

Keep Source

1  
201  
13  
43  
1012

# IOWA'S EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM

*correlation courses of study*

THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
AND ITS REPORT TO THE  
GOVERNOR

*educational institutions*

*A Discussion of the Problems Involved in the Recommendations  
of the Board, Together With An Opinion by  
Hon. Frederick W. Lehmann, of Saint Louis, Late  
President American Bar Association, and  
Solicitor General of the United States,  
as to the Legality of the Board's Proposed Action*

REFERRED TO THE PEOPLE OF IOWA BY  
THE UNDERSIGNED ALUMNI OF  
THE STATE UNIVERSITY

JAMES B. WEAVER, JR., Des Moines  
GEO. S. WRIGHT, Council Bluffs  
W. O. FINKBINE, Des Moines  
H. W. SEAMAN, Clinton  
ARTHUR J. COX, Iowa City  
CARL F. KUEHNLE, Denison  
E. W. WEEKS, Guthrie Center  
EUCLID SANDERS, Iowa City

## SUBJECTS TREATED.

1. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, ITS ORGANIZATION, FUNCTION AND RECENT REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR.

2. MAY THE COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCES BE LEGALLY REMOVED FROM THE STATE UNIVERSITY? OPINION OF HON. FREDERICK W. LEHMANN, OF ST. LOUIS, LATE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

3. HISTORY OF ENGINEERING AT BOTH SCHOOLS.

4. PROPOSAL TO REMOVE HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS FROM AMES TO THE UNIVERSITY.

5. TRADE AND AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOLS. THE MORRILL ACT AND THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS.

6. COMMENT ON OPINIONS OF EDUCATORS CITED BY THE BOARD.

7. DUPLICATION, ECONOMY AND EQUIPMENT.

8. CONCLUSIONS.



## FOREWORD.

In dealing with the great question of education the first important consideration is to arrive at the actual facts in the premises. Without these no safe conclusion can be reached. In the within statement we have endeavored to present facts within our knowledge and without institutional bias. The cause is greater than any institution or any Board. We have not hesitated to criticize the plan proposed by the State Board of Education and the method by which the plan was evolved, but in so doing we here and now disclaim any intention to reflect upon the character of the gentlemen composing the Board, or Finance Committee or their loyalty to the cause of education. They are each and all well known to the state and gentlemen of high standing and character. If they may seem from a reading of this statement to have fallen short of success in reaching a wise solution of the task imposed or to have based their action upon a mistaken conception of vital facts, we submit that such result is to be attributed most of all to defects in the system under which they were organized and working. We believe the Finance Committee, which is outside the Board, to have been delegated by the latter and to have assumed, with perfectly honest intentions, vital functions not assigned to it by law and for which it admits its unfitness and the responsibility for which rested upon the Board alone. In consequence of this the system now proposed by the Board is claimed by us to stand upon erroneous statements of fact and upon unsound principles, educational and legal, and to be fraught with grave peril to all three institutions and to the cause of education in Iowa.

We ask for this statement a careful and dispassionate consideration by the people of Iowa.



## THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, ITS ORGANIZATION, FUNCTION AND RECENT REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR.

March 31, 1909, the 33d General Assembly abolished the separate boards theretofore existing for the government of the State University, the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, and the State Teachers' College, and created a new governing body, to-wit, the State Board of Education. Very briefly, the powers and duties of the State Board of Education may be gathered from the following language of the act creating the board:

**"Sec. 1. STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION:** The State University, State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, including the Agricultural Station, and Normal School at Cedar Falls, shall be governed by a state board of education of nine members.

**"Sec. 4.** The State Board of Education shall have power to elect a president from their number, a president and treasurer for each of said educational institutions and professors, instructors, officers and employes; to fix the compensation to be paid to such officers and employes; to **MAKE RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF SAID SCHOOLS NOT INCONSISTENT WITH THE LAWS OF THE STATE.**"

**"Sec. 6.** Said Board of Education shall appoint a **FINANCE COMMITTEE** of three **FROM OUTSIDE ITS MEMBERSHIP** and shall designate one of such committee as president and one as secretary."



The secretary of the Finance Committee is to act as secretary of the Board of Education, keep a record of the proceedings of the Board and of the Committee and preserve all books and papers. There are other sections also dealing with the Finance Committee with respect to the investment of funds, keeping of accounts, etc., from which it is clear that the Finance Committee's duties relate to the accounts, records and financial details of the Board. The Finance Committee is OUTSIDE THE BOARD and IN NO SENSE A GOVERNING BODY, the government of the state institutions referred to being lodged alone in the State Board of Education.

At an executive session of the State Board of Education held on July 16, 1912, the following resolution was adopted, as shown by the minutes of the Board:

**"Resolved: That the FINANCE COMMITTEE be instructed to report to this Board at its next meeting the FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY of carrying out the co-ordination of work in the three institutions, and particularly the consolidation of the Engineering schools at Ames and Domestic Technology at the University, along lines SUBSTANTIALLY AS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD MEMBERS RECENTLY IN A PREPARED MEMORANDUM on the subject, and that they prepare financial and sentimental facts in connection therewith."**

Pursuant to the authority thus delegated by the State Board of Education to the Finance Committee "to report to this Board at its next meeting the FEASIBILITY AND ADVISABILITY of carrying out the co-ordination of work in the three institutions" the Finance Committee undertook the work of investigating and recommending a scheme of co-ordination, and prepared and filed with the Board its report on Oct. 8, 1912.

This report as will be noted above, was based upon a prior memorandum presented by the Finance Committee for in the report will be noted the following statement:



“Some time ago a memorandum setting forth a tentative plan of co-ordination was somewhat carefully prepared and the undersigned were satisfied that taking all things into consideration this plan offered the best possible solution of this co-ordination problem. Further study did not materially alter our opinion; but, **REALIZING THAT WE WERE NOT EDUCATIONAL EXPERTS**, we thought it wise to submit this to several eminent educators.” The recommendations of the Finance Committee and the report above referred to are, in the language of the report, thus summarized:

“First: That all work in Engineering be centered at the Agricultural College.

“Second: That all courses in professional education and in Liberal Arts now offered at the Iowa State Teachers’ College, which extend beyond the sophomore year, be discontinued.

“Third: That all courses in general science and in domestic science now existing at the College of Agriculture be discontinued, and that the field of household arts be opened at the University.”

The report of the Finance Committee was prepared by Mr. W. R. Boyd, its chairman, and is signed by W. R. Boyd and Thomas Lambert. Mr. D. A. Emery, the third member of the Finance Committee, concurred in the report except in so far as it effects the State Teachers’ College, as will be seen by reference to his dissent attached to the report.

Thereupon the State Board of Education (Trewin, Funk, Baker, Murphy, Brenton and Shoentgen voting aye, Holbrook no, and Leavitt and Eicher absent) adopted the recommendations of the Finance Committee as above set forth in their entirety and has filed its report to the Governor and Legislature setting forth in detail its reasons for such action. The report to the Governor and Legislature was evidently prepared by Mr. Boyd, of the Finance Committee, and the matter is presented with



great elaboration. In the Iowa Alumnus of November, 1912, is an article entitled "The Board's View" signed by the Finance Committee, and an elaborate synopsis of the report to the Governor and Legislature has been prepared by the Finance Committee, distributed broadcast throughout the state and published in various papers with varied comment. The Finance Committee and Mr. Boyd for that Committee, are the active sponsors for the Board in support of the plan in the public discussion that has been going on during the past two months. The Board states in its report that three years have been given to the study of this problem and this is no doubt true. It cannot be overlooked, however, that while the Board had shortly prior to July 16, 1912, considered to some extent "a memorandum setting forth a tentative plan of co-ordination, somewhat carefully prepared," it was prepared by the Finance Committee and not by a member of the Board of Education. Further, it was only within the last five months that the Board passed its resolution of July 16, 1912, directing the Finance Committee to report to the Board upon the "advisability and feasibility" of co-ordinating the three schools. The report of the Finance Committee itself was not presented to the Board until Oct. 8, 1912. Whether it was the intention and is now the desire of the people of Iowa, the Legislature and those who created the State Board of Education that the Finance Committee should have delegated to it and assume the initiative and responsibility here shown is a question that we leave, without discussion, to the public sentiment of the state.

