MORRILL LAND-GRANT ACT

For a complete copy of this act SEE: History of the Ohio State University: 1878 on Shelf 109-65. (Has green cover)
S. 3714.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

JUNE 31, 1860.

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Education.

AN ACT

To apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, arising from the sales of public lands, to be paid as hereinafter provided, to each State and Territory for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established, or which may be hereafter established, in accordance with an act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, the sum of fifteen thousand dollars for the year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, and an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for ten years by an additional sum of one thousand dollars over the preceding year, and the annual amount to be paid hereafter to each State and Territory shall be twenty-five thousand dollars: Provided, That no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such colleges separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds received in such State or Territory be equally divided as hereinafter set forth: Provided, That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, or may be hereafter established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue, for the education of colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act between one college for white students and one institution for colored students established as referred to, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thenceupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provision in reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.

Sec. 2. That the sums hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for the further endowment and support of colleges shall be annually paid on or before the thirty-first day of July of each year, by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of the Interior, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the State or Territorial treasurer, or to each such officer as shall be designated by the laws of such State or Territory to receive the same, who shall, upon the order of the treasurers of the colleges, or the institution for colored students, immediately pay over said sums to the treasurers of the respective colleges or other institutions entitled to receive the same, and such treasurers shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior, on or before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received and its disbursement. The grants of money authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative assent of the several States and Territories to the purpose of said grants: Provided, That payments of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made, at the request of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

[OVER.]
SEC. 2. That if any portion of the money received by the designated officer of the State or Territory for the further and more complete endowment, support, and maintenance of colleges, or of institutions for colored students, as provided in this act, shall, by any act or default, be misapplied, it shall be reported by the State or Territory to which it belongs, and until so apportioned no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to such State or Territory; and no portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings. An annual report by the president of each of said colleges shall be made to the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to the Secretary of the Interior, regarding the condition and progress of each college, including statistical information in relation to its receipts and expenditures, its library, the number of its students and professors, and also as to any improvements and experiments made under the direction of any experiment stations attached to said colleges, with their cost and results, and such other industrial and economical statistics as may be regarded as useful, one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free to all other colleges further endowed under this act.

SEC. 3. That on or before the first day of July in each year, after the passage of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for colleges, or of institutions for colored students, under this act, and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of the Interior shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory of its appropriation the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress, in order that the State or Territory may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of the Interior. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid it shall be carried into the Treasury. And the Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall annually report to Congress the disbursements which have been made in all the States and Territories, and also whether the appropriation of any State or Territory has been withheld, and if so the reasons thereof.

SEC. 5. Congress may at any time amend, suspend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

Passed the Senate June 24, 1862.

Attent:

ANSON G. McCOOK, Secretary.

By: CHAS. W. JOHNSON, Chief Clerk.

The House amended the bill so as to provide "That the appropriation shall be appropriated only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanical arts, the English language and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life and to the facilities for such instruction."

The bill as amended passed without division.
Justin Smith Morrill.

Excerpt from the minutes of the Board of Trustees:

The Secretary reported that on the occasion of the death of Senator Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, in the absence of the President he had communicated with Messrs. Chamberlain and Jones and had sent the following telegrams:

Columbus, Ohio, December 28, 1899.

Hon. Redfield Proctor,
Washington, D. C.

Trustees, Faculty, and one thousand students of Ohio State University desire to express through you to the family of your distinguished colleague, Senator Morrill, their sympathy and condolence and to join in tribute of respect to the exalted character of the father and guardian of the national system of "Land Grant Colleges."

W. I. Chamberlain,
Pres. Board of Trustees.

and upon motion of Mr. Wing said telegram was directed to be spread upon the records.

Excerpt from minutes of the Faculty:

Resolved, that the President and Faculty of the Ohio State University desire to put upon record an expression of their sorrow at the death of Justin S. Morrill, lately and for many years a member of the Senate of the United States, and of the honor in which they hold his memory as a statesman, and especially as a leader in the field of higher industrial education.

Through his wise foresight and untiring support the institutions founded upon the "Land Grant Acts" of 1862 and 1890, of which he was both author and champion, have become the greatest single agency of our age in shaping the educational ideals and in directing the educational policy of the United States.

By enlarging the scope of collegiate instruction so as to include "the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes, in the several pursuits and professions of life," he not only greatly increased the number of highly trained men and women, but reinforced the working power of the modern world by all the accumulations of knowledge and the discoveries of science. As a result, the dominant industrial forces, thus strengthened and directed by applied science, are gradually discarding empirical methods and rising above merely selfish and sordid ends.

The purity and simple strength of Mr. Morrill's personal character, combined with the unselfish devotion of his public life, made him an exalted example of civic virtue and usefulness, and entitle him to the sincere admiration as well as the enduring gratitude of his countrymen.
PROGRAM

Exercises in the University Chapel at 2 P. M.
Dr. W. I. Chamberlain,  
President of the Board of Trustees  
Ohio State University, presiding

Music, "Integer Vitae"  University Glee Club

 Invocation,  
Dr. W. H. Scott,  
Professor of Philosophy

 Address,  
Hon. David K. Watson,  
Member of Fifty-fourth Congress

Music, Hymn 542  University Glee Club

Address,  
Dr. Thomas J. Burrill,  
Professor of Botany and Horticulture and Dean of the General  
Faculty, University of Illinois

Music, America  
Congregation  
Benediction

Justin Smith Morrill.

Born: Strafford, Orange County, Vermont, April 14th, 1810. Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, December 3rd, 1855 to March 3rd, 1867. Member of the Senate of the United States, March 3rd, 1867 to December 27th, 1898.

Died: Washington, D. C., December 27th, 1898.

Author of AN ACT donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts. (Approved July 2nd, 1862.)

Author of AN ACT to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress, approved July second eighteen hundred and sixty-two. (Approved Aug. 30th, 1890.)
Reserve Officers’ Training Corps

DEPARTMENT

Military Training in the Land-Grant Colleges

An address by Dr. W. O. Thompson, President Emeritus, Ohio State University, January 10, 1929, to the Assembled Cadet Corps, at the University of Minnesota

In responding to the invitation to appear before you today and to speak upon the topic assigned, namely, Military Training in Land-Grant Colleges, permit me to say that I am not here to argue but rather to state a case. My desire is to state the situation for your own information and consideration. What I have to say is the result of over thirty years’ experience as President of a Land-Grant College, namely, the Ohio State University. During these years I have had to do with the discussions in the Land-Grant College Association concerning proposals for legislation in the interest of these colleges and with the preparation of the National Defense Act of 1916.

I. The Objection

At the outset it may be well to state as clearly and concisely as possible the principal objections to compulsory education. These are: first, that it is not required by the Act of 1862; second, that such education fosters militarism which is not in harmony with American ideals; third, that the spirit of compulsion is out of harmony with the spirit of modern education; fourth, that the practice assumes the probability of future wars and is out of harmony with the present trend of thought in American life.

These four objections probably include all the more important points of view. Specific objections could be presented against this as against any other type of education. With

In order that the force of the above objections there, the principal address is not concerned, may be given due consideration permit me to bring to your attention the following considerations.

II. The Land-Grant Act of 1862

In the Civil War on July 2, 1862, an Act of Congress known as the Land-Grant Act made certain grants of land and landscape for the purpose of establishing in each State which should accept its provisions at least one College, where the leading objects shall be without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of individuals. Military, several practical and professions of life.

The Act has been previously passed by Congress and vetoed by President Buchanan. It was re-enacted and signed by President Lincoln in the midst of Civil War.

The interpretation of this Act is important to its proper and complete understanding. The question of agriculture had been before the country, especially in Illinois and Michigan and in certain agricultural circles before the same time. When, however, the matter came up for consideration by Congress, the subject of agriculture were considered to be a contribution to the national defense. The opposition to the Bill is not so important at this juncture but it is well to remember that the phrase "without excluding other scientific and classical studies" was intended to do two things, to make it possible to teach outside of a strict interpretation of the Bill; the second important fact is, that military tactics was included as a positive contribution to and a part of the Bill.

Without these features there is reason to believe that the Bill would not have been enacted into a Law. Further the phrase "in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively be recognized" was due to the fact that a strong factor in Congress recognized education as a state function. President Buchanan had vetoed this measure principally on the theory that the proposed legislation interfered with the right of the States in education. The phrase under consideration was intended to prevent interference by the Federal Government and to protect the rights of the States in education which by many was regarded as a function of the State. It forms no basis for the elective idea as applied to education in military tactics.

