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INTRODUCTION

In the present-day world of change, every time we pick up the paper we read of something new in our society. We now have new rockets, new satellites, new computers, and new methods of destruction. There are also many "new" things in the field of education. One of these is federal aid to education. As yet, there seems to be no consensus on the merits of this supposedly new approach to educational finance. Some view it as a kind of plague; others see it as an unmixed blessing. Actually, federal aid to education is quite old and quite common.

It was just a hundred years ago that federal aid to education began in the form of grants of land to states to start colleges with emphasis on agriculture and mechanic arts. Since that time the aid has been continuous. It has increased rather than decreased, and it can fairly be said that many of our state colleges would not have been established had it not been for this aid.

The land-grant system has given us a valuable example of the operation of federal aid to education and what it means to our educational system. Has it taken away our freedom? Has it improved our educational system? Does it bring on greater control of our teachers and the courses taught on the college level? Has the national government assumed greater control? Have the states given up their function of supporting our educational system on the college level? The answers to these questions may give us insight into the problems created by expanded federal aid,
and may possibly help us find a solution to our growing educational problem. On the National Archives Building in Washington D. C. there is a saying, "What's Past is Prologue." It could be that a study of the past will be a guide to the future in providing us with an educational system adequate for our changing times.

An analysis of federal aid and its impact and consequences logically begins with a study of its history—of its role, for example, in the establishment and growth of a particular land-grant college. Some studies of this nature have already been done. Earle T. Ross, Professor at Iowa State University, has made an excellent study of Iowa State University from a historical point of view. A. C. True, recently with the Department of Agriculture, made a competent general statistical study of federal aid to education. This thesis dwells mainly on the general and political implications and actions of federal aid as they pertain to one university, Utah State University.

The research has involved the study of books that have been written about the acts of Congress in support of educational aid to colleges; it has required the study of the acts themselves in the United States Code of Laws; and it has included studies of the minutes, reports, and financial statements of the Board of Trustees of Utah State University.

Each of the major bills passed by Congress has been given individual study. These have included the Land-Grant Act of 1862, The Morrill Act of 1890, The Hatch Act, The Smith-Lever Act, and the legislation of the New Deal period as it relates to education. The influence of the military on the University has also been considered. The history of each act has been considered, as has its operation as it relates to Utah State University.
This study is restricted to that part of state and university policies which relate to federal aid. Other aspects of the relationship of the state government to the university are beyond the scope of this thesis. Certain other major bills passed by Congress relating to federal aid to education, as for example the G. I. Bill of Rights, provided direct assistance to the student, and therefore only minor effect on college administration, policy, or curriculum, have not been considered.
CHAPTER I

LAND-GRA NT ACT OF 1862

History

I think by far the most important bill in our code, is that for diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised, for the preservation of freedom and happiness.

A sense of necessity, and a submission to it, is to me a new and consolatory proof, whenever the people are well informed, they can be trusted with their government; that whenever things get so far wrong to attract their notice, they may be relied on to set them to rights.

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.¹

The above excerpt from one of our great Americans, Thomas Jefferson, indicates that the idea of educating the mass of American people is not a recently-contrived doctrine. It was in the hearts and thoughts of those Americans who founded our democratic system of government. The above quotations also imply that government action should be taken to make sure that the masses receive their opportunity for educational progress. The above words were uttered in the late 1780's and early 1800's, many years before the Land-Grant Act of 1862. This would indicate that it took the American mind many years to be conditioned to the idea that everyone should have the opportunity for an education, and that the government should provide aid for this education.

In the early 1800's many events and actions were taking place that would mean, eventually, that the government would provide education for the masses. The property restrictions on voting in most states were disappearing, and in the west new states were coming into the Union with no property qualifications for voting at all. With their new-found power at the voting booth, the people clamored for more services. They wanted new roads built and their children educated. With the vote going to all adult males, during the Jacksonian period, no longer could education be only for those who could afford it. The people who could not afford it now had the power to persuade their local governments to enact legislation providing for public education. Every state gradually built up its own public school system, and facilities and teachers were provided out of state funds.

It must be noted, in this drive for education for the general public, that the desire and drive did not come from the government. The public school system was organized because of the requests and actions of the people themselves, with the help of the educators and crusaders of the Jacksonian period. The states did exercise increasing control over education when they began to provide the finances, but this was not done without the people's consent.

As the nation stumbled into the 1840's from the Panic of 1837 many realized that to keep the Industrial Revolution going at full pace there would have to be greater effort made to train men at higher educational levels.¹ Those two handmaidens of history, politics and economics, started to shape the course of America's educational system.

Factories were being built at a rapid rate in New England. More Americans were moving west to claim new farm land. The factories needed an ever-increasing number of trained personnel to handle the many new technical jobs that were being created. The prevailing program of education was not geared to provide this increase. At this time, higher education consisted mainly of the teaching of the arts and letters, and its main purpose was to give to those who could afford it a cultural education. With the advent of industrialization, the emphasis began to switch to vocational education.¹

New developments in agriculture were also increasing the need for more training in agricultural science. It had always been the tradition that a farmer could train and educate his son in all the things that were necessary to be a good farmer.² This tradition, however, was changing. The use of new seeds and fertilizer could not be learned from the father. The land in the west was different than it was in the east, and new methods had to be learned and used to achieve efficient use of it.

The world of science was also increasing the desire for new facilities for research and learning. Many were going to Europe to the science centers of Giessen, Munich, Paris, and Edinburgh to get a scientific and technical education, and there was a growing demand that America build its own training institutions.³

The people at this time were still not accustomed to a federal government which was active in local affairs. Washington was far away, and people turned mainly to their local governments for assistance. The states provided initial assistance in higher education in the agricultural

¹Ibid., p. 14.
²Ibid., p. 16.
³Ibid., p. 16.
and mechanic arts. The first state to establish a state college for the teaching of mechanical and agricultural arts was New York. It was in the year 1853 that the New York State Agricultural College was incorporated on a joint stock basis.\(^1\) This was soon followed by action in other states. Pennsylvania established a school of its own, and it was not long before Massachusetts, Iowa, Kentucky, and Virginia also had their own state universities. By 1860 there were many such universities.\(^2\) It was the industrial and agricultural interests that demanded federal aid on the college level in the agricultural and mechanical trades. The agricultural societies requested help in training the farmers, while the industrialists saw that the need for skilled personnel in industry would increase beyond the means of the present system to supply them. Some advocated use of the western lands held by the government to create and support state universities. Jonathan B. Turner first proposed land-grant aid, but it was Justin S. Morrill who introduced a bill into Congress in December, 1857, to provide for land-grant institutions.\(^3\)

The temper of the times made the passage of the first Land-Grant Act very difficult. The bill became involved in the sectional conflict that was soon to result in civil war. There was opposition from both the South and New England. Southern politicians thought that the bill would invade states rights and open a flood of requests to the national government in all walks of life. New England leaders, on the other hand, felt that the west should build its own railroads, roads, and colleges

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 28.  
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 34.  
\(^3\) Ibid., p. 45.
as had the people in the east.¹

The political and economic interests that were for the land-grant bill were located in the new states of the west. The west was financially weak but growing and needed help. Roads and railroads had to be built, and their men had to be trained. The west did have plenty of land, and the land-grant scheme was well adapted for its requirements.

The west combined its efforts with those of the industrialists who needed trained personnel, and thought the cheapest way to get them was for the Federal Government to provide land-grant colleges. The combination was strong enough.

The battle was not over, however. In fact, it was finally lost. The President, Buchanan, refused to sign to the bill. He cited as reasons for his refusal the ineffectiveness of the system and the belief that land-scrip would drain the treasury. He charged that speculation in the new land-grants would have a depressing effect on the new states.² Buchanan was also a southern sympathizer and this must have had much to do with his veto of the act.³ He also refused to sign because he interpreted the constitution strictly. He reasoned that it was not within the power of the national government to provide aid for higher education.

The battle may have been lost, but the war was not. There would be another Congress and another president. The time came with the Civil War and the departure of southern politicians. In 1862 the bill easily passed Congress. President Lincoln did not press for the bill, but did interpret

¹Ibid., p. 56.
²Ibid., p. 58.
the constitution less strictly than had Buchanan, and was willing to
sign the bill.\textsuperscript{1}

Very liberal in its terms and provisions, the Land-Grant Act pro-
vided as follows:

1. The Federal Government would apportion to the states
30,000 acres of land for each senator and representa-
tive.

2. Land scrip was to be issued, and could be sold by the
states for a minimum of $1.25 per acre.

3. The proceeds were to be invested and the interest
used for the teaching of agriculture and the mechan-
ic arts.

4. The money was to be invested in state or United
States bonds designated by the state legislatures.

5. Diminished capital was to be replaced by the state.

6. The funds were not to be used to erect or repair
buildings.

7. The state legislature had three years to act, and
five years to establish a college.

8. No state in rebellion could obtain any land-grant.

9. The governor was required to submit an annual report
on sales of land and the progress of the school.

10. None of the money was to be used to administer the
fund, and the cost of the fund had to be paid by
the state.

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 35.
The colleges were required to teach agriculture, mechanical arts, and military tactics; but this was not to exclude instruction in other scientific or classical studies.¹

The great events of the Civil War temporarily obscured the importance of the Morrill Act.² The resources of the country were being used to fight the war that was dividing the nation. The young men were going off to war and not to college. The states were not under much political pressure to take advantage of the provisions of the act, and the result was that few states took the opportunity to establish a college. Nor was the Federal Government passing a new system of education upon the states. The act was an offer that the states could reject or accept as they wished. The provisions of the law left the initiative up to the states for instituting any action that would lead to the founding of a land-grant college.

All states eventually made sure, however, that they got their share from the land-grant provisions. There had been only three states which had passed enabling acts by the close of 1862. Eight years later thirty-seven states had followed suit.³ The approaching end of the Civil War with victory for the Union had speeded up the action of the states.

The actions of the states in implementing the provisions of the act seem to indicate that although the states were slow to act there

²Eddy, op. cit., p. 44.
³Ibid., p. 43.
was really no opposition to the establishment of land-grant colleges. This is not entirely true. The opposition ran from indifference to hostility. There was not a reference to the act during the proceedings of the American Institute for Instruction in its conventions of 1862 and 1863. This institute, made up of college professors, had for its prime purpose the improvement of education on the college level. The farm organizations were also indifferent about the land-grant act, because they did not realize its significance and were dubious about some of its provisions. The farmers were of the opinion that they could learn enough about farming from actual experience. There was also objection to the use of the Federal Government for such action. The nation had just gone through a war to preserve the Union, but the war had brought so many centralized controls that the people were now tired of government interference and wanted to get on with life as it was before the rupture. Any type of law or action made by the government was regarded suspiciously, even though government supervision was held to a minimum. There was scarcely any provision for control by the Federal Government within, and most of the act concerned itself with giving the states an opportunity to better its educational system. This, however, did not put at ease the suspicions of many on the idea of federal control of our educational system.

Self-interest was also a factor in the opposition to the land-grant idea. The private institutions of learning throughout the country looked upon the new land-grant colleges as competitors. The charge was

1Ibid., p. 44.
2Ross, op. cit., p. 66.
made that the act would take away the traditional right of Americans to solve problems without government interference.\(^1\) The land-grant schools were attacked because their curriculum was not sufficiently broad. The courses given were too restrictive, it was said, and in order for a person to get a good education it was still necessary for him to go to a private or sectarian school. On the other hand, the same groups attacked the land-grant schools for not being sufficiently restrictive in their offerings. It was contended that the colleges were paying too much attention to "cultural" courses, and not paying enough to the teachings of agricultural science and mechanic arts to the farmers and tradesmen.\(^2\)

This opposition slowed but did not stop the advance of the land-grant college. All states had passed enabling acts, and had started the construction of buildings to meet the time limits of the act, but from that point on the progress of the land-grant idea was slow. The states were hard-pressed to find the means of constructing the necessary facilities in the face of opposition to the land-grant idea. Progress was slow, but it gradually gained momentum. As the people's suspicions of federal support to college training lessened, more headway was made.

There are factors in the struggle for land-grant education that relate to our present day conflict in the field of education. One of these is in the provision of the land-grant act which requires that money from the sale of land must be used for the instruction of agricultural and mechanic arts and not for the erection and repair of buildings.\(^3\) This is the reverse of the general attitude today. Many are fearful that if the Federal Government pays for instruction this will mean federal control

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 174.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Code, op. cit., Title 7 Section 307.
over what will be taught in our schools. On the other hand, many are willing to accept federal help in the construction of the buildings. It is argued that the construction of buildings will not lead to federal control, while payment for instruction will certainly do so. Federal grants for instructional purposes are not unprecedented, of course, since land-grant funds have always been used for this purpose. The practice has shown that the Federal Government can control what is to be taught by the use of federal funds. The Federal Government has, however, been very lenient in its restrictions on the courses taught in the land-grant colleges.