The plan thus evolved, approved and decided upon by the State Board of Education has naturally and properly aroused a state-wide interest. It directly and vitally affects for all time all the youth of Iowa as well as the material progress of the state in industry, agriculture and every line of education. At no time in the history of the state have its people been confronted with so vital a problem. Let it be said at the outset that its solution is not to be rightly determined by listening alone to the contentions of any of the three institutions, though they have a right to be heard, but in the light of the educational needs of the people of Iowa and the organic



law that controls the action of the state in supplying those needs. The parties to this statement are alumni of the State University. We have carefully considered the proposals of the Board and believe them to be not only illegal but fraught with grave peril not only to the University but to the other institutions involved and to the great cause of education in the State of Iowa. So believing, it is our duty to present, in what is necessarily an inadequate form, our convictions concerning the proposed plan. In so far as this presentation shall seem to the reader to be based solely on sentiment due to our relation to the University we ask that it be disregarded, but in so far as it shall address itself to the sound and patriotic judgment of the people of Iowa we ask its careful consideration by the friends of all three institutions and by the citizenship of the state.



**MAY THE COLLEGE OF APPLIED SCIENCES  
BE LEGALLY REMOVED FROM THE  
STATE UNIVERSITY AND ESTAB-  
LISHED AT THE COLLEGE OF  
AGRICULTURE AND ME-  
CHANIC ARTS?**

In the statement recently furnished by the Board to the press of the state at the time of filing the report to the Governor is the following statement of its proposal to remove Engineering from the University and concentrate same at Ames:

**"2. An institution at Ames which shall be the GREATEST TECHNICAL INSTITUTION IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY along the lines of agriculture, ENGINEERING and veterinary medicine, WITH COLLEGE STANDARDS AS HIGH AS THE HIGHEST; and, supplementary to this, work along sub-collegiate lines which shall bring the beneficent influences to those having little time to devote to fitting themselves to do well some of the ordinary work which the world always has to do in abundance.**

Perhaps the most radical of the changes recommended, certainly that most discussed throughout the state, is this proposal to remove the School of Applied Sciences from the State University to the College at Ames and to make of the latter not only a college of agriculture and mechanic arts but "the greatest technical institution in engineering in the Mississippi valley,"—thus outranking Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Illinois, and all other states where engineering is upon a University basis. The College of Applied Sciences as now in operation at the State Uni-



versity includes the following departments: Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Chemical Engineering and a course in Industrial Chemistry.

That the Board and Finance Committee are of the opinion that branches of the University may be discontinued at Iowa City and established elsewhere is clear. It is not their plan that University training in engineering be wholly discontinued within the state, but that to the three institutions may be assigned such functions as the Board may determine and when the branches are thus placed the three institutions will thus become IN EFFECT ONE UNIVERSITY. Note the following language in the statement of the Board:

“The entire state is rightfully the campus of the University.”

“Are the institutions to continue practically as they have been in the past, separate institutions, each conducting its work without any special thought of the other, or shall the Board undertake to explicitly define the function of each **TO THE END THAT THEY MAY IN REALITY CONSTITUTE WHAT WOULD BE TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES A SINGLE INSTITUTION?**”

“An institution at Ames which shall be the greatest technical institution in the Mississippi Valley along the lines of agriculture, engineering, and veterinary medicine, **WITH COLLEGE STANDARDS AS HIGH AS THE HIGHEST.**”

It cannot be questioned that engineering in its varied applications is universally regarded as appropriate to university instruction, nor can it be denied that it is thus established at the State University. That this was a wise course from the beginning we call attention to the following comments in the opinion of the experts cited by the Board as supporting their contention:



**HENRY S. PRITCHETT:** "As you know, I have always believed that the right solution was to leave the engineering at the University.

"In the first place the School of Applied Sciences in the present day is on a university basis. It is educationally at home in our universities as now organized. The natural place for the school of engineering is in the University."

**A. ROSS HILL:** "Logically, the school of engineering should be at the University."

**CHAS. R. VAN HISE:** "It is unfortunate that the University and the State College are separate and in depriving the University of Engineering work and the Agricultural College of Domestic Science you are merely paying a part of the penalty of having two institutions instead of one."

The Board itself plainly recognizes this argument for in its recent statement to the public it says: "Theoretically engineering might more logically have been established originally and exclusively at the University." And again in the statement of the Finance Committee to the educators it is said: "It is unfortunate perhaps that engineering was not originally and solely developed at the University. A College of Applied Sciences is AN ESSENTIAL FACTOR in nearly every great University. Our own University WILL NOT BE IDEALLY COMPLETE WITHOUT ONE."

It must indeed be apparent to everyone that in an age whose dominant note is its triumph over the forces of nature and its gigantic achievements in engineering, that department of instruction is appropriate to a great University. Back in the early 70's when the word "engineering" was used the mind at once reverted to civil engineering, surveying and the like. Now engineering includes sanitation, electricity, chemistry, physics, mining, mechanics, public health, sewage disposal, electro



chemistry, flood protection, and many more subjects intimately connected with the common life of the nation. Though the triumphs in engineering have been great in the past there can be no doubt that we are only upon the margin of that great field upon which are achieved the control by mankind of the elemental forces of nature. We are confident that the people of Iowa desire their University to have a share in this noble service to the race.

It will thus be seen that the College of Applied Sciences is appropriately established at the State University and is as much a branch there as is Law, Medicine or the full course in Liberal Arts. Can this branch of the University be discontinued and legally established elsewhere? This question, not discussed by the Board, lies at the very root of the proposal to remove engineering of University grade to Ames and abandon it at the University. Let it be noted once for all that the question is not, may such instruction be given at Ames, for undoubtedly it may, but whether this branch of the University may be discontinued and established instead at the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. We call attention to the following provision of the first constitution:

**CONSTITUTION ADOPTED IN 1846, ART. 10, SEC. 5.** "The General Assembly shall take measures for the protection, improvement and other disposition of such lands as have been, or may hereafter be reserved or granted by the United States or any other person or persons to this state for the use of a University and the funds accruing from the lands or the sale of the lands or any other source for the purposes aforesaid, shall be applied to the support of said university with such branches **AS THE PUBLIC CONVENIENCE MAY HEREAFTER DEMAND** for the promotion of literature, arts and sciences."

Under the foregoing provision of the first constitution the University could and did consist of a central institu-



tion with branches in different parts of the state, to-wit, at Fairfield, Dubuque and Keokuk, the Medical College being established at the latter point.

A new constitution was adopted by the State in 1857 by which a new and radically different policy as to the State University was determined upon as will be shown by the following language:

**ART. 9, SEC. 11: "The State University shall be established AT ONE PLACE WITHOUT BRANCHES AT ANY OTHER PLACE and the university funds shall be applied to that institution and no other."**

**ART. 11, SEC. 8: "The seat of government is hereby permanently established as now fixed by law in the City of Des Moines, in the County of Polk, and THE STATE UNIVERSITY AT IOWA CITY, in the County of Johnson."**

We have asked a number of lawyers over the state whether under the foregoing provisions of the constitution and the statutes since enacted, a branch of the State University may be removed from the University and established instead at some other point in the state. The answers received have determined the question uniformly in the negative. Some of the gentlemen consulted were alumni of the University and might be deemed to be influenced by their University connection. To remove any question of bias we have taken the pains to consult and obtain the opinion of a lawyer of national standing who has never had the slightest relation to either of the institutions, Hon. Frederick W. Lehmann, of St. Louis, late President of the American Bar Association, and Solicitor General of the United States. Mr. Lehmann's attainments, character and wide learning must give to his opinion the greatest possible weight with the people of Iowa, by whom he is so well and favorably known. A copy of his opinion follows and no elaboration on our part could add one iota to its convincing logic. We ask every reader of this statement to give it his careful and unbiased perusal. It shows that while the Board may



give such instruction as it chooses at any other institution, it may not emasculate the University by divorcing from it its present branches of law, or medicine or engineering, or liberal arts and establishing said branches at other points in the state. As Mr. Lehmann well says, if this may be done with the College of Applied Sciences it may be done next with law or medicine and so on and thus the constitution wholly nullified:

**OPINION OF HON. FREDERICK W. LEH-  
MANN.**

November 20, 1912.

Arthur J. Cox, Esq.,  
Iowa City, Iowa.

Dear Sir:—You ask my opinion as to the legality of the proposed action of the Iowa State Board of Education stripping the State University at Iowa City of its College of Applied Sciences and establishing it at the Agricultural College at Ames. I have examined the question and conclude that it cannot be done without disregard alike of the constitution and statutes of Iowa.

The acts of Congress granting two townships of land to the State for the use of a University did not undertake to define the institution which was to be the beneficiary of the grant further than was done by the use of the general term University, but left all the particulars to be determined by the proper authorities of the state.

Pursuant to the acts of Congress, the Constitution of the State adopted in 1846 provided by Art. 10, Sec. 5, that,

**“The General Assembly shall take measures for the protection, improvement or other disposition of such lands as have been, or may hereafter be reserved or granted by the United States or any person or persons to this State for the use of a University and the funds accruing from the lands or the sale of the lands or any other source for the purposes aforesaid, shall be applied to the support of said university with such**



branches as the public convenience may hereafter demand for the promotion of literature, arts and sciences.”