From the days of President Washington the attention of Congress had been directed to the necessity of means to maintain the fertility of the soil. The improvement of live stock, the importance of fertilizers and the increase of production were all chief topics in the minds of the advocates of agriculture at that period. Congress was convinced that all of these points. It needed no persuasion on the importance of the mechanic arts as related to national efficiency and of its own motion inserted the provision to teach military tactics, a provision entirely in harmony with the prevailing theories concerning military defense at that time. From Colonial days the Militia and later the National Guard in addition to the regular army were regarded as perfectly legitimate and desirable means in the way of defense. West Point and Annapolis stood for the professional and official training, essential if the country were to have an available list of officers. The Act of 1862, therefore, was the natural expression of the current theory and the widely accepted idea that national defense was a part of the obligation of Congress.

III. The Acceptance by the States

As a further comment it may be added that the provisions of the Act of 1862 were accepted by all the States of the Union. These acceptances began at once and continued through a period of practically ten years, the time being extended by Congress in order to make abundant provision for every State in the Union to give the Act full consideration. It is important here to note that not a single State in the Union at the time of acceptance raised any objection to the subject of military science or military tactics as the statute expressed it. In other words this law as enacted was accepted by the States not on any theory of permission, but on the theory of accepting a status universally recognized. That status was, that at least three things were to be taught: first, agriculture; second, mechanic arts; and third, military tactics. The phrase, "without excluding other scientific and classical studies" permits the introduction of other than the three professional topics in the curriculum. Too often we overlooked the fact that military tactics in the statute is on precisely the same basis as agriculture and the mechanic arts. Beyond question the country accepted these colleges on the ground that these topics named were to be a part of the body of instruction in the colleges.

IV. The Organization of the Colleges

When these colleges were organized under the provisions of the Act of 1862, military tactics was just as much a part of the instruction as any other topic. No question was then raised whether it was mandatory or permissive. The colleges accepted in good faith just as the States have done the provisions of the Act without reservations. Departments of military instruction accordingly were found at first in every Land-Grant college.

It was believed that this was keeping faith with the letter and the spirit of the Act of 1862. It has remained for substantially fifty years as the prevailing custom in all Land-Grant colleges. During the passage of the years, however, the curricula of these colleges have undergone various examination, discussion and revision. The administrative officers of these colleges by a large and decisive majority at any time in the past twenty-five years in my opinion, if a vote had been taken, would have favored the retention of military tactics as from the beginning.

In later years, however, the discussion outside of the Land-Grant colleges has formulated objection to the compulsory feature. Some years since the legislature of Wisconsin took action making military tactics elective in the University of Wisconsin. The time it was regarded by many of the Land-Grant officials as a breaking of faith with the understanding between these colleges and Congress even though the action was possible under a literal interpretation of the Act. The understanding more often was in a literal sense and discussion and conferences in the annual meetings of the Land-Grant Association have uniformly confirmed the historical position of the colleges.

It should further be noted that during the fifty years since the Civil War the administration of these colleges has been through the department of Agriculture and the War Department. Representation of the War Department has been irregularly in attendance at the annual meetings and have taken assigned places on the
programs. During these years many con-
ferences have been held by all of these de-
partments as to the problems arising in a-
administration. The War Department and the
President have of these conferences discussed at
length all the questions involved in
military education and its administration. As
is well known, the emphasis is placed on
military instruction due to limitations of the War Department
and in some cases on being required to
the first two years of college. Two years of military
instructions varying from three to five hours
per week were given in all these colleges as a
required subject. The limited number of stu-
dents who became cadet officers received suit-
able additional instruction during the Junior and
Senior years.
When the World War burst upon us these
Land-Grant colleges like all other colleges
responded to the call of the country. At the
close of this war the organization of a
Reserve Officers' Training Corps received
favorable consideration. The government was then in a position to provide more military
officers for instruction than it previously had
been. No effort was made to extend the features of
military instruction beyond the two years. Too
much was made, however, that where stu-
dents in the upper two years of the colleges
elected the R. O. T. C. courses they should be
required to satisfy the same requirements and
regulations as all other courses leading to a
degree. At this juncture after conferences with the War Department certain subjects
such as mathematics, topography and military
made a part of the requirements for the degree
were introduced after faculty approval and
made a part of the requirements for the degree
thereafter. We thus have in these colleges
a substantial course of study providing a well-rounded training in military science to warrant a commission in
the R. O. T. C. at graduation. In certain cases
that extended courses of a military
character have been taken and a degree of
excellence achieved a commission as second
lieutenant in the regular army is awarded.
This will probably suffice for the statement of
the status of military science as a part of the
present instruction in these colleges.
V. The Doctrine of Compulsion

The most serious and perhaps must effective
objection from those outside the Land-Grant
Colleges has found expression against the com-
pulsory idea. As a mere comment on the situ-
ation it will be recalled that in the
Colleges was organized the elective idea had
not taken hold of American education. It first
found expression in the University of Michi-
gan under the advocacy of President James
Angell. Later the idea was accepted and
advocated by President Cha. W. Eliot of
Harvard and quite promptly throughout the entire
country. From the passing of the Act in 1862 and for some years thereafter the idea of
the elective principle had no consideration
whatever in Congress, in States, or in
the Colleges. When the elective idea actually
made its appearance it was confined to the
Junior and Senior years and would have had
no relation whatever to the military instruc-
tion as given in the Land-Grant colleges.
Furthermore the elective idea was an effort to
escape the rigidity of the fixed curriculum
in classics and to open up the way for a free
acceptance of science and a wider field for
business, economics, and allied studies. It
is not quite relevant, therefore, to argue for the
elimination of military science as a subject
required of all students from a premise based on
either the elective theory or the permissive
interpretation of the Act itself. If the objection to compulsory educa-
tion in military tactics is to be sustained it
must be on other grounds and for other rea-
sons.

It may be well in passing to note that there is
a well-founded objection in certain circles
to anything compulsory in modern education
or modern life. The revolt of youth is on
other than military and educational circles. It is also well to recognize that the
American college has never surrendered its right
privilege to insist upon certain requirements
for its degrees. Thence is no prospect that the
American College will ever recede from this
position. Thus we have the doctrine of
compulsion in the history of every institution of
Learning. The elective idea was believed to
give the individual a wider range of choice in
determining his education but once that
decision was reached the faculty insisted upon
its requirements with just as much emphasis
as it ever had done in the older fixed curricu-
lum. The unsatisfactory experiences with
the free elective system nearly all colleges
and universities not to name specifically either
particular subjects, groups of subjects, course,
or groups of courses to a degree. It may be
well for us to understand that the college has
not vacated its right to determine the courses
of instruction open to and available for stu-
dents. In every case, however limited the
choice may be, the consequences of that choice
must be accepted by the student. From this
statement of the current argument against the advanced courses in military science as a mat-
ter of compulsion falls to the ground. These
courses, therefore, stand upon their merits and
fall with their declensions. There is no compul-
sion in the upper years, not common to all
other academic subjects.

"There remains, however, some consideration
of the doctrine of compulsion in the first two
years of the college course. I shall not re-
peat the argument from history. The objec-
tion now proceeds upon the theory that a cer-
tain dispensation comes over the thinking of the
country and for that reason compulsory mili-
tary education is no longer justifiable. It is
worth while to note that change of thinking is
almost entirely outside of the colleges them-
selves. A change of social or national motives shall not question, have felt called upon to express
this objection with every argument at their command. Among these, the first, is that of
militarism. The answer here is an appeal
to fact. I venture to affirm that there is no
more militarism to be found in the graduate
bodies of these Land-Grant colleges or among
their alumni than will be found in a similar
body of students in either the Ivy colleges or
among our citizens who have never attended
college. The truth is this objection is academic
in the same sense that the objection is a matter of
facts. No proof has been offered that the students of the American Land-Grant colleges
were more satiated with the ideas of mili-
tarism. As every one knows it has been
charged that the students in all our American
colleges are centers of socialism, bolshevism,
radicalism and other ideas that ought to re-
cieve public condemnation. Certain investiga-
tions have been made. These investigations
have demonstrated that there is no organized
force among the American students in these
alleged sins. There are certain indi-
viduals who profess these sins. There are
certain small groups who comfort each other
In my judgment a university, and particu-
larly a State university, is an excellent place
to give military training. Training there is
bound to be imparted by the university autho-
rity. The training is given in a civiliza-
tion, from a civilian point of view, with
emphasis on the values of the institution.
The training is the study of other subjects, and under the
in-
spiration of university ideals. Under such
conditions it is not likely to be over-em-
phaisized, but takes its place as one subject in
the curriculum.