Another point that is pertinent to our times is that in the 1870's, Representative Morrill tried to add public schools to the land-grant law.¹ The temper of the times was opposed, however, and the bill was defeated. Too many people, after the war, were tired of centralized control, and wanted to return to individualism. Federal aid to education on the lower public school level was thus an issue one hundred years ago. The people then had the same feelings and employed the same arguments as they do today.

Land-Grant at Utah State University

Utah State University, contrary to general belief, did not begin as a land-grant institution. While it is now a land-grant college and has been for over sixty years, the first federal funds used to found the college came from the Hatch Act of 1887, which appropriated funds to establish agricultural experiment stations in the states and territories. In 1887 Utah was not a state and was not entitled to

¹Ross, op. cit., p. 176.
land-grant funds. The territories were excluded from the bill because states were afraid that the territories would have an added advantage in that they would be run by the Federal Government and might get the choicest land-grants. In the original act vetoed by Buchanan the territories were included, but to insure safe passage this part was deleted from the act of 1862 which Lincoln signed. The first land-grant funds were used at Utah State University in the year 1902. However, the Land-Grant Act has played a part in the growth and financial structure of Utah State University.

The idea of making Utah State University a land-grant college existed from the founding of the school. It was impossible to use land-grant funds to begin with, but the day would come when Utah would enter the Union, and then it would be possible to tap this revenue. The idea of establishing a college devoted to the study of agriculture and mechanic arts did not spring up overnight. As early as 1872, delegates from the territory of Utah attended a convention of agricultural colleges, state societies, and boards. The purpose was to take action regarding the interests of agriculture. The delegates discussed means of getting more land-grants, establishing experiment stations, and other matters of interest to the agricultural world. Utah was in search of new methods to increase the agricultural production of the area. The land was arid, and different methods had to be used than was the case in other areas. This added to the impetus for the founding of an agricultural college in the territory. When Utah was given the opportunity, it was not long in accomplishing the act. The first land-grant funds

---

1 Eddy, op. cit., p. 33.
2 Ross, op. cit., p. 168.
for Utah State University came as part of the enabling act of the Congress of 1894 that admitted Utah to the Union. The act gave Utah 200,000 acres of land to be used by the newly-formed agricultural college in Utah. When Utah became a state in 1896, this land-grant went into effect. The land-grant was large because of the poor condition of the land in the arid west. The land was to be sold in accordance with the land-grant act, and the school was to invest the money and use the interest. Under these circumstances it would be a few years before there was money for the school to use. In 1902 the first $15,000 was available for use.1

In the sale of the land the legislature laid down policies to control the sales and keep any mishandling to a minimum. In the first place, the Utah constitution had provided that the proceeds of all land-grants would constitute permanent trusts.2 A number of sales methods were used. These included public sale, private sale, preference, relinquishment, select and purchase, and the Carey Act.3 In a public sale the land is appraised, and sold at public auction. In a private sale, individuals buy land not sold at a public auction. A preference sale is the type in which the land is withheld from public or private sale to give public institutions a preference in the buying of land for their own uses. It was also used to allow people who were living on land that was given to schools for land-grant purposes the right to buy it before it was sold at public auction. The relinquishment sales allowed people who were on land-grant land to relinquish that land for other land that was available. In some cases people and institutions were allowed to select and purchase

1Trustees Report, 1907-1908, p. 125.
2Arthur D. Smith, Utah's Federal Grant Lands, Special Report 14, Logan Utah, Agriculture Experiment Station Utah State University, 1960, p. 4.
3Ibid., p. 6.
land of their choice at a set price. The Cayce Act was the sixth method used to dispose of the land obtained from land-grants. It gave to the western states 1,000,000 acres of land to be reclaimed by irrigation.\(^1\)

It should be noted that there were other land-grant bills that provided for more than mere grants for education. There were also grants for homesteading, grazing, industry, and for other institutions of the state.

It can be seen from above that the state was the most active participant in the administration of all land-grants given by the Federal Government. The state established the procedure for the disposal of the lands, and also the manner and means by which the proceeds from the sale of the lands would be handled. The state also stipulated the price paid and designated the lands to be sold within the terms of the law. The Federal Government would allocate land for general purposes, but within this range there was discretion for the state in disposal and administration. This type of handling left the state with the greatest amount of power in the land-grant program. In the case of the land-grant institution of Utah State University, the control of the school was by the state government, which exercised a greater voice in the administration of the school. The state determined the type of courses to be taught, hired and fired teachers, and appointed the Board of Trustees which had the responsibility of the general administration of the school.

The administration of the land-grant programs in Utah has been under a Land Board since the founding of the state.\(^2\) The Land Board was given the responsibility for the disposition of the land, the administr-

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 4.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 20.
ration of the land still in state hands, and the investment of the proceeds that came from the sale of the lands. The Board has usually had the governor as a member as well as the secretary of state, but this has not always been the case. The organization has changed many times, depending on the attitude of the legislature. At times, it has been made up of appointed citizens, while the remaining times it has been composed of elected officials.

The quality of operation of the Land Board since the state entered the Union has been mediocre. Much valuable land has been lost to the state because the Board did not know its true value. This was true in the case of many coal fields in eastern Utah which were leased for grazing purposes. There has also been a lack of initiative on the part of the Board in the upkeep of the land, and in providing for its future use. This lack of responsibility, however, could have been caused by the fact that the organization of the Land Board was always being changed by the legislature, thus making it impossible for the Board to develop a systematic method of operation. It appears that the Land Board has, on occasion, dabbled in politics, although this might be hard to prove.

There has been at least one aspect of the federal land-grant program that has not been in the best interests of the state. This has been the Federal Government's habit of withdrawing land from use by the state. Withdrawal is made on land where the state has not claimed title. If a state has a title that antedates the withdrawal it can acquire the land for its own use. The withdrawals, however, stopped the state from obtaining land in the future, and left in doubt the disposition of some of the land-grants. It is in this area that the Federal Government could bring

---

1 Ibid., p. 20.
2 Ibid., p. 9.
about pressure upon the state government and its institutions that have federal land-grants. Since Utah has become a state, the Federal Government has taken much of the mountainous part for national forests. With valuable mineral deposits and timber, this land has been the most valuable in the state, and it could have provided a great amount of revenue. Land has also been withdrawn for military purposes, but in the main this has been land that was not of much value. The land that has been left has been arid and of low value. The returns from land-grants have been much lower than they would have been otherwise, and Utah has received less for its land because of the general poor condition of the land. Other states with better land received more money.

When Utah was admitted to the Union and the Enabling Act was passed by the legislature granting land to the state, the Board of Trustees checked to make sure that Utah State University was within the provisions laid down by the Land-Grant Act. The school was able to make these provisions with no change, because it was already complying with the second Morrill Act. The Board was able to report and recommend that the state obtain the 200,000 acres of land that was due the state from the Federal Government.

The school hoped to receive the best possible land that it could from the government. If it could get high-priced land, it could conceivably have the land-grant pay the entire cost of running the university each year. The difference in one piece of land in the desert from a piece of land which has many natural resources was of great importance to the school. With this in mind, the Board of Trustees urged that Congress be persuaded to allocate federal lands in the Uintah Basin to the college for its use before the lands went on public sale. This area
was rich in natural resources, and showed signs of having oil. The university put pressure on the governor to get this land, and send a representative to Washington to secure the land.¹

There was no further reference in the Minutes of the Board of Trustees relating to the acquiring of Uintah Basin land for the school, but Utah State University was never able to obtain this land for its use.² It was also never obtained for state use under any of the other grants made by the Federal Government. The land designated for the use of Utah State University was located in central Utah, a strip in east central Utah, and a strip near Tooele.³ This land was not the most valuable land in the state, and the revenues that have come from it has not been substantial. In 1952, 1954, and 1958 this amounted to $17,812, $27,307, and $21,191 respectively. In the same order, this amount made up 0.5%, 0.7%, and 0.4% of the yearly budgets.⁴ There were three methods of obtaining funds from the lands: rental from leased land, interest from money obtained from the sale of lands, and royalties from the mineral deposits taken from the lands.⁵

The supervision and control of the lands were not the responsibility of the college but rather of the Utah State Land Board which has turned over to the school money obtained from the lands on a yearly basis. For this reason, the university has been remote from the administration of the land-grant. The State Land Board has been the main instrument of control. Professor Arthur D. Smith stated in an interview that it was his opinion

---

¹Minutes, op. cit., 1888-1900, p. 162.
²Interview with Arthur D. Smith, Professor of Range Management, USU, March 20, 1961.
³Ibid.
⁴Smith, op. cit., p. 10.
⁵Interview, op. cit.
that the Federal Government had not used the Land-Grant Act either to control teaching or administration at Utah State University. He could not recall any instance of the Federal Government checking on state compliance with the Land-Grant Act.

The minutes of the Board of Trustees indicate that the Land-Grant Act has not played an important part in the deliberations of that body. Since the early days of the school, there has been little mention of the act in relation to the supervision and control of the university. This would indicate that the Federal Government did not try to control education at Utah State University through use of the Land-Grant Act. As years passed, the annual accrual from the act became a routine affair, and was automatically entered in the minutes in the biennial budget without discussion.

Professor Smith has said that the university has attempted on several occasions to obtain control of its own land-grants from the Land Board. It was felt that the college could best administer the lands for the interest of the school. To do this it would be necessary to obtain legislative action. The college has never been able to obtain this right, and the administration of the lands have remained outside the control of the university.

The state legislature has been the agency that has assigned general areas of study to Utah State University. These fields of study had to include agriculture, mechanic arts, and military science. Aside from these, the state could assign any other areas of education to the school and still receive its land-grant. The Board of Trustees decided on the specific courses to be taught. The first courses outlined by the Board
were English, Literature, Mathematics, Civil Engineering, Agriculture, Chemistry, Animal and Vegetable Anatomy, Entomology, Physiology, Veterinary Art, Geology, Political Science, Household Economy, Horticulture, Moral Philosophy, History, and Bookkeeping.¹ The general fields of study, as laid down by the legislature in 1915, were Agriculture, Home Economics, Agricultural Engineering, Mechanic Arts, and Commerce.²

¹Minutes, op. cit., 1888-1900, p. 40.
²Reports, 1915-1916, op. cit., p. 5.
CHAPTER II

THE HATCH ACT

History

The Land-Grant Act enabled the states to establish colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, but it did not provide them with the funds to do large-scale research on farm methods. Research requires considerable expenditures in time, money, and facilities, and there is always the possibility that there will be no direct return on the investment. As a migratory people followed Horace Greeley's famous injunction to "Go West and Grow Up With the Country," there developed need for experimentation in new methods of agriculture. There were new climates and an arid soil with which to deal. These conditions required experimentation in the use of new seeds and new fertilizers that would increase the productivity of the new areas that were being farmed in the west. Research centers were needed that would add to the knowledge of agriculture and facilitate successful settlement in the new states of the growing nation.

The idea of agricultural experiment stations did not originate in the United States, but in Germany.¹ In the early 1870's there was pressure on the states by agricultural societies to establish experiment stations which would resemble those first pioneered in Germany. Many states responded to these calls; by 1887 there had been established experiment

stations in Alabama, Indiana, Maine, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The fact that experiment stations were first established and operated by the states was significant in that it established the first pattern of control. It made them state organizations operated by the states. If the stations had been formed by the Federal Government the control pattern might have been much different; they might have become research centers under the Department of Agriculture, and they might not have been as close to the state colleges as they are. Many state agricultural colleges might not have been founded if research centers had not been built first. This would almost certainly have been the case with Utah State University. The states, however, made their experiment stations a part of their state colleges. This became the standard for subsequent stations and ultimately the policy of the Federal Government when legislation was passed appropriating money to assist the state experiment centers in later years.

One fact that stands out in studying the various moves made to benefit the farmers and vocational groups is that the prime movers and leaders have not been the farmers individually, but rather the farmer's associations and the professional groups. The farmers seemed either too busy farming or else they were satisfied with the status quo. The old way of farming was too ingrained in the farmer for him quickly to accept new ways of doing things. Also the farm associations took the lead in farmer experimentation and education because they were composed of men who had a college and professional background in agricultural science, and were interested in improving the lot of the farmer.

\[1\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 94.}\]
Starting in the 1880's Congress was persuaded to appropriate money to assist the various state experiment stations.¹ The stations had been successful in discovering new seeds for the arid west, new fertilizers, and better methods to till the soil. Many groups wanted the states to expand their efforts, but the states found themselves short of funds and did not have the financial base to support a large-scale research effort. A number of bills were introduced for the purpose of supplying federal funds for the experiment stations between the years 1882 and 1887. A bill was drafted by a group of college presidents headed by S. A. Knapp of Iowa to provide for national experiment stations attached to the colleges in the several states.² The main purpose of the bill was to give the Department of Agriculture a better working relationship with the new state stations and to provide an appropriation of $15,000 for the experiment stations. It was not received enthusiastically, mainly because it gave too much authority to the national government, and the states were fearful of federal supervision, although there was little objection to the financial provisions. Ultimately a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Hatch of Missouri which deleted the objectional feature of federal control, and this bill established experiment stations in all the states and territories and provided federal funds for that purpose.