Here is something in the way of definition. The University is to be an institution of learning, dedicated to literature and the arts and sciences. And under this provision of the Constitution the University might consist of a central institution WITH BRANCHES IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE STATE “as the public convenience may hereafter demand.”

Consonantly with the constitution the legislature by act approved February 25, 1847, established at Iowa City “an institution to be called the State University of Iowa,” and subsequently, I am informed, branches were established at Fairfield, Keokuk and Dubuque.

A new constitution was adopted by the State in 1857, and by this new and radically different policy as to the State University was determined upon.

**Art. 9, Sec. 11, provides that, “The State University shall be established at one place WITHOUT BRANCHES AT ANY OTHER PLACE and the University funds shall be applied to that institution and no other.”**

The “one place” was determined by Article 11, Sec. 8, which provides, that

**“The seat of government is hereby permanently established as now fixed by law in the City of Des Moines, in the County of Polk, and the State University at Iowa City, in the County of Johnson.”**

Section eleven of article nine by its plain language precludes more than one State University. And the one institution must have one fixed place without branches at any other place. The wisdom of this constitutional provision is not open to question by any one, save by the people of the state acting in their primary capacity, by



way of amending the Constitution or adopting a new Constitution.

There was, however, no definition in the Constitution itself of the word "University", and it must be taken to have been used in its accepted popular sense. And so it has been construed by the legislative and administrative branches of the State government from the beginning to the present time. A rule of construction of the Constitution observed without breach, from the adoption of the Constitution for fifty-five years, by all those having occasion to act under its provisions is the very highest evidence of the intention of the framers of that instrument and of the people in ratifying it.

The Board of Education, a QUASI legislative body provided for by the same Articles of the Constitution, enacted in 1858, that,

**"The object of the State University of Iowa, ESTABLISHED BY THE CONSTITUTION AT IOWA CITY, shall be to provide the best and most efficient means of imparting to the youth of the state, of both sexes, upon equal terms, a thorough education and a perfect knowledge of the different branches of literature, THE ARTS AND SCIENCES, WITH THEIR VARIED applications."**

This is not merely a declaration by the Board of Education of their sense of what a University should be, but a declaration of their view of the nature of the institution which had been established by the Constitution at Iowa City.

The Board of Education further enacted, that,

**"There shall be ATTACHED TO THE UNIVERSITY A COLLEGIATE department, in which as soon as may be deemed expedient by the board of trustees hereinafter provided, regular college classes shall be formed or provided for, and a president and the necessary professors**



and tutors elected. There shall also be a normal department of the university, in which shall be taught the theory and practice of teaching and everything which enters into it as an art, including all the most improved methods and processes now in use in all the varieties of teaching."

Here is recognized a difference between a college and a university, and that while a university may properly include a college, it is something more and higher than a college, and may as is the case with the German Universities and with Johns Hopkins in this country, begin its work where the college leaves off.

The above enactments of the Board of Education were approved and adopted by the legislature of Iowa and appear as sections 1926 and 1927 of the Revision of 1860.

Chapter 87 of the Acts of 1870 repeats the description of the State University, varying the language used, and going into more detail, but in no way altering the sense. Section 1 of the act prescribes,

**"That THE OBJECTS OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY, ESTABLISHED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF IOWA, shall be to provide the best and most efficient means of imparting to young men and young women on equal terms a liberal education and thorough knowledge of the different branches of literature, the ARTS AND SCIENCES WITH THEIR VARIED APPLICATIONS. The University, so far as practicable, shall begin the courses of study, in its collegiate and scientific departments, at the point where the same are completed in high schools; and no students shall be admitted who have not previously completed the elementary studies in such branches as are taught in the common schools throughout the State."**



This was continued substantially as section 1585 of the Code of 1873 and as section 2640 of the Code of 1897 and is the law of Iowa today and remains as well the present day legislative interpretation of the Constitution.

The administration of the University was at all times consonant with this view of what a University should be, and its different courses, departments and colleges as the institution developed were determined accordingly. Engineering was first adopted as a course of study, then established as a department and more recently as the College of Applied Science. And it cannot be doubted that this School of Applied Science is as much an integral part of the University such as the framers of the Constitution intended the institution at Iowa City to be, as is the School of Law or that of Medicine. And the legislature of the state has from time to time by specific designation in its appropriation bills recognized instruction in engineering to be as legitimate a function of the University as instruction in Law or Medicine.

It is not intended to suggest that instruction appropriate to a University course may not be given at other schools of the state. The utmost latitude is to be allowed in this respect. Courses in literature and history, proper in a University, might have as proper place as part of a comprehensive plan of instruction in the Iowa State Teachers' College at Cedar Falls. Certain branches of the law might be studied to advantage by the students of the Agricultural College at Ames, sanitation, hygiene and other subjects related to medical science may be taught in the high schools as appropriate to a general plan of public education. There is no occasion to attempt to determine the extent of legislative authority in this respect. It is plain, however, that when law and medicine and engineering are taught at other schools of the State, not simply as incidents to the distinctive purpose for which those other schools were founded, but as entirely independent courses, and the University at Iowa City is stripped of them, then branches of the University are established at the other places and the University at Iowa City is dismantled. If this can be done with one of the departments or schools of the University it can be done with all of them and the Constitution of the



State nullified altogether, for the State University would no longer be established at Iowa City without branches at any other place.

The present State Board of Education in the draft of their report submitted by you recognize that their proposals for the future government of the University, the Agricultural College and the Teachers' College involve a radical departure from the previous policy of the State, which the Board declares to be a mistaken one. The report says:

**"Are the institutions to continue practically as they have been in the past, separate institutions, each conducting its work without any special thought of the other, or shall the Board undertake to explicitly define the function of each TO THE END THAT THEY MAY IN REALITY CONSTITUTE WHAT WILL BE TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES A SINGLE INSTITUTION?"**

The wisdom of this proposed plan is not for me to consider, but it is obvious that if the University, the Agricultural College and the Teachers' College are made "what will be to all intents and purposes a single institution," then there will not be "to all intents and purposes" a State University "established at one place without branches at any other place," but an institution consisting of three branches, each branch located at a place separate from the others.

Is this plan of the Board in accordance with the intent of the Constitution? I think not, and the Board itself is evidently of the same opinion and so states by implication, for it says, "other states wiser THAN OUR OWN it would now seem elected to do this from the beginning." The meaning of the Constitution, its intent, is a matter for interpretation and therefore for discussion by those acting under it, but its wisdom is not. When administering office under the Constitution we must take it as it is, even though we may not believe it to be as wise in its provisions as the Constitution of some other



state. Its wisdom is to be challenged only by proposed amendment to be effected in the prescribed manner. What the Board of Education is now proposing to do can properly be done only under sanction of an amendment to the Constitution which will put Iowa in line with "other states wiser than our own," if so be it, other states are wiser in this regard.

The Board is apparently of opinion that its proposals are sanctioned and even required by the act of the Iowa legislature which called it into being. But the legislature no more than the Board may disregard the Constitution. I do not, however, so read the act, which is Chap. 170 of the Acts of the Thirty-third General Assembly.

Section 1 of this act provides that,

**"The State University, the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts including the agricultural experiment station and the Normal school at Cedar Falls shall be governed by a State Board of Education consisting of nine members and not more than five of the members shall be of the same political party. Not more than three alumni of the above institutions and but one alumnus from each institution may be members of this Board at one time."**

This takes the institutions as they are and provides for no radical change in their character. It does not authorize a consolidation nor dispense with nor modify the Constitutional provision that "the State University shall be established at one place without branches at any other place."

Section 4 defines the powers and duties of the Board and provides, that,

**"The State Board of Education shall have power to elect a president from their number, a president and treasurer for each of said educational institutions, and professors, instructors, officers and employes; to fix the compensation**



to be paid to such officers and employes; to make rules and regulations for the government of said schools, not inconsistent with the laws of the state; to manage and control the property both real and personal, belonging to said educational institutions; to execute trusts or other obligations now or hereafter committed to the institutions; to direct the expenditure of all appropriations the general assembly shall, from time to time, make to said institutions, and the expenditure of any other moneys; and to do such other acts as are necessary and proper for the execution of the powers and duties conferred upon them by law."

Here certainly is no evidence of any purpose to change the character of either of the institutions. It is the "said institutions," as they exist which the Board is to govern. The separation is expressly maintained. Each is to have its own president, professors, instructors, officers and employes. The Board of Education is to take the place of the previous Board of Regents and Boards of Trustees and to become vested with their powers. One general supervising board is made to take the place of three. The new Board is charged with "the government of said schools," and empowered "to manage and control the property" of each. The one power is as broad as the other. They certainly cannot take the property of the University and use it for one of the other schools for the Constitution says that "the university fund shall be applied to that institution and no other." And yet if the three institutions are to be dealt with as one "to all intents and purposes" then the property of all should be dealt with as one common fund to be applied and used for one institution or the other as need may be. This would be clearly unwarranted. And there is no greater warrant for taking from the University, a school, whether of Law, Medicine or Engineering, which is a proper integral part of it, and transferring it to one of the other institutions. If donations of money or of property have been made to the Law or Medical or Engineering school



in the view that they were to be maintained at Iowa City, certainly they cannot be transferred with the school to some other place.

