine months so that the elementary principles of reading, writing and arithmetic could be learned thoroughly. An extension of the school term gave the student an opportunity to observe agriculture in its seasonal stages on the farm. He went a step further when he recommended that county and state agricultural schools be established if the common schools were insufficient or too expensive to accomplish these purposes.[4]

Many seeds for higher education had been planted but it is

---

[3] Ibid., p. 99.

[4] Ibid., p. 99.

possible that Lothrop's statement on this subject was the first seed to take root for the establishment of an agricultural college.

There were occasions when discussions arose regarding the teaching of agriculture at the University at Ann Arbor. Some eighty acres of land was offered to the University shortly after its establishment in order that a proposed Department of Agriculture could be incorporated into the University. Although the law founding the University made provisions for the establishment of an agricultural department in the branches, this suggestion as well as one for the development of an experimental farm, was received rather coolly by University officials. Apparently no rational explanation can be given other than the fact that the art and science of agriculture was not being taught in any of the states of the Union.

Lathrop found it difficult to understand how a Legislature, four-fifths of whose members were farmers, had neglected to enact laws that would have been beneficial to their own group. Lothrop seemed to think that this situation existed because of a lack of intelligence or honesty on the part of the legislators.[5] However, he was not so naive as to think that an undertaking as sweeping and as unheard of as this would be accomplished quickly. He envisioned years of work to attain this aim. His main interest in 1849, however, was that the initial steps be taken. He expressed it very well in his address at Detroit, when he said, "It is our duty to commence preparations for agricultural education, and prosecute it with all of our ability and

---

[5] Ibid., p. 99.

all our energy. Then let our sons be the first to receive the advantages of this new and mighty effort in improving the tillage of our soil, by first improving and cultivating the minds of those who are to be her future lords."[6]

Lothrop's sentiments were echoed a month later by Joseph R. Williams of Constantine, who believed that if there was any man in the world who needed enlightenment, it was the farmer. He proposed to do something about it by encouraging the teaching of chemistry and physiology, geology and natural history, so that agriculture would begin to assume the dignity of a science.[7]

The legislature was first confronted with the problem of agricultural education in 1850. A resolution had been adopted by the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society in December 1849, requesting that the Legislature take some kind of action to establish an agricultural college as soon as practicable. The resolution also asked for the establishment of a State Central Agricultural Office. This office was to be connected with a museum of agricultural products and implements and an agricultural library.[8]

At this point Hubbard introduced what was to be a controversial issue for two decades when he suggested that the College should be a part of the University at Ann Arbor. It was Hubbard's opinion that professors from the University could be called upon for lectures

---

[6] Ibid., p. 100.

[7] Ibid., p. 163.

[8] (Michigan) State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1850, p. 12.

in the field of natural science, and that a botanical garden could be attached to the farm which would be under the charge of the professor of botany at the University.

There was some delay in adopting Hubbard's resolution, perhaps because some members of the Executive Committee wished to establish an agricultural college in the State which would be completely separate from the University.

Pursuing this idea, Bela Hubbard, presented his view in January 1850, in behalf of the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society, urging that "the institution should be attached to, or form a branch of, the State University."[9] His contention was that it would be beneficial from the standpoint of experienced professors and available facilities. Quite obviously, he did not overlook the fact that a new institution would involve considerable expense, and much of his case for its being a part of the State University seemed to be based on this premise.

Apparently he contended that a student attending a school exclusively agricultural would not receive instruction in some of the finer things in life. Bela Hubbard, Titus Dort, and John C. Holmes also supported Williams' contention and they stated it in a memorial to the State Legislature when they said: "Nor should the claims of literature and the fine arts be wholly neglected, as tending to polish the mind and manners, refine the taste, and add greater lustre and dignity to life. In fine, those branches of education which will

---

[9] Ibid., p. 56.

tend to render agriculture not only a useful but a learned and liberal profession, and its cultivators not the 'bone and sinew' merely, but the ornaments of society."[10]

Whether these statements were a sincere expression of their beliefs cannot be definitely determined, but it appears that these men had the true interests of the farmer in mind. Hubbard, too, was one who displayed amazing foresight. He knew full well that if a farmer was to gain anything from a formal education, it would have to be that kind of an education that indulged in the practical as well as the theoretical, in other words what we know today as a liberal education. Hubbard's amazing foresight was this philosophy of practicality which was unheard of in those days of the European system of education.

The Constitutional Convention of 1850 which met to revise the State Constitution could not but feel the influence of this popular interest in agricultural education that seemed to continue to swell in all parts of the State.

In considering the educational provisions, the Convention, at the motion of Samuel Clark of Kalamazoo resolved to instruct the Committee on Education to "inquire into the expediency of providing for the establishment of an agricultural school and model farm connected therewith."[11]

---

[10] Ibid., p. 57.

[11] Journal of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Michigan, 1850, R. W. Ingles, state printer, Lansing; p. 502.

This resolution crystallized itself in Section 11, Article 13 of the Revised Constitution of the State of Michigan. This section of the Constitution stated that "the legislature shall encourage the promotion of intellectual, scientific, and agricultural improvement; and shall as soon as practicable, provide for the establishment of an Agricultural School." The Article empowered the Legislature to twenty-two square miles of Salt Spring Lands for the maintenance and support of an agricultural school.[12] At this point it is interesting to note that the proposed agricultural school could be made a branch of the University and placed under the supervision of the Board of Regents of the University.

Apparently speaking in behalf of that institution, Dr. M. A. Patterson declared on October 4, 1950, at the Lenawee County Fair that the State University was richly endowed through the sale of public lands, and that it taught whatever was considered necessary to qualify young men for the higher walks of life.[13]

He extolled the physical facilities of the University -- "the valuable library, the splendid mineralogical cabinet, and the rare and curious specimens of natural history for teaching and illustrating scientific knowledge and classical lore."[14] He praised the faculty with its twelve different professorships and an imposing array of literary ability. However, he pointed out what he felt was

---

[12] The Compiled Laws of the State of Michigan, Vol. I (1857), p. 68.

[13] (Michigan) State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1850, p. 432.

[14] Ibid., p. 432.

a great defect and that was the lack of a professorship of agriculture. He believed that such a professorship should have been established not as a contingent or collateral to some other department, but solely and exclusively devoted to instruction in scientific agriculture. It was also his belief that it would not be until this was accomplished that the " . . . interests, the honor, and the dignity of the cultivators of the soil be faithfully and fairly represented in Michigan."[15]

He decried the attitude that seemed to be so prevalent at the University toward agricultural science as a part of a formal education. " . . . Agriculture," he said, "whose followers compose nineteen-twentieths of our population, agriculture alone, the most useful of all arts, the most important of all sciences, is not represented here! Why? Is it not worthy of a seat in the temple of honor? A science that has commanded the devoted attention of such men as Sir H. Davy, Liebig, Johnson, Emmons . . . would not dishonor by contact or association, even the learned Professors of the University of Michigan."[16]

During 1851 the agitation for some definite provision for agricultural education continued. In his message to the Legislature, Governor John S. Barry called attention to the constitutional provision on the subject and considerable discussion followed, but nothing of any consequence was determined by the Legislature during

---

[15] Ibid., p. 432.

[16] Ibid., p. 433.

this session.

Michigan's State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Francis W. Shearman, and Jonathan Shearer, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, recommended the establishment of a Department of Agriculture in the Normal School at Ypsilanti. The legislative act of March 25, 1850, had already provided that the Normal School should "give instruction in the mechanic arts and in the arts of husbandry and agricultural chemistry."[17] In addition, the State Board of Education, which was the governing organization of this school, was "to provide suitable grounds and buildings, implements of husbandry and mechanical tools either by purchase or lease, for the purpose of more effectually and experimentally carrying out the provisions of the second section of this act."[18]

With these seemingly explicit requirements, there was still delay in carrying them into effect.

Apparently the importance of this venture had still not been driven home to the members of the Legislature nor to the educators who were already operating schools at Ypsilanti and Ann Arbor. There still seemed to be question as to its feasibility from a financial standpoint as well as from the standpoint of its importance in the category of higher education.

---

[17](Michigan) State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1852, p. 9.

[18]Ibid., p. 10.

CHAPTER II.

Bid for the Agricultural School

Although little was heard from the legislative session of 1851, and less from any other source during the early part of 1852 concerning the establishment of an agricultural school, a new approach was taken the latter part of that year. Justus Gage delivered an address at the State Fair held at Detroit, September 22-24, 1852, in which he took occasion to give several reasons for recommending "the institution of public agricultural schools for the education of farmers' sons and others, in the scientific principles of farming."[19]

Although Gage's comments did not directly concern the establishment of an agricultural college, it is quite possible that his reiteration of a great need for an organized program of agricultural education spurred others to consider the possibilities of higher education in this area. The State was awakening to the fact that it was necessary to establish an agricultural school which would be liberally endowed and organized so as to teach theory as well as the practical methods of farming, and thereby combine the science and art of agriculture.

A few days before Justus Gage addressed the Detroit Fair,

---

[19] Ibid., p. 193.

Francis W. Shearman wrote to J. C. Holmes, Secretary of the State Agricultural Society. His letter proposed that the agricultural school become a part of the State Normal School at Ypsilanti.[20] Shearman pointed to the fact that the law establishing the Normal called for instruction in these areas, the interests of the Normal coincided with those of the State Agricultural Society. He added that the Normal had been permanently endowed with twenty-five sections of Salt Spring Lands which would yield, in time, sufficient revenue to carry out all the purposes designed in its establishment. He emphasized that the class of young men who were expected as pupils at the Normal School were those who for the most part engaged in the pursuit of agriculture, and who in most cases, after securing their educations would return to farms within the State.[21]

Shearman closed his letter by saying, "The great interests of education and agriculture can be there (the State Normal School) most practically identified and cherished. Those views are thrown out to you (Holmes) as suggestions which may lead to some more important action in the future, should it be deemed a matter of importance to the agricultural interests of the State, in connection with one of its most practical educational institutions."[22]

It should be pointed out that neither Ypsilanti nor the University was completely altruistic in its suggesting that the

---

[20] Ibid., p. 12.