The provisions of the Hatch Act are as follows:

1. There is an annual appropriation of $15,000 to each state and territory from the Federal Government for use by their experiment station.

¹Ibid., p. 96.
²Edward D. Ross, Democracy's College (Ames, Iowa, Iowa State College Press, 1942), pp. 139-140.
2. The stations are to be under state control with the states and territories administering and supervising the stations.

3. The money to be given to the states and territories by the Federal Government was to come from the sale of public lands.

4. The Department of Agriculture of the Federal Government was to have supervision over matters involving more than one station and in giving out federal research assignments.

5. The stations were required to make annual reports to the Department of Agriculture.

6. The stations were required to publish periodic bulletins concerning their research findings.\(^1\)

The states and territories were not long in taking advantage of the provisions of the Hatch Act. Within a few years most of them had taken some form of action to implement its provisions. By 1897 the number of staff members working in experiment stations reached 628, and by 1903, 6,143 bulletins had been published to help the farmers.\(^2\) The states that already had colleges put the experiment stations within their college organisation, while others established an experiment station, and used its organisation eventually to start a state agricultural college.

As already mentioned, the Land-Grant Act had not applied to territories, but the Hatch did. This made it possible for the territories to reverse the process of the states by first creating an agricultural experiment station and later a state agricultural college. Some territories used part of the money which was supposed to have been used

\(^{1}\)United States Code, 1958 Edition, Title 7 Section 361.

\(^{2}\)Eddy, op. cit., p. 98.
for research in order to create a school. In establishing the University of Arizona, for example, federal funds allocated to the experiment station were used to pay some of the general administrative expenses of the university.¹

It should be noted that up to this time in our history of federal aid to education the states were willing to accept aid, but only on their own terms. In this matter the states always were able to have enough independence and power not only to get funds from the Federal Government, but also to determine what control the national government would have and how the money would be spent. It appeared at this time that the states were exercising much greater control than was the Federal Government, although the latter put up a good portion of the funds.

Utah State University and the Hatch Act

At the time of the founding of Utah State University, Utah was a territory. Thus, U. S. U. was one of those schools which was begun first as an agricultural experiment station, and later became a land-grant college. Since the provisions of the Land-Grant Act did not apply to Utah until it became a state, Utah State University received its first funds from the Federal Government under the terms of the Hatch Act.

Agricultural experimentation in Utah did not start with the Hatch Act. Research in agriculture may be said to have begun in July, 1847, when the first Mormon pioneers to come to the territory experimented with irrigation of crops. The experiment was successful, and with this

stimulus the pioneers continued to seek new ways to improve farming in this arid region.

One of the most significant and successful experiments, that of dry-farming, occurred in 1865 in Bear River Valley, where more land was planted than could be irrigated. The farmers in this region had traditionally used irrigation, but as the years passed it was found that the irrigation water from Malad River had left excessive alkali in the soil and curbed crop growth. In desperation farmers planted the land above the irrigated part in crops that needed less water and hoped for the best. Their hopes paid off; the experiment demonstrated that crops could be grown without irrigation, and dry-farming came to Utah.¹

The people of Utah never stopped experimenting with new methods. The type of land and the physical characteristics of the area called for constant change in farming methods: The water level would not remain the same year after year; the high alkali content of the soil called for new methods of reconditioning the land or new methods of watering; and with the advent of crops new pests, weeds, and plant diseases came.² The people were experimenting up to the time of the Hatch Act, and when it was enacted they welcomed it.

The action to get a bill passed in the Utah legislature creating a state agricultural college and experiment station had its difficulties at first. The legislature had passed the enabling act only to have the appropriations vetoed by the territorial governor. This slowed down but did not stop the advocates for a state college within the state. In 1888 there was a new governor, and prospects for getting the legislation passed looked

¹Bulletin Number 262, A First Half-Century of Research at the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station (Logan, Utah, 1938), p. 9.
²Ibid.
more promising.¹ Anthon H. Lund, who had been impressed with the agricultural high schools he saw in Denmark, introduced the successful bill. Mr. Lund saw that Danish schools were turning out youngsters who were well equipped to lead a prosperous farm life, and who would be able to help increase the agricultural productivity of their small country. The Lund Act of 1888 was patterned after these schools.

Sectional interest within the state stimulated political controversy over the Lund Act. Utah County and Cache County both wanted the school.² This conflict delayed passage of the Lund bill, but a greater amount of legislators favored Cache County which was eventually designated as the site of the school. The controversy was, however, strong enough to persuade Lund to omit the selection of a site from his original bill to make sure of its passage. During the course of the debate the delegates from Weber County threw their support to Cache County in return for support to establish the reform school in Weber County. This insured the Cache County location. The bill then passed both houses of the legislature by a unanimous vote of all those present. The governor, Caleb W. West, vetoed the first bill because he did not like the method designated for choosing trustees, but this was ironed out in a legislative session in which the clock had to be stopped. The bill was eventually signed by the governor and became law on March 8, 1888.³

The bill provided for:

1. An appropriation of $25,000.
2. The erection of a school building.

² Ibid., p. 18-19.
³ Ibid., p. 20.
3. The purchase of farm lands to conduct agricultural experiments.

4. A governing body to consist of the governor and secretary of the territory, and the assessors of the counties of Davis, Utah, Salt Lake, and Sanpete.

5. Permission for trustees to elect one of their number president, and appoint a superintendent, secretary, and treasurer.

6. Permission for trustees to enact by-laws and regulations for the new school, and have general supervision of the school.

7. Permission for trustees to exercise general control of the erection of buildings.¹

The purpose of the act was to provide for teaching agriculture.

A section of the bill reads as follows:

The leading objective of the Agricultural College of Utah shall be to teach branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts, and such other scientific and classical studies as shall promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

The courses of study to be offered were also laid down in the act:

The English language and literature, mathematics, civil engineering, agricultural chemistry, animal and vegetable anatomy, and physiology, the veterinary art, entomology, geology, and such other natural sciences as may be prescribed, technology, political, rural and household economy, horticulture, moral philosophy, history, bookkeeping, and especially the application of science and the mechanic arts to practical agriculture in the field.²

¹Ibid.
²Ibid., p. 21.
The provisions and statements of the Lund Act are useful in showing the control that is exerted by the state that set up the organization for the school in forming the Board of Trustees under state control. The state appropriated $25,000 while the Federal Government advanced $15,000 for the agricultural experiment station. Thus, the state had a larger financial stake than did the Federal Government. The territory of Utah was able to designate those whom it wanted to serve on the Board of Trustees. This gave the territory a good deal of control over the affairs of the school. Through the trustees the state would be able to control such things as the erection of buildings and the hiring and firing of the officers and teachers of the school. The state was also the organization that stipulated what courses were to be taught at the school. In this it was very specific. If the courses were not named, the fields of study were. If there was to be any regimentation of the minds of the young people by a higher power, it would be the states that would do it.

The state did put into the Lund Act those provisions that would insure that the state could get the $15,000 granted by the Federal Government to those states establishing an agricultural experiment station. The standards imposed by the Federal Government were mild, however, and it was no trouble for the state to meet them. By meeting these standards, the states could obtain $15,000 yearly to help defray expenses.

There was one provision of the act that enhanced federal control over the operation of the school. The territorial governor was on the Board of Trustees, and was appointed by the Federal Government. Thus it was possible that through the governor the national government could
exercise much influence over the school. It should be pointed out, however, that this situation was only temporary, and when Utah achieved statehood, it changed. The Federal Government, then, could not use this method to influence teaching or other actions taken by the experiment station or school.

The political control of the school was not entirely in the hands of the state government in Salt Lake City. They had much of the control, but they did not have it all. The Board of Trustees consisted of the assessors from the five counties of Cache, Davis, Utah, Salt Lake, and Sanpete and this diluted state central control. However, the appropriations were made by the state government and came from the taxes paid by the local citizen. The state legislative body had to heed the advice of local politicians and citizens in matters pertaining to the school.

The citizens of Cache county, where the school was to be located, lost no time in expressing their enthusiasm for the new venture. This was especially true of Logan. There were a number of sites around the city that were looked at, and the one that was finally chosen consisted of ninety-three acres of land on a bench east of the city. The land was then donated by the city to the school. The selection of the site had officially been the responsibility of the Board of Trustees, but the selection was made with the concurrence of the City Council of Logan, which had visited all the sites with the Board of Trustees.¹

The selection of Jeremiah W. Sanborn as first director of the station and first president of the college reflects Utah's territorial status. Sanborn was the only president to have been selected from outside the state. There were other considerations that were taken into account.

¹Ibid., p. 25.
One was that Professor Sanborn had the qualifications to organize and run the new Research Center for Utah. The Department of Agriculture was more directly concerned with work of the experiment stations than with the Land-Grant colleges. This was owing to the necessity of co-ordinating the various research activities to achieve the best research and to prevent duplication. Another reason for the selection of Professor Sanborn was that he was to be both President of the College and Director of the Experiment Station. It was only later that the two jobs were separated, and in this situation it was wise to get a man who came closest to filling the qualifications for both positions. The state, on one hand, wanted a man who could fill the position of President, while on the other it needed a man who could fill the position as director of the experiment station in order to meet the requirements of the Federal Government so that it could get federal funds.

It has been shown that the Hatch Act which created experiment stations was instrumental in the beginnings of Utah State University. School and experiment stations were intermingled. They were organized with different purposes in mind; however, and it was inevitable that their paths would diverge and their organization become separate. To demonstrate this separation, we can look at Section 18 of the Utah Legislature, enabling Act of 1888 which reads as follows:

In connection with said College there shall be established an agricultural experiment station to conduct original researches. ... Said agricultural station shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of an act passed by Congress March 2, 1887.¹

¹Bulletin No. 282, A Resume of the First Half-Century of Research at the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station (Logan, Utah), p. 10.
With the coming of statehood for Utah in 1896, and the expanded work of both the college and the station, the organization of the two branches was separated. With the beginning of the fiscal year of July 1, 1896, there was appointed a President of the College, J. M. Tanner, and a director of the experiment station, Luther Foster.

The purpose and limitations of the Utah Experiment Station were laid down by Director Sanborn in the first bulletin issued by the station:

The demand for agricultural experiment is the direct outgrowth of the development of the natural sciences, which have shown the great truth that agriculture is broadly founded in the laws of nature. No other industry or profession is so deeply anchored in law and none is so complex in its ramifications. By rod, measure, and scale in all the unverified fields of agricultural thought, exact data are to be secured in order to supplant conjecture by certainty, the rule of thumb process by the reign of law. . . . The experiment stations, existing for investigation and not primarily as teaching adjuncts of college classrooms, are to sacredly devote their funds to this purpose of research.

This statement is as true today as it was some seventy years ago when the station was founded. With these views in mind, the station has always looked toward the solution of farm problems that are peculiar to this area. Dr. John A. Widstoe, director of the station from 1900 to 1905, made the statement:

During my directorship it was decided that the Utah Station should concern itself primarily, without ignoring other desirable studies, with the problems peculiar to the State. . . . This policy included also the requirements, not stressed in the earlier years, that the station staff must become acquainted first hand with the conditions of the State. The experimental fields and laboratories were to be testing places of facts gathered and ideas developed from direct contact with state conditions.

the big problem that limits agriculture in Utah has been the lack of

---

1Ibid., p. 11.
2Ibid.
3Ibid., p. 12.
water. The solution of this problem has comprised a large part of the experiment station work since its founding. New forms of irrigation have been devised through the research done in Utah that have greatly improved the productivity of the land. Throughout the years, there has been a steady increase in the efficient use of water in the intermountain area, and much of this has been accomplished by the Utah Station.

It was the Experiment Station that made the decision to devote much of its research to the water problem. It was not the case of a higher supervisory power directing the station in its program of research. It is true that the Federal Government co-ordinated the various programs of the different experiment stations, but this would not be classified as control of the functions and research of the different stations. It was done more on a cooperative basis. Each station was allowed to do research on those agricultural problems which were peculiar to its area, and these programs were then co-ordinated by the Department of Agriculture.

The relationship of the Experiment Station to the rest of the school and the Federal Government has been relatively stable from the beginning. As was said earlier, the Experiment Station and the college were in the same organization, with one man as head of both. The later separation of the two organizations led to confusion and conflict the first few months. There were some in the Experiment Station who felt that they were not obligated to teach courses in the college. In 1897, it was necessary to outline the responsibilities of each area and decide if the Experiment Station came under the direction of the President of the school. It was recommended that the Board of Trustees obtain a ruling
from the Attorney-General as to the correct interpretation of the Utah law.\(^1\)

Through this analysis, it was decided by the Board of Trustees that the Experiment Station was a branch of the college and not independent. The station staff was subject to the president of the college and to the president of the faculty. Curriculum decisions for the station staff was to be determined by the heads of the school.\(^2\) The policy was also established which permitted the Board of Trustees to hire and fire the teachers of the station staff and to set their salaries.\(^3\) Its lines of authority went through the administration of the school, through the Board of Trustees, and finally to the state legislature.