The remaining sections of the act deal with details that do not bear upon the question, but the repealing section is significant. It repeals specifically twenty-one sections of previously existing law relative to these three educational institutions. It does not repeal Sec. 2640 of the Code of 1897 which defines "the object, departments and degrees of the university," nor section 2648, which defines the "courses of study" in the agricultural college, nor yet section 2677, which defines the "branches of study" in the Normal School. It repeals sections before and after and between, but it leaves the sections which determine the distinctive characters of the institutions untouched. And in the face of these specific repeals, it cannot be claimed that there was an intention, by the general repealing clause of "all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act" to repeal the vital sections above mentioned.

There is nothing in the latter act inconsistent with these sections. There is not a word in the latter act defining the scope of any of the institutions and so the law already upon the books, which did make such definition stands unimpaired.

The act of the legislature is in entire harmony with the Constitution. By the Constitution section 8 of article nine a single Board of Education was given control over all the educational institutions of the state. This was not inconsistent with maintaining the University as a distinctive institution, for provision for that was made in the very next section of the same article. And in section fifteen of article nine, the legislature is given power to abolish or reorganize the Board and "provide for the educational interests of the State in any other manner that to them shall seem best and proper." But standing with that always and unimpaired by it or by what may be done under it is the explicit command,

**"The State University shall be established at one place without branches at any other place,**



**and the university fund shall be applied to that institution and no other."**

The people in their primary capacity, promulgated this mandate and they, and they alone, can recall it.

The proposal to strip the University of its College of Applied Science is in my judgment in violation of this mandate and the attempt to carry it into effect may be enjoined at the suit of any citizen of the State.

Respectfully yours,

FWL

(Signed) F. W. LEHMANN.

We call attention to a decision of the Supreme Court of Colorado rendered in 1897, *People ex rel Jerome vs. Regents of University*, 49 Pac. Rep. 286, which is in principle directly in line with the foregoing opinion of Mr. Lehmann. To recite the facts briefly, the Constitution of Colorado fixed the location of the State University at Boulder and in 9 Col. 626 it was held that its location could not be changed except by constitutional amendment. The Board of Regents were under the constitution given general supervision of the University and exclusive control of its funds. By later statutes various departments were added from time to time to the University as the wants and necessities of the people required. One branch was a Medical department consisting of a three years' course. On account of alleged lack of clinical facilities at Boulder the Regents concluded to remove two of the three years of the Medical course to Denver. The graduating exercises were held at the University proper and degrees issued from Boulder. Action was brought to test the right of the Regents to conduct a department of the University elsewhere than at Boulder. This right was denied and the action of the Board of Regents held to be in violation of the constitution. The following quotation from the decision will be of interest in the matter now in hand:

**"Our constitution confirms the location of the University of Colorado at Boulder, and our statute reaffirms it. The location of the University includes all its departments, and every part**



thereof. With the wisdom of this policy, we repeat, we are not now concerned. It is conceded to be a part of our state history that the location of the university was not 'solely the result of a selection of the fittest place for such an institution, but was largely the result of the claims made and enforced by that particular section of the state to have one of the great institutions of the state located in its midst.' This has its bearing and should have its influence upon the interpretation to be given to the language of the constitution, if of doubtful import; but in this case the meaning is so plain and clear that it needs not the aid of contemporaneous history to interpret it. In *Re State Institutions*, supra, this court recognized that the location of these institutions, including the university, was confirmed by the constitution. IF THE REGENTS HAVE POWER TO REMOVE A PART OF ANY OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY, IT FOLLOWS THAT THEY HAVE THE POWER TO REMOVE THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT. IF THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO REMOVE AN ENTIRE DEPARTMENT, THEY ALSO HAVE THE POWER TO REMOVE ALL, OR SUCH OF THE DEPARTMENTS AS THEY MAY DETERMINE. To say they have any such power would be equivalent to declaring that they might remove the entire university from Boulder, and thus override the constitution itself, and render nugatory the efforts of those by whom the location was secured. The fact that the regents keep their business office at Boulder, that commencement exercises are held there, and diplomas awarded and fees received, and accounts kept, is not a compliance with the mandate of the constitution that the university lo-



cated at Boulder is the university over which they have supervisory power. To retain the shell at Boulder, while the real work of the university, or of any of its integral parts, is done elsewhere, would be an evasion of the letter and spirit of the statutes and the constitution. That instrument, indeed, gives to the regents the general supervision of the university; but this does not include the power to establish the university, or change its location, in whole or in part, as previously fixed by the constitution and statutes of the state. Their supervision must relate to, and be confined to the university, and all its departments as located at Boulder and not elsewhere."

The people of the state of Iowa will be interested in noting how completely parallel run the reasoning in Mr. Lehmann's opinion and that of the court in the foregoing decision. The opinion and decision cited, whether taken separately or together, are conclusive of the legal proposition involved.

It will be noted that Mr. Lehmann refers to the fact that the statutes cited and the action of the state during the fifty-five years that have elapsed since the University was founded are the highest evidence of the intention of the framers of the constitution and of the people in ratifying it and constitute a legislative interpretation of the intent of the people. In this connection we refer to the following significant action of the state legislature in 1904. In that year the general assembly of Iowa overturned a committee report recommending the abolition of engineering at the State University and made an appropriation of \$50,000 for its development on the double grounds that engineering was properly a branch of University work, and that the laws of the state required that it should be taught at the University. We quote from the report in which the \$50,000 appropriation was urged: "Under the grant of land to the University and the laws establishing the same, it was contemplated the establishment of a great University, and TO TAKE



FROM IT ONE OF THE MOST USEFUL DEPARTMENTS, WOULD BE IN VIOLATION OF THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL LAWS CREATING THE SAME.”

We also refer to what Mr. Lehmann says about the Board presuming to interfere with the institutions as they exist and change the courses of study at their will. The present State Board of Education owes its existence to the Whipple report and we call attention to the following statement in that report in this connection: “To the presidents and faculties of the several institutions properly belongs the duty of instituting courses of study. A Board of the kind and character suggested WOULD NEVER ARROGATE TO ITSELF SUCH WORK.”

We have already seen that by the opinion of the expert educators and the admissions of the Board itself the location of the college of Applied Sciences at the University was educationally sound policy.

The Board has mentioned the unfortunate spirit of rivalry that has existed between the institutions. We now appeal to the Board of Education and ask whether it is not its solemn duty in the light of the foregoing legal considerations to forthwith recede from a position unsound in law and in policy to the end that there be allayed at once the renewed antagonisms aroused by the Board's action.



## HISTORY OF ENGINEERING AT BOTH SCHOOLS, ETC.

In the report of the Board to the Governor, and also in the statement made by the Finance Committee to the educators consulted, stress is laid upon three considerations, namely, the historical status of the two institutions in the matter of engineering, the question of duplication in instruction, and the problem of economy.

In the following pages we will discuss these questions. We will first inquire whether the Board and Finance Committee are within the facts in the historical statement as to engineering furnished to the Governor as well as to the expert educators as basis for the opinions now offered in support of the Board's action.

In its statement made to the expert educators consulted the following statement is made as to the historical development of engineering at the two schools:

"Date of founding: Iowa State College, 1862, University of Iowa, 1905." The following FOOT NOTE was appended: "The department of engineering had existed for many years at the University but the above date indicates the time when the Colleges of Applied Sciences as now organized was established."

The fact is that 1862 is the year of the passage of the Morrill law and the purchase of the farm for location of the Ames institution. The latter did not open its doors to students until 1869. Engineering was not taught at Ames until February, 1872, when it was placed in charge of the professor of mathematics. Nov. 13, 1873, Prof. Jones of the department of mathematics was removed. In the legislative investigation that followed Prof. Jones testified: "At which time (1872) I was relieved from that part (cashier) of my work and continued to serve as professor of mathematics and SUBSEQUENTLY as



professor of engineering." Senator Merrill (Ia. Documents 1874, Vol. 3, p. 475\*6) intimates that Jones took charge of the class in engineering at request of President Welch "as a temporary expedient" and that he "didn't pretend to be a civil engineer and only taught it for the purpose of saving the funds of the college." It was not until 1874 that a regular Chair of Engineering was established.