[21] Ibid., p. 13.

[22] Ibid., p. 14.

establishment of an agricultural school on its campus. Both schools were in serious financial difficulties. The acquisition of Salt Spring Lands and the sale of those lands would certainly have put either in good financial condition.

Stimulated by Shearman's letter, Henry P. Tappan, the University's President, wrote J. C. Holmes in December of 1852 informing him that he was fully awake to the situation around him.[23] In his letter, he presented the measures proposed by the Board of Regents that would embrace an agricultural course. These included: daily lectures on chemistry, animal and vegetable anatomy and physiology, organic chemistry and the theory and practice of agriculture and soil science. Probably one of Tappan's most important points in this letter was his statement that the Legislature had been empowered and should make the proposed Agricultural School a branch of the University and appropriate twenty-two sections of Salt Spring Lands for the maintenance of this school.

Once again, it was quite obvious that there was much interest in the Salt Spring Lands and the financial gain that could be derived from them.

Considerable interest is added to this evident competition of the two older institutions for the control of the new one from the fact that Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti were less than ten miles apart.

It would seem that between these two schools the State Agricultural Society, which appeared to have been the acknowledged arbiter

---

[23] Ibid., p. 15.

of the controversy, should have been able to find an ideal location for a "model farm"; but they were evidently not yet ready to determine the question. Secretary Holmes was apparently more influential than any other man in securing the final location of the new school in another part of the State.

Holmes' first move in this direction was his noncommittal attitude. Rather than an immediate decision or advice to Tappan or Shearman, he advised the State Agricultural Society to appoint a committee to confer with the Board of Education and the Board of Regents of the University regarding an agricultural department at the University or the Normal School.

A committee was speedily appointed. The committee was comprised of Titus Dort, A. Y. Moore and Shoemaker. They asked the Legislature to establish an agricultural school at once and recommended that it be a branch of the University, controlled by the Board of Regents, and accompanied by a farm comprising at least 640 acres. The concluding recommendation of this group was that the proposed school not be established in immediate proximity to any existing educational institution.[24]

Reaction to the committee's recommendations by the general public, the newspapers and farm journals was mixed. Some regretted that the committee recommended making the new school a branch of the University. Others felt that under the circumstances the arrangement should be accepted for the present time.

---

[24] Michigan Farmer, January, 1953, p. 18.

The Adrian Watchtower appeared to lean toward the establishment of an independent institution. In an editorial the paper proposed private support for the proposed institution. It added that possibly support from the State could come whenever and wherever it was needed.[25]

Although the editor of the Michigan Farmer claimed impartiality on the subject, he strongly stated that he preferred the proposed agricultural school to have no connections with the University. There were some points that he objected to, namely, the sketchy statements regarding an experimental farm. In his mind the fact that the school would be established on University lands a distance from the University, as well as the unavailability of University laboratories to the proposed experimental farm, was a strong reason for objection.

Although the Michigan Farmer was an influential farm journal with a monthly circulation of nearly 50,000, the University attacked it for its hostile attitude and standoffishness, which Tappan claimed existed for years. Tappan strengthened his stand by saying that regardless of the Michigan Farmer's opinion, the University would establish an agricultural department and it would present the best sort of instruction in agricultural subjects. The Farmer did not look kindly upon the University's attack. Lashing back, the editor accused Tappan of illogical conclusions. "Is not that the place to learn logic? And is this the sort of logic there taught,

---

[25]Adrian Watchtower, February 13, 1852.

that because we are disinclined to such a step, therefore it follows that we are unfriendly to the Institution?"[26]

The editor of the Farmer felt that the people had a right to ponder over this question as to whether the agricultural school would be best promoted by a connection with the University. The editor reiterated that the Michigan Farmer was not attempting to blot out the University but merely expressing an opinion on a very important subject.

True to his promises, Tappan inaugurated the agricultural courses he had outlined to J. C. Holmes in December of 1852. These courses were placed in operation the following spring and summer.[27] They were of a general nature, but their generalities were not the source of irritation with the Michigan Farmer. Criticism by the Farmer was due to the fact that the lectures offered were available only to a few people living in the immediate vicinity of Ann Arbor.[28] The Farmer felt that if these lectures were to be of value to the farmers of the State, then they should have been prepared for dissemination with an agency established to assure proper distribution throughout the State. Further criticism was leveled at the University because of its sense of timing for presentation of the courses. The farm journal pointed to the fact that spring and summer months

---

[26] Michigan Farmer, February, 1853, p. 41.

[27] (Mich.) State Agricultural Soc., Annual Report, p. 15.

[28] Michigan Farmer, February, 1853, p. 41.

were not the most satisfactory months for farmers to attend lectures.[29]

It was not until September of 1853 that Tappan took his case directly to the people.[30] His address at the State Fair in Detroit appealed to their practicality as well as to their emotions. He insisted that the University was designed to prepare the way for their sons in any chosen profession, including agriculture, for which a department was established at the University. He promised that the University would teach agricultural science and that it would be carried whether or not it received the Salt Spring Lands from the State. His aim was to make the University one of the first in the country where no branch of knowledge was omitted.

He was blunt and to the point in condemning a separate agricultural school. First, he claimed that he was free from all sectional and local jealousy. Although he indicated competition was nothing to fear, he believed that the State should concentrate its means and its endeavors toward one great university rather than establishing a "half dozen abortions." He contended that a "great" institution had to be located somewhere, but that it could not be located everywhere. A division meant nothing but weakness, he said. He felt that the University already had the apparatus, the books and the professors which could not be duplicated elsewhere. Finally, he suggested that when the agricultural school became strong and had

---

[29] Michigan Farmer, May, 1853, p. 156.

[30] (Mich.) State Agricultural Soc., Annual Report, 1853, p. 152.

sufficient strength to stand alone, then it could become a separate institution.[31]

---

[31] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

A Look At Others

It was the wish of the Executive Committee of the Michigan State Agricultural Society to visit Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti with the intention of observing first hand the facilities and course-offerings at each institution. Then, the committee hoped, an honest recommendation could be made regarding the future of the proposed Agricultural School.

On January 25, 1854, the committee arrived in Ann Arbor where its members, Starkweather, Moore and Bartlett, were greeted by President Tappan in the library of the University.[32] President Tappan was most anxious to cover much ground during the committee's brief visit and immediately took the group into the class of one of his newest faculty members. The Reverend Charles Fox, an Episcopal clergyman of Grosse Ile, who was responsible for the teaching of all subjects connected with practical and scientific agriculture, gave a synopsis of all of his preceding lectures. The committee, in its report, made no statement as to their reaction to Fox's lengthy lecture.

Tappan hastened to inform the committee that Dr. Douglass, another faculty member, lectured on chemistry. He stated that all

---

[32](Michigan) State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1854, p. 20.

of his lectures dwelt fully upon the application of chemistry to the mechanical arts and to practical and scientific agriculture.[33]

Accompanied by a large force of faculty members, which included Professors Williams, Sager, Fasquelle, Haven and Fox, the committee was conducted throughout the University museum and other points of interest. Their reaction was that "there was much to gratify curiosity and interest the mind."[34]

That afternoon, Professor Fox accompanied the group to the medical department where they listened to a chemistry lecture by Professor Douglass entitled "Burning Gases." At the conclusion of the lecture the committee praised the subject matter and the lecturer. They commented that all of the experiments were perfect and that every word conveyed the proper meaning. It is interesting to note that not once did the committee make reference to students attending these lectures with the committee; whether or not the lectures were given behind closed doors to this group is not known.

That same afternoon, Professor Fox again treated the committee to another lecture. This time, his subject was " . . . Rotation of Crops and Drainage." In addition, he gave a synopsis of his preceding lectures which highly pleased committee members.

In its published report, the committee stated that lectures of this nature should certainly be continued until the legislature provided more liberal and extended facilities for agricultural education. However, they noted that it was necessary to have a model and

---

[34] Ibid., p. 21.

experimental farm where the practical as well as the scientific branches could be taught. The committee regarded the acquaintance with the practical duties of the farm indispensable to anyone who intended to make agriculture his profession. Therefore, the committee suggested that the Legislature be petitioned at its next session for an appropriation of money arising from the sale of swamp lands. It was their opinion that these funds could be used to purchase a farm where practical and scientific agricultural education could be taught on a scale corresponding with the ever increasing wants and growth of the nation and of the state.[35]

It is rather interesting, however, that not one public statement was made by the committee regarding the feasibility of an agricultural school as a part of the University of Michigan.

The following day, January 26, 1854, the committee traveled seven miles to Ypsilanti where they visited the Normal School. The group was met by Professor A. S. Welch, principal of the institution, who followed Tappan's example of conducting the group around the grounds. They were immediately ushered into a lecture hall where they heard Professor Fiske lecture on the subject, "Organic and Inorganic Nature of the Soils and the Production of Vegetable Matter by the Mechanical Operation of Agriculture, including Manuring, Draining, Plowing and the Proper Pulverizations of the Soil." Once again it is interesting to note that it is doubtful whether this was a regular lecture in the course because of the

---

[35] Ibid., p. 22.

diversity of subjects covered. As in the case of the University lectures, it is not known whether students attended these lectures or whether they were merely for the benefit of the committee. The committee's only comment on this lecture was that it was done in a happy style and comprehensive manner.[36] The committee appeared to be sidestepping the issue in the report for they devoted a major portion of it to the order and regularity observed at the school, and the cleanliness and neat appearance of the buildings. A clue to their thinking is or can be traced in this statement: "The teaching of Agricultural Science in this institution will be felt to a greater or lesser degree in almost every school district throughout our State, but we do not think the information to be derived from these sources is sufficient to constitute the education of a professional and practical farmer."[37]

It is clear that the committee was convinced that neither the Normal School nor the University was satisfactory as a proposed agricultural school. It is possible that the entire report was written merely to answer the pleas from both institutions. Quite obviously, there were no immediate results, but in December 1854 the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society recommended that an agricultural school be established entirely separate from any other institution. To strengthen this recommendation, they created a committee to draft a petition to the State Legislature requesting an

---

[36] Ibid., p. 21.