In dealing with the Federal Government, the Experiment Station was obliged to spend the money appropriated by Congress in the way prescribed in the Hatch Act. To facilitate this, a law was passed by the state in 1894, calling for a regular accounting and audit of the funds provided for the station.\(^4\) This audit and report on expenditures was then sent to the Federal Government.

In 1896, an agreement was worked out with the Federal Government to obtain twenty-five acres of land with funds provided by the Department of Agriculture for a forestry experiment. It was provided that the station would conduct the experiment, and the Department of Agriculture would give information and assistance in getting the program started. The agreement was to remain in force until terminated by the Secretary of Agriculture.\(^5\) Subsequent agreements followed this same pattern. There

---

\(^1\)"Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1888-1900," p. 422.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 443.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 427.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 254.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 401.
was an agreement in 1901 providing for experiments to reclaim alkali land. In 1903, the Department of Agriculture co-operated with the experiment station in doing irrigation research. Both the Department and the Experiment Station were to be equal partners in this venture. The station would provide equipment and have the responsibility for executing the program. Planning and publishing results would be done jointly. A yearly report was to be sent to the Department of Agriculture. The agreement called for equal financing by the Experiment Station and Department of Agriculture.¹ In later years, there were agreements to study the yield of beet sugar, entomology, horticulture, animal husbandry, and various other aspects of agriculture.

A law passed by Congress (in 1894) created in the Department of Agriculture an agency to investigate and watch the disbursement of funds to the experiment stations. This was in keeping with the provisions of the Hatch Act. There were also federal consultants at the experiment stations.² This was the limit to which the Department of Agriculture went in exercising any direct supervision over the policies and actions of the Experiment Station. The consultants were at the station mainly as advisers for the various projects in research. An incident in 1907 illustrates the relationship of the Experiment Station and college in this regard. In that year, there was a recommendation that a substation be put in operation in southern Utah in conjunction with the main experiment station in Logan. The government ruled, however, that Hatch funds could not be used to put up another station.³ The money was to be

¹Ibid., 1900-1909, p. 116.
²Trustees Reports, 1890-1905, p. 5.
³Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1901-1910," p. 224.
used to establish one experiment station in each state. In strictly interpreting this provision, it ruled out the possibility that Hatch funds would be used to set up a substation. Without the Federal funds, the state legislature did not feel it was within its financial capacity to pay for the whole station.
CHAPTER III

THE SECOND MORRILL ACT

History

Once begun, a government project has a way of growing and expanding. This was the case with the Land-Grant movement. It was found that the original bill did not provide enough funds to pay for the expanding activities of the Land-Grant colleges. For this reason it was not long before there was pressure put on Congress to pass legislation that would increase the amount of federal funds used by the Land-Grant colleges.

The one who was most responsible for the Second Morrill Act was the same man who had pushed the Land-Grant Act of 1862—Justin Morrill, a Congressman from Vermont. Within ten years after the first Land-Grant Bill was enacted, Morrill had sponsored new legislation giving additional funds to the colleges. In the year 1872 he introduced a bill for further endowment, but it was defeated. This, however, did not cause him to despair. Every session of Congress would find a new bill introduced by Morrill. He eventually was able to get the necessary support.

The help came again from the farm association. After the Civil War there were many farm movements that grew in importance and power on the national scene, and they were beginning to show their influence. Some of these movements were the Grange, the Alliance, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Experiment Stations, and the new Populist party.¹

These groups lent their support to the new Morrill bill assuring the eventual passage of the Act.

The opposition to the bill centered on the idea that the farmers were really not interested in it. It was said that the agricultural college system to teach agriculture had not really materialized. It was also claimed that the bill would give the Federal Government too much control over the college education. There was also opposition because many thought that the colleges did not allow for a broad education for those going to school. This opposition was enough to stop the passage of the Bill for a number of years. In fact, Representative Morrill submitted the bill a total of twelve times before it was eventually passed in 1890.¹

The advent of the new act brought an increase in the activities of the land-grant colleges around the country. The states that had not used the original land-grant provisions were now in a position to establish their own college system. Furthermore, the new bill applied to territories as well as states, and the territories were also able to take advantage of its generous provisions. With an annual sum of money coming from the Federal government, the states could make more positive programs and plans for its college educational system. On this, Edward D. Eddy Jr. says:

State support had been meager throughout the sixties, seventies, and eighties. . . . With better definition of their role, with wider appreciation of their work, and with increased interest and support of the part of the people, the colleges came to be regarded more as state than national institutions.²

¹Eddy, loc. cit.
²Ibid., p. 103.
The purpose of the Second Morrill Act was to provide additional funds for the state colleges of agriculture to meet the growing needs of the farming community of the nation, and the provisions of the Act followed along these lines:

1. It provided for an annual appropriation of $50,000 from the Federal treasury, of funds not otherwise used, to the agriculture and mechanic art colleges of the nation for the purpose of teaching agriculture and the mechanic arts.

2. This fund was to come from the sale of public lands.

3. In the allocation of the funds there was to be no racial discrimination. The negro colleges were to get an amount equal to the amount given to other schools in a state.

4. The Act was to be administered by the Department of Interior in co-operation with the Department of Agriculture.

5. An annual progress report was to be made to the Department of Interior and Agriculture on the progress of the school.

6. An annual financial report was to be made to the Department of Interior and Agriculture giving an account of how the money was spent, and for what purposes.

7. The Interior Department could disallow any funds that were not spent in the way stipulated by the Act.

8. A state could appeal to Congress from any decision made by the Department of the Interior disallowing any funds because of disuse.
9. If a state misused the funds given in any one year, they had to be replaced by the state, and their appropriation for the following year was to be held up until the funds were paid.1

The Second Morrill Act went further than any previous action taken by the Federal Government in tying college education to a national program and control. The First Morrill Act (Land-Grant Act) provided for a donation of land to the states which was to be used for the purpose of investment to obtain a perpetual fund for the land-grant colleges. There was only one appropriation from the Federal Government and that was in land. The new Morrill Act, on the other hand, called for an annual appropriation for $50,000 (starting at fifteen thousand, and eventually increased to $50,000) from the sale of lands, and was to be given yearly. Under the original Morrill Act there had been little control over the disposition of the grant. There were two reasons for this: (1) The grant was given once. (2) It was given in the form of lands to be sold and the revenue invested. With the new Act which had an annual appropriation, Congress felt the need for a greater control over how the money was to be spent. This closer supervision and control of the financial aspects of the land-grant college system meant that the Federal Government would, out of necessity, play a larger role in the other aspects of land-grant college administration.

Contemporary opinion and retrospective conclusion agree that the act of 1890 marked a definite turning point in land-grant education—the transition from the period of pioneer uncertainty and instability to one of permanent establishment and progressive achievement. . . . The measure which, along with those for experiment stations and the secretaryship,
opened the way for an expanding range of federal relationships was directly responsible for securing permanent state recognition and support.1

It must not, however, be assumed that the Federal Government was taking over the operation of the land-grant system. Several interests had asked for this annual appropriation, including many of the states, and it was only with reluctance that it was finally given in 1890. This increased supervision by the government was an inevitable concomitant of its appropriation. The government was only obeying its own rules and the dictates of its taxpayers and constituents in guarding the spending of federal funds.

The Morrill Act of 1890, along with the Agricultural Experiment Station Act of 1862, provided the main stimulus for the creation of an agricultural college within the state of Utah. The Morrill Act had not been passed when the college was formed, but it was thought that it would be passed within the next few years. It was on this basis that the state legislature was willing to pass a bill establishing an agricultural college. The bill acted as a catalyst to activate the many diverse interests into united action.

It must be remembered that none of the legislation up to this time, including the new Morrill Act, had provided for the erection of the physical facilities for an agricultural college in each state. The acts only made available these appropriations in the event that a state built the physical plant necessary to house a college. Because of this the states were the ones which had to take action first. They were not in a position to impose an educational system on a state, unless the

state agreed to the provisions of the acts and took steps to set up a physical plant.

Utah, on the strength of the Hatch Act, enacted legislation providing for the construction of a physical plant to house the experiment station and the beginnings of an agricultural college. With the college under construction in 1890, the state could show that it was complying with the provisions of the Second Morrill Act. After the act was passed on August 30, 1890, the Board of Trustees asked the territorial treasury for the money appropriated by Congress.¹ This was the first step taken by the school to use the funds of the Act and it came after school had opened for its first classes in September 1890 with twenty-two students.²

Compliance with the Second Morrill Act was relatively an easy matter. There was no need to comply with the discrimination provisions in regard to race because of the absence of Negroes. The school taught agricultural and mechanic arts. As for the other provisions in the act, compliance would come later depending on how the funds were used, and on whether or not a financial report was submitted yearly as requested by the Interior Department. Utah was still under federal control. Any decision that was made was agreed to by the government before the school took action. This was shown by Professor Joel E. Ricks in his Fifty Year History of Utah State, in which it was intimated that Governor Caleb W. West's approval was gained before the territorial legislature passed the bill creating the school.³ This close relationship between the Federal Government and the Territory of Utah does not belie the fact

¹"The Board of Trustees, 1888-1900," p. 70.
³Ricks, loc. cit.
that the government was very lenient with the territory in its compliance with the Second Morrill Act when the State Agricultural College was founded. It could only be a matter of speculation if Utah would have had a harder time receiving its grants from the Second Morrill Act if it had been a state instead of a territory.

There was one stipulation that the Territory of Utah had to live up to that was peculiar to this area. This was the order or request that officers on the Board of Trustees had to sign affidavits that they were not indulging in the practice of polygamy. The affidavits that they signed had to be submitted to the Board of Trustees before there was approval of that person for his position.\(^1\) This ban was operative because of the federal grants that the territory was trying to obtain, and thus it could be said that the Federal Government could put restrictions on the use of its money much as would be the case with private enterprise.

After the school was founded and well on its way, the minutes of the Board of Trustees state that there was government supervision over the school in matters pertaining to finance. The record shows that there was one motion made to notify the Comptroller of the Treasury in Washington that Mr. Hatch had resigned as treasurer.\(^2\) This action would indicate that it was necessary to notify the Interior Department for many of the actions taken by the school in financial affairs, especially when it pertained to any money used from the funds provided by the Federal Government.

\(^1\)Minutes, 1888-1900, p. 6.

\(^2\)Minutes, 1888-1900, p. 81.
There was another incident that shows the financial supervision that the Federal Government exercised over the school. In 1892, Utah State University spent $3,700 on desks. This was considered by the Interior Department to be outside the scope of the regulations as laid down by the Second Morrill Act. For this reason the Interior Department held up the appropriation to the school the next year until the discrepancy of the $3,700 was cleared. The money was made good, and the school was able to get its next appropriation.

There is one aspect of federal financial control that seems somewhat arbitrary. This is that the government is judge of a state in the misuse of funds. In the case cited above, the State of Utah might very well have thought that it was spending its money in the proper way when it spent it on desks. The law stated it was to be used to provide teachers and equipment needed in the specific teaching of the agriculture and mechanic arts. Buildings and other permanent facilities were specifically not to be provided by this fund. The final decision was up to the Interior Department alone. However, the states might appeal to Congress if they thought an Interior Department ruling was unfair.

In other matters concerning the Morrill Act of 1890, the administration was left in the hands of the Board of Trustees. The Board kept the various funds from the government separate to facilitate auditing. The fixing of the over-all policy for the school was with the legislature. They appropriated the money for the buildings and determined the general areas of study. It was, however, the Board of Trustees which decided what courses would be taught and this gave the actual control of what

---

1Ibid., p. 115.
the students would specifically be taught up to the Board.¹

Has the Morrill Act of 1890 influenced the decisions and policies of the state and Board of Trustees since the school was founded and up to the present time? A careful search of the minutes of the Board of Trustees reveals that with the exception of items previously mentioned that occurred early in the history of the school, the Morrill Act of 1890 is hardly mentioned. The annual report to the government becomes a routine affair and is not mentioned in the biennially with no comment from any of the members of the Board. The procedure for handling this fund is that the national government gives it to the state and the state then releases it to the college for its use.

Has there ever been any evidence that the Federal Government used the Second Morrill Act to pressure Utah State University in any of its policies and actions? Again the minutes of the Board show that it was in the early days of the school that the government showed the greatest interest in the school. Once the school was organized and had complied with the provisions of the act, the mention of the government in relation to the Morrill Act of 1890 disappears. There is also no indication that the national government sent any representatives to check on the spending of Morrill Act funds once the school was off to a good start.

¹Ibid., 1888-1890, p. 40
CHAPTER IV

THE SMITH-LEVER ACT

History

The land-grant colleges could teach and fill their bulletins with volumes of research done at the experiment stations. Yet if none of this research and information reached the farmer it would be of no practical use. The farmer was the one who needed to know the best methods of farming.