Another objection is to the effect that this
education is based upon the belief in the prob-
ability of future wars and is out of harmony
with modern thought. As a matter of fact
wars always have been probable and what is
more they have been actual. No one regrets
this more than the educator or the soldier.
It may be worth while to make the observa-
tion that the World War did not originate
with the people nor did it originate with the
soldiers. It did it originated by the actions of
ments of Congresses of the world. Every
intelligence reader knows the World War sprang out of the
inability and incompetence of diplomatic forces when faced with the war-
like proposals of government officials. As
it is necessary to note that no more ardent advocates of the Kefauver
Fact now pending will be found than in the
Land-Grant colleges. No group of young
men will endorse more cordially than boys wear-
ing the uniform in these colleges. The most
advanced thought of the present time upon the ques-
tion of war and peace recognizes the right of
defense as being just as sacred as the right
of life. It cannot, therefore, be charged
that the educational institution, giving the young
men the elements of education in mili-
tary tactics is transcending the limits of a
rational defense or proceeding upon the theory
of an unjustifiable aggression.

The objection is not true to fact. The
instruction in these colleges is not based
upon any probabilities or upon a belief in
probabilities. It is pertinent to recall that
instruction in military tactics in these colleges is
one of the three subjects of the Act of 1862 and
specifically provided for. It is a matter of contract between the Federal Gov-
ernment and the several States under the
Act. The fact that a change of opinion has
taken place in certain circles should not in any
degree deter administrative officials from pro-

BRIG. GEN. EDWARD ORTON, JR.
Senior Vice President, R. O. A.
Columbus, Ohio
ceeding in accordance with the historical interpretation of the Act and its acceptance by the States.

VI. The Merits of the Case

I recognize that every course of instruction and every curriculum ever constructed has its defenders as well as its critics. We have long discussed the question whether certain subjects provide a training superior to others; whether these subjects are essential in the education of the youth. These are debatable questions and will remain so until the end of time. The educated world will never agree on any one fixed curriculum. The tendency has been to recognize the legitimate claims that can be made for certain subjects of instruction and for their place in a systematic curriculum. It is not necessary, therefore, in academic circles to do more than to make sure that a subject provides a reasonable contribution to the intellectual life and to the development of citizenship. The modern college catalogue is sufficient evidence of this general position. From the origin of the Land-Grant college, military tactics has been a part of its required curriculum. It has kept its place from the beginning. The faculties are not now disposed to abandon the subject. In the discussions of the past fifty years, attention has been frequently directed to the fact that instruction in military tactics as practiced accomplishes certain definite results. Among these is a widespread activity in outdoor recreation. Walking is still regarded as the best recreative exercise for the human body. The physical activity required in the drill and in the setting up exercises needs no comment of approval. It may be observed that in all modern departments of physical education the intra-mural activities have unconsciously paid a high tribute to the value of the outdoor life of the cadet. No other college activity engages so many students or has a more widespread benefit. From that point of view military training needs no defense.

Second, it teaches men how to give and receive commands, how to obey, how to coordinate themselves with other men and to cooperate in the attainment of a given end. All these qualities are highly prized in every program of life. It is not essential to the question at issue to lay any claim to military tactics as the supreme or exclusive agent in teaching these habits. All professions, all business, all organized society acclaim the excellence of these qualities. Furthermore military science emphasizes the importance of organization. Here is the key to the greatest activities and to the mammoth enterprises of modern life. The ability to organize whatever materials one is dealing with, whether it be intellectual, physical, social or financial, lies at the very basis of our progress. Modestly we affirm that the organizing ability of men well trained in military science is so obvious that education embodying these qualities needs little defense.

The general support of the education in military tactics as now practiced comes from the alumni of these institutions and from Presidents and Faculties. Individual objectors are to be found. It may be said, however, that for twenty-five years past the education in military tactics has met with less disapproval and has elicited more favorable comment from the Faculties than almost any other subject.

There remains a word as to student opinion. Here will be found some division due to several causes, a failure to understand the place of such instruction as related to the institution, a widespread but indefinite opposition to any required subject, to a certain feeling that it interferes with the major college interests and in some degree to a dislike for wearing a uniform while in academic work.

Careful observation establishes the fact
Land-Grant Act Eliminates Exclusiveness Of Education

By JOYA WYANT

On July 2, 1862, Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act which provided for grants of public lands to the states in proportion to population. The states in turn were to use the money the sale of these lands provided, to build colleges whose main object was, to quote the Morrill Act itself, "to teach such branches of learning as are related to Agriculture and the mechanic arts... in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." Thus, thanks to what were to become the Land-Grant colleges and Universities, the exclusiveness of education became a thing of the past. Now, one century later the Land-Grant colleges across the country — 68 in all — celebrate their anniversary and honor the memory of the men who were far-sighted enough to make such colleges possible.

Besides the President, who in the midst of the civil war found time to sign a bill that was to prove so important to the future of his country, two other men played an important role in the formulating and passing of the bill. They were: Jonathan B. Turner of Illinois and Justin S. Morrill of Vermont. The latter, who served 50 years in Congress, led the fight for the necessary Federal Legislation and for this reason the bill bears his name.

The PROGRESS that the Land-Grant colleges have undergone in 100 years is tremendous. Although Land-Grant institutions number fewer than 4 per cent of the nation's colleges, they enroll about 20 per cent of all the country's undergraduate students and grant nearly 40 per cent of all the doctoral degrees.

Ohio itself was rather slow in opening benefits from the Morrill Act. It was only in 1873 that the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, now known as the Ohio State University, opened its doors. The college was given its present name in 1878.

It is of interest to note that Ohio State may never have been what it is today.

Indeed, the major issue during its formation period concerned the nature and scope of the college, whether it should be broad gauge (taking full advantage of the Morrill program). Fortunately, the proponents of the broad gauge won—even though by only one vote!

Thus, when the plans for the new University were laid out in 1871, 10 departments were projected. There are now 80 departments of instruction.

On September 17, 1873, nineteen students met on the former Neil farm. Except for brief declines, the student body has grown steadily ever since.

Today, Ohio State is among the dozen largest universities in the nation. It has become a great public asset that may not have been possible without the Land-Grant Act.

This campus stands, today, in the words of President Fawcett, "as a great citadel of learning and as symbol of man's unswerving pursuit of knowledge, truth and wisdom. Its influence cannot be contained within the state or the nation for there are no boundaries around knowledge... The service aspect of this enterprise, which has its genesis in teaching and research, is now world-wide and can never be otherwise."
STATE OF OHIO

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A RESOLUTION

H. R. No. 182

MESSRS. HOLMES-ZUBER-McNAMARA
SHAWAN-HERBERT-WYLIE-REILLY

Recognizing the statewide observance of the centennial of the signing of the Land Grant Act.

WHEREAS, The members of the House of Representatives of the 104th General Assembly of Ohio note that July 2, 1862, marks the centennial of legislation providing for the establishment of the national system of Land Grant colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, Ohio has extensively benefited from the outstanding educational and research facilities of its Land Grant institution, The Ohio State University; and

WHEREAS, The centennial of this historic Act of Congress will be accorded national recognition during the academic year 1961-1962, an observance in which Ohio most certainly wishes to participate; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the members of the House of Representatives of the 104th General Assembly of Ohio commemorate the wisdom and foresight that led to the enactment of the Land Grant Act in 1862, and, in adopting this resolution and causing a copy thereof to be spread upon the journal, express Ohio’s determination to conduct a suitable statewide observance during the 1961-1962 academic year in cooperation with the national recognition of the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Land Grant Act by President Abraham Lincoln; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to John W. Bricker, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, and to Gordon B. Carson, Vice-President of Business and Finance of The Ohio State University.

Adopted
June 27, 1961

ATTEST:

Clerk
Perspective on Land-Grant Universities
Edward H. Jennings
March 31, 1989

As we look to the future of The Ohio State University and of higher education in Ohio and across the nation, it is important to do so within the context of Ohio State's history, which largely parallels the history of public higher education in the United States. Ours is a land-grant university with the characteristics and responsibilities that are the essence of our uniquely American system of higher education.

The Ohio State University was founded shortly after the enactment of the Morrill Act of 1862, which by any definition was revolutionary. Nevertheless, most of its fundamentals predate it by at least 75 years and had their origins primarily in the Midwest.