[37] Ibid., p. 22.

appropriation of money sufficient for the establishment of an agricultural school, with the addition of an experimental farm, where experimental and theoretical agriculture would be taught on a scale equal to our best colleges.[38]

---

[38] Ibid., p. 23.

CHAPTER IV

Location

The committee's recommendations were not too favorably accepted in some quarters. Specifically the Executive Committee's memorial to the legislature in December of 1854 was objected to by the University of Michigan because that memorial embodied the committee's belief that an agricultural school should be entirely separate from any other institution.

The petition drafted by this committee was circulated for signatures in the various counties of the state. It was felt that in this manner the legislature would not be dealing with a memorial from the agricultural society but a mandate from the people. The petition called attention to the fact that the constitution of 1850 made it imperative that the legislature provide for the establishment of an Agricultural School as soon as practicable. It closed with an appeal to establish this school without any unnecessary delay and to make suitable appropriations by law for the purchase of a tract of land, sufficient and suitable for an experimental farm, and for the erection of suitable buildings.[39] Probably the most important point of this petition was its request that the Agricultural School be placed on a basis of its own, separate from any other institution

---

[39] Ibid., p. 20.

of higher learning.

The petitions that arrived in Lansing during the legislative sessions of January and February of 1855 were no doubt effective in speeding up the legislative process of passing a law for the establishment of an agricultural school.

One of the recurrent serious problems was the location of the new college. The State Agricultural Society had pretty much ruled out the University at Ann Arbor and the State Normal School at Ypsilanti as possible locations after a committee had visited both areas. Their recommendation that the new institution be entirely separate from any other strengthened the thought that the new college should be located elsewhere.

Several motives can be credited with the legislature's final decision to locate the Agricultural College at Lansing. They are purely speculative but logically sound. Lansing, as the state capital, was a raw frontier community. Possibly it was the hope of the legislators to aid in the development of the city. There was the belief that the location of an institution of higher learning in the community would do much for the development of its commerce as well as its prestige. Secondly, many may have felt that the state capital would eventually become the population center of the state. The westward movement of the population continued to gain momentum at this time and it was conceivable that the near geographical center could also become the population center of the state. Third,

it could be expected that there would be a degree of jealousy from the people living in the western counties of the state over the fact that up to this time much of the educational training in the state was being taught at the eastern end of the state, or more specifically, Washtenaw County. It should also be pointed out that this posed great transportation problems for those living in the western and northern counties. A more central location would alleviate this situation for many. A fifth motive for locating at Lansing could be attributed to the fact that the legislature placed restrictions on the amount of money to be expended for purchasing acreage. Obviously, land in underdeveloped areas would be considerably cheaper per acre. The limitation of fifteen dollars an acre practically assured a victory to those who opposed connection with the University. The college and its experimental farm was to be no less than five hundred acres and not more than one thousand acres. This again posed problems for those desiring location in the more heavily populated counties. It would have been rather difficult to obtain that much land in one area. To purchase parcels of land could not even considered because it was believed that the operation of an experimental farm, in close proximity to the college, was a fundamental part of this education.

It is interesting to note that no less than nine counties were suggested as sites for the proposed agricultural college. They were: Cass, Ingham, Eaton, Washtenaw, Ontonagon, Montcalm, Clinton,

Newaygo, and St. Clair.[40]

However, it was a wise legislature that inserted in the law the line "within ten miles of Lansing."[41] This eliminated any possible feeling of jealousy of one county for another. It also afforded the possibility of being located in any one of four counties: Ingham, Eaton, Clinton, or Ionia.

There was much discussion over the distance the proposed school should be located from the state capitol. Some felt it should have been within five miles, others spoke in terms of as many as twenty-five miles, and still others were in favor of fifteen miles. Possibly the ten mile figure was a compromise.

It was a great victory for those who opposed affiliation with the University of Michigan when the Legislature provided that the Agricultural College would be under the direction and supervision of the State Board of Education. Looking back, the legislature could have placed it under the Board of Regents where it would have been a branch of the University in fact even if not in law. The fact that it was not placed under the Board of Regents adds one more reason to the assumption that the Agricultural College was forever to remain free and independent.

The Michigan Farmer, which could be termed a weather vane of rural thinking at that time, summed up the public's reaction to the location of the Agricultural College near Lansing when it said:

---

[40] House Journal, 1855, pp. 410-11.

[41] Senate Journal, 1855, p. 330.

"At one time, for want of an agreement as to where the location of the college should be, the bill was given up as lost, but the good sense and the general desire of the members of the Legislature to perform a duty long delayed, led them to lay aside all local feelings, and do what was thought best for the general good. In this way they have acted wisely. And now that the first great step is taken to promote the cause of agricultural education in Michigan, let us all keep the ball rolling, until such an institution is established as will be worthy of the liberality of the State, and not only an honour, but a source of real practical benefit to the people."[42]

A "regular" writer to the Letter to the Editor column of the Michigan Farmer, "Philo Cultus," summed up his feelings on location when he said: "I am opposed to the system of centralization, which makes the whole state tributary to one particular locality (Ann Arbor). I think it bad economy. They (the University) have more now than they can manage. The creation of a new institution elsewhere will require a little more outlay in the beginning but will be good economy in the end."[43]

Regardless of the opposition of a group which was believed to be a minority, the Governor signed on February 12, 1855, an act establishing an Agricultural College to be located within ten miles

---

[42] Michigan Farmer, February, 1854, pp. 42-3.

[43] Ibid., pp. 42-3.

of Lansing on a tract of land not less than 500 nor more than 1000 acres.[44] The site and location was to be selected by the State Agricultural Society subject to the approval of the State Board of Education.

The enactment of this law did not end the complaints of those in favor of connection with the University.

---

[44] Ibid., p. 134.

CHAPTER V

Winchell vs. Holmes

Less than a month after the legislature had passed the act establishing an agricultural school, rumblings developed at the University. Professor Alesander Winchell, one of the University's leading faculty members, attributed the proposed separate founding of an agricultural school to the following causes:[45]

1. jealousy of centralization.
2. fear that a sufficiently technical education would not be furnished by the University.
3. fear that if connected with the University, the college could not be sufficiently under the control of the State Agricultural Society.

Professor Winchell vigorously disarmed the first argument by citing the American dread of governmental centralization and consequent duplication of educational agencies. He declared that scientific agriculture was as important to the University as medicine or civil engineering.

In answer to the second objection, he excused the inefficiency of the University's short lived agricultural course on the grounds of insufficient funds for its adequate support. He said he did not want to see the Agricultural College go through a repetition of these struggles with a divided endowment.

---

[45] (Michigan) State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1854, p. 344.

He answered the third objection with a rather interesting proposal. The proposal formulated his reasons for attaching the college to the University:[46]

1. "such a connection would cause a great saving in the first outlay."

2. "such connection would cause a great saving in the subsequent support."

3. "a separate college of agriculture must necessarily afford instruction somewhat inferior to that which was and could be afforded by the University."

4. "the particular principles of scientific agriculture constitute properly an inseparable part of the University instruction."

5. "a union of the college with the University would tend to the centralization and reproduction, instead of the dispersion and dissipation, of our educational resources."

These arguments were urged with all the fairness and cogency of statement that made Professor Winchell a power in the classroom, on the platform and in the press. To them, he added a remarkably liberal proposition concerning the guarding and preservation of the special field of the college in its interrelations with the University.

Professor Winchell commented that the Regents of the University should continue their present relations to that institution, but that the Regents should act as an Executive Committee to the Agricultural Department under the instructions of the State Agricultural Society. He emphasized that the Board of Education should retain

---

[46] Ibid., p. 345.

its present relationship with the State Normal School. Finally, he suggested that the Agricultural College be governed by the President and Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society, or if more expedient, by a joint board comprising the State Board of Education and the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society.

There is no doubt that Winchell's proposals were good and practical and conciliated and satisfied the farmer of 1855, with one exception, and that was his demand for an institution that was not in immediate proximity to any existing institution. They were unable to dismiss the conviction that organic union in one locality meant at least delay in the development of the specialties of agriculture, with the possibility of a diminution in the number of those who could avail themselves of such teaching in the atmosphere of a great literary and professional school.

Those who supported the idea of a separate institution were just as loud and strong in their attacks. An editorial in the January, 1855, issue of the Michigan Farmer strongly supported a separate institution.

The Farmer insisted that agriculture required, and deserved, and called for an institution of its own. Its editor, R. F. Johnstone, argued that educational funds had been too long and too exclusively devoted to fitting students for the learned professions and that it was time for a change. Johnstone's view was that the

State had neglected the farmers' interest in the area of higher education.[47]

There were other arguments supporting the separate institution. One was that there was ample endowment that would be forthcoming from the United States government gift of swamplands within the Michigan borders.

It was also believed that the establishment of a separate institution to supply the wants of the state would not cost over $50,000 if it was managed properly, and it was the opinion that a farm of a thousand acres, all of the necessary buildings and professors competent to teach all that was required, could graduate in the not too distant future an average of nearly two hundred students a year. Little did they realize that almost one hundred years would pass before the institution would graduate two hundred agricultural majors in any year.