What are the facts as to engineering at the State University? Engineering instruction began at the University WITH ITS FOUNDATION IN 1857. The University catalogue for 1857 says:

"In surveying and civil engineering, students will be thoroughly drilled in the use of instruments, by frequent field exercises and exercises in draughting. The design is to teach the art as well as the science—to teach land surveying in addition to book surveying. During the past year, THE DEPARTMENT has been furnished with a complete set of surveying and engineering instruments."

For many years after this date engineering was taught by Prof. Leonard as a part of the work of mathematics. Of course it was not taught extensively, because the University was struggling for existence, but there are references to it, outside of the catalogue. The University report of 1870 says:

"The mathematical studies have been arranged with a view to their application in engineering. Instruction in these studies IS AT PRESENT being given with this object in view, so far as the means at the disposal of the Board will permit."

The Chair of Civil Engineering was created June 19, 1873, and Prof. Philbrick placed in charge. The records



at the University show that Prof. Philbrick was elected to the chair on that date and COMMENCED TO DRAW HIS SALARY in October, 1873. Engineering was regularly continued from that date to this at the University. As a matter of course at both institutions engineering in the early 70's was in no sense the broad science which it has become under modern conditions. Both institutions started out with the teaching of it as a branch of the Department of Mathematics. And the Board's statement that "engineering was taught AFTER A FASHION at the University for many years" is misleading and unfair, the Department of Engineering at the State University being of equal dignity if not superior in those early years to that at Ames. The first civil engineering class at the University graduated thirty-six years ago, in 1876. In 1890, twenty-two years ago, electrical engineering was added. The first graduate of that department finished in 1894. Mechanical engineering was added in 1904, and other branches later. All of the branches were made into a School of Applied Sciences in 1903 and organized as a separate college in 1905.

The statement of the Board that "the historical development of the work in engineering at Ames is an element in the problem which must be given due weight, the dates given above (1862-1905) show the advantage of the work in engineering at the Agricultural College in age," etc. falls to the ground so far as priority of instruction is concerned when it is shown as noted above that instruction in engineering originated in the University in 1857, while it began in Ames in 1872. The uniting of the various branches of engineering into one College of Applied Science in 1905 we submit, in view of the foregoing facts, has no material bearing upon the priority of engineering at the two schools, and is misleading both when addressed to the people of the state and to the educators whose expert opinions were solicited. In the light of the facts above set forth showing beyond question a Department established in 1857, a Chair established in 1873, a continuous graduation of classes since 1876, Electrical Engineering added twenty-two years ago, all branches gathered into a School of Applied Sciences in 1903, and into a College of Applied Sciences in 1905, what shall be said



of the Board's statement that: "While theoretically engineering might more logically have been established originally and exclusively at the University, the fact is that it was not so established and not having been thus established we question the wisdom of attempting to establish it when it was **ACTUALLY ESTABLISHED ONLY SEVEN YEARS AGO**"(!) We forbear further comment on this statement made publicly to the people of Iowa and the educators as a basis for their support of the proposed plan. Nor do we feel inclined to hold the Board of Education responsible for conscious error in this connection. Doubtless it has relied upon the chairman of the Finance Committee for its facts, for in the resolution directing that Committee to inquire into the "advisability and feasibility" of co-ordinating the schools there was the further direction to "prepare financial and sentimental facts in connection therewith." Their historic statement is clearly a **PREPARED "sentimental fact."**

**ATTENDANCE:** A statement issued by the Alumni of the Ames institution was published in the Register and Leader Nov. 29, 1912, signed by five Alumni of that college. This statement, prepared with such elaboration of detail as to suggest its preparation under the guidance of the Chairman of the Finance Committee, was mailed at Ames and is upon the letter head of the Engineering Alumni of the State College. The statement embodies a table of attendance in Engineering at the two institutions. It places the number at the State University at 165 and at Ames in 1912 at 585 but to make that number includes the Agricultural Engineering students of whom this year there are about ninety. The work of Agricultural Engineering is stated by the college to be "that of giving instruction to those who intend to make the farm the object of their life work." The engineering attendance at Ames has decreased this year while there has been a sixty per cent increase in engineering freshmen at the University the present year. We do not argue against the engineering efficiency of the institution at Ames. We are as proud of that as of the work being done at Iowa City, but the people of the state are entitled to know what the facts are with respect to the matter of attendance.



On this point of relative attendance we call attention to the statement of the Board that this matter of co-ordination has been under consideration for three years, and to the following further significant statement: "DOUBT AS TO THE FUTURE OF A DEPARTMENT IS A SEVERE HANDICAP, AFFECTING ADVERSELY BOTH FACULTY AND STUDENTS," and again: "IN ANTICIPATION OF THE ACTION TAKEN THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS SCHOOL (State University) HAVE BEEN HELD DOWN TO THE LOWEST POSSIBLE POINT." It is the strongest evidence of the hold of the College of Applied Sciences at the University upon the youth of the state that a threatened withdrawal of the department and the admitted policy of insufficient appropriations, have failed to prevent the University from achieving a sixty per cent increase in engineering freshmen for the current year and in holding its attendance so well through these years of uncertainty. More than anything else conducing to the relatively larger attendance at Ames are the lower requirements necessary until quite recently for admission to the freshman year at Ames. Until 1898 engineering students were admitted there direct from the county district schools. Since then requirements have been slowly raised. It is only in recent years that high school work was added to the requirements for admission at Ames and in 1910 full college entrance requirements went into effect.

We have felt it necessary to devote the foregoing space to an explanation of the matter of attendance and the facts cited are important. Since the requirements at Ames have been brought to college grade the attendance has decreased while there is a sixty per cent increase in engineering freshmen at the State University this year. This problem we fully realize is not to hinge on these questions of priority or attendance and we only mention them because of the weight sought by the Finance Committee to be given to claims having no basis in fact.



## THE BOARD'S PLAN AS TO HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS.

The Board proposes in its report to remove the department of Household Economics from Ames to Iowa City. Let us turn to the report for a statement as to the character of this department as now organized at Ames:

"There are at the University at present time between seven and eight hundred young women who are clamoring for the establishment of a department of home economics. Moreover this subject can best be pursued in connection with a wide range of subjects in liberal culture which already exists at the University, but which do not and cannot exist at the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. There is also at the University a college of fine arts, and this in connection with a strong college of liberal arts, is a most valuable adjunct for those interested in household arts.

"It is evidently not understood by the public generally that the home economics course at the Iowa State College of Agriculture is a purely technical course designed to prepare young women to teach this subject. It is not a home-maker's course, as many seem to believe, which shall aid young women from the farms toward better housekeeping. It is a teachers' course. No one can enter it who has not mastered the entrance requirements insisted upon for entrance to the standard colleges. Formerly a home-makers' course of two years existed at this institution, but it was abolished years ago by the former board of trustees, and this strictly college course was established in lieu thereof."



Among the reasons given for the removal of the department is the presence at the University of "seven or eight hundred young women who are clamoring for home economics." That is an encouraging sign and we submit further that their clamor should be heard. Not that alone but the clamor of all the young women of Iowa at all three institutions should be heard with like effect for like instruction. Household economics belong in every school in the state where the young women of Iowa are gathered and we here and now declare our unqualified disapproval of the proposal to deny that branch of instruction to the young women who attend the Ames institution. The University has no desire to profit by the denial of household economics to her sister schools. The Board's plan is to transfer to Iowa City a department described as above—a department for the creation of teachers of household economics with high requirements for admission, and nowhere in the plan is provision made for household economics at either institution upon that popular plane which would "teach the young women from the farm better housekeeping." A plea is made for carrying education to those who cannot take the college course and in the same breath is proposed but one school of instruction in household economics and that on a UNIVERSITY BASIS. This is as illogical as it is unsound in policy. Is this carrying out the Board's express statement that "provision ought to be made for the great body of young people who have hitherto been practically neglected in the American scheme of education?" Is a false economy or a craze for "co-ordination" to deny the girls at Ames this vital branch of instruction? If the UNIVERSITY GRADE of household economics now taught at Ames properly belongs at the University as may be, for the reasons given by the Board, let it be so transferred, but that is no reason for failing to provide at all three institutions for courses of instruction in that great field for every girl who attends either school. The Board makes the following statement:

"As it is now the boys outnumber the girls at this institution (Ames) four to one. When these plans outlined shall have been carried out they



will outnumber them ten to one or more, a condition which we do not deem satisfactory, to say nothing about duplications."

If household economics are to be denied the girls at Ames the result here deplored by the Board will indeed come with promptness.