The Northwest Ordinance, enacted in 1787, established the process of governance over most of the Midwest and contained the first official mention of public education. The Ordinance was the first document to assign -- at least partially -- to government the responsibility of providing an educational opportunity for its citizens. This idea undoubtedly existed before the Northwest Ordinance, but it was first codified there. Spelling out this obligation and setting aside land to finance public education were radical notions, yet they provide the foundation of what we see today.

The Northwest Ordinance helped define the uniquely American approach to education that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In other words, the Northwest Ordinance implied that education was a public good. While the benefits of education to the individual had long been recognized, the Ordinance acknowledged that education had a public value, that educated citizens were a benefit to society and, consequently, that it was appropriate for the populace as a whole to finance part of that education. This idea is well-accepted today, but 200 years ago, in a world dominated by colonialism, feudalism, and illiteracy, where the ideas of democracy were new and untried, the concept of an education for and by all of the public was radical indeed.

Public education came to be recognized as a public good not only for its economic benefits, but also because general education was necessary for democracy to survive and prosper. Thomas Jefferson understood that the public must be educated in order to be informed on the issues, ideas, and public processes in society. It was in this context that Jefferson founded the University of Virginia. While today, that university is significantly different from most land-grant universities, it nonetheless rests on the foundation of public education as a necessary component of democracy.

As the country developed, the Northwest Ordinance gradually was replaced in the Midwest by the U.S. Constitution, which did not specifically mention or assign governmental responsibility for education. These ideas of public education began to flounder during the early part of the 19th century.

The Morrill Act re-established the early ideas of public education and provided a mechanism that led to the founding of our great land-grant universities. But it was not without controversy. Introduced in the early 1860's, it barely passed in Congress in 1862, and was vetoed by President Buchanan. The act finally was signed into law in 1862 by President Lincoln. The act set aside federal lands to be used to provide the basic funding of universities with the purpose of teaching agricultural and mechanical arts, and promoting "the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

Out of these roots came a model of a university that changed the face of primary, secondary, and higher education -- a system of education which transformed America. The characteristics of this educational system remain fundamental to Ohio State's mission today and, I might add, to the mission of many other colleges and universities which do not have a land-grant history.

One of the tenets of the land-grant system was that government was responsible for providing an educational opportunity to all qualified individuals -- independent of their social standing and financial needs. This land-grant idea today has been extended not only to all public institutions, but to private colleges and universities as well. Today, an opportunity for all who are qualified is a fundamental tenet practiced in varying degrees by every institution of higher education in the United States.

The key to implementing this principle is three types of government funding which take the metaphorical form of a three-legged stool: one leg being tuition, the second student financial aid, and the third opportunities to earn money for expenses and tuition through work at the university. The three-legged stool is the technique whereby government provides educational opportunities for all citizens who seek educational advancement. Low to moderate tuition, adequate financial aid, and sufficient work opportunities are fundamental constructs of higher education in America today. Some institutions -- mostly private -- emphasize financial aid more than lower tuition. Others -- mostly public -- emphasize low tuition. But all emphasize affordability, at least in their public relations. And virtually all governments -- federal, state and local -- participate in the idea of financing education for the masses.

A second concept introduced through the land-grant act is local control of institutions. In most nations today, the great universities are national universities, controlled, governed, and financed at the national level and expected to direct their
attention first and foremost to national issues. In the United States, however, the land-grant movement established the concept of local control.

While there are American institutions considered to be national and international universities -- some public, some private -- it continues to be clear, particularly in the public sector, that the first obligation of the institution is to serve the city, county, state, or regional community, not the federal community. When service extends beyond the local community, it clearly is a byproduct of meeting local responsibilities or contributing directly or indirectly to the local welfare. In this context, Ohio State is, indeed, a national/international university, but our mission and responsibility is to the state. We are national/international only insofar as that scope helps us meet our local responsibilities. However, as modern communications and transportation shrink the world, Ohio State continues to extend its worldwide influence and participation.

The land-grant universities also introduced a major change in our definitions of higher education. The earlier, largely European-modeled colleges focused on liberal education with little, if any, professional or vocational education as part of the curriculum. Apprenticeships served the vocations and professions and in many cases did not require a classic liberal education. Land-grant universities were established with the mission to teach the professions of agricultural and mechanical arts. However, in the dialogue over the Morrill Act, a new idea was born that integrated liberal education with the professions in one curriculum graduating a vocationally competent and educated individual.

The Morrill Act called for a college where "the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts ... in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." What great debates there must have been among 19th century land-grant faculties in interpreting this mandate! With agricultural and mechanical arts, should we also include Greek or Latin? Should we include Shakespeare and Chaucer, or read Adam Smith?

Out of that debate came an institution, a curriculum, and an idea which we take for granted today: that our obligation is to integrate professional and liberal education into a coherent whole. This integration creates individuals, because an educated people, creative and adaptable to the future, who have learned how to learn, and who know and understand the basic tenets of their particular profession whether it is agriculture, medicine, law, engineering, dance, accounting, pharmacy, or music. While in most of the world, professional schools were -- and are -- separate, our uniquely American institutions have a full range of liberal and professional programs as part of the curriculum that we have come to expect.

Twenty-five years ago, higher education was criticized for not providing enough professional education. We were accused of having irrelevant courses in the curriculum, of not preparing people for a job or career. Today, I believe correctly, the criticism has swung the other way. We have become too vocational and have short-changed our mission of liberal education. This balancing of liberal and professional education has been going on for more than 100 years and is the source of most of the tensions in our modern universities. We constantly are faced with decisions that trade off liberal and professional education. But as we see time and time again, these tensions are also the source of our greatest strength, namely, our reliance upon each other in academe. It is rare for a professional school to be truly outstanding without other strong professional schools surrounding it or without a strong liberal arts program in existence side by side.

Furthermore, with the speed of technological change today, incorporating liberal and professional education in one whole is even more important. Biotechnology combines medicine, agriculture, and engineering with the basic sciences of chemistry, botany, and zoology. Biotechnology cannot exist without the land-grant idea of combining professional and liberal education. Materials research developing at Ohio State relies on this interdisciplinary approach, as does the further development of computers.

An excellent example of the results of combining disciplines -- professional and liberal -- is the Magnetic Resonance Imaging machines now found in most research hospitals. The MRI machines are the direct result of combining quantum mechanics and computers. While these fields developed along separate tracks for many years, they finally came together in the 1970's in response to the imperatives of medical research. Bringing together such disparate advances is an important characteristic of all universities today, but it was the land-grant idea that established the principle of combining professional and liberal education.

As the land-grant system evolved, it was recognized that the responsibility for basic research should be assigned primarily to universities, particularly in a free enterprise system. Basic research is a highly risky activity that will seldom be supported within the private sector. The great bulk of basic research today is conducted in institutions, because an environment that does not require immediate results and that encourages interdisciplinary collaborations fosters basic research. Also, universities ensure that young minds surround the research enterprise and provide the continuous stimulation of new ideas, new thoughts, and new approaches to existing techniques. While applied research continues outside the university, basic research has become part of the fundamental mission not only of land-grant universities, but of all institutions of higher education.
In the 1930's, a debate raged at Ohio State and all over the country regarding agricultural research. As a cost-saving measure, land-grant universities, pressed for funds, debated whether or not to continue basic research in agriculture. After all, it did appear that the agricultural advances of the early 20th century were so great that little was left to do! Yet in the wisdom of society, agricultural research continued to be made. Today, fifty years later, yields in most cases are more than five times what they were in the 1930's, and advances continue to be made. The risks were obvious, the benefits unclear, and yet the research continued in universities to the advantage of our society today.

It also became clear that, as university teaching enhances research, so does research enhance teaching both in direct and indirect, synergistic ways. It maintains a faculty member's interest. It stimulates the student's ability to learn, think, and apply new information and test new ideas. Engaging in research keeps one more fully up-to-date in a field. And, as we see today with a few exceptions, the great research universities of America also are the great teaching universities, and vice versa. Research and teaching go hand in hand, and they cannot be separated from each other. Despite "profscas" and examples of poor teaching, poor research, or both, no one suggests a separation of teaching and research. It is the degree of emphasis that is criticized.

A further outgrowth of the land-grant act is the radical concept of service as it relates to teaching and research. Land-grant universities were charged with solving their research results for the practical arena so that they could be rapidly and fully exploited by the community at large. The earliest manifestations of this were our agricultural research centers and cooperative extension programs. Through these programs we could take the newly-developed technology in agriculture and food sciences to the local grower rapidly and in a manner that would produce an immediate impact on productivity. But, the idea of service involved more than simply technology transfer. It included a commitment to the social benefits that could accrue to society if the universities became a part of society instead of isolating themselves as they had in the past.