J. C. Holmes, secretary of the State Agricultural Society, challenged Winchell's arguments in an address before the State Agricultural Society's Executive Committee on June 12, 1855, at Lansing.[48]

First, Holmes was still concerned about the differences of opinion regarding the best methods of obtaining a scientific and practical agricultural education and where that education should be provided. In his address, he admitted that some still favored and urged the establishment of an agricultural department at the State

---

[47] Michigan Farmer, January, 1855, pp. 4-5.

[48] (Mich.) State Agricultural Soc., Annual Report, 1854, p. 343.

University, whereas others favored an agricultural department at the Normal School. He contended, however, that a great majority still favored an independent institution.[49]

He said that it had been urged by some that the Revised Constitution of the State required that when an agricultural school was established . . . "it shall be a department or branch of the University . . . ".[50] Holmes pointed out that this was a mistaken idea, in that the Constitution said "may" rather than "shall". Holmes stated that he was informed by a member of the convention for revising the Constitution that it was the wish of those at whose suggestion this section was placed in the constitution, that it should require the school to be established separate from and independent of all other institutions, but several of the members thinking it would be economical to connect it with the University, were unwilling, under the then existing financial embarrassment of the State, to try the experiment of establishing an independent Agricultural School. Accordingly, the matter was compromised and the section adopted to read, " . . . may make the same a branch of the University for instruction in agriculture and the natural sciences."[51]

It was Holmes' belief that the more this subject had been considered and discussed, the stronger had become the conviction of

---

[49] Ibid., p. 339.

[50] Ibid., p. 340.

[51] Ibid., p. 340.

those most interested in the matter, that in order to have it succeed and become of great practicable utility to the farming community, the Agricultural School should be founded upon a basis of its own.

CHAPTER VI

Consolidation 1855-1862

The period from 1855 to 1862 were years of consolidation for the new Agricultural College, involving construction of initial buildings, and the development of a curriculum. The organic law of 1855 which established this new institution continued in force until March 15, 1861. This law, besides providing for the selection of a site, placed the college under the direction and control of the State Board of Education.

The original course of instruction set forth by the law was to include "an English and scientific course, natural philosophy, chemistry, botany, animal and vegetable physiology, geology, mineralogy, meteorology, entomology, veterinary art, mensuration, leveling and political economy, with book-keeping and the mechanic arts which are directly connected with agriculture, and such other studies as the board of education may from time to time see fit to prescribe, having reference to the objects specified in the previous section."[52]

There were to be two terms of study a year, the first term from the first Wednesday of April to the last Wednesday in October, the second term from the first Wednesday in December to the last Wednesday

---

[52] Michigan Pioneer Collections, Vol. 6, "The Earlier History of the College Up To Its Reorganization in 1861, by Theophilus C. Abbot, W. S. George & Co., 1884, Lansing, Michigan, p. 130.

in February. Students were to labor daily, and during the first term of each year, not less than three nor more than four hours a day, and none were to be "exempt from such labor except in case of sickness or other infirmity."[53]

The secretary was to keep a full record of improvements and experiments, and of the crops and their yield in each field. Tuition was to be free to citizens of the State.

On June 16, 1857, the college was formally dedicated by the State Board of Education to the purposes for which it was designed.[54]

Joseph R. Williams, president of the College, delivered the inaugural address. He spoke of the lack of institutions which provided for education in the practical business of life. He said: "That the agricultural masses have felt keenly this great want is evidenced by the simultaneous creation of agricultural societies and periodicals, and the craving for more abundant knowledge. Colleges are springing from the same necessity. New York and Pennsylvania are maturing and two or three other states are taking the initiatory steps toward establishing agricultural colleges. Here on the very margin of the cultivated portions of our country, where the 'forest primeval' are just vanishing before the encroachments of civilization, the youthful and vigorous State of Michigan, first among her sister states, dedicates this institution to the instruction of men who are

---

[53] Ibid., p. 130.

[54] Michigan State Agricultural Society, Annual Report, 1857 pp. 304-315.

devoted exclusively to the cultivation of the earth."[55]

It is possible that Williams was serving notice to those continued advocates of uniting with the University, that the founding of an agricultural college in Michigan was merely the beginning of a nation-wide revolution in the educational system of this country. And that there was no turning back to the ways of former times.

Williams spoke of the objections that would be raised to this new institution. He said they would call it an experiment, and demand results before they were willing to afford aid or sympathy. He warned they would object to its cost and that the institution would be left unendowed, and subject to the caprices of the individual politicians and successive legislatures.

In referring to the manual labor system, he said: "If manual labor has failed in all other colleges, it ought not to fail here, where it is inseparably connected with the acquisition of knowledge. Practical labor in this institution is the vital, cementing, invigorating influence, that will give it dignity, and it is hoped, complete success."[56]

It is interesting to note that these and other sentences from Williams' address now read more like history than like prophecy. He spoke of the hard times that prevailed, of the virgin forest in which operations were begun and the valuable hints which could be derived from European schools, but all of these were only a preview of

---

[55] Ibid., p. 315.

[56] Ibid., p. 309.

what was to eventually come.

Williams' address clearly set forth the aims and the philosophies of this newly-created institution. Upon the completion of his address, it should have been clear to everyone that Williams was determined to make this new venture a success. This was probably the most significant factor in its early success --- strong and determined leadership.

Was the college sufficiently a success in these initial years to justify its continuance? The college's success in this period of consolidation cannot be denied. A distinguished faculty comprised the college's teaching staff.[57] Some of those in these early years were Henry Goadby, M.D., professor of entomology and physiology; Lewis R. Risk, professor of chemistry; Theophilus C. Abbot, professor of history, English and philosophy; George Thurber, M.D. of New York City who for many years was editor of the American Agriculturalist, professor of botany and vegetable physiology; Manley Miles, M.D. of Flint, State Zoologist, professor of zoology and animal physiology; and John C. Holmes, referred to many times in this paper, superintendent of the horticultural department.[58] And there were other distinguished men who made up the faculty of the Agricultural College in this brief period. Students attending were bound to gain much from the excellent instruction and experiences of these gentlemen. Inferior instruction could not be included in the complaints of the

---

[57] Michigan Pioneer Collections, Volume 6, p. 133.

[58] Ibid., p. 133.

college's opponents.

One area where it was not successful was in the financial one. This difficulty eventually created great problems for the institution by its opponents. Some $56,000 realized from the sale of the Salt Springs land was entirely spent before the opening of the college year in 1858.[59] A monthly allowance of five hundred dollars was borrowed and by the close of the year, the college was $13,000 in debt.

The difficulties of establishing a college in the forest had been greatly underestimated. Prices had increased since the undertaking began and hard times throughout the country added to the problems of the new institution. However, the students were loyal and remained working for the continued success of the college and its growth.

Financial problems continued to exist until an appropriation of $37,500 was made to the college for 1859-1860. With this sum the board of education paid the large debts of the previous two years and by the close of 1860 the college was virtually free from debt thus ridding it for the time being of one of its greatest problems.[60]

During this four year period, (1857-1860), enrollment was generally good. In the first term, May 13 to October 28, 1857, the number of students enrolled totaled 81. In the second term, December 2 to February 22, 1858, enrollment totaled 101. In the fourth term,

---

[59] Ibid., p. 132.

[60] Ibid., p. 134.

November 30, 1858 to February 23, 1859, there were 86 students, 39 of these entering for the first time. In both the third and fourth terms there were 137 different students. On April 5, 1859, the fifth term opened and closed August 5; August 16, the sixth term opened and closed November 16. Total number enrolled for the year was 106.[61]

In 1860, there was a decided falling off in enrollment, dropping from 106 to 49 students. However, this was generally attributed to a change in overall operation of the college rather than because of the quality of instruction. The plan was to make the college more strictly a technical school, like the medical school at Ann Arbor. It is possible that those hoping to make the agricultural college a branch of the University instigated such a move. John M. Gregory, ex-officio secretary of the board of education developed the plan; however, there are no records to indicate his sentiments regarding the status of the agricultural college. Under the new plan all forms of literary study were to be eliminated from the curriculum. This prevented any possibility of duplication of courses with the University at Ann Arbor, but it also restricted the course of instruction so drastically that any possibility of receiving a well-rounded education was completely nullified.

In the previous year, 1859, a bill was introduced into the legislature which would have transferred the College to the University. This bill, which was offered as a substitute for the appro-

---

61 Ibid., p. 133.

priation bill, was defeated. It was felt by most legislators that too much had already been spent on the present site to bring about such a transferral economically. The fact is that strong opposition from legislative supporters of the college and its present location cannot be discounted as a reason for the refusal to transfer the institution to Ann Arbor.

In 1861, J. M. Gregory, who as Superintendent of Public Instruction had changed the college's curriculum in 1859, recommended that a new board be created to control the operation of the State Agricultural College. Much dissatisfaction was expressed with the new course of instruction, the so-called Gregory Plan which was set up in 1859. There was a feeling amongst farmers that their sons were receiving an education that was inferior to that which was given at the University.

The inferior education matter came up in the executive committee meeting of the State Agricultural Society in December, 1859. This group appointed a committee to investigate the condition of the College and report the following fall (1860).

In its report that fall, the committee stated that the objects of the college were: first, explaining the philosophy of agriculture and developing a knowledge of the laws of nature concerning the cultivation of the soil; secondly, affording mental culture and discipline to enable the student to comprehend and reason about the laws.[62] It was the committee's feeling that farmers' sons should not be satisfied

---

[62] (Mich.) State Agricultural Soc., Annual Report, 1860, p. 133.

with anything less than a full course in science and literature. The Committee recommended the transfer of the care of the college to a State Board of Agriculture. The report was adopted in December 1860, and a committee appointed to present it to the Legislature.

