

**THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF
INDIANA. THE
CAUSES OF ITS WANT OF
PROSPERITY CONSIDERED**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649165780

The state University of Indiana. The causes of its want of prosperity considered by Lewis Bollman

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

LEWIS BOLLMAN

**THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF
INDIANA. THE
CAUSES OF ITS WANT OF
PROSPERITY CONSIDERED**

10
2518
.B7

THE

STATE UNIVERSITY
OF INDIANA.

THE CAUSES OF ITS WANT OF PROSPERITY CONSIDERED.

BY LEWIS BOLLMAN,
Of Bloomington, Indiana.

INDIANAPOLIS:
WM. H. BUBFORD, PRINTER AND BINDER.
1882.

To the Members of the General Assembly

of the State of Indiana:

GENTLEMEN—There is a general recognition of this fact, that the State University has now reached a crisis, demanding a wide departure from its past management.

Coming with President Wylie to it, when he became its President in 1829, I graduated in the class of 1831, and soon after became a citizen of Bloomington. Warmly attached to the University, I have closely watched the causes which have depressed it for more than half a century, and can no longer remain in opposition to these causes as a private individual, but must assume a more public position by placing before you, the representatives of the people, what I know are the true causes of its want of prosperity.

I do so in the pamphlet I now lay before you, hoping that, old as I am, I may still live to see my Alma Mater assume its true place, as the successful and honored head of that system of public instruction, which should be cherished by every citizen.

LEWIS BOLLMAN,

Bloomington, Indiana.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF INDIANA, AND THAT OF MICHIGAN COMPARED.

The most instructive knowledge we can acquire on the subject of the proper management of a State University will be found in a comparison of the State Universities of Indiana and Michigan. Both were endowed by Congress with two townships of land; both were located in retired and healthy localities, very similar in all respects; that of Indiana commenced its collegiate existence in 1829; that of Michigan in 1837. Yet in 1881-2 Indiana University had 155 students, and but a literary department only, while Michigan University had 1,534 students, with all the principal departments belonging to a University.

Why this almost complete failure of our own, and why this great success of that of Michigan?

I answer chiefly to four causes:

1. A better financial management.
2. A thorough appreciation of public instruction on the part of the Board of Regents (Trustees), and as thorough a presentation of it to the people of Michigan by this Board, by the Faculty, and by the Legislature.
3. By curbing all attempted sectarian interference with the University and the lower public schools.
4. By requiring fees to be paid by the students for the special instruction given to them.

In these four particulars will be found the causes that have made Michigan University the greatest in the United States, and Indiana University almost the least. I will consider them in the order stated.

1. *A better financial management.*

The endowment, as already stated, was two townships of land to each. In 1837, when Michigan University was established, the Board of Regents borrowed from the State \$100,000, and after repaying \$95,000 as interest, the State remitted the principal. Out of this fund the Regents erected four buildings, designed for residences of the Professors, for in the beginning they received but \$700 each as a salary. These buildings were subsequently used for University purposes, and were erected on grounds (40 acres) donated by the citizens of Ann Arbor. The Regents had not sold lands as yet. The minimum price of these was fixed by the Legislature at \$20 per acre. The first sales averaged \$22.85 per acre, yielding \$150,000.

But our Legislature, as early as 1827, ordered the sale of the two townships, except three sections of the Monroe township. The sale was by a Commissioner for each township, in 1827 by public sale; but in 1828 the lands could be entered at private sale, for not less than the minimum prices, which were—for first quality, \$3.50; second quality, \$2.25; and third quality, \$1.25 per acre.

Thus prematurely the lands were forced upon the market, and sacrificed. And this was the fate of the sixteenth sections, for common school purposes. Neither should have been sold for twenty-five years. The attempt to establish the College was as premature as the sale of the lands. It should have followed, not preceded, the successful establishment of the common schools, for it is the outgrowth of these.

When Congress donated to our State, lands in lieu of the Gibson township, the same indiscreet haste was seen in their disposal. The average price received for these was but \$3.30 per acre.

In 1839, a year of great financial distress, the demagogues had the supremacy in the