Cooperative extension took on the additional task of educating the rural population on the problem solving required in everyday life. Home economics extension taught rural homemakers nutrition and child care, giving them the ability to prevent disease and opening opportunities for education for the next generation. Congress was lobbied for a rural electrification system. Communities were challenged to take advantage of educational opportunities to break the cycle of poverty. In Latvian communities in northwestern Ohio, Serbo-Croatian communities in southeastern Ohio, and Irish communities in Cleveland, it was the land-grant universities that provided services to these -- and all -- communities. Now, of course, every college and university in some way engages in service activities to the betterment of society.

These several principles of education, financing, and governance that have evolved from the Morrill Act, now are part of the fabric of the American system of public education. This system continues to insist that education be made available to all qualified individuals independent of their social and financial need, and that government be a significant partner with financial support to provide moderate tuition, adequate student financial aid, and work opportunities. It is a system characterized by diversity and local control that provides all students in America the opportunity to pursue their own individual ambitions.

There are large and small universities; undergraduate and graduate schools; schools with global perspectives and those which are more narrowly focused. With local control, American higher education has evolved into a system where students can choose the institution that best suits their needs. Great diversity in higher education has resulted from the Morrill Act.

From the public point of view, virtually every state in the nation has developed a system of higher education characterized by three categories of institutions. Regional differences exist but, by and large, we are a nation of community colleges or two-year schools, four-year institutions, and comprehensive colleges or two-year school is primarily local in nature, serving an individual city or county with the students not leaving home. Its educational mission is to provide technical or vocational training and/or a liberal arts program transferrable to a four-year baccalaureate degree-granting institution. It generally is the least expensive of all institutions from the student point of view and is specifically designed to respond to and satisfy the immediate and local post-secondary needs of its home city or county.

The four-year institution takes a state-wide view and has as its primary objective providing a liberal arts baccalaureate degree. It includes a smattering of professional schools and very little graduate education. The comprehensive institution offers a full undergraduate curriculum with a complete range of liberal arts programs as well as opportunities for professional education. It also has a full range of post-baccalaureate programs -- both professional and in the basic sciences and humanities. These institutions generally cater to the most academically qualified undergraduates, but they also are receiving institutions for transfer students from community colleges and four-year institutions.

Virtually all states can separate their institutions into these three categories. There are as many governing structures for these three types of post-secondary education as there are states, from single governing authorities for all institutions to separate authorities for each institution. In all cases,
however, each state has, to varying degrees, adopted for all its institutions the fundamental ideas of the land-grant institution — financial availability, local control, mixing professional and liberal education, research, and service. Today, no single institution is able to satisfy all the needs of the state as perhaps was contemplated in the past. Today, essentially all states have established a system of diverse institutions that combine, satisfy, and embrace the land-grant ideas and ideals. Now, the land-grant fundamentals are broader and deeper than ever could have been contemplated by Congressman Morrill.

Higher education in the State of Ohio has many of the characteristics of the three types of institutions mentioned above. However, there are some unique features that bear reflection as we look to the future. Many of the larger Ohio communities have a community college which incorporates technical as well as liberal education into one institution. There are, however, several technical schools that focus solely on vocational or technical training, usually accompanied by a separate organization whose primary function is the two-year liberal arts program. These separate organizations typically are operated by a four-year or comprehensive institution in the state, which is a somewhat unusual configuration when compared to other states.

The distinction between the four-year institutions and the comprehensive institution are less clear-cut than they are in many states. The four-year institutions in Ohio have a mixture of programs from very fine graduate and research programs to professional programs that rival any in the country, such as the engineering and medical schools at the University of Cincinnati and the urban planning program and law school at Cleveland State University. Both institutions are primarily four-year, undergraduate institutions, but they include graduate and professional education which would more generally be limited to the comprehensive flagship institutions of a state.

This blurring of categories is at least partially the result of the presence in Ohio of only one comprehensive university. Most states have at least two, and in many cases several, comprehensive institutions. A typical midwestern model is at least two comprehensive universities: one the original state university, incorporating the health sciences and a strong component in the basic sciences, and the other the land-grant university, including agriculture and engineering and very large professional schools.

The absence of other comprehensive universities in the state explains why The Ohio State University is so large. It recently was noted in USA Today that we are the largest single campus in the United States in the number of students in Columbus. We are not the largest because our individual departments are especially large. By state university standards, these departments are fairly average in size. The reason Ohio State is large is that everything exists on one campus. In other states, functions are separated into two or more institutions: Indiana and Purdue; Michigan, Michigan State, and Wayne State; Iowa and Iowa State; Georgia and Georgia Tech; Texas and Texas A&M — there are many such examples. We are large because by policy, this state has concentrated its comprehensive activity in one location, The Ohio State University.

Another important characteristic of Ohio is that in providing financial access, Ohio has consistently adopted a policy of being a high-tuition public university state. Both now and historically, Ohio ranks among the highest ten states in tuition. Correspondingly, Ohio ranks among the bottom ten states in the amount of state support for higher education. Many reasons exist for such a state policy, but it is worth noting that Ohio also has ranked in the lower ten states in the percent of high school students going on to college. Tuition levels are, of course, the subject of the General Assembly debate that engages us today. The outcome of this debate is, I believe, extraordinarily important as we look at charting a course for The Ohio State University in the years to come.

While there is a great deal more to discuss, this brief historical view of the University and its distinguishing characteristics should be helpful in the development of institutional policies as we move into the decade of the nineties and prepare for the 21st century.
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PERSPECTIVE ON LAND-GRAIN UNIVERSITIES IN THE 1990'S AND BEYOND (contd)

President Jennings: (contd)

the land-grant. And, I note, that that was not really an idea that was without controversy. We think of it today as something normal and ordinary—government taking responsibility, but we should note that the land-grant act was originally put forth in the 1850's and originally voiced by President Buchanan. Public education had been incorporated into the Northwest Ordinance but had floundered a great deal after that.

The second thing that came with the land-grant was this idea that education should be for the masses, independent of one's social standing and one's financial standing. That it was not just for the elite, but it was for everybody. And again, this was not a model that was accepted in the United States nor in Europe, and to some extent not accepted today. Some of our problems are dealing with a portion of the community who would claim that we don't have a responsibility for certain elements of society. But more on that later.

Evolving out of that came this notion that you should make higher education financially available in three ways. One with low tuition; one with some sort of financial aid; and a third log of this accessibility still being work opportunities. That developed in the late 19th Century and is still true today. It is very interesting also, that even today the most expensive institutions will have some sort of financial aid so that they can make the claim that their institution is affordable by anybody qualified. Even the most expensive institutions today make that claim. I would challenge those statements, but there is an awful lot of financial aid in institutions now that are either private or very high priced.

The third concept that the land-grant introduced was that I and a lot of people would call "local control." Again, a fairly radical notion by world standards. Most of the major universities of the world are national universities with a mission designed to deal with national issues. Whereas in the United States we have no national universities. We have some who will address national issues and Ohio State will address nation/international issues, but the control and the mission is local. In our case, our responsibility is to the State of Ohio. And insofar as that has effects on the nation or the rest of the world, that is a byproduct of our responsibility, but our responsibility nevertheless is to the State of Ohio.

The fourth concept that the land-grant introduced was this mixing of professional and liberal education. Most of the conflicts that you see in a university, most of the tensions you see, most of the problem areas you see, most of the budget issues are this inevitable trade-off between professional training and liberal education. We consistently have that, but that is a very new notion to the world of higher education. Professional education historically was an apprenticeship system that wasn't necessarily involved with a college education. Indeed, most of your early attorneys, early physicians were not college educated people. They were people who were apprenticed to another professional. Indeed, a lot of the teaching techniques you see going on today in the professional schools, particularly at the graduate-level, deal with that apprenticeship point of view. Sophia is going through some of that right now in the College of Medicine, where she is really not going to class, but is making rounds with a group of doctors. This is very similar to the old fashioned apprenticeship system. We, for the first time in the land-grant, mixed those two issues.
April 7, 1989 meeting, Board of Trustees
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Another aspect that got slowly introduced was the issue of basic research in science and technology. In a free enterprise market economy, particularly, the private sector could not accept the risks involved in delving into some basic research activities where the chances of it being profitable are very, very slim. Or if they are profitable, the profitability is very, very long-term. It became very much more clear as society evolved that that basic research should go on in universities so that the individual and the institution could take those risks without affecting society. And of course, in the land-grant that research originally took the form of agricultural research, because agriculture was 80% of our economy at that time. But that, of course, is now expanded out way beyond agriculture in recognition that basic research becomes part of the institution. As that evolved, it became also a tenet that it was not only the risk taking, but research was a necessary ingredient not only to provide the economy with research results, but to stimulate the improvement of teaching. The teaching and research became an integrated and integral set of activities. Good classroom teaching required individuals who were up to date on their field, who were excited about their field, and who were looking at the very frontiers of a particular subject matter that they were teaching. In other words, teaching and research were recognized, were synergistic and accomplished the same thing.