A bill to this effect and to reorganize the college was introduced in the Senate. For several days, the debates continued. Some legislators were in favor of closing the doors forever, others were still pressing for transferral to Ann Arbor. Many of the newspapers, particularly the Detroit papers and those in the southeastern counties favored removal to the University.[63]

Probably, the one man who had more influence than any other in preventing this in 1861 was Joseph Williams, ex-president of the college. Mr. Williams was a member of the Senate and his influence is plainly visible in the provisions of the bill. It was passed by the Senate by a vote of 24 to 5.[64]

In the House of Representatives, a bill creating a State Board of Agriculture was passed with but one negative vote, but was not approved by the Senate committee. The Senate bill, when it came down to the House was passed instead, by a vote of 58 to 18.[65]

Under the new law a Board of Agriculture consisting of six members was established. According to the law, the course of study was to be of not less than four years and it was to be liberal in its

---

[63] The Laws of Michigan, 1855, P. 43, Act 130, p. 279.

[64] Michigan Pioneer Collections, p. 135.

[65] Ibid., p. 135.

range. Soon after the opening of the Spring term of 1861 a four years' course of study and an additional preparatory course of one year was adopted by the college.[66]

Even after the establishment of a new law and the almost unanimous support of the State Legislature, the Agricultural College still faced the bitter opposition of those still favoring connection with the University.

Nearly ten years had passed since serious consideration had been first given to the idea of an Agricultural College. Money had always been a problem, not only to the Agricultural College but to the University and the Normal School as well. The sale of Salt Spring Lands had been of great help to those schools, but what was to come in the way of a federal land grant in 1863 meant almost complete freedom from financial worries to an already established school, and it was this thought that once again set off the feud.

---

[66] Ibid., p. 135.

CHAPTER VII.

The Morrill Act and the Session of 1863

Few realized how much consternation the Morrill Land Grant would create. There were those who considered the land grant merely a method of quieting the cries of the agricultural groups. There were few who fully realized the value of the land grant.

As early as 1859 a joint resolution in the Michigan legislature approved without amendment and recommended passage of a bill accepting grants or donations of lands from the United States government.[67] From the Morrill Act of 1862 the Agricultural College received some 240,000 acres of federal land in Michigan. Since most of Michigan's best farm land lay in the southern half of the lower peninsula and had already been sold off to settlers by the mid-1860's, much of the grant by the federal government was land located in the north country.

There were many in Ann Arbor in the 1860's that fully realized the potential financial return of this grant, and began working toward the annexation of the Agricultural College or gaining control of the land grant.

Friends of the University again renewed their efforts for

---

67 Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1859, House Document No. 15; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing.

transferral. Agitation began in the newspapers, particularly the Detroit Free Press shortly after the legislature went into session in January, 1863. In an article written by the Lansing correspondent of the Free Press, it was stated that the College was on its last leg. He said: "It is now shut up for the winter, and it would be better for the taxpayers if it were shut up forever. It was started as a speculation, run as a political machine, and here is the final showing after the people have put just two hundred thousand dollars into it. It don't pay."[68]

Detroit newspapers sided with the University. The Detroit Advertiser and Tribune proposed the removal of the Agricultural College to Ann Arbor and merging it with the University. However, on the other hand not all of the newspapers were against the College. The Lansing State Republican was a staunch supporter. The Republican attacked the Advertiser and Tribune editorial on the grounds that should this merger occur it would mean defeating the purpose Congress had in mind in the offering of the land grant for the endowment of agricultural colleges. The editorial based this premise on the point that agriculture and the mechanic arts would become subordinate subjects should the merger become a reality.[69]

It was the Republican's belief that Literary, Law and Medical Departments would still remain the leading and principal branches of the institution at Ann Arbor. However, the Republican pointed out

---

[68]Adrian Daily Watchtower, January 17, 1863.

[69]Lansing State Republican, January 7, 1863.

that the act of Congress establishing the land grant contemplated independent Agricultural Colleges.[70] It may have been the House minority committee's report of 1863 that caused the Republican to make this statement. The committee's report reads: "Here the undersigned would also observe that in making this grant, Congress undoubtedly had in mind the endowment of independent Agricultural Colleges; the very terms of the grant preclude the idea of professorships or departments in other colleges."[71] It might be well to point out that the Lansing Republican was incorrect in its statement that the act of Congress establishing the land grant contemplated independent Agricultural Colleges. The Morrill Act merely offered endowment to colleges where agriculture and the mechanic arts might be taught.

The Republican's editorial continued by saying " . . . it would be nothing less than a breach of good faith, in the Legislature to accept the munificent bounty of Congress for our Agricultural College and then incontinently pass the whole benefit over to the University."[72] It was the newspaper's belief that the farmers of Michigan would never consent to having their institution merged or hitched to the University.

---

[70] Lansing State Republican, January 7, 1863.

[71] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1863, Report of W. T. Howell, House Document No. 11; John A. Kerr and company, Lansing.

[72] Lansing State Republican, January 7, 1863.

Pressure continued on both sides with the focal point the Legislature which was then in session at Lansing. Some of this pressure was reflected through a joint legislative committee whose majority proposed the conversion of the college buildings and farm into an annex to the State Reform School. The committee also proposed to assign the Morrill Land Grant to the University. It was the committee's belief that such a move would be a great financial savings to the State. The committee's report pointed to the fact that a $10,000 annual appropriation to the college would be saved, in that no additional professors, library, apparatus or buildings would be required at Ann Arbor. The majority report went on to say that agricultural students would not only enjoy superior educational opportunities at the University but that they would have the advantage of living in a healthful and highly respected community and district. It is also believed that by uniting the apparatus of the College with that of the University, all classes of students could share the benefits of an extensive laboratory; that the University would afford a superior means of instruction in every branch; that it would centralize and reproduce instead of dispersing our education resources; that there were advantages of society, business, and trade. It was the committee's feeling that it was unfair to the sons of farmers to be placed in the wilderness for an education while others had access to the cultivated society of the best agriculturalists,

mechanics, merchants and professional men at the University.[73]

The Lansing State Republican picked up this charge of failure because of its location "in the woods." The Republican claimed that the Agricultural College's opponents were at fault as to its facts. To the committee's charge that the College had been located on uncultivated lands, the Republican was quick to point out that about 38 acres of the College farm had been ten years under cultivation when the College was located. "So those who located the College were not guilty of a very strange oversight after all," said the Republican.

This same newspaper further attacked the majority report because of its claim that it would be an economy measure inasmuch as a lesser number of professors would be required to conduct the classes. The Republican stated that the same number would be needed unless they planned to reduce the quality of the course and the number of students permitted to enroll in the course. The editorial concluded by saying " . . . The course of instruction at the Agricultural College, in order to carry out the object for which it was founded, is, and must necessarily be altogether different from the University. Either the one or the other, or both would have to be changed, which would be impracticable. Besides this, we are told professors in the University have as much on their hands already as they can attend to. That institution already has irons enough in the fire."[74]

---

[73] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1863, House Document No. 18. John A. Kerr and Company, printers to the State, Lansing, pp. 8-10.

[74] Lansing State Republican, January 21, 1863.

A few weeks later the Lansing correspondent of the Detroit Free Press unleashed a blistering attack upon the Agricultural College for its "extravagance and its imbecilic policies," which as he claimed, filled up the complement of its history.

This correspondent claimed that should the transferral come about, there would be required but one additional professorship for the Agricultural Department at the University and one for the establishment of a military school. This would make the University eligible for the transferral of the grant of lands (240,000 acres) made by Congress. The correspondent once again emphasized, as many others had, that concentration and centralization was desirable if the youth of the land was to secure the highest and most complete education. He strengthened this statement by pointing to the advantage of a large, well selected and superior library as well as the advantages of able and instructive lecturers in various fields.[75]

The article concluded by intimating that the citizens of Lansing might possibly be behind the entire movement. "Of course the good people of this town are a good deal exercised about the matter. They propose to give a supper to the honorable legislators -- whether their toasting and feasting will have effect to swerve our incorruptible legislature from the path of duty, or prevent the accomplishment of a great public good remains to be seen."[76]

---

[75]Adrian Daily Watchtower, February 20, 1863.

[76]Ibid., February 20, 1863

It is not surprising that the majority report was strongly supported by some newspapers throughout the State and by private citizens. There were several reasons for this support. First, the possibility of tax reduction, and this point interested many people. Secondly, there were those who objected to decentralized higher education as an unnecessary addition to the educational institutions of the State. Third, there were those who felt that the College's primary function was to operate a model farm, and that the farm should be located in an area where the State's more prosperous farmers could more conveniently visit. And finally, there were even those who felt that the farmers should not be educated beyond the elementary school.[77]

The Agricultural College, however, still retained its friends, who, regardless of opponents, put up a strong defense for independence.

A minority report from the same legislative committee supported separate existence. One of the committee's reactions was that if there was to be a high standard of instruction, then money would have to be expended to maintain that standard. It was argued that the University was already filled to overflowing, and that it would mean the construction of new buildings as well as a farm with its equipment. It was the minority committee's belief that it would require

---

[77] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1863. House Document No. 18, pp. 1-4; Report of the majority of the joint committee on education and agriculture relative to the Agricultural College; John A. Kerr and Company, Printers to the State, Lansing.

an appropriation of at least $100,000 to accomplish these ends or approximately $90,000 more than it would cost to retain the present operation at the Agricultural College. It was also believed that the University would be required to hire additional professors if it was to offer courses in agriculture, horticulture, botany, chemistry and zoology.[78]

The minority committee hammered away at the point of centralization. "It cannot be justice or sound policy to concentrate all the institutions even the educational institutions, at one place." A wise government will labor to develop every part of its territory. The new idea of concentration and centralization of all the institutions of education in the State, is not calculated to promote the interests of all sections, or work the greatest good to the greatest number.[79] The fact that the City of Ann Arbor had swallowed up the land around the University created the problem of suitable land for experimental use and practical application of classroom theory. The University claimed they had available land, but it was several miles from the main campus of the University.