How was this information to be distributed to the farmers? They were busy on the farms all year, and with the farms scattered it was difficult to persuade them to come to the various colleges to receive the information. This problem was encountered shortly after the land-grant system was established.

The first method used to increase the flow of information to the farmer was made before the land-grant colleges were begun. It consisted of using the state and county fairs as a way of spreading knowledge among the farmers. The fairs, however, were not established for this purpose. The lecture and lyceums given the farmers were incidental to the main purpose of the fairs, which was to promote business. The states were approached for help.

---

The first beginnings of state action were in New York, where it was proposed that the state hire a scientific and practical farmer to give lectures.¹ In 1845, N. S. Townsend, Dean of the College of Agriculture, advocated the formation of farmer's clubs for the discussion of science and its application to agriculture. These clubs were not at this time connected with a state agricultural college, but were private organizations which co-operated with the state.

The first state-run farmer's institute or club was established in 1852 in Massachusetts, where a State Board of Agriculture was organized at the same time.² These state institutes were a more sophisticated method of educating the farmers. Professors, who had previously been used as advisers to establish methods to educate the farmer, were now used to give direct instruction to the farmers. In addition, a bulletin was published which gave the farmers greater opportunity to keep abreast of scientific research. Other states, such as Kansas, Iowa, Vermont, New Jersey, Michigan, and Pennsylvania followed in organizing state boards of agriculture and in establishing farmer's institutes. Most of the states had done this by 1880.

The farmer's institutes were first established on a temporary and irregular basis. They were usually created by one legislature and killed by the next. As extension work expanded, however, they became more permanent. Twenty-six of the states between the years 1860 and 1890 supplied the farmer's institutes with an annual appropriation. This amount varied from state to state, ranging from $90 in the less populated states, up to as high as $12,000 in Wisconsin.³

of state participation in farmer's institutes greatly facilitated the
education of the farmer. In the state of Ohio, for example, before the
annual appropriation, the program included instruction, the systematic
collection of crop statistics, and the issuing of monthly reports.¹
During the winter of 1881 meetings were held in forty of the eighty-seven
counties of the state. After the state legislature approved the annual
fund, the institutes increased to eighty-one during the year 1887-88. In
1890 the legislature strengthened the laws pertaining to education—
farmer's institutes were organized with by-laws on a county basis. These
were incorporated and certified by the state board of agriculture. In
the meantime, other states were also enlarging their extension services.
In Wisconsin the institutes were operated by farmers.²

As the farmer's institutes expanded they developed national
significance. The influence of the institutes was felt beyond state
lines. Eventually, the inevitable happened. The institutes joined
together in 1896 in a national organization called the American
Association of Farmer's Institutes.³ The significance of this associa-
tion's work was its advocacy of uniform operation of the various programs
run by the states, and the expenditure of federal funds. These proposals
had a significant influence on the eventual provision of federal funds
for extension work done by the state colleges.

The first step taken by the federal government in support of the
state extension program was the creation of a federal farmer's institute
office in the Department of Agriculture. This office was organized to

¹Ibid., p. 15.
²Ibid., p. 17.
³Ibid., p. 22.
to assist the state experiment stations in distributing the results of their research to the farmers. Mr. Atwater, Director of Experiment Stations, said:

What the Farmer's institutes are now doing with great success is largely an extension and development of the work done by various organizations, such as boards of agriculture, agricultural societies, farmer's conventions, farmer's clubs, and agricultural colleges and experiment stations for many years over a large portion of the country. The movement is one of the most encouraging features of the agricultural and intellectual progress of our times.¹

At first the Farmer's Institute Office was used to assist the experiment stations at the state colleges along with the state farmer's institutes. Later on this office grew into a full-fledged operation of its own in the extension service.

The Federal Government's involvement in extension work with the states, even on limited basis, had a significant effect on the expansion of institute work. In 1904, there were 1,755 one-day institutes, 1,476 lasting two days, and 75 lasting three days or more. In 1907 the respective numbers were 2,063, 1,784, and 80. In 1912 they were 5,328, 2,015, and 247.² Much of this increase was a natural expansion in the distribution of information by the states and colleges themselves. Much of the expansion, however, resulted from the fact that the Federal Government was now giving institutional and financial help to the states' extension programs.

By 1913 the demand for extension services in the states was growing to the extent that the states were not able to satisfy the additional

¹Ibid., p. 25.
²Ibid., p. 32.
requests unless extra help was obtained from the government. Interest was increased for more federal aid on a permanent basis with a separate agency to direct and administer the extension program for the entire country. This pressure came from farm organizations and agricultural colleges, as well as from the states.

While the agitation for extension service reform by the Federal Government started in 1908, it was not until 1914, that the Smith-Lever Act was passed establishing the Extension Service. The provisions of the law are as follows:

1. To diffuse among the people practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and encourage its application.

2. To establish an extension organization in the state colleges that benefited from the Land-Grant Act of 1862, and the Morrill Act of 1890.

3. To give instruction and practical demonstrations of agriculture and home economics to those not attending college.

4. Policy put into effect were to be agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the college involved.

5. Each state was to be provided with and annual Federal appropriation of $10,000 plus additional amounts based on rural population.

6. A fund of $600,000 was established for extension work which was to increase annually by $500,000 for seven years, until it reached a total of $4,100,000.
7. Each state was to be provided with the money on a fund basis, and the state might make up the amount out of its own budget or by contributions from county, local, or private organizations.

8. Each college was required to have its annual program approved by the Secretary of Agriculture before the grant was given.

9. No portion of the grant could be used for the erection or repair of buildings, for the purchase or rental of land, for the teaching of college courses, lectures, or any other purpose not specified in the act, and only 5 per cent of the amount could be used for the printing and distribution of publications.

10. Each college was required to submit a yearly report to the Governor to be transmitted to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Treasury. This report must include receipts, expenditures, and operations of the Extension Service.

11. The administration of the act was placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, who was required to report to Congress on the receipts, expenditures, and results of the Cooperative Extension program in the states receiving funds from the government.1

The provisions of the Smith-Lever Act followed much the same pattern that followed in other acts designed to aid land-grant colleges. The

1Ibid., p. 114.
outstanding difference between this bill and other bills of the same
general kind was that the appropriations were much larger, thus showing
the increasing responsibility of the Federal Government in local affairs
and the increasing cost of servicing a growing economy. Another dif-
ference was that there was tighter control by the Secretary of Agricul-
ture over the actions that could be taken by the Extension Service at
a state university. The bill provided that before a college could get
its money for the fiscal year it had to submit its program to the
Secretary of Agriculture for approval. If the plan was approved the
college could then get its allotment. Such a provision was not put into
earlier bills. There had previously been clauses insisting on financial
accounting of the money spent, but this did not involve checking on the
specific program. In early bills the main concern was with material
objects for which the money was spent. Thus, the Federal Government
became a partner with the states in promoting and extending knowledge
to the farmers in the fields of agriculture and home economics. Another
provision was that the Secretary of Agriculture was required to make
an annual and detailed report to Congress the results of the Cooperative
Extension Service.

Extension at Utah State University

Extension work at Utah State University began almost with the
establishment of the school. The Experiment Station made its first
bulletin available to farmers in 1890. Followed the pattern laid down
by the other states, the territory of Utah established volunteer
farmer's institutes to distribute information to the farmers. Conducted
in the different counties in the state, these consisted of meetings of
the farmers in a certain county with instructors from Utah State Univer-
sity as well as others who would have information that would be helpful
to the farmers. Classes were also conducted in home economics for the
benefit of the housewives.

The first institutes were operated on either a volunteer or private
basis. It was not long before the state was called upon for additional
funds to make institutes more effective. In 1897 a state law was passed
requiring the holding of institutes, and requiring that the teachers
at Utah State University make themselves available for instruction to
the farmers.1 More money was also made available to the college to
carry on this work with the farmers. Through the institutes organized
under the supervision of Utah State University, the teachers had to
instruct the farmers on their own time, and with no additional salary.
The school was to assist and regulate the institutes in the various counties.
An annual report was required of the school on the progress it had made
in instructing farmers in new methods of agriculture. The state
legislature provided $1500 a year for this purpose.2

The Utah extension program was more closely controlled by the state
than had been the case in other states. While there had been a certain
amount of private instruction when Utah was a territory, there was not
a long period of extension work without the assistance of the state.
From the beginning of statehood, in 1896, the state legislature had
established an institute system and appropriated money for its operation.

---

1 Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1888-1900," Utah State University,
p. 421.
2 Board of Trustees Reports, Utah State University, 1907, p. 155.
The next step in Utah was to organize an extension branch within the organization of Utah State University and to put the program on a more permanent basis. A proposal by the Board of Trustees that the college establish an Extension Department within the school was made in 1906.1 This proposal was carried out, and the Extension Service was made a part of the permanent organization of the University. By 1908, the Extension Service had grown to the extent that it was estimated that $10,000 would be needed to meet all its commitments.2

The legislature had authorized the creation of an Extension Service within the college, but the general administration was under the Board of Trustees. In 1910 the Board asked the President to investigate and clarify the matter of the relationship of the Experiment Station to the Extension Service.3 This would seem to indicate that the Board of Trustees had the control over policy and administration in the Extension Service at Utah State University.

Thus, when the Smith-Lever Act was passed in 1914, Utah had had its own Extension Service for nearly seventeen years, and had been an Extension Department within the University since 1907. The school and state were ready for the additional funds that would now be available from the Federal Government. The school was already operating within the provisions of the act in its own program. It was thus an easy matter for the college to meet the standards set down in the Smith-Lever Act, and obtain approval for its extension program from the Secretary of Agriculture.

---

1Minutes, 1906, op. cit., p. 192.
2Reports, 1907, op. cit., p. 51.
3Minutes, 1910-25, op. cit., p. 479.
The Extension Service at Utah State University has worked on a co-operative basis with Department of Agriculture and the State of Utah. In 1956, for example, a project was started in the Sevier River Basin which illustrates this cooperation. The Basin was in the midst of a drought, and the people got together in an effort to study ways to increase the supply of water. The lack of money, equipment, and experience restricted their efforts. They went to the county agents of the extension service in the area, and their survey revealed that it would be necessary to get additional help. For this reason the Extension Service was invited to participate along with the Experiment Station and the College of Agriculture. The State of Utah was also involved as were agencies of the Federal Government including the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and the Forest Service.

A joint meeting was called of all these groups and a program was worked out for the project. Different committees were formed to study the various methods to increase the supply. These included committees on the watershed, precipitation and streamflow, groundwater, water from outside sources, economic development, and water rights. The several committees each had members from the various state, college, and federal agencies that participated in the project. The participants from the Federal Government acted more as advisors than as active participants. Their main control was over the disposition of federal funds, to see that the money was spent properly. The main control and supervision, however, was in the hands of the Extension Division, Experiment Station, and the College of Agriculture at the University.

---

1 Minutes of the Meetings of the Sevier River project, Richfield, Utah.
An incident that happened in 1949 gives insight into the operation and control of the Extension Division. In this year the governor vetoed the legislative appropriation for the Extension Service at Utah State University.\(^1\) Because of this action the Service was not able to operate. The case was eventually taken to the state Supreme Court, where it was decided that the governor had no authority to veto an appropriation for the Extension Division. It was a requirement of state law that the state engage in extension work.\(^2\)

The Federal Government was involved only to the extent that if there had been a stoppage of extension work by the state, there would also be a stoppage of federal funds. The Federal Government had no authority to determine whether or not the state of Utah should have or not have an Extension Service. It can be said that the Extension Service at Utah State University is a state affair with the Federal Government cooperating in various ways and providing a substantial amount of funds for its support.

**Home Economics and Extension Work**

Extension work did not pertain exclusively to the program of the farmers' knowledge of agricultural science. Attention was also given to the rural housewife and the spread of home economics. New methods of cooking and homemaking were being discovered and improved upon that would help rural families to live more satisfactorily and economically. The development of extension work in home economics was, of course, related to the extension work in agriculture. The work in household

---

\(^2\)Ibid., 1949-50, p. 2.
economy enabled the rural families to live more cheaply, while the
distribution of agricultural knowledge to the farmers enabled the rural
families to increase their productivity.

As with agricultural science, extension service to rural women was
first done on a commercial basis at the early county and state fairs.
Lyceums held at these events taught the farmers' wives the latest methods
in household economy. In 1855, Amasa Walker, in an address to farmers in
Massachusetts, had stressed home education through state farmers' clubs,
to which women should be invited along with the men. Such subjects as
butter-making, he pointed out, would be of equal interest to them.1
This may have been the first time that home economics was mentioned as
a proper subject to be taught rural families with other courses in
agriculture. From this point on, the home economics aspects of instruction
to farmers and their families became of increasing significance.

In 1885, when the Wisconsin legislative established its farmer
institute program, women were invited to play a part. Indeed, the first
bulletin published by the Wisconsin Farmers' Institute contained articles
on home economics, such as on butter making and the education of farmers'
dughters.2 Cooking schools were also held for women, at which the
nutritive value of various foods was explained and methods of preparing
various dishes were demonstrated.