One of the amusing things, although not quite so amusing, is to look at Ohio State’s Board Minutes in the ’30’s—when we think we have budget problems today, our budget problems are minor. One of the great debates then was that we really ought to get rid of agricultural research, because look at all of the money we are spending and we really don’t need any more. After all, it did appear that agricultural advances of the early 20th Century were so great that little was left to do! But, of course, basic research was going on and a great deal more has happened in that. Field after field can be described in that way.

Associated with this came this service-mission that we recognize today and recognize in virtually every industry, where one of our missions becomes that of taking our research results to the public, to the community-at-large and implementing those research results so that the public benefits directly from the research activity we are doing. Again, that got started with the agriculture community and cooperative extension, but today it has spread to virtually every activity we do. I might add though, I think it is fair to say that still the most successful service element of the institution, of any institution, is the agricultural activity. We are doing a better and better job in business and government and so forth, but still today that service is an important element.

Now these concepts have evolved into a system of higher education that has some great similarities from state to state. There are different governing bodies in every state. And there is anywhere from a governing body in higher education covering all the institutions in the state, to individual independent institutions. But what has developed in our country now is that virtually every state has three levels of higher education, the community colleges, the four-year institutions, and the comprehensive research institutions. And while there are differences across states, that general breakdown is pretty clear, and pretty well developed right now. Community colleges are strictly local, I mean local to the city or county. It is two-years, it is has the dual mission of technical education for a particular occupation or the first two-years of liberal education that would transfer to a baccalaureate degree.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Grant Colleges and Universities (1989)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University (Mississippi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University (Alabama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska-Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas-Fayetteville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas-Pine Bluff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University (South Carolina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida-Gainesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State College (Georgia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Guam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Manoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois-Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois-Urbana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston University (Oklahoma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University (Missouri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine-Orono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-Eastern Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Micronesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Rolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada-Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Marianas College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University (Texas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University (Indiana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University (Louisiana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee-Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuskegee University (Alabama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One view of land-grant’s future: More service

By Tom Spring

Land-grant universities with an updated, broadened and enhanced public service mission would provide “amazingly” new ways to serve society, said Bryce Jordan, president emeritus of Penn State University.

Jordan thinks land-grant universities can and should address issues such as the economy, ethnic and class conflicts, health and aging, poverty, homelessness, drug abuse and crime.

Jordan spoke Oct. 11 at the Ohio Union as part of a Project Reinvint symposium sponsored by the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Science.

Project Reinvint is funded by a Kellogg Foundation grant to envision and develop a model of an interdisciplinary curriculum that will better meet the needs of students, food-related business and industry, and the general public in the 21st century. Eleven other land-grant universities are involved.

“All of higher education, but particularly public higher education, is undergoing a crisis of public confidence,” Jordan said. “There is a feeling that the universities don’t serve society as well as they might. Many think we should be doing a better job to help society.”

Jordan said many people conceive of improvements to public service at land-grant universities as something that should take place through reorganizing their cooperative extension services.

But broadening and deepening outreach to solve societal problems will require an examination of the conflicts that throw up barriers to change, he said. Conflicts include:

- Where to focus research. “Our best public research and land-grant universities now rank among the best universities in the world,” he said. “The principal component has been their heavy emphasis on research — an emphasis few of us would want to change given the fact that research helps public knowledge. However, there has been a flood of inconsequential research that should never have been the light of day.”

- The emphasis on undergraduate teaching. “The renewed emphasis on teaching is highly desirable, but it poses a policy conflict. Should land-grant universities shift faculty and research (funding) to public service activity?”

- Faculty rewards. “Our standard for faculty appointment, promotion and tenure will almost certainly have to be revised if public service is to take a broader role.”

- Creating interdisciplinary projects. “Intervention of universities in solving the country’s most difficult problems will require a great deal of interdisciplinary effort, which is hard to sustain in our universities. Some (problems) have a difficult time finding an academic home.”

Jordan said, “I’m looking at a reorganization, perhaps a massive reorientation of land-grant universities to provide large, direct intervention to solve the most pressing of ills in our society.”

Building consensus will fall primarily to the chancellor or president and his or her closest associates, and will require support by business, government and foundations.

Jordan said the rate of social change is increasing dramatically and that university administrators must remain flexible and ready to change if the needs of society are to be met.

“We don’t live our lives in English literature one day and physics the next,” he said. “The world is organized in a different way than the university. So, the faculty have to be reorganized.”

The key is teaching people from various disciplines how to work together.

Jordan cited a paper-making corporation that hires chemists, engineers, agriculturalists and specialists from other disciplines, then trains them to work together.

“I think the way it’s likely to happen is through a germinating group at Ohio State or Penn State that is highly infectious and will spread its ‘disease’ everywhere.”

Richard Sisson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost, said the principles on which the land-grant institutions were founded are still appropriate and sound.

“The question now is one of creating knowledge and of implementation to contribute to economic productivity, quality of life and quality of education,” he said.

The next step for Project Reinvint will be for the steering and operating committees to meet with focus groups of citizens around the state to solicit ideas and input for reinventing land-grant universities.

The committees will then meet to discuss the ideas generated in those meetings.
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Introduction

"It was an immortal moment in the history of higher education in America and the world" (Nevins, 1962, p. 3). On July 2, 1862, President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, which was named after its primary author, Senator Justin Morrill, who is pictured on the cover page. The Act provided federal lands to qualifying states to sell and to use the proceeds to establish an endowment for a postsecondary institution. According to the Act, the endowment would support and maintain at least one college in the state, "where the leading objects shall be...to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts...in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes" (National Archives and Records Administration, n.d.). The Act provided 30,000 acres of public land to states to sell for each of its Representatives and Senators in Congress based on the 1860 census.¹

This paper analyzes how each of the Big Ten Conference's eight land-grant institutions, and their corresponding states, executed the provisions of the Morrill Act. Specifically, it outlines answers to the following questions:

1. When did each state accept the conditions of the Morrill Act?

2. How many acres of land did the U.S. government provide to the state to sell and where was the land located? What was the original size of the endowment as a result of selling the land?

3. Did the state use the Morrill funds to establish a new institution or to reorganize an already established institution? What was the rationale for the decision?

4. What date was the institution officially founded and under what name? How is the institution still fulfilling its duties to teach subjects in agriculture?

All of the institutions’ archives were contacted, and they all responded with valuable input and additional resources for the contents of this paper. Although some sources were much more in-depth than others, this paper provides a general overview of each institution. A footnote at the top of each section references brief citations of the sources used for that respective section. A complete list of citations is outlined in the References section.

**Michigan State University**

According to Michigan State University’s website (n.d.), the institution was the prototype for land-grant institutions, since it was the first institution of higher learning in the United States to teach scientific agriculture and founded in 1855, prior to the Morrill Act. Governor Kingsley Bingham signed Act No. 130, *Establishing a state Agricultural College*, in 1855 to select “a location and site for a State Agricultural School, within ten miles of Lansing [the state’s capital]” (Lautner, 1984, p. 12). The Burr farm, located three miles due east of Lansing and composed of over 675 acres, was eventually chosen as the location for the institution. The institution was originally named the Agricultural College of the State of Michigan when it was founded, and its current name, Michigan State University, was adopted in 1964.

Michigan was the seventh state to accept the terms of the Morrill Act through its *State Act of Acceptance* legislation on February 25, 1863. The state was granted 240,000 acres per its two Senators and six Representatives in Congress. The total acreage selected was 235,673 and was located in 17 counties in northern Michigan below the Straits of Mackinac. The land was not sold quickly, contrary to many states, but over several decades. It sold at an average price of approximately $4.50 per acre, ranging from prices as low as $0.50 to as high as $7.00 an acre, and generated an endowment of $1,059,378.58 to assist the already established Agricultural College of the State of Michigan.