The minority report made an additional comment on location when it said that it was too late in the day to discuss the wisdom of

---

[78] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1863, House Document No. 19, pp. 1-32; Report of the minority of the joint committee on education and agriculture relative to the Agricultural College; John A. Kerr and Company, Printers to the State, Lansing.

[79] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1863, House Document No. 19, pp. 2-3; John A. Kerr and Company, printers to the State, Lansing.

planting such an institution in the woods. It was the committee's feeling that it was established, and had sent out its roots in many directions and that if it was torn up, could not be transplanted to any other location without great danger of destroying it forever.[80]

There were many who questioned the proposed use of the Morrill Grant if there was no need for funds to operate an agricultural department at the University. Some hinted that perhaps it was not to be used for agricultural purposes, but for the education of those entering law, medicine and the liberal arts.[81] It was believed that it was not the intent and purpose of Congress to provide the land grant endowment for the support of the teaching of courses of this nature but rather for the development of agriculture and the mechanic arts throughout the State.

As had been the case in the past, the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society went on record in support of the Agricultural College. It resolved that the State Board of Agriculture deserved the complete confidence of the Legislature and the people of the State because of its excellent governing job in the previous two years.

It also went on record to say that the proposed removal of the College was a hazardous experiment calculated to injure rather than benefit the cause of agricultural education. Finally, it proposed that all appropriations needed for the college be granted by the

---

[80] Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[81] Lansing State Republican, January 7, 1863.

Legislature.

A letter printed in several newspapers in the State and signed "KALAMAZOO" which many assumed to be written by Hezekiah G. Wells said, " . . . let no other institution of the State heretofore considering agriculture and the mechanic arts of secondary importance, now having its cupidity aroused, compete for this splendid endowment."

Apparently the University's arguments were not strong enough to convince the State legislators that the Agricultural College should become a part of the University. More serious, however, was the fact that they could not convince them that the Congressional grant should be turned over to the University. Thus in 1863, the Agricultural College was assigned the Congressional grant.

Unfortunately for those who supported the Agricultural College, the University was able to defeat all bills in the legislative session of 1863, designed to provide for current expenses of the Agricultural College. This created a serious housing and classroom shortage in the late 1860's. In fact, it was so serious that nearly half of the young men applying for admission to the Agricultural College had to be turned down.

It was unfortunate that some of the legislators of the rural areas were not as enthusiastic in their support of the College as might be expected or believed. Possibly because of the undeveloped agricultural land in and around the College or because of the inaccessibility of Lansing to the rest of the State, support from

members of this group wavered more than once. Remembering that legislative sessions came during the cold months of January, February and March, it must have been most unimpressive to many of the legislators to visit the College on these cold, bleak and lonely days. The College was closed during the winter, thus the students were gone, professors were not teaching and all of the college buildings were closed. Even the snow swept fields were discouraging to a visitor of this comparatively undeveloped section of the State.

But regardless of these difficulties, the College continued its existence. It weathered the storm of the legislative session of 1863, and was to exist in relative quiet until the winter of 1865, when once again the battle reopened. Strangely enough, the next siege was instigated by its strongest supporters up to this time.

CHAPTER VIII

Relocation

There were many who were shocked at the Michigan State Agricultural Society's change of attitude in 1865. The organization which for so many years had supported the college and vigorously defended it in 1863, turned against it in 1865. In March 1865, the officers of the Society presented a memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives asking the transfer of the Agricultural College. The memorial was presented by W. G. Beckwith, President of the Michigan State Agricultural Society.

The Executive Committee believed that the Legislature should have taken steps to remove the Agricultural College to a more central location. It was the committee's desire to make the Agricultural College more accessible to farming communities. Had it been put in a central location it would have been more likely to promote and improve agriculture, they said. The committee urged removal to a better location.

The group laid down several reasons for desiring a change of location. First, they felt that expenditures for the operation of the College were too great, and that no return was being realized from the College farm. According to the committee's statistics, the first eight years of operation cost the State $168,320.00. Of this

amount $112,000 had been raised by direct taxation; $70,000 had been expended in the purchase of land and the erection of buildings. The education of the students attending in that period cost $98,320.00 or an average of about $12,390.00 each year.[82] The average attendance during the eight year period, according to the committee, was fifty, and this figured to an approximate cost of $346.40 per student. It was the committee's feeling that this was far too much to expend on each student, when comparing it with other educational institutions.[83] Apparently it was believed that if the institution was removed or absorbed into another school, operating costs would be reduced.

Secondly, they felt that its location should have been considered under two aspects: its effect upon the institution, and its adaptation to the wants of the agricultural interests. They believed that the location from the very outset had paralyzed the efforts of all who had been placed in charge of the institution, and that it placed the school where it was surrounded by few or none of the influences of improvements. "Students went to it, became discouraged, and left it to be succeeded by others, who went through the same experience."[84] The committee continued by saying that it

---

[82] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1865; House Document No. 45; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing, pp. 2-3.

[83] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1865; House Document No. 42, p. 3; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing.

[84] Ibid., p. 3.

was not accessible to the farming community that sought the best sources of information in regard to progress in agriculture. It was also felt that the College had nothing to offer to enterprising citizens, because it had no experience of its own. Opponents claimed that students and professors were annually subjected to diseases from swamplands in the area and soon parents became unwilling to send their sons to an institution where it was difficult and expensive to reach them as well as unhealthy. Others felt that their sons would be so far distant that they would be outside the realm of the influence of society, the committee said.

Third, the feeling was that the general management of the College had not been such as to have given the agricultural community any confidence in the school or to have made them feel that they had any interest in it, and that it was not patronized by them. The committee accused the State Board of Agriculture and the President of giving the people a very limited and general report of the operation of the College.[85]

The committee stated that the revenues of the College were limited to four sources: appropriation for its support from the State; the produce of the land cultivated by the College; the board of the students, and the sale of the swamp lands as well as the interest derived from the funds created by the sale of the United States grant.

---

[85] Ibid., p. 5.

To the above the committee added that no financial record was ever made public showing the amount received from any of these sources, or how they had been appropriated and expended. It was the committee's belief that the cost of the crops and the general farm management had been very carefully concealed so that nothing was known of it. Thus the general attitude prevailed that the Agricultural College was simply an experiment, and not an agricultural or an education institution that was likely to be permanently useful.

The committee's fourth point was that the location forced the College to lower its admission standards in order to lure students. "It is undoubtedly necessary to its present location to have a preparatory course, but it is well understood, from inquiry and research amongst the students who have been at the College, that this preparatory year is simply the tuition of the ordinary branches usually taught at district schools, and that for this so-called collegiate course, the State has really to pay the large amounts aforementioned."[86]

It wasn't long before there were misgivings to Beckwith's report and the committee's criticism of the Agricultural College. Many citizens of the State were satisfied with the development and operation of the College. Several people presented a memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the State. This statement by influential men of the State pointed to the State Agricultural Society's memorial to the Legislature of 1863 which was also signed

---

86 Ibid., p. 5.

by Beckwith. His views were quite contrary to those stated by the State Agricultural Society in 1865. Two years previously he said: "We have reason to believe that the same quality of education would not be furnished more cheaply, or so successfully at any other institution than it is at this one."[87]

The second point of the 1865 memorial by the State Agricultural Society was also pointed to by the citizens' committee as a complete contradiction of what was said in 1863. In that year Beckwith said: "Your committee deem it to be too late in the day to discuss the wisdom of planting such an institution in the woods. It is established, and has already sent out roots in many directions, which, if torn up, could not be transplanted to any other location, and the time lost in waiting for the transplanted tree to live if it did live, would place the period at which this generation would gather fruits from it, farther off than ever."[88] Beckwith went on to say that the State Board of Agriculture should be strengthened and not weakened. This too, was quite contradictory to his 1865 statements.

The citizens' committee made clear that a group of resolutions adopted unanimously by the State Agricultural Society and signed by Beckwith in January, 1863 were nothing but praise of the Agricultural College and its governing board. These resolutions should probably be quoted in their entirety in that they clearly point out the complete about face of the State Agricultural Society. The resolutions

---

[87] op. cit., House Document No. 45, p. 2.

[88] Ibid., p. 2.

reprinted in House Document 45 of the legislative session of 1865, were as follows:

> Resolved, that the efforts made by the State Board of Agriculture, during the two years it has been organized to administer economically and usefully the State Agricultural College, and its revenue, merit our most hearty approbation, and entitle it to the confidence of the Legislature and the people of the State.
>
> Resolved, that in view of the prosperous condition of the agricultural interests in all parts of the State of Michigan, we recommend that such appropriations as may be needed by the State Board of Agriculture be granted by the Legislature.
>
> Resolved, that it is hereby recommended to the State Board of Agriculture, within a reasonable time, to lay down, fence and put in condition, so much of the land immediately around the college buildings as would form a moderate sized model or experimental farm to sustain the said Board in the exercise of a judicious liberality in securing the services of competent instructors in the various departments of instruction; and it is believed that such judicious liberality will add materially to the reputation and usefulness of the institution.[89]

The citizens' committee lashed out at the untruthfulness of the allegation that the Agricultural College did not have the confidence of the citizens of the State. They stated that the number of students was greater than it had been for several years; that the boarding hall of the institution was filled to capacity; that the applications for admission to the College was almost two hundred in 1865; that the farm was well adapted to grains of all kinds cultivated in the State.