It is true the Board says that "extension courses in household economics will be carried forward by the extension department of this institution (Ames) as heretofore." How the Board proposes to do that with no central department of household economics at Ames is not explained. And right here we wish to call attention to a significant fact: When the proposals of the Board were first announced the opposition from the alumni, students and citizens at Ames was quite as pronounced as at the University. There was open talk of an injunction suit, resolutions, parades and "seventeen interrogatories" by the students and indignant editorials. Notable among such expressions from the press were those of the Ames Times and Ames Intelligencer. It is interesting to note that this opposition has recently and quite completely quieted down—so much so that on Nov. 29th an elaborate statement, prepared apparently under the guidance of the Finance Committee and headed "Ames Students Sustain the Board", was issued and mailed from Ames by the Ames Alumni Bureau and published in the Register and Leader Nov. 29th, signed by five well known Ames alumni, including Mr. McElroy, of Newton, ex-trustee, who it is announced is to have charge of Ames' engineering interests for the alumni this winter in the legislature. Can it be true that as Mr. Bryan said of Gov. Wilson these five alumni "have seen a great light,"—namely, that the farm girls of Iowa are in no real danger of being long, if ever, denied a department of household economics at Ames while the University is threatened with the removal of its college of applied sciences to Ames, there to be made into "the greatest technical institution in the Mississippi valley?" Again we declare our opposition to any scheme that proposes to compensate any of the three schools for removal of a department by taking from some other of the three some branch to which the latter is rightly entitled on sound educational grounds.



## TRADE AND AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOLS AND EXTENSION WORK.

We wish here to go on record in the most emphatic way in favor of Trade schools, Agricultural high schools and experimental stations, in short a complete system of agricultural and trades education brought squarely and closely home to the people of Iowa. Likewise we favor the creation of additional normal schools for the education of the teachers who will be needed to man these new schools. Let there be no misunderstanding about this matter. We do not commit ourselves unreservedly to the plans of the Board as now outlined in the matter of industrial education for we believe the subject to be so vast and so vital as to demand the most serious and thorough investigation by the legislature and the people. But to the PRINCIPLE of trade schools and agricultural education for the great masses of our youth who never reach the colleges, and to the prompt inauguration of such work we adhere unreservedly and assert that the state has much to answer for in its past neglect of such education. The statistics of every one of the colleges of Iowa will prove beyond question the vital fact that the percentage of attendance at such colleges from the territory near by is amazing and, as naturally follows, you cannot by centralization and the elimination of half the institutions transfer an equal body of students to those surviving. So it is the duty of the state to take home to the people by a thorough and proper system the training essential to enable the youth of Iowa to do more effectively the common tasks of life and do for our own people the labor that lies ahead of us. Not the University but the institution at Ames, an institution for the teaching of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, was instituted to develop the greatest calling known to mankind, agriculture coupled with, to quote the law founding it, "Such mechanic arts as are **DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH AGRICULTURE.**" The Morrill Act of which it is the beneficiary and the action taken by the state to bring the



institution within the intent of that act are so clear and vital that we submit the following extracts from the official records. The act founding the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts thus defines its purpose:

“The course of instruction in said college shall include the following branches, to-wit: Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Botany, Horticulture, Fruit Growing, Forestry, Animal and Vegetable Anatomy, Geology, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Entymology, Zoology, the Veterinary Art, plain Mensuration, Levelling, Surveying, Bookkeeping and such Mechanic Arts as are **DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH AGRICULTURE**. Also, such other studies as the trustees may from time to time prescribe, not inconsistent with the purpose of this act.”

As to what Representative Morrill meant by “Mechanic Arts” we quote the language of Gov. Lowe in an address delivered Jan. 9, 1860, favoring the Morrill act then pending in Congress:

“Give to our young farmers and mechanics the benefit of Morrill’s Agricultural College bill which proposes to develop a new interest, and an increased efficiency in general husbandry and the useful arts, by bringing to their aid the treasures of science and knowledge; so that the **LABOR** thus educated, which may be expended upon the soil should yield the richest reward with the least expense. \* \* \* (Plea for factories in Iowa). \* \* \* It will have the effect to refine and diversify the pursuits of our people, to emancipate labor and make it free—to give to the **LABORING MASSES** a feeling of moral worth—a throb of self-respect—a perception of the rights, dignity and duties of their calling.”



The trustees of the Agricultural College named an executive committee to consider this matter which reported to the legislature in 1868 as follows:

**"No similar institution in the west is in a better condition, when we consider its buildings, endowment and favorable surroundings, than the Iowa Agricultural College; and it only remains for the legislature at its present session, to act with its customary liberality, to insure the success of the only college within its borders devoted to the INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION OF FARMERS' AND MECHANICS' SONS WHO DESIRE TO REMAIN IN THE PURSUITS FOLLOWED BY THEIR FATHERS."**

The foregoing noble plea was made by the institution itself. The whole problem of migration of youth from the farms of Iowa is suggested in the final sentence where there is pictured an institution "devoted to the industrial education of farmers' and mechanics' sons who desire to remain in the pursuits followed by their fathers." What has the state done to encourage that desire or aid its development? Has it not laid too much emphasis on professional education in its appeal to its youth, thus firing their imagination with ambition along purely professional lines? Is it any wonder that so few graduates go back onto the farms?

We have already noted the objects of the Morrill Act. It is interesting to note also that in 1864 the State University sought to include agriculture in its courses. The regents of the State University recommended to the legislature that agriculture and mechanic arts be made a department of the University. This was denied and the reasons are set forth in the report of a legislative committee which investigated the proposition, and advised against it on the ground that the purposes of the two state educational institutions were utterly at variance. The report follows:



"The proposition has been made by the friends of the State University to take charge of the Agricultural College, and attach a department to the University, in which shall be taught such branches as relate to agriculture and the mechanic arts, provided a large portion of the land be diverted to the use and benefit of the University. We regard this proposition as so manifestly unjust and dangerous, that we feel it our duty to refer to some of the difficulties in the way of such an attempted union of the two institutions. The University is intended to be a higher grade of school than any other in the state, in which graduates from the varied seminaries, academies and colleges may enter, and complete an education in the highest branches taught, according facilities and advantages that no other educational institution in the state possesses. The object is a noble one, worthy of our great state, and we trust that the purpose will be fully carried out, without endangering its success in any way by 'entangling alliances'. The state and general government have dealt most liberally with it, affording it support and aid, in lands, buildings, money, to the amount of more than \$330,000.

**"THE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE WAS PROJECTED FOR A VERY DIFFERENT PURPOSE, AND IS INTENDED TO BE CONDUCTED ON AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT PLAN.** The want of a high school or college for the sons of working men, where they could, at trifling expense, acquire a thorough, practical education, adapted to the industrial pursuits they desire to follow through life, has been long felt and earnestly desired. It is evident to everyone who has studied the subject that this institution, **TO BE SUCCESS-**



FUL, MUST BE ENTIRELY INDEPENDENT OF ORDINARY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WHERE THEORIES ARE TAUGHT WITHOUT PRACTICAL ILLUSTRATIONS. \* \* \* A department thus conducted (in connection with a University) can derive none of the benefits contemplated by the friends of the agricultural college in providing an INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL in accordance with the acts of our own legislature, and the law of Congress making the munificent land grant, to enable the plans of the college to be faithfully and honestly carried out."

It cannot be doubted that the state's action in refusing the request of the University as noted above was educationally sound. The effect upon the great cause of agriculture and agricultural education if the request had been granted is well stated in the opinion of one of the educators in his statement to the board, Mr. Henry S. Pritchett, late President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and now President of the Carnegie Foundation in the Aid of Education. His statement follows:

In the matter of the duplicate engineering schools, there can be no difference of opinion in the committee's conclusion that the present duplication is absolutely unjustifiable, and that it leads not only to waste, but to unwholesome rivalry and that it ought to stop. If the whole matter could be gone into anew, the situation would never occur. The problem is to readjust the matter now in the best practicable way.

"There are strong educational reasons for leaving the school of engineering in the University, but two of these reasons are preeminent."

"In the first place the school of applied sciences in the present day is on the university basis, it



is educationally at home in our American Universities as they are now organized.

“But the strongest reason of all for leaving the teaching of engineering to the University, is that only in this way will the teaching of agriculture have a fair chance. The school of agriculture and the school of engineering are educationally incongruous. The school of agriculture ought to teach preeminently the trade of farming, even though it does research work in its experimental station and conducts certain classes of high order, its primary function ought to be not the training of agricultural teachers but the training of farmers, and the cultivation of the means by which the scientific knowledge in a practical form can be put into the hands of farmers. The great part of this work is not on a professional plane. Students of agriculture ought not to be required to comply with the same academic standards as those who expect to enter the profession of engineering.

“The engineering school on the other hand, as I have said a moment ago, is distinctly a professional school on a university basis.

“The two kinds of education are incongruous and do not go well together. The engineering school under such conditions always tends to overshadow the school of agriculture. It appeals to the students who come to the school as being something higher than agriculture, and many of them who come to the school with the intention of following an agricultural calling are led off into engineering.

“Where they are associated together, the agricultural school tends to become a training place for agricultural teachers. Very few of the graduates of such school go into actual farming.