Just as the Farmers' Institutes were the foremost method for
instructing the farmer, they were also a device for educating the farmer's
housewife. While a number of states followed Wisconsin in establishing
a women's section in their institute program, the development of

1True, op. cit., p. 6.
2Ibid., p. 17-18.
instruction in household economy was slower than the development of agricultural education for farmers. Special institutes for women were confined to about one-fourth of the states in 1911. The states that had home economics extension courses were North Carolina, Wisconsin, Michigan, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Iowa, Nebraska, Indiana, and Minnesota. In Colorado a dollar was collected from each woman for expenses, while in most states the funds came from the state appropriation to the farmers' institutes. The instructors were teachers in home economics at the state colleges or experts in subjects of cooking and canning foods, sewing, child development, housekeeping, etc. The education of rural housewives in home economics was given a big boost when the teachers were permitted to give instruction in their homes.

By 1914, when the Smith-Lever Act was passed, Home Economics was a part of the Extension program in most of the states. One of the provisions of the Act provides that the work of the states' extension services would consist of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics. Of the $480,000 originally appropriated under the Smith-Lever Act, $320,000 was used for Home Economics. All federal sources provided $320,000 for home economics.

With the passage of the Act, states started to appoint county agents in Home Economics. By July 1, 1916, there were twelve County Home Demonstration Agents in ten northern and western states. The states were also organizing a home economic extension division within their state universities.

---

1 Tbid., p. 37-38.
2 Tbid., p. 36.
3 Tbid., p. 117.
4 Tbid., p. 127.
5 Tbid., p. 130.
Home Demonstration came natural to the women of Utah. Mormon women, in their Relief Society, already had an organization that had for years given instruction to the housewives in household economy. In this arid land the women had learned to adjust their households to the conditions, while their husbands were busy finding new methods to till the land.

Shortly after the founding of Utah State University Home Economics was offered, along with agricultural science, as an extension course in the rural areas. Mrs. Dolinda Cotty, Head of the Home Economics department at the University, gave talks on home economics to women in various areas of Cache County. In 1902, Mrs. Leah D. Widstoe went on a trip to Sanpete and Sevier counties at which she held meetings in various towns to educate the housewife in household economy. At first the women eyed with suspicion these efforts of attempting to show them how their home should be managed, but later they came to like the idea. Other women faculty members and wives of faculty members gave early help in home demonstration. One bulletin on women's household work was published during this early period: "Labor Saving Devices for the Farm Home" by Leah D. Widstoe.¹

Extension work in Home Economics had proved sufficiently successful by 1913 for the University to place its first permanent Home Demonstration Agent in the field. Amy Lyman was appointed by President Widstoe as the agent for Sanpete County.² She may well have been the first Home Demonstration Agent in the nation. She held lectures and home demonstrations

---

¹John A. Widstoe to Lyman H. Rich, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, December 29, 1947.
²Amy Lyman Merrill, "The Beginning of Home Demonstration in Utah," Utah State University, Logan, Utah
in different areas of the county on such subjects as cooking, laundry, canning, cleaning, home nursing, infant care, sewing, and interior decorating. As a county agent she was within the Extension Division of Utah State University, and her supervisor was Dr. Robert J. Evans, Director of the Extension Service at the College. The funds for agent work was provided by a state law passed in 1913 that provided $6,000 a year for this purpose, to be increased annually by $2,500 until it reached $25,000. The law also provided that the state agents cooperate with the Federal Government in extension work.¹

It is interesting to note that in other states the Home Demonstration Extension Service has established its own associations throughout the counties. This has not been true with Utah. In this state the county agents have used organizations that were already established, such as the Women’s Relief Society of the L. D. S. Church, Parent Teachers’ Association, women’s clubs, 4-H clubs, civic improvement clubs, the Farm Bureau, and other organizations which would be useful in giving information to housewives.²

The Home Demonstration Service at Utah State University has been particularly successful in training volunteer leaders, for which it has received national recognition. County Home Demonstration Agents have a regular program of training volunteer agents to teach home economics to other people in their counties. In this way the Extension Service has greatly increased the amount of Home Demonstration leaders in the state. In 1952, 189 leaders were trained at the College. These leaders, in turn,

¹True, op. cit., p. 68.
²Interview with Thelma Huber, Head of Home Demonstration Extension Division, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, May 11, 1961.
trained 2,380 local leaders. In 1960, 236 leaders were taught at the University; these returned to their various counties and trained another 3,065 local leaders.¹ These local leaders were very useful in judging county and other local fairs and in giving home demonstrations.

With all of this activity, there was no interference by the Federal Government. Federal staff members have acted as advisors, and the Home Economics Extension Division has had contractual relationships with the Department of Agriculture, just as has the agricultural Extension Service.

¹Annual Reports, 1960, State Home Economics Supervisor, Utah State University.
CHAPTER V

THE MILITARY INFLUENCE

History

The quickest and easiest way for a central government to take over the complete control of a democratic nation is to use the military. This is true in the control of education as in other areas. Because of this basic fact it is appropriate in this study to investigate the degree—if any—of control which the military has exercised over education at Utah State University. In order to do this we must explore certain background events in order to see how the military got involved in the Land-Grant system.

The first drafts of the Land-Grant Act did not contain the provision that military science be taught at schools obtaining land-grants from the government. As the final bill was passed during the Civil War, however, such a provision was inserted as a supposed aid to the war effort. The provision stated that military science must be taught at all colleges receiving land under the Land-Grant Act of 1862. It was not stated that training was compulsory for all students. The Morrill Act of 1890, which also pertained to Land-Grant colleges, contained a provision requiring training in military science in order for a state college to receive its annual appropriation.¹ Again it was not stated that it was compulsory for the students. Until 1956 it had been a practice of the Land-Grant

schools to require such training for the first two years under their own interpretation of the act. Since 1956, however, there have been three schools which have made their programs voluntary. The schools are University of Minnesota, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Utah State University.¹

The Military at Utah State University

Utah State University has offered military instruction since the school was first founded. The first course in military science was started when the school first opened for classes in the Autumn of 1890.² The appointment of an instructor or instructors to teach military science was the responsibility of the War Department. The President of the College had written to the War Department requesting that it appoint a lieutenant as an instructor at the college.³ The first military science course was treated as a regular offering at the school. In the list of courses for the Autumn of 1890 it is listed along with English, German, French, and Shop Work.⁴ As the military science program currently operates a student may take military instruction instead of the required physical education courses.⁵ The attitude of the school trustees was stated in their report of 1908:

Military instruction at the college is not a matter of choice with the authorities or students. The Congress of the United States requires this instruction in return for large appropriations; it is thus an obligation—an obligation in return for the advantages of free education.⁶

The military exerted its greatest influence at Utah State University in periods preceding, or during a time of, war. The colleges of the nation have been good training grounds for military personnel. This has been especially true of land-grant colleges where military instruction has been taught regularly. At the land-grant colleges the equipment has been already at hand, and the drill fields already provided. In time of emergency it has not taken long to expand the land-grant military facilities for the training of men.

The Spanish-American War was the first after the founding of Utah State University. Compared to the impact of other wars, this one was negligible. At the outbreak of the war twelve students from the University enlisted. In this early period, this number comprised a substantial proportion of the student body. The military instructor was also called to active duty, leaving the school with no military instructor. To further the war effort the school organized the students into a militia, and the drilling of students went on throughout the war. After the war with Spain the influence of the military declined and the drilling of the students ceased. However, courses in military instruction remained in the curriculum for these were required by law. A modest benefit accrued to the University from the equipment, which consisted of infantry rifles, sold by the military to the school after the war. Inasmuch as the war was short, and its total effect on the region or nation not very great, the Spanish-American War was not a true test of the influence of the military on Utah State University during wartime.

---

1 Ibid., 1896, p. 6.
World War I provided a better example of the influence of the military on the school. The war lasted longer and had a greater impact on the country. At one stage the Board of Trustees debated whether or not it would be wise to close school altogether because of the predicted labor shortage. This was not done, however, and instead the school made efforts to cooperate with the Federal Government to increase the production of crops. Authority was also given to the President of the University to change courses when he considered such action as necessary to the war effort. ¹

When the war broke out, the Board of Trustees put the school at the disposal of the government, and the school was used as a training ground for troops. ² There thus arose a need for housing and eating facilities for troops. Consent was given by the governor and an appropriation was obtained from the state legislature through the State Council of Defense to build facilities. All male students of military age were to be housed on the campus. The Minutes of the Board of Trustees indicate that the use of the school for military purposes was developed by the state rather than by the Federal Government. The State Council of Defense was the main coordinating agency for matters pertaining to the school and the war. When the war ended Utah State University had more buildings than would have otherwise have been the case. These buildings were designed to house and feed troops, and they were now available for school use.

The Defense Department, formerly the War Department, has naturally had a close relationship with the land-grant college system. The Defense Department recommends the courses it would like taught, and it is up to the

²Ibid., p. 252-254.
Board of Trustees to approve or disapprove. From 1892 to 1916 the school taught general military science. The course was not comprehensive enough to give commissions. In 1916 the army approved Utah State University as an infantry school for the training of officers. In 1921 the military curriculum was changed over to provide for the training of artillery officers, and Utah State University was an artillery school from 1921 until 1953. In addition, a quartermaster officer's training course was added in 1946 and retained until 1953. In 1946 there was also added an Air Force R. O. T. C. which was under army supervision until 1949 when the Air Force became a separate branch of our military establishment. An ordnance course for the training of officers was added in 1950 and taken out in 1953. In 1956 a course in army flight training was added. The school now has both Army and Air Force Officer training programs.¹

The military instructors and administrative personnel are today chosen by the services. They are military personnel who are on active duty with the two services. Although they are appointed by the services, they must be approved by the Board of Trustees.² This approval is usually automatic with the Board accepting the recommendations of the services.

The relationship of the school and the services is on an equal partner basis. It is not the case of one telling the other what to do. There must be a meeting of the minds in all policy decisions with approval by both to initiate action.³ This relationship can be shown in the action

¹This information of military courses was provided by the courtesy of Colonel Anderson, Commanding Officer of Utah State University Army R. O. T. C.
³Interview with Major Civille, Professor of Military Science, Utah State University, May 1, 1961.
of the university in dropping compulsory military training in 1957, the Board recommending that it be made voluntary. This was all that was needed. Without the approval of the Board the Defense Department could not require students to take military training.1

The Second World War provided the most instructive experience in the relationship of the services and Utah State University during wartime. The war lasted longer and more profoundly affected the many aspects of civilian life throughout the country. All civilian production was used to further the war effort. There were also food and goods rationing that affected every segment of our society.

The change from peace to a wartime basis at Utah State University came about slowly. The first action prompted by the emergency was taken by the Board of Trustees when it provided for a refund of tuition to any student drafted into the armed forces.2 The War Department gave the school an additional $100,000 for military training to enable the school to increase its ability to handle more students in the R. O. T. C. program.3 The school was also busily making plans for a new armory on the basis of a recommendation of the Board of Trustees. The plans were then approved by the Ninth Corps area commander, General E. P. Peek.4 The school and the Army cooperated to build the new armory since the agreement of both was needed on an equal basis.

These actions took place while the nation was still at peace. After the war began in December, 1941, the tempo of activity increased. The Board of Trustees offered the facilities of the school to the War

---

1 Ibid.
2 Minutes, 1940, op. cit., p. 125.
3 Ibid., p. 183.
4 Ibid., p. 279.
Department and the Governor for the duration.\(^1\) The government was not long in putting the university to use in the war effort. In late March 1942, the Navy Department and the University signed an agreement providing for the training of navy personnel in radio theory and communications.\(^2\) The agreement stipulated that the Navy Department would pay tuition and expenses equal to that paid by regular students. The school would provide facilities including radio equipment, laboratory, work rooms, and quartering facilities.\(^3\)

In the Autumn of 1942, enrollment at Utah State University dropped by 2700.\(^4\) Many of the school facilities were idle, and there were teachers who could not be provided with a full schedule of teaching. It was then that the biggest wartime program involving the college was put into effect, enabling the school to make full use of its facilities and teachers. This program was the training of crews for the Air Force. The first indication of this new project came in a telegram to the President of the University on January 9, 1943, from the chief of the air staff, General Stratemeyer. It read as follows:

YOUR INSTITUTION CONSIDERED FOR ACADEMIC TRAINING ARMY AIR FORCES COLLEGE TRAINING PROGRAM COMMA CONSISTING FOUR HUNDRED AND TWENTY HOURS DISTRIBUTED IN MATHEMATICS COMMA PHYSICS COMMA HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY AND ENGLISH AT FRESHMAN LEVEL STOP YOUR QUOTA FIVE HUNDRED MARCH FIRST AND FIVE HUNDRED APRIL FIRST PERIOD THIS TO EXCLUDE YOUR NORMAL CAPACITY FOR TRAINING COMMA HOUSING AND FEEDING ENGINEERING STUDENTS PERIOD WIRE INTENT TO DIRECTOR OF INDIVIDUAL TRAINING HEADQUARTERS ARMY AIR FORCES WASHINGTON D.C NOT LATER MIDNIGHT FEBRUARY TENTH STOP FOR ADJUSTMENTS PRIOR TO DEAD LINE TELEPHONE REPUBLIC SIXTY SEVEN HUNDRED EXTENSION FIVE NAUGHT NAUGHT TWO.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) Ibid., 1941-1943, p. 14.
\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 61.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 63.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p. 147.
The school was not ordered to take the program outlined in the telegram. The words and intent of the message indicates that the military was still maintaining its equality with the school and was taking into consideration the desires and intentions of the college.