It is interesting to note the report of the Committee on Agriculture before the Legislature of 1865. The report strongly

---

[89] Ibid., p. 3.

criticized the Executive Committee of the State Agricultural Society for its action. The committee cautioned the legislators that the Society had no official or legal connection with the Agricultural College and that the action was not the action of the State Agricultural Society, but that of the Executive Committee. The committee on agriculture claimed that the members of the Society were not even consulted before the action was taken and that under the circumstances the petition was entitled to exactly the same weight as the petition of so many other private men of like intelligence.

It was pointed out that the members of the Executive Committee of the Society had recently visited the College, that they were fully aware of the changed sentiment of the public toward the institution, and that because of this change they fully endorsed the College's present officers and its management. It seems that the only ground for the petition was their feeling that the location was inaccessible.

The Committee on Agriculture claimed this to be an absurd plea, in that Lansing was accessible to Grand Rapids and Detroit by railroad and would soon be accessible to Jackson.[90] "No place in the State, will be, on the completion of the railroad to Jackson, more accessible from every quarter than Lansing."[91]

The Lansing State Republican once again came to the support of the College. An editorial printed on January 25, 1865, attacked the

---

[90] Lansing State Republican, January 25, 1865.

[91] Journal of the Senate, State of Michigan, 1865, Senate Document No. 21, pp. 4-5; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing.

State Agricultural Society's notion that it was in an inaccessible location. The news article pointed out the number of arrivals and departures of trains every day from Lansing with bright prospects of increased rail service in the not too distant future. The article emphasized its accessibility to the large cities and major terminuses in the southern part of the State. The Republican went on to say that it regarded the suggestion of removal as a pretense and excuse for a prejudice and dislike which had always been manifested toward the College by a certain class of people. The article stressed the fact that it was the opinion of the citizens of Lansing that the institution was then well conditioned, and that they believed along with Governor Blair that its dangers were past and its permanence and success secured as well as the land grant making it productive and placing it upon a basis of usefulness and independence unsurpassed. The editorial concluded by saying: "If it (the College) is to exist among us merely as a target for an annual exhibition of a sharpshooting contest -- if it is to be a name rather than the reality which it ought to be, and which it may be -- we had rather see the College removed at once and forever from our midst."[92]

Nearly a month later the Lansing State Republican once again attacked those who were in favor of the College being removed. The paper said that there was nothing further to be gained by any further agitation of the question of discontinuance or of merger with the University. "Its enemies have fought it sufficiently long now to

---

[92]Lansing State Republican, January 25, 1865.

consider its establishment a fixed fact, and the attention of the Legislature in its present session should be given to a determination of the best method of insuring its immediate prosperity."[93] It was the newspaper's hope that no time would be spent in debating whether some things in the past might or might not have been better done. The editorial concluded by complimenting the judicious governing body, the efficient educators, and the model farm.

Probably more significant and more interesting than the attack by the citizens' committee and the newspaper was the violent attack unleashed upon the State Agricultural Society by Hezekiah G. Wells. Wells was amazed at the committee's sudden change of sentiment toward the College. As a member of the State Board of Agriculture, he attacked the committee's resolution to the Legislature as a conglomeration of "Distorted facts" and "fancy opinions."[94]

Wells recalled that the College was first opened for the reception of students in 1857; that it was planned and inaugurated before a single other institution of this kind existed in the United States, and that it had no precedent from which it could adopt all that was good or avoid that which had been proved and tried as evil. Wells made clear that the Legislature had carried out the constitutional provision and established an Agricultural College. He admitted that possibly the location was not as good as it could have been; that

---

[93] Lansing State Republican, February, 1865.

[94] Journal of the House of Representatives, State of Michigan, 1865, House Document No. 11, p. 1; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing.

errors in management had occurred; that large amounts were imprudently expended on the erection of the College, but said Wells, this was far from establishing the fact that it now failed to have the sympathy of the farmers of the State. Inaccessibility was no longer a true statement, he said. The railroads were rapidly establishing Lansing as an important center. In fact, Wells went on to prophesy that Lansing would someday become a prominent city in the State.

Wells insisted that the College had received careful attention from its managing board and that during the four years since the board's establishment, the College had steadily grown in favor with the people. Some of the improvements made by the board were the reorganization of its labor system, changing the course of study to a more practical than theoretical study, as well as the development of its real estate.

It was Wells' belief that the greatest hindrance to the institution would have been the uncertainty of its continued existence. He said that students never had any guarantee that the Legislature would appropriate money for the coming year, and as a result they hesitated to enter an institution with such a shaky and uncertain future. However, with the coming of the Congressional land grant, Wells felt that sufficient funds would be available to sustain and support the institution.

It was his conviction that the time was past for the consideration of the question as to whether the location of the Agricultural

College was the most judicious that could have been made. He pointed out that the College farm had been purchased and paid for; buildings had been erected and in extent were sufficient to accommodate more Than one hundred and twenty students. An able corps of professors and teachers were employed, all impressed with the idea, that during the coming two years, more character could be given to the institution than during its entire former history.

He concluded his memorial to the Legislature by saying, "Permit me here especially to invite your attention to the fact that the class of pupils now in the common schools of the State are looking forward to this College as the only place where, with the glorious privilege of self labor, they can bring themselves forward to take position among the intelligent farmers, mechanics and professional men of their time."[95]

When the appropriation bill came before the Senate and House of Representatives the bill was passed. In the House of Representatives by a vote of 51 to 26 and in the Senate by a vote of 23 to 5.

The geographical alignment indicated that strong support for relocation of the College centered in the eastern and southeastern counties of the State, with strong support to remain in its present

---

[95] Ibid., p. 5.

location from most of the other counties in the State.[96]

---

[96] Journal of the House of Representatives, 1865, pp. 1742-43.
Journal of the Senate, 1865, p. 697.

House and Senate Combined Vote, 1865

	Yea	Nay
Northern Michigan	33	6
South-east	23	19
Lower Michigan outside the South-east	18	6

CHAPTER IX.

Last Ditch Efforts

In 1867, the subject of removal of the College was once again advocated in Detroit newspapers as well as others throughout the State. But it was rapidly becoming a losing battle for those who advocated this. The Legislature too, was having its discussions on the situation, for once again bills of appropriation were before the legislative body of the State.

A minority report of the Committee on Agriculture and Public Instruction while agreeing with a majority of the committee in regard to many matters connected with the Agricultural College, dissented on some portions of the majority committee's report.[97] Cyrus G. Luce, a member of the minority Committee on Agriculture, expressed the opinion for the committee that the College had failed to promote the interests of the farmer and that they had no reason to believe that their interest would be promoted in the future. Luce pointed out that after ten years of operation it had averaged an actual attendance of fifty or sixty per year and that of the entire number graduated only five were known who were farmers or had engaged in agricultural pursuits. Luce felt that the idea of graduating but five persons engaged in agricultural pursuits was too absurd even to

---

[97] Journal of the Senate, State of Michigan, 1867, Senate Document No. 6.

make comment. It was the minority committee's belief expressed by Mr. Luce that many country district schools in the State were doing more to educate farmers and their sons than the Agricultural College. "It is a well known and admitted fact that students after pursuing a college course for four or five years, seldom thereafter engage in industrial pursuits, and more seldom in anything requiring as severe toil as the farm; and students from this College have proved no exception to this rule."[98]

It was also this committee's opinion that the control of the College be given to live, energetic, practical farmers — men who could teach the science and the practice of making a farm a source of profit or at least self-supporting. Furthermore, they felt that the Legislature or the State Board of Agriculture authorize or require the boards of supervisors to select one student from each representative district so that all portions of the State would be equally represented.

The minority of the committee on agriculture therefore recommended that the bill appropriating $40,000 for the expenses of 1867 and 1868 be stricken out of the bill as well as the request for $20,000 to erect a new building.

The majority report of the same committee however, presented arguments in favor of continuance. These positive points seemed to outweigh the negative presented by the minority.

---

[98] Journal of the Senate, State of Michigan, 1867, Senate Document No. 6, p. 4; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing.

First, the majority report stated that Michigan had taken the lead in establishing an Agricultural College; that it had succeeded as no other manual labor school because its plan successfully combined labor and study. It pointed out that the agricultural press with scarcely an exception united in declaring it the most successful agricultural college in the country. The committee recommended that the State should maintain the College by appropriations sufficient to meet its present wants and growing necessities. They cautioned that the Congressional endowment of 240,000 acres would not be sufficient properly to develop the College into an Agricultural College, a Military School and a Polytechnic Institute. Furthermore, it was felt that the grant should be carefully guarded from any sacrifice through a false economy on the part of the State. Secondly, it was claimed that requests for admittance to the College had been more than two-thirds of that which could be accommodated. It was the opinion of this combined committee that funds were not wasted. Its affairs had been repeatedly examined by committees of agriculture and education, and its management was always found to be economical. The committee had complete confidence in the ability of the State Board of Agriculture.

This same committee on Agriculture and Public Instruction quoted from an article printed in the Massachusetts Plowman of July 1, 1865, in which the President of the Massachusetts Agricultural College commented on his visit to the Michigan Agricultural College. This article was reprinted in Senate Document No. 5 of the Michigan

Legislature of 1867. Briefly, the President of Massachusetts State Agricultural College was highly complimentary, stating that it was one of the very few such institutions in the country that was flourishing, and that it had made far more progress than its officers had claimed.

The committees of Agriculture and Public Instruction concluded its report by recommending to the Legislature that the appropriation of $40,000 as well as $20,000 be made to cover the operational expenses and the construction of a new building.[99]

Even the State Agricultural Society had a change of heart. In its report of 1867 it stated: "The Agricultural College is now giving substantial evidence of its progress towards a realization of what was contemplated in its original creation, under the provision of our constitution. And we regard it as one of the instrumentalities that is now placing the science of practical agriculture in the same honorable position that the University is conferring upon the law and medicine and our Normal School on the profession of teaching."[100]

Thus, at the conclusion of the Legislative session of 1867 the appropriation bill providing operational expenses plus additional funds for new buildings was passed.