How many graduates of the Iowa Agricultural and Mechanic Arts College are actually engaged in operating farms? Very few indeed in comparison to those who are in the profession of engineering. My impression is that more lawyers than farmers have come from the Agricultural College graduates, but its chief work is and has been for some time, the training of engineers for Iowa and more particularly for nearby states. The cheapness of living and the rather low standards which existed before the creation of this Board, operated to draw students from other states.

“In my judgment the interests of agriculture will be subserved by making the agricultural college a straight out school of agriculture, with entrance requirements suited to the needs of those who wish to become practical farmers. I should not make these academic requirements for admission higher than the equipment afforded by the elementary school. If the state of Iowa desires to help agriculture and to train men for the farms, the way to do it is to make of the agricultural college a straight school of agriculture, and to spend some of the money which would be saved from the abolition of the engineering school in the establishment and maintenance of experimental farms, so situated as to be convenient to the farmers of the whole state. So long as the school of engineering and the school of agriculture are yoked together, the team will pull unevenly, and mainly on the engineering side. The tendency will always be felt to have standards in engineering that are too low and standards in agriculture that are too high. The output of graduates from such an institution will consist as the graduates of Iowa Agricultural and Mechanic Arts have



consisted, in the past, almost altogether of engineers and other professional men. Those who have taken the agricultural courses and have graduated in them, will be found generally filling professors' chairs or employed in technical work in the Department of Agriculture. The great and important reason for separating the engineering school from the agricultural school is to give the school of agriculture a fair chance.

"I can well understand that there are difficulties in the way of an ideal solution. An outsider is, however, naturally enforced to speak from the standpoint of educational efficiency. What the difficulties are he does not know. It is now just fifty years since the passage of the first Morrill bill which created the Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges. In the light of the experiences which we have had, there is now the opportunity to build an agricultural school which shall really minister to agriculture. **IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE STATE OF IOWA HAS HERE AN EXCEPTIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD AN AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL IN THE WIDEST AND MOST PRACTICAL SENSE. IN MY JUDGMENT THAT WILL TURN OUT TO BE IMPOSSIBLE IF AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING ARE TO REMAIN YOKED TOGETHER.**"

That the danger pointed out by Pres. Pritchett is not without foundation it is interesting to note the experience of Purdue University, which is the Agricultural College of the State of Indiana and was founded under the Morrill Act. Indiana is a state of one million five hundred thousand rural population; Purdue in 1911-12 has a registration of 1956 of which the Agricultural students number 319, winter course agriculture 182, making the total of 501. Utah with a rural population of about two hundred thousand has kept her agricultural college separate. At



the latter the registration is 1069, of which 407 are students in agriculture. Of these 106 are preparatory and high school agricultural students, while at Purdue there is none such.

Again we state that we are not asking the state to discontinue engineering at the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts but are trying to point out that if engineering is to be DISCONTINUED at the University and concentrated at Ames the dangers mentioned by Pres. Pritchett and others will be only increased.



## STATEMENTS MADE TO EXPERT EDUCATORS AND THEIR "APPROVAL".

The Finance Committee and the Board offer the foregoing Pritchett letter as supporting its plan for removal of engineering from the University to Ames for in its statement the Board use this language concerning the view of the expert educators consulted: "With the exception of Dr. Draper all approve the recommendations contained in the memorandum as being the best solution under all the circumstances." Where these men say the solution proposed by the Board was the best "UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES" let it be remembered the educators were confronted with a special plea prepared by the Finance Committee in which not one of them was advised of the history or scope of the two institutions as disclosed from the statutes and records quoted herein and when it came to statements of fact we refer again for illustration to the gross misstatement by the Finance Committee recited earlier herein as to the respective dates of origin of engineering at the two schools.

That President A. Ross Hill, of Missouri, was influenced by the "historical statement" referred to is shown by the following from his letter: "I am pleased to note that the report is influenced not only by logic but by the HISTORY OF THE SITUATION." Evidently he was deeply impressed by the erroneous statement that the engineering department at the University was founded only in 1905, for he says again:

"Logically the School of Engineering should be at the University, but under your conditions, I see no reason why the University should NOW proceed to develop a school of engineering unless it is to be made of distinctly higher grade than the one at Ames and to emphasize strongly engineering research, a great field which so far has been very much neglected. Doubtless your



Schools of Law and Medicine at Iowa City will soon be requiring at least two years of college work for admission, if they are not already doing so. A School of Engineering based upon such entrance requirements and extending over three or four years of applied scientific and technical studies, would be justifiable, whereas the typical college of engineering offering identical work with that offered at Ames, does not seem to be justified."

What would he have said if he had known the department at the University was established in 1857 and has regularly graduated classes for thirty-six years? But let us quote further from Pres. Hill's letter: "Further, I can see no excuse for the maintenance of a general science curriculum at the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. Such a plan is too evidently meant to catch students who normally belong to the College of Arts and Sciences at the University."

Of all the educators consulted the man best qualified perhaps to give an opinion is Dr. Draper, Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Dr. Draper is a man very famous in educational circles and has received many honors. Among the positions held by him now and earlier may be mentioned the following: State Superintendent of Public Instruction for New York, member of the Court of Commissions Alabama Claims, President University of Illinois, Chairman of Board of Indian Commissioners since 1902, editor Educational Department Encyclopedia Americana; awarded silver medal at the Paris Exposition in 1900 for a monograph on the Organization and Administration of the American School System, and a gold medal and one of two grand prizes given at the St. Louis Exposition in 1904 for unusual service in educational fields.

Dr. Draper's letter to the Finance Committee is extremely significant. We give it in full and commend its consideration to all who love Iowa, its youth and its institutions:



"I have your letter of Aug. 30th concerning the plan for the co-ordination of the institutions of higher learning under the control of the Iowa State Board of Education.

"I ought to have answered your letter earlier but did not return from Europe until the second week in August, and have been very busy and not quite so well as usual since then.

**"IT IS EXTREMELY EXPERIMENTAL, IF NOT SENSATIONAL,** to undertake to co-ordinate under one management three educational institutions of essentially different purposes and certainly very different plans, and of somewhat different grade. I have no confident opinion about the outcome. In my judgment, the outcome will be ultimately unsatisfactory unless the members of the Board of Trustees and particularly those who exercise the most vital influence in administration, are large enough and strong enough to know what each department in each institution requires, and are able to put each in its right place, give it what it needs, and hold it there. After all, this cannot be done except by a large dependence upon the presidents of the several institutions, and in turn that will be worse than worthless, unless the presidents are men to be depended upon. I happen to know that certain of them are men to be depended upon if they are allowed independence of judgment and action, but how it will work with the scheme now in operation in Iowa **IS TO SAY THE LEAST, PROBLEMATICAL.** I wish the whole scheme in each institution well, with all my heart, but I must be excused from any very confident opinions upon matters that have so little basis of human experience in advanced school administration."



It will be noted Dr. Draper says, speaking of the necessity for a clear understanding of the needs of each institution:

“After all this cannot be done except by a large dependence upon the presidents of the several institutions, and in turn that will be worse than worthless unless the presidents are men to be depended upon.”

Mr. Boyd, the Finance Committee and the Board were of the contrary opinion evidently for the Finance Committee says in its report: “Little practical help in the solution of the Board’s great problem is to be expected from the officers and faculties of the several institutions.” Can it be possible that a comprehensive educational scheme for the state of Iowa may be formulated by the Finance Committee and the Presidents of the Schools not consulted? Were the presidents of the schools seriously consulted and without pressure from the Board? Not one word can be found in the report concerning the views of the several presidents and it is understood all of them were surprised when the report was promulgated.

We conclude this branch of our statement by calling the attention to the following suggestion in the memorandum of the Finance Committee to the several educators whose opinion was asked:

“A further reason why the engineering of the two institutions should be consolidated at the Agricultural College is that far less friction, **PERSONAL AND SENTIMENTAL**, will be aroused by this procedure. This argument is somewhat temporary in its nature, but because the Iowa State **BOARD OF EDUCATION IS STILL IN A PERIOD OF EXPERIMENT THAT ARGUMENT IS OF GREAT SIGNIFICANCE.**”

We have no hesitancy in declaring that considerations of a purely political character have no place in the determination of the educational problems of the people of Iowa.