The school did not delay long in accepting the program. The next day, President Peterson dispatched a wire to the Director of Individual Training Headquarters, Army Air Forces, Washington D. C. The school appointed a committee to make a survey of college facilities available for use. After the survey was completed there was a conference with Governor Maw to obtain permission and the funds necessary to renovate the facilities for use by the Air Force.1

The contract between the University and the Air Force was signed on February 18, 1943. It stipulated that the school was to provide property and services for the operation of a preflight training program for 750 aviation students.2 These would include activating expenses, use of facilities, instruction, medical services, subsistence, and maintenance. In return the school would receive from the Air Force $102,601.16 for the term of the contract. The amount was adjustable to changing conditions (i.e., length of instruction time and number of students). The program was to run from March 1, 1943 to June 30, 1944 with an option allowing the government to renew it annually.3

The length of the college training program depended on the conduct and requirements of the war, and this, of course, was beyond the power of University to control. The Air Force notified the school in late

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p. 4.
3 Ibid., p. 6.
January, 1944 that the program would be terminated with the graduating class of June 3, 1944.\footnote{Ibid., p. 76.} The University was to make no further commitments or obligations in regard to the operation beyond that point.

The Air Force only supervised that part of the school which had to do with the training program. Included in this was the supervision of course taught the military personnel, the length of the training period, and the making of policy and administration of the training operation. The influence of the military during this temporary period has apparently left no lasting effects on the administration of the college.

The close of the war saw Utah State University return to a normal condition. The enrollment increased beyond its pre-war level. Teachers were also returning to the school from military service. Plans were laid for expanding the college—plans which, however, had to be set aside because of the war shortages. There was need for new facilities because of the increase in registration that stemmed from the G. I. Bill of Rights relating to education.

The building program was furthered by the quantities of surplus material and buildings left from the war. There were classrooms and housing facilities that were constructed for the training programs. After the war these were used by the school. The government offered homes, quonset huts, barracks, and other wartime buildings which could be moved from military bases to the college. The government gave to the University twenty-four homes and thirty-two quonset huts.\footnote{Student Life (Logan, Utah), December 12, 1946.} The school paid the cost of moving them to the college. These war surplus transactions were
handled by contractual agreement between the University and the government.¹

There is an increasing presence of the military at the land-grant colleges. Utah State University has seen this increase as well as others. The peril of the times apparently makes it necessary that the nation achieve a much greater degree of military preparedness than in other peacetime periods. The presence of the military has been increasingly felt in the added number of military science courses. There were thirty-four courses offered during the academic year of 1960-1961.² This compares with two when the school first opened.³ The newest courses added have been flight training for both services and international relations. These courses were agreed to by the military and the Board. Although there has been greater emphasis on military instruction since the Second World War, this apparently has not led to a greater influence by the services on the control and administration of the college. The relationship is still one of equals, and contractual agreement is the method used for handling transactions.

¹Minutes, 1943-1944, op. cit., p. 163.
²Catalog, op. cit., p. 224.
³Ricks, op. cit., p. 30.
CHAPTER VI

THE NEW DEAL

Public Works Administration

In 1929 and the early 1930's, the United States, along with the rest of the world, went through an economic depression of such severity that many changes were made in the philosophy of the role government should play in the economy. The depression had brought on widespread and continuing unemployment. There was a curtailment of economic activity by business. There seemed to be no way to stimulate the return to normal business activity except through government intervention. Regular economic channels seemed paralyzed in attempting to cope with the situation.

It was demanded that the Government should provide the necessary means of correcting the situation. One of the main areas of government activity was in the construction of public works. There was strong opposition to proposals that the government enter into direct competition with business, one of the segments of the economy it was trying to help. Thus, one way of stimulating the economy which would not defeat the purpose for which it was intended was the construction of public works. This kind of government action would not compete with other segments of the economy, and it would also assist business by providing a market for materials.
With these views in mind, the Public Works Administration, or FWA, was formed in 1935. The purpose was to provide the funds necessary for the construction of public buildings for various uses throughout the nation. The Public Works Administration was to provide half of the funds, while the states were to provide the other half. The various building projects had to be approved by the Public Works Administration as being necessary and feasible to build. Through this means many cities were able to obtain new school buildings, courthouses, and other public buildings.

On the college level, the use of federal funds for the construction of new buildings was something new. In the past, federal assistance to colleges had been used only for the teaching of specific areas of study. With the coming of the New Deal this conception was gradually changed. No longer was the state alone responsible for the construction of its own buildings. Gradually the philosophy has shifted so that it is now felt that the payment of teachers with federal money would lead to federal control of education, while using federal funds for construction would not. Many felt the government would be in a position, conceivably, to stop a teachers salary if he did not teach the government way. On the other hand, construction of school buildings with national funds would not lead to the control of teaching in future years after the buildings were constructed. This new conception was undoubtedly brought about in part by the New Deal and the depression. The temper of the times thus had a great deal to do with breaking down the barrier against the federal provision of funds for the construction of college buildings.
The states at this time were also suffering a loss of revenue because of the depression, and thus were not able to keep up with planned building programs. To meet this situation the states were willing to take advantage of the government offer to furnish half the money for the construction of buildings under the Public Works Administration.

PWA at Utah State

Utah State University was short of buildings when the PWA was inaugurated. There was need for a Home Economics building, dormitories for both men and women, and a field house. The school made a survey of its building needs, and recommendations were made to the Board of Trustees to be proposed to the state legislature. The legislature was willing to meet the requirements laid down by the government. The most difficult provision to meet was that of matching funds. The fact that the Federal government was willing to pay half the building expense was an opportunity that the state was unwilling to pass up, yet the accumulation of the other half of the funds needed was a goal that the state found difficult to meet.

The principal method of providing funds was by the issuance of state bonds. This type of financing was used to provide funds for those buildings that would provide some kind of revenue after their construction—such as, for example, dormitories and the field house. The bonds were made up in various denominations to be distributed in different issues. They were to be paid on maturity by the money collected from the rental of rooms in the dormitories to students, and from revenues obtained from athletic and other events in the field house.
and stadium. Student fees and land-grant funds would be used to provide security for the bonds.¹

The buildings constructed on Utah State University campus through PWA assistance were the Commons and Home Economics buildings, Lund Hall, and the Field House. The building of the field house is an illustration of the relation that exists between the University of Utah and Utah State University on the state level. It might seem to many that the two schools are separate in all relations and this is undoubtedly true in many areas. There are, however, areas where their activities are co-ordinated. The reason for this is that both must go to the state legislature for funds, and the general supervision of both schools rests with the state legislature. The building of the field houses at the two schools were done at the same time, and the construction of the buildings are of the same basic design, and they were both financed in the same way. Both were approved by the state legislature and governor at the same time.²

The PWA provided for the construction of public buildings other than college buildings. High schools, libraries, auditoriums, civic centers, and other buildings for public use were constructed. It cannot be said, therefore, that the Public Works Administration was designed to give the government control of education. In the building of the Field House, as in other buildings, the Board of Trustees not only considered the usefulness of the project to the school, but also how the construction would help alleviate the unemployment situation in Cache Valley.³

¹"Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1936-1939," Utah State University, p. 163.
²Ibid., p. 121.
³Ibid., p. 137.
National Youth Administration

With the depression affecting every segment of the population, many parents were unable to raise the funds to send their children to college. There were families which did not have enough for subsistence, let alone enough to help a child through college. It was difficult for many youths to find work to pay their own way. The National Youth Administration was established nationally to alleviate conditions that were holding back the educational development of the young people. By combining education and employment in a national program, needed assistance was provided the youth of the country.

There was considerable opposition to the National Youth Administration, mainly because many felt that a national program for the benefit of youth would mean regimentation. For this reason President Roosevelt hesitated to put the program into effect. In 1935, however, Congress appropriated $4,880,000,000 for the purpose of work relief. With this amount of money at his disposal, the President decided to establish the National Youth Administration. He did this by an Executive Order which allotted $50,000,000 for the benefit of the unemployed youth of the country.¹

Under the Deputy WPA Administrator, the program was to be administered on a decentralized and local basis, with close coordination between the WPA and NYA. In this way it would be possible to get the cooperation of local and state agencies in the program. A decentralized organization would also be more useful in getting more youths into the program. The program from the state was handicapped because of lack of

funds. The $50,000,000 that was allotted for use averaged out to about ten dollars a month for each youth.¹

On the college level, the National Youth Administration established co-operative housing units for the students to live in while attending an institution of higher learning. These housing units were built at minimum cost, and in many cases they were built by the students themselves. The students were, in many cases, given financial assistance for living expenses to help them through school. In most instances, however, they were provided with some type of work around the school or community to pay their expenses. The work projects included research, community service, ground and building maintenance, departmental service, library service, clerical service, tutorial service, laboratory assistance, home economics, construction, and janitorial services.²

The main goal of NYA was to help those students whose families were on relief or were at least in the poorer classes. The decision as to which students would receive assistance was, however, left up to the college, and the students having the greatest need did not necessarily have to be the ones to get help from the government. The reason for this was that a student had to meet a specified scholastic standard before receiving help. If money were given out merely for the reason that a person was in need, it was thought that perhaps some undesirables would go to college just for the money.³

¹Ibid., p. 144.
²Ibid., p. 165.
³Ibid., p. 159.
NYA at Utah State University

The National Youth Administration was soon effective in assisting the school and students in their joint efforts to provide ways for needy and ambitious youth to go to college. The program was first started in Utah in 1935, and continued until the beginning of World War II.¹ NYA operated in many ways at Utah State University.² The first project was to find a place where the students could live cheaply. This was accomplished by obtaining the Woodruff School in Logan and using student help to renovate it for domestic use. The Woodruff School was abandoned by the Logan school district and bought at a low price by the University to be used in conjunction with the NYA program. It was provided with kitchen facilities and sleeping rooms. The girls who were on NYA did the cooking to earn their pay. There were other methods used to employ students. They were given jobs as secretaries, research assistants, janitors, ground maintenance personnel, tutors, etc. The biggest project at the college involving the National Youth Administration was the construction of the rural arts building. The funds came from the NYA, and the work was done by students at the college connected with the Federal program.

The administration and supervision of the program was by the school and the state office. Shortly after the Federal Government announced the youth plan, a state NYA office was established in Salt Lake City to administer the program on a state-wide basis. The college NYA was responsible to the Federal office in Salt Lake City. The Federal

¹Minutes, 1941-1943, op. cit., p. 11.
²Much of this material is based on an interview with Lee Focock, Administrator of National Youth Administration at Utah State University, April 22, 1961.
Government left supervision to the college while it (the Federal Government), acted as a dispenser of funds. The U. S. U. Administrator could recall no instance in which the Federal Government interfered with the University's administration of the NYA program. The school was responsible for the hiring of needy students and the establishment of projects. The state office approved substantial projects such as the Rural Arts Building and allocated the funds among the various programs throughout the state. One person who was a student in the NYA during those years stated that the students were paid by government check. The highest amount that a worker could earn in a month was $19.80.¹

The method of handling the funds of the National Youth Administration indicates a facet of the relationship between the school and the NYA. NYA funds were handled separately from the regular school funds. Although the school supplied the administration for the program, the accounting of funds had to be made to the state NYA office and not to the school.²

The following table shows the amount of money spent in Utah by NYA for the years 1935 through 1938. It also shows the amount spent on student aid in total and for individual items.

---
¹Interview with Mr. W. W. Skidmore, U. S. U. Housing Administrator, April 20, 1961.
²Interview with Mr. Sylvan Erickson, U. S. U. Controller, April 20, 1961.
### Fund Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Work Projects</th>
<th>Student Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935-1936</td>
<td>$310,864.87</td>
<td>$92,401.28</td>
<td>$218,463.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1937</td>
<td>352,941.00</td>
<td>133,955.00</td>
<td>218,463.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-1938</td>
<td>343,603.00</td>
<td>183,808.00</td>
<td>159,795.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$1,007,408.87</td>
<td>$410,164.28</td>
<td>$597,244.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment on National Youth Administration Programs for March 1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>Number of Persons Total</th>
<th>Total Earnings</th>
<th>Average Hours Worked</th>
<th>Average Hourly Earnings</th>
<th>Average Monthly Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>$15,537</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>$.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>$14,031</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>$.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-relief</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>$.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>$19,770</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Aid</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>$6,983</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Aid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>$12,671</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Aid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed</td>
<td>3,923</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Works Progress Administration

The third New Deal program which had an influence on Utah State University was the Works Progress Administration. The main purpose of this enterprise was to provide work for the unemployed. In many ways these three administrations, PWA, NYA, and WPA, had a similar goal. There were, however, some important differences among them. The Public Works Administration dealt with the construction of permanent public works. The National Youth Administration was created to help the youth of the nation to find work and finance their college education. The Works Progress Administration was established to provide relief and put men to work as quickly as possible. The projects could be of almost any kind that would provide employment, including public works.