---

[99] Journal of the Senate, State of Michigan, 1867, Senate Document No. 5, pp. 1-13; John A. Kerr and company, printers to the State, Lansing.

[100] Michigan State Board of Agriculture, Annual Report, 1867, p. 287.

The situation remained relatively quiet until 1869 when the Legislature came back into session at Lansing. In that year a carefully prepared bill for the transfer of the College to Ann Arbor as a department of the University was introduced in the Senate, and came up for action before the House bill appropriating $70,000 came up for concurrence from the House. On a side issue the bill for the transfer was defeated, and the appropriation bill passed in the Senate by the decisive vote of 22 to 8.

This bill not only provided for the support of the Agricultural College, but also made money available for the construction of a new hall for students. Its passage was ably advocated by Senators Williams, Koon, Pierce, Phillips, Turner, Winsor and T. G. Smith, and was opposed by Senators Boles, Jones, Morton and Norris.[101]

An editorial appearing in the Lansing State Republican on March 18, 1869 spoke of the vote as ending forever a fight to destroy an institution, which a Democratic majority had provided for in the Constitution, and a Republican majority had put into active operation. Stephen D. Bingham, the newspaper's editor added: "To the warm friendship of Governors Bingham, Wisner, Blair, Crapo, and Baldwin much is due in the past and present; to the Honorable Hezekiah G. Wells, of Kalamazoo, who has stood by it in all these years of battle, and with his pen, and by his influence, exerted in its behalf at all times, and most effectively in the present decisive struggle, all honor; to the Honorable J. Webster Childs, of

---

[101] Ibid., p. 287.

Washtenaw, and the members of the State Board of Agriculture, thanks for their effective vindication of its merits, and unflinching friendship in its behalf; to the Honorable George Willard of Battle Creek, editor of the Battle Creek Journal, both Regents of the University, who has by all honorable means, advocated the claims of this institution to the support of the State, grateful recognition is due; to the citizens of Washtenaw, Oakland, Livingston, Calhoun, Eaton, Bay, Jackson, and other counties who have sent in petitions on short notice in favor of the College and its present location, the just need of praise for carrying out honest conviction for justice and for right."[102]

The editorial went on to say that the College's friends had no desire for it to become a rival of the University, and that there was no desire or wish that the University should not now, and in all time to come receive a generous and ready aid from the State that would enable it to carry out all that it might desire to accomplish in the years to come.

The editor of the Republican felt that it was due the citizens of Lansing to say that further than in the sending of petitions in its favor, little work was done in its behalf. He explained that this was due to the fact that to get aid for home institutions meant relying upon the aid of citizens from other sections.

He went on to say that the opponents of the College having done what they could in the Legislature to destroy the College's prestige

---

[102]Lansing State Republican, March 18, 1869.

and future had now better lay down their arms.

"To the Adrian Times, Detroit Free Press and Detroit Post, the friends of the College and of agricultural education owe no thanks for their opposition. It has simply demonstrated the fact that the people of this State are not under the thumb of the Detroit press or the alumni of the State University. The fact is proven that this State is not wholly comprised in the counties of Wayne, Lenawee and Washtenaw. Let the friends of the Agricultural College show themselves in the future worthy of the confidence and support granted them by the Legislature, and Michigan will in the future, as in the present, continue to support the best agricultural educational institution in the world."[103]

On March 31, 1869, the Detroit Post, which had advocated removal printed an editorial:

> " . . . but for the action of the State government has been so sweeping and provident that the Agricultural College may be looked upon as a permanent institution, unless it contains some inherent defect that no money nor State aid can supply. We by no means undertake to say this, and we hope the citizens of the State will so avail themselves of its privileges as to put its success beyond peradventure. Since the State has determined to pay for this, they ought not to be neglected. It would be folly not to seek as large a return as possible from the investment, and we have no hesitation in urging a cordial support of the college, and to invite a renewed interest in it, and in its capabilities for educating and developing a strong, earnest, intelligent farming community.[104]

---

[103] Ibid., March 18, 1869.

[104] Detroit Post, March 31, 1869.

The Saginaw Daily Enterprise also commented on the disposition of the appropriation bill. It insisted that the institution was worthy of support, although the Enterprise did raise the question as to whether it might not be more economical if it was connected with the University. It went on to say that friends of the College insisted that without the labor system the College would be worth nothing to one wishing a scientific agricultural education, and that that system would be impossible in the University because of the caste feeling between the workers and the non-workers.

It was the Enterprise's feeling that the State had already expended too much money already on the Agricultural College to jeopardize its interest and prospect of usefulness by any experiments. It concluded by saying that the friends of the Agricultural College were getting up quite a feeling against the University, asserting that the University men were the head and front movement against their pet institution. President Haven was even accused of active complicity against the College, even though he had expressed a friendly feeling toward the institution when the bill to aid the University was before the Legislature.[105]

The geographical alignment of counties in 1869 was very similar to that of 1865. The counties in the eastern and southeastern part of the State continued to support relocation with those elsewhere in

---

[105]Saginaw Daily Enterprise, March 12, 1869

the State supporting the present operation.[106]

Obviously, all of the efforts to stop further development of the Agricultural College had failed and with the final vote of the Legislature of 1869 it was assured that the College would continue as a separate entity.

---

[106] Journal of the Senate, 1869, House Bill No. 63, pp. 1002-5. Journal of the House of Representatives, 1869, House Bill No. 63, pp. 760-61.

House and Senate Combined Vote, 1869

	Yea	Nay
Northern Michigan	36	12
South-east	12	30
Lower Michigan outside the South-east	24	5

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Libraries

The libraries used in the preparation of this thesis were those of the Michigan State University, the Shiawassee and Cass branches of the Michigan State Library, the Lansing Public Library and the Detroit Public Library.

While all of these libraries have collections of many of the government documents, newspapers, periodicals and journals used in the preparation of this paper, it is my opinion that the best coverage for all sources was found in the Shiawassee and Cass branches of the Michigan State Library.

Primary Sources

One of the most important primary sources on this study of the Michigan Agricultural College wasthe Michigan State Agricultural Society, Annual Reports. These annual reports from 1849 through 1860 and the report of 1865 were of particular value in gaining considerable background on the development of the separate agricultural college idea. They were also of importance in indicating the leaders of this educational revolution. In most cases the reports are clear and concise and invaluable in the amount of information they present toward a study of this nature.

Another interesting source was Theophilus C. Abbot's account in the Michigan Pioneer Collections (Volume 6). The article is entitled "The Earlier History of the College Up To Its Reorganization in 1861." Although the account is brief, it gives many sidelights of the happenings at the College during this time by an eye witness. It is very helpful in pointing out the development of the curriculum, College finance problems and the selection and addition of members to the College faculty.

One other article in the Michigan Pioneer Collections (Volume 38) was also used as a source of information. The article entitled, "The Earlier Railroads of Southern Michigan" by Clarence Frost shed some light on the fact that eventually Lansing would play an important part in the development of the railroad system of Michigan. This, of course, was an important point in the continued development or the dissolvement of the Agricultural College near Lansing.

The Michigan State Board of Agriculture, Annual Report of 1867 was of value in reporting the proceedings of the Agricultural Society of that year as well as the report on the growth and development of the institution for 1867.

Government Documents

State government documents have contributed much to this study. Particularly the Michigan Joint Documents for the Sessions of 1849, 1851 and 1855. The Journals of the Senate of the State of Michigan for the years: 1765, 1867, and 1869 were also of considerable value.

For detailed information on appropriation bills and the legislative reaction toward the Agricultural College, the Journals of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan for the years 1859, 1863, 1865, and 1869 were used.

The Compiled Laws of the State of Michigan (Volume 1, 1857) was also of value in citing the revised constitution of the State of Michigan, 1850.

The Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for 1858 and 1859 were of use in filling some of the details not covered in the Agricultural Society reports of those same years.

Newspapers

A number of newspapers have been consulted in preparing this thesis. They are the: Adrian Daily Watchtower, Lansing State Republican, Detroit Free Press, Detroit Advertiser and Tribune, Battle Creek Journal, Saginaw Daily Enterprise and the Detroit Post. Unfortunately, the microfilm files or copies of the original are not completely available in any of the libraries. Newspapers thoroughly covered the Agricultural College developments during January, February and March of the year. At other times, during the year almost nothing can be found relative to the College. The years that newspapers are of considerable value are: 1863, 1865, 1867 and 1869. These of course, were years in which legislative sessions were held.

Periodicals

Periodicals were helpful in getting the reaction of individuals. The Letters to the Editor column of the Michigan Farmer was many times valuable in determining the thinking of the farmers in this period. Editorials in the Farmer were also of great use, although many times it appeared that the Farmer was definitely pro-Agricultural College. Sources from the Farmer were consulted for the years 1849, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1863 and 1864. As in the case of the newspapers the majority of the articles concerning the Agricultural College are found in the months of January, February and March with a few articles in the month of December for the years 1849, 1859 and 1860.

Two additional periodicals, Prairie Farmer (January 1867 and January 1868) and Western Rural (November 1866 and March 1867) were consulted but not used.

Secondary Sources

There have been two histories of Michigan State. The first one was written by William J. Beal, History of the Michigan Agricultural College and Biographical Sketches of Trustees and Professors (the Agricultural College, East Lansing, 1915). The second one is Michigan State, The First Hundred Years, Madison Kuhn (The Michigan State University Press, 1955).

Owing to the restricted area that this thesis covered, both sources were only of value in providing a broad background to the overall picture.