---

2 Sources include: Michigan State University websites; Lautner, 12 & 15-16; and Berg, 11, 19-20, 25 & 30.
Today, approximately 47,954 students call themselves Spartans at the institution’s East Lansing campus. Michigan State’s agricultural roots are still alive today through the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, which offers 23 undergraduate majors.

**Purdue University***

The Indiana General Assembly passed an act in 1852, prior to the Morrill Act, calling for the reorganization of the state university, Indiana University, to include an agricultural department. However, the statute provided no financial support to assist with the creation of the department, so Indiana University established agricultural courses on paper but did not offer them. However, in 1865, the State of Indiana passed a law to accept the conditions of the Morrill Act and to establish the tentatively named Indiana Agricultural College. Purdue University uses four years later, in 1869, as the date of its founding because while the state had decided to accept the land grant in 1865, they did not know where the university would be located or what it would be named (S. Morris, personal communication, May 23, 2012). Plans to use the Morrill funds were offered to the Indiana legislature including a proposal by Indiana University to expand its curriculum. However, a new site soon emerged victorious.

John Purdue assisted with the state’s location decision by offering a donation of $150,000 if the state would locate the college in Tippecanoe County, name the institution Purdue University, and make Purdue a member of the Board of Trustees with lifetime “visitorial power”. Combined with $50,000 from Tippecanoe County and 100 acres of land from local residents, the General Assembly agreed. The state was granted 390,000 acres, per its two Senators and eleven Representatives in Congress, to sell because of its acceptance of the Morrill Act. Indiana did not have sufficient federal lands within its borders so it had to sell scrip, or land certificates, from

---

*Sources include: Topping, 11, 29-30, & 32; General Assembly of Indiana; and Purdue University websites.*
federal land outside of its borders. The land was quickly sold in 1867 at prices ranging from as $0.40 to $0.625 an acre, and generated an endowment of $212,238.50.

Today, approximately 75,436 students are enrolled at Purdue University’s main campus in West Lafayette and four other regional campuses across the state. 39,637 students call themselves Boilermakers at the main campus, which houses the College of Agriculture that offers more than 40 undergraduate majors.

University of Minnesota

“In the act erecting the Territory of Minnesota, approved March 9th, 1849, the Congress of the United States granted two sections of public lands for the endowment of a University” (The University of Minnesota Board of Regents, 1875, p. 25). Jump started by the 46,000 acres granted from the Congress of the United States, which was mentioned above, an atmosphere of determination to create an institution of higher learning began to spread across the territory. An editor of the St. Anthony Express captured this atmosphere, “We should start with the determination that not a single youth of either sex should be permitted to leave the territory to acquire an education for want of an institution at home fully endowed to meet the needs of this class. Nature has furnished one of the most beautiful sites in the Union for the establishment of a university” (Gray, 1951, pp. 17-18).

The Second Session of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Minnesota incorporated the University of Minnesota through its session laws in 1851. Franklin Steele, a businessman and the first President of the Board of Regents, offered his land near the Falls of St.

---

4 Sources include: The University of Minnesota Board of Regents, The calendar for the year 1874-5, 25-26; The University of Minnesota Board of Regents, The annual report of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota to the Governor of Minnesota, for the year 1868, 5 & 13; Gray, 16-18; Regents of the University of Minnesota website; and University of Minnesota website.
Anthony, “where resources in water power must presently be of great value,” for the institution (Gray, 1951, p. 16). The Regents accepted Mr. Steele’s proposal.

Minnesota accepted the terms of the Morrill Act a few years later, in 1868, through An Act to Re-organize the University of Minnesota, and to establish an Agricultural College therein, which established the College of Agriculture at the University. The State was given 120,000 acres per its two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Unfortunately, only an estimated value of the land could be located. The Board of Regents estimated the minimum value of its acreage at $721,515 in 1868 based on its high Pine timber coverage. However, this valuation was based on 166,083 acres that had been granted to the University by Congress, which includes the 46,000 acres originally granted to the territory and the 120,000 acres from the Morrill Act.

Today, approximately 62,378 students are enrolled at the University of Minnesota’s flagship campus in the Twin Cities and four coordinate campuses across Minnesota. The Twin Cities’ campus enrolls 52,557 Gophers and includes the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences, which offers more than 14 undergraduate majors.

**The Ohio State University**  

The Ohio General Assembly accepted the terms of the Morrill Act on February 9, 1864 and authorized the land’s sale in 1865. Per its two Senators and 19 Representatives in Congress, the state received 630,000 acres largely west of the Mississippi River. Although a commission was created and charged with selling the land for no less than $0.80 per acre to net at least $504,000 for the endowment, competition from other states selling their lands forced Ohio to sell its land at an average price of $0.50 per acre by the end of 1867 to generate an endowment of $340,894.70.

---

5 Sources include: Ohio History Channel website; Goerler, 7-8, 13-15, & 30; and The Ohio State University websites.
Ohio's already established colleges and universities sought out the lucrative endowment. However, the argument was settled in 1870. Representative Reuben P. Cannon authored the Cannon Act to establish and maintain a new and independent Agricultural and Mechanical College in Ohio, which was strongly supported by the State Board of Agriculture, dominant agricultural groups within the state and then Governor Rutherford B. Hayes. The precursor to The Ohio State University, the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College was thus established in 1870. The institution changed its name in 1878 to The Ohio State University to reflect its broadening scope of education.

Four counties in Ohio vowed for the institution's location: Montgomery, Clark, Champaign and Franklin. Although Montgomery County made the highest donation offer to the Board of Trustees, the Board ultimately chose to purchase land from the Neil Farm in Franklin County due to its railway accessibility, close proximity to the state legislature and the zeal of Joseph Sullivant, a member of the Board.

Today, approximately 64,429 students are enrolled at The Ohio State University's central Columbus campus and five other regional campuses across the state. The Columbus campus hosts 56,867 Buckeyes and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, which will offer 22 undergraduate majors beginning autumn semester of 2012.

University of Illinois

"From 1833 to 1863 various unsuccessful attempts were made in Illinois to establish a state university or an agricultural college" (Powell, 1918, p. 164). However, in 1863, Illinois accepted the conditions of the Morrill Act through An Act accepting the donation of Public Lands from Congress, approved July 2d, 1862. Per its 14 Representatives and two Senators in

---

6 Sources include: Slater, 25; Nevins, 31-32; Powell, 164 & 178; University of Illinois website; and University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign websites.
Congress, the state received 480,000 acres that were located in Illinois, Nebraska and Minnesota. The sale of the land netted the University $649,012.91 for the endowment.

A convention of farmers, mechanics and manufacturers spoke in favor of using the funds to create a single institution, while college presidents across the state declared their wish to divide the funds amongst them. In 1867, the Illinois legislature passed *An Act in relation to the location of the Industrial University* to formally accept proposals from counties, cities, townships or incorporated towns wanting to bid for the location of a new university. Aspiring locations included Chicago, Springfield, Peoria, Bloomington, Lincoln, Urbana-Champaign and Jacksonville.

However, some speculators in the Urbana-Champaign area had already purchased acreage and begun erecting a brick building to open the Urbana and Champaign Institute, a small agricultural school that they received a charter for in 1861. Unfortunately, the war prevented its opening. A month after passing legislation to open bids for a location, the legislation passed *An Act to provide for the organization and maintenance of the Illinois Industrial University*, which permanently located the institution in Urbana-Champaign at the site of the Institute and formally established the institution (E. Li, personal communication, May 23, 2012). According to Li, “However, the negotiations for the site were rife with charges of bribery and corruption” (personal communication, May 23, 2012). In 1885, the institution’s name was changed from the Illinois Industrial University to the University of Illinois to “indicate the aspirations of faculty and alumni and to avoid the confusion with schools for delinquents” (Brichford, 1983, p.1).

Today, approximately 77,635 students attend the University of Illinois’s family of campuses at its original and largest location – Urbana-Champaign, along with campuses in Chicago and Springfield. 42,605 of those students call themselves Fighting Illini at the Urbana-
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Champaign campus where agriculture is taught through the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences, which offer 11 undergraduate majors.

University of Nebraska

The state of Nebraska accepted the terms of the Morrill Act and chartered the University of Nebraska in 1869 through the Joint Resolution accepting act of Congress and S.F. No. 86, An Act to establish the University of Nebraska, respectively, just two years after it had gained statehood. The location of the institution, however, was already pre-determined through the state’s original statutes set upon its admission to statehood in 1867. An Act to provide for the location of the Seat of Government of the State of Nebraska, and for the erection of Public Buildings thereat passed in 1868 outlined that, “The State University and State Agricultural College shall be united as one education institution, and shall be located upon a reservation…in said ‘Lincoln’” (Nebraska Legislature, 1867, p. 55).