The new administration had previously established relief programs to give the destitute enough subsistence to prevent starvation. Cities and state governments had borrowed $300,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but this was not enough to solve the problem. Unemployment had become a nationwide and not a local problem calling for a greater effort to be put forth by the Federal Government. In the spring of 1933, at the request of the President, Congress passed the Federal Emergency Relief Administration Act with a $500,000,000 appropriation. This program was mainly an emergency relief measure. A public dole, however, was thought to be demoralizing to a majority of those who received it, and it did not provide a permanent solution. In May 1935, Congress appropriated $4,000,000,000 for various emergency programs under Harry Hopkins. Of this, the WPA received around $1,500,000,000.1

---

Works Progress Administration at Utah State University

The Works Progress Administration was used mainly at Utah State University to construct new buildings and renovate existing facilities. The first criterion in applying the program was whether it would help unemployment. In order to receive Works Progress Administration funds, the University was required to submit a project to the government for approval. If the government gave such approval, it would grant funds on a matching basis with the school. In the case of the dormitory construction program of 1936 the total amount was $135,000 of which the University paid 45 per cent and the government 55 per cent.\(^1\) An agreement was drawn up between the Works Progress Administration and the college, spelling out the responsibilities of each—the two being equal partners in the undertaking. The projects using WPA funds were a girl's dormitory, improvement of the stadium, the dormitory program of 1936, and provision of some of the funds for the Rural Arts Building in co-operation with the National Youth Administration.\(^2\) There is no evidence that the government used the WPA to supervise or control either administration or teaching at Utah State University. Along this line the minutes of the Board of Trustees show no signs of the government trying to control the administration or the teaching by use of the WPA building programs. A review of the contractual agreements between the school and the WPA show they were concerned with the financial arrangements and did not delve into the administration or teaching at the school. The NYA Administrator, for example, stated that in building the Rural Arts Building in conjunction with WPA, the Federal Government

\(^1\) Minutes, 1925-1936, op. cit., p. 497.
\(^2\) Ibid., 1936-1939, p. 30.
left the supervision of all school matters up to the college. There were no signs that the WPA tried to influence the school in its administration. Furthermore, after a building is completed, it would be hard for the agency that built it to influence the future use of the facility.

1 Interview with Les Pocock, NYA Administrator at Utah State University, April 22, 1961.
The preceding pages have shown that Federal aid to education has had a great influence on education on the college level. This must be conceded by all who have studied to any extent the land-grant system of the United States. The problem is how this aid has influenced college education and how much. This study has dealt with the problem of whether Federal aid to education has resulted in federal control of any kind at Utah State University, including school administration, instructional and research staff, and the curriculum.

The first form of Federal aid was the Land-Grant Act of 1862. This act did not affect Utah State University until Utah became a state in 1896. The main influence of the Land-Grant Act has been in giving the college additional funds for use. The total amount has not been substantial and has amounted to only a fraction of one per cent of the annual budget in any year.

The Land-Grant Act, however, had one provision that directly influenced the subjects to be taught. In order for the state to receive the land-grants it had to provide for instruction in the agricultural and mechanic arts and in military science. The colleges could teach any other subjects they wished so long as these were taught. This left Utah State with a wide area of choice. There seems to be no evidence that the government
tried to control how a course would be taught, except in military science. The methods of instruction have been left up to the administration and the teachers.

The Land-Grant Act stipulated that the money from the grants had to be used for the teaching of agricultural and mechanic arts and not for the construction or repair of any physical facilities. In order for this part of the law to be followed, it was necessary for the government to keep a constant check upon the colleges. In the early days of Utah State University the check was closer than it has been since.

There has been closer relationship between the Experiment Station and the government than there has been between the government and the rest of the school. One reason for this was that there was more federal money spent with the Experiment Station. Federal agencies have also been interested in the results of Experiment Station research. The Hatch Act was a product of the changing times in agriculture. New technology was needed to meet new conditions in farming as the people moved west. The idea for state experiment stations came from farm groups and others interested in help for the farmer. The Federal Government did not advocate the establishment of experiment stations until they had been asked to help.

The provisions of the Hatch Act left supervision up to the states in regard to their own experiment stations. The Federal Government had general supervision in matters involving more than one agriculture research center. It was to provide an annual appropriation for support of the stations. The research centers in return were to publish bulletins divulging the results of experiments. The stations were also required to submit an annual report to the Department of Agriculture.¹

¹United States Code, 1958, Title 7, Section 361.
Have the provisions in the Hatch Act led to federal control of the teaching and supervision of Utah State University? There is no indication that this has been the case. There have been many dealings between the government and the Experiment Station, mainly concerned with agricultural experiments in which both the school and federal authorities have had an interest. The agreements between the government and the Station have been negotiated on a basis of equality. Contracts between the two have stipulated the obligations of the two participants. Both sides had to be satisfied before a contract was signed.

The second Morrill Act had many of the same provisions as the Land-Grant Act of 1862. The fundamental difference was that the first act provided land-grants to the state colleges while the act of 1890 called for an annual appropriation for the state universities. The annual fund was under closer observation by the government in early years than was the case later. The Federal Government watched closely to see that the money appropriated was used to teach agriculture and mechanic arts. In the first years, the school occasionally was required to refund money to the government which it had spent on unauthorized items. The annual appropriation eventually became a routine action on the part of the government. The annual audit submitted by the University was enough to allow the government to make the fund automatic. This was true as long as the College stayed within the provisions of the act.

The Smith-Lever Act has given the government more control over the Extension Service than over other branches at Utah State University. Many of the workers in the Extension Service are paid in part by the Federal Government. The Department of Agriculture supplies a greater
proportion of funds in relationship to state appropriations than in other areas of the University. The Extension Service, however, is not as closely connected with the University as are its other branches. The main purpose of the Extension Service is to distribute information directly to the farmer and to assist him at his farm. The administration of the Extension Service is at Utah State University, but the main areas of work and instruction are away from the school.

The military, according to indications, is not interested in influencing policy at Utah State University. Its main purpose has been to protect its interest in the military program at the school. It has tried to make certain that the school program provided sufficient instruction in military matters to insure a minimum of trained officers. The military science program was, for many years, compulsory for the first two years for male students. Since 1957, however, the program has been on a voluntary basis. This was done at the request of the University and is an indication of the lessening influence by the Federal Government. In their relations, the University and the military have been equal partners. In any military project undertaken at the school, the two have used contractual agreements.

The era of the New Deal provided an opportunity for the Federal Government to impose control on teaching and administration at the land-grant colleges. The principal objective of the New Deal, however, was to cure the ills of a national depression, rather than to establish a national college educational system. The influence and benefit that the colleges and universities obtained were a by-product of this fundamental idea. At Utah State University, the largest share of New Deal
funds were used to construct new facilities and improve the old. These were projects to provide employment, and did not include support of the University as such. In the case of the National Youth Administration, money was given to the student directly, and the funds were handled separately from the funds of the university. There is no evidence that teaching was brought under federal supervision by any action of New Deal legislation. A check of the minutes of the Board of Trustees shows that the control of teaching was up to the school and the Board; they recruited and hired the staff.

In reviewing federal aid to education there are a few things that should be kept in mind. Our system of national and state governments does not lend itself well to national control of education. When there are two governments operating in their own spheres of action within the same area, each is able to counteract the actions of the other. The power is distributed so that no one agency can become completely dominant. If the national government tried to gain control of our educational system it would have to have state acquiescence. In other countries where dictators have been able to control education this system has not existed or it was not very significant. Germany had a federal system under its republic after World War I and Russia has one now. Both of these countries, however, have not had a tradition of democracy and local control. In this country, on the other hand, the tradition of democracy and local control has existed from the beginning. This country was comprised first of individual colonies ruled on local basis before it emerged as a nation.

The federal system enables the people in the various states of the country to be a power in local governmental affairs, including education.
There has been no thought of asking the people to give up this control. The Senators and Representatives from the various states and localities reflect the opinions of their constituents and would hardly be the ones to advocate national control of education unless the people of their respective states or districts wanted it.

The Federal Government in the past has shown no inclination to try to control the land-grant system. One reason for this has been the great cost involved. There would have to be supervisors and other federal agents in every state college. There would be need for a constant check on the teaching and supervision. Federal funds for land-grant instruction would have to increase in ratio to state aid. In the past, national aid has been insignificant as compared to state participation. At Utah State University the state has contributed far more than the Federal Government. This situation is likely to continue.

If the national government were to make an effort to control education it would be difficult to do it without the consent of the people. In our country where there is freedom of the press and speech it would be difficult to conceal or accomplish such a move. The minute the government indicated what textbooks would be used or what teachers should teach it would become known to the people. The press would report it as would those people in government who were not in favor of federal control of education. In order to control education the Federal Government would have to take first some of the basic freedoms—freedoms which are the fundamental basis of the American government. The system of free government would have to change before there was extensive control over education. The alternative to this would be for the people to deliberately seek federal control. In a democratic system if the people generally desire national
controls or aid they will get it.

There are conditions which would lead many to seek Federal control of education. A state government could impose restrictions and control on its educational system to such an extent that the people would call for outside assistance. The state of Louisiana faced such a prospect in the early thirties. At the present time, in many Southern States, there are far more limitations to free education by state governments than the Federal Government would be likely to impose. State control of education can be both good and bad, and this can also be true of federal supervision. A state government could find it difficult to obtain the funds necessary to support their school system. The expanding school population makes it difficult for many state and city governments to provide the necessary facilities. A condition like this would lead many state and city governments to go to the national government for aid. This would conceivably be done at the expense of giving some of the supervision of education to the national government.

Federal aid has had an impact on education at the college level, although it has not tried to supervise. The Land-Grant Act of 1862 was instrumental in helping many states establish a college system. At the time of the Act higher education was mainly a private enterprise. In a number of states it may have stayed this way, but the Land-Grant Act inspired the states to form their own college system. Many states were doing this on their own, but it would have taken longer. Two provisions of the Act speeded up this action. The donation of land helped many states to obtain the funds necessary to build a school earlier than they could by themselves, and the provision giving the states five years to act prompted many to take action early. The Land-Grant Act changed the
direction of instruction on the college level. Up to this time private
colleges had taught the arts and letters. There was no instruction in
agriculture and mechanical trades. The land-grant colleges were created
for the teaching of these two subjects. This opened up training on the
college level to new areas and to many people who had not desired to go
to college before. The Land-Grant Act acted like a catalyst activating
the states to promote education on the college level.

The Hatch Act enabled those states that had colleges to establish an
experiment station. The ones who had stations were able to improve them
with the additional funds. The big impact, however, was to give the
territories an opportunity to use an experiment station to establish a
state college. This was the case with Utah State University. The Hatch
Act brought a large increase in the amount of agriculture research done
in the country. It increased the number of research centers and the
funds available for this purpose. Up to this time agriculture experimen-
tation had not been coordinated. With the Department of Agriculture
acting as supervisor of research between two or more state research
centers it was possible to prevent duplication of effort. This decreased
the cost of experimentation and the time involved. The Second Morrill Act
was passed three years after the Hatch Act. The two were used by the
states and territories together. The contribution on the Second Morrill
Act was that it provided for an annual appropriation that the states and
territories could count on year after year.

The Smith-Lever Act carried education to the farmer and his wife in his
home. Many states had already extended agricultural education to the
rural areas with their farmers' institutes. There were few states, however,
that had an agent in each county the year around. The Smith-Lever Act
established the county agent system on a nationwide basis. It also expanded the agricultural knowledge that would be available to the farmer by bringing the various state programs into a single organization. The Department of Agriculture acted as a clearing house of agricultural information. Knowledge from one state could be obtained by another through the coordinating effort of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Land-Grant college system has affected the military more than the military has affected it. The schools have provided a training ground for future officers, thus increasing the nation's military base. During wartime it has given the country facilities to expand our forces in the shortest possible time to meet the exigencies of war. The impact of the New Deal Period has been to increase the amount of facilities in the land-grant college system. With this increase in facilities done by stimulating the states to increase the amount of construction by offering grants-in-aid. The New Deal programs acted as a catalyst to the states. This can be said about all the federal programs that affected the land-grant system. Any action taken by the Federal Government prompted a greater effort to be made in the same area by the states.
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