## DUPLICATION, ECONOMY, EQUIPMENT, ETC.

The Board in its report has much to say about duplication and economy. Before these questions can be rightly understood it is necessary to consider what is duplication in connection with education. It is not a question entirely of the number of schools for the Board itself recommends the multiplication of Normal, Trade and Agricultural high schools. It is not the absolute separation of courses for it is true as Mr. Lehmann says that, "Courses in literature and history, proper in a university, might have as proper place as part of a comprehensive plan of instruction in the Iowa State Teachers' College at Cedar Falls. Certain branches of the law might be studied to advantage by the students of the Agricultural College at Ames; sanitation, hygiene and other subjects related to medical science may be taught in the high schools as appropriate to a general plan of public education." Let us turn also to one of the experts quoted by the Board and see what Pres. Pritchett says on this point:

"The matter of duplication of general courses between the college of agriculture and the arts college of the University is not a matter of serious moment under any conception of their functions. The same general subjects, English Mathematics, Chemistry, must be taught at both. It should be made clear, however, if the differentiation is finally made, that no courses leading to degrees shall be duplicated. The mere taking of English or of physics at both places has no significance from the standpoint of unwholesome duplication."

The duplication that is to be avoided as far as possible is the granting of degrees of identical grade to achieve



which the state is put to the necessity of building up not only the college to which the graduate directly owes his diploma but all associated branches essential to the rounding out of a complete education in that college. We have already seen that by all the authorities engineering of university grade properly belongs at a State University and is at home there. This is because it involves in this age much general university instruction, such as liberal arts, physics, chemistry, and the like. It may be of interest to note the conditions and courses at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the most famous engineering school on the continent. An institution of this grade must have been in the mind of the Board when it proposes that Iowa under its plan is to outrank Minnesota, Illinois, Missouri and all her sister states and make of the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts "the greatest technical institution in the Mississippi valley in the way of engineering."

The faculty at the Massachusetts institution numbers several hundred including instructors, attendance 1575 (1911). The courses in engineering are: Civil, Mechanical, Mining and Metallurgy, Architecture, Chemistry, Electricity, Biology and Public Health, Physics, Chemical Engineering, Sanitary, Geology and Geodesy, Marine and Electro-chemistry. There are scores of laboratories covering these branches. There are twelve libraries for the several specialties. Included in the engineering courses is instruction in German, French, English and U. S. History, English Literature, Law, Corporation Organization, Political Economy, Bacteriology, etc., studies many of them ordinarily regarded as strictly cultural but all going to fit the graduate to perform the functions required in this age in the great profession of engineering.

What is the tendency in engineering courses at the great schools? It is to extend these courses and raise higher and higher the requirements. Harvard has made engineering a graduate course and Columbia has done the same. This is what Columbia says of the breadth of engineering instruction:



"The purpose of this important change is to offer better and broader training to students of engineering, and to place the instruction in these professional subjects upon the same university plane as the instruction in law and medicine. The recent rapid development of engineering practice, the wider social and public recognition now given to the engineering profession, and the frequent demands that men in executive and administrative posts shall have had an engineering education, make it imperative that the engineer of the future shall widen his intellectual outlook by continuing his general education considerably beyond the limits of the ordinary high school course. Distinguished engineers among the alumni of Columbia University are already sending their sons through a college course as a preliminary to entering upon the professional study of engineering. At the present time, even before the proposed new system is in operation, fully one hundred students in Columbia University are taking advantage of the existing opportunity to combine a college and engineering course covering six years of study."

Missouri and Minnesota declare their intention to make their courses five and six year courses with requirement that the student must have from two to three years in liberal arts along with it.

With the requirements noted above, the high grade of scholarship gradually being insisted upon and the competition to be met with in Minnesota, Missouri and Illinois, to say nothing of the great eastern schools, how weak and inadequate indeed sounds the suggestion of the Finance Committee and the Board that after the removal of all engineering to Ames the equipment will be adequate. It says: "The memorandum submitted in regard to the engineering school shows the salary budget at each institution. IT IS NOT PROBABLE THAT AFTER THE CONSOLIDATION THE SALARY ROLL AT THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE



CULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS WOULD NEED TO BE MATERIALLY INCREASED.” Does that sound like “the greatest technical institution in engineering in the Mississippi valley?” The fact is that such an institution would require a corps of instructors and an equipment of buildings and laboratories that would afford a score of university courses and require an investment beside which the present outlay would be as but the beginning.

EQUIPMENT: Just a few words on the question of relative equipment. The Board in its report says:

“Value of plant and equipment, Iowa State College \$550,000, State University \$201,059.” Let us look into this statement. The OFFICIAL INVENTORIES give the following figures as to engineering investment: State College at Ames \$362,589, State University \$262,798. How curious indeed that these figures have suddenly grown in the mind of the Board by nearly \$200,000 in the case of the State College and shrunk by over \$60,000 for the University! A part of the sudden growth noted is doubtless achieved by including in the Ames figures at \$110,000 a building filled with farm machinery devoted to agricultural education and credited in the State Biennial report to agriculture for it is used for those who intend to make the farm their life work. It is likely the Board includes also for Ames the college heating plant \$23,000, old power plant, \$12,000 and water works \$46,500. Thus and thus only approximately \$550,000 may be reached and \$50,000 of this is devoted to Physics, leaving \$500,000. As to the University figures it is probable the Board cut out of its total the Hydroelectric plant listed at \$37,000 and estimated by Prof. Weld for the late Board of Regents at \$113,600. Apply to the University the same “inclusive tendency” shown toward the Ames figures and we have:

Inventory (less Hydroelectric plant) ..	\$225,798
Hydroelectric plant (Weld's figures) ...	113,600
Heating plant .....	40,000
Physics Department (included in Ames figures) .....	188,000
Total .....	\$567,398



We do not argue that these items are rightly or wrongly included but wish to show that if the Financial Committee had shown the same spirit or animus in making up the figures for both institutions the difference in totals is insignificant and we protest against that kind of special pleading that seeks to create an impression by magnifying one institution and minimizing another. The problem is not to be determined on such an issue and such tactics are unworthy the cause involved. In this connection too we may well recur to the language of the Board when it says of this department in the university: "IN ANTICIPATION OF THE ACTION TAKEN THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS SCHOOL HAVE BEEN HELD DOWN TO THE LOWEST POSSIBLE POINT." And again: "If the two colleges of engineering are continued it will be the duty of the Board to request of the legislature a large sum for additional equipment at Iowa City and to be available immediately and it would be no less the duty of the legislature to vote the money." The Board's statement puts the professors and instructors in engineering at Iowa City at eighteen as against forty at Ames. It is not stated, which is the fact, that half the heads of the departments in liberal arts at Iowa City are also members of the Applied Science faculty which numbers in all between thirty and forty. But why go on correcting figures that are in effect but a special plea for approval of a certain proposed plan and colored with the bias that inheres in such special pleading and that too in settlement of a great problem of state policy.



## IN CONCLUSION.

We submit in conclusion:

1st. That the separate functions of the Board of Education and the Finance Committee have not been kept clearly in mind; that the functions of the latter have been unduly enlarged and a too exclusive reliance placed upon the investigations of the chairman of that committee who, having fixed upon a pet plan, has not been able to avoid in his statements to the Board and the State bias in favor of a particular scheme and the coloring of facts common to human nature under such conditions.

2nd. That the Constitution of Iowa and the statutes forbid the removal of the College of Applied Sciences from the University and that the State has not attempted to confer such power on the Board of Education.

3d. That the historical statement made to the educators and to the state is erroneous and misleading in vital particulars.

4th. That the expert opinions submitted with the report in effect condemn more than they approve the proposed plan.

5th. That Household Economics should be taught in a popular way at all three institutions.

6th. That in the provisions of the constitution and the statutes relating to the University and the action of the state thereunder, and in the Morrill Act and the contemporaneous action of the Agricultural College and of the legislature relating thereto, will be found inevitably if studied carefully, the straight, clear path to a true and wise solution of the problem of co-ordination and of the question of economy.

7th. That differences in present equipment or attendance are relatively secondary matters when weighed beside the great cause of permanent and efficient educational facilities for the youth of Iowa for all time.



8th. That it is the duty of the state to make at once the necessary appropriations for immediate necessities at the several schools in the way of salaries, etc., and take up ANEW the problem of providing the state an adequate educational system that shall have in mind the organic law of the state, the functions which the several institutions are best adapted to perform and the needs of the state not only in university instruction but in bringing closer to the people teaching in agriculture, the trades, home economics and teaching.

9th. That we pledge to the people of Iowa in the foregoing task, if undertaken without fear or favor, the loyal support of the alumni of the University throughout the state and we repeat that our Alma Mater does not desire to profit by depriving any of her sister institutions of any department to which they are entitled in the judgment of the people of Iowa.

10th. That in all we have said of engineering at the State College or the Morrill Act we are prompted by no feeling of jealousy. If the state shall continue engineering of a university grade at the Agricultural College in competition with that at the University, which it is bound to retain, it does not concern the University.

11th. We wish to urge with all our power the duty of the presidents, alumni and students of the several schools to drop the spirit of bitter rivalry and political methods, come to the aid of the state in the solution of this problem and have the courage to solve the questions involved in the light of the best interests of the youth of Iowa, the needs of the state and the institutions and organic law provided to supply those needs.





3 1723 02050 9238