Per its one Representative and two Senators in Congress, the State received 90,000 acres, which were located in Antelope, Cedar, Cuming, Dakota, Dixon, L’Eau Qui Court (now Knox), Pierce and Wayne counties in Nebraska. An enabling act by Congress in 1864, providing for the admission of a state into the union, also set apart and reserved an additional 46,080 acres for the use and support of a state university. Thus, the total acreage of land that supported the University’s endowment was 136,080 acres.

Nebraska fared somewhat better than other states in the sale of its public lands. According to Knoll (1995), “The sums received by all states from Morrill land averaged $1.65 per acre, but in Nebraska the sale of educational lands had brought the state an average of $8.37 per acre” (p. 3). Unfortunately, a total endowment amount could not be located, so the average

Sources include: The University of Nebraska, Semi-Centennial Anniversary Book, 14-16; Nebraska Legislature, Joint resolution accepting act of Congress; Nebraska Legislature, An act to provide for the location of the seat of government, 55; Lee; Knoll, 3; and University of Nebraska-Lincoln websites.
price per acre, mentioned above, was multiplied by the amount of acres provided through the Morrill Act, 90,000, to determine an estimated endowment size of $753,300.

Today, the University enrolls approximately 50,352 students at its flagship campus in Lincoln and four other campuses across the state. Approximately, 24,593 students call themselves Cornhuskers at the Lincoln campus, which houses The College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and its 28 majors.

**The Pennsylvania State University**

Amid a fervor pulsating through Pennsylvania in the 1850’s to adopt more scientific methods of agriculture and establish a school where these methods could be studied, the legislature passed a measure granting a charter for the establishment of The Farmers’ High School in 1854. According to Bezilla (1985), the name was chosen to “allay the suspicions of farmers who might be distrustful of traditional colleges.” An amended charter had to be passed in 1855 to reduce the size of the Board of Trustees due to its inability to meet quorum at its first few meetings. Thus, The Pennsylvania State University uses the year 1855 to commemorate its establishment.

The board considered proposals on where to locate the institution from individuals in five counties. Ultimately, James Irvin’s pledge to donate 200 acres at the confluence of Nittany and Penn’s Valleys in Centre County, along with the pledges of two trustees from Centre County to help raise $10,000 if the cite was chose, convinced the Board. President Evan Pugh anticipated the passage of Morrill’s bill and wanted to strengthen his school’s bid by changing its name to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania, which he achieved in 1862. His foresight was instrumental – the state legislature named the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania as the sole

---

8 Sources include: Bezilla and The Pennsylvania State University websites.
recipient of the land-grant revenues in 1863. Its final name change, to The Pennsylvania State University, occurred in 1955 (P. Dzyak, personal communication, May 30, 2012).

The state received 780,000 acres, per its 24 Representatives and two Senators in Congress, which it sold for a total of $439,000. Today, Penn State enrolls nearly 86,205 students at 20 campuses across the state. Approximately 45,194 of those students call themselves Nittany Lions at the largest campus – University Park, which is located in State College and whose College of Agricultural Sciences offers 19-related majors.

**University of Wisconsin**

The Constitution of Wisconsin, established in 1848, provided for, “the establishment of a state university, at or near the seat of state government, and for connecting with the same, from time to time, such colleges in different parts of the state as the interests of education” might require (Curti & Carstensen, 1949, p. 6). Thus, on July 26, 1848, the University of Wisconsin was established. The Wisconsin legislature accepted the terms of the Morrill Act in 1863. However, according to Curti & Carstensen (1949), the University of Wisconsin did not reap the benefits as the benefactor of the Act until 1866 because of disagreements in the legislature to create a separate college of agriculture, “to give the land grant to the University [of Wisconsin], or to one of the sectarian colleges which offered to establish an agricultural department” (p. 297).

Ultimately, a joint committee of the Assembly Committees on Agriculture and Education set the tone for the legislature’s decision in 1866, “it was now too late to establish a separate institution...the new college should be part of the University since it was the only institution over which the legislature had control and...in which the whole people, without regard to locality or religious creed, can have a common interest” (Curti & Carstensen, 1949, p. 298). The

---

9 Sources include: Curti & Carstensen, 6 & 296-299; Berg, 30; University of Wisconsin System website; and University of Wisconsin-Madison websites.
legislature passed a reorganization act prior to accepting the Morrill funds to ensure the
University of Wisconsin met the stipulations of the Morrill Act, including the creation of an
agricultural college. Shortly after, the legislature voted to sell the land-grant acres and to funnel
its endowment to the University of Wisconsin.

Per its six Representatives and two Senators, the state received 240,000 acres of land via
the Morrill Act. According to Curti & Carstensen (1949), “Over half the land selected lay in
Marathon and Polk Counties, the remainder in Chippewa, Clark, Dunn, Oconto, [and] Shawano
[in Wisconsin]” (p. 299). The sale of the land generated an endowment of $303,595. Today, the
University of Wisconsin System boasts an enrollment of more than 181,000 students at 13 four-
year universities and 13 freshman-sophomore campuses. Nearly 42,595 students call themselves
Badgers at the system’s largest campus in Madison, which offers 24 undergraduate majors in the
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences.

**Conclusion**

According to Nevins (1962), “Altogether, the Morrill Act provided more than $7,500,000
for founding or invigorating land-grant universities and state universities all over the republic”
(p. 28). Although the Morrill Act was passed at the national level, its execution was left in the
hands of each state’s legislature. Each state’s approach to using the Morrill funds differed as
dramatically as the enrollment numbers of each of the Big Ten institutions today. It also appears
that many people and interest groups played dynamic roles in swaying the legislatures’ decisions
to allot the Morrill funds. Each university still has a college of agriculture, but with a varying
amount of majors. Ohio tied with Indiana for the lowest selling price of its Morrill lands at $0.54
per acre, even though The Ohio State University boasts the largest enrollment on a single campus
compared to the other Big Ten schools. Nebraska, meanwhile, netted an incredible average of
$8.37 per acre. This discrepancy appears to be connected with the location of the acreage and the amount of time the state allowed the land to sell on the market, with quicker sales netting lower prices. However, the sizes, changes, impacts and accomplishments of all eight institutions today can be connected back to one “immortal moment” in 1862.
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The Ohio State University

While the Civil War was raging, Congress passed the Morrill Act of 1862. It offered land grants to any state or territory that would establish a college focused on agriculture and the mechanic arts. The Morrill Act thus became the basis for the nation’s impressive “land grant” universities, most of which are A&M (Agricultural and Mechanical) universities.

On February 9, 1864, the Ohio legislature accepted this act’s terms and received 30,000 acres of public land for each federal senator and representative. Since Ohio had two senators and 19 representatives, the state was entitled to 630,000 acres. Federal lands were no longer available in Ohio, however, so the state accepted land scrip in its place. Land scrip, issued by the federal government, could be used to acquire land anywhere in the public domain open for private entry. Instead of buying land, Ohio sold its land scrip for $342,450.80, about 54 cents per acre. This became the university’s initial stake. The Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College was chartered in 1870, opened its doors to students in 1873, and graduated its first class in 1878. In addition to the Morrill Grant, the state legislature assigned the school at least 76,735 acres of unlocated
lands remaining in the Virginia Military District. These lands were sold or quit claimed to individuals until the 1940s.

Though initially designed to be an A&M college, the school’s trustees soon decided its curriculum should reach beyond agriculture and the mechanical arts, and, consistent with this belief, they renamed the school Ohio State University. To emphasize its place in the state system, the name later became The Ohio State University.

**Original Surveys Influence Ohio’s Development**

The original surveys of federal lands in Ohio often defined regions set aside for the benefit of specific groups. Survey lines defining congressional land grants became, in effect, boundaries setting off one cultural group from another. Ohio, therefore, was a mosaic of diverse peoples from its beginning. These groups of dissimilar background, with different economic, political, and social traditions, were present in large enough numbers, and they maintained their regional hold long enough to leave enduring marks upon Ohio. To this day, a discerning viewer can find cultural traces that the state’s earliest settlers left in their various regions.

*Ohio State University’s First Graduating Class 1878 in Columbus, Ohio, Photo courtesy of The Ohio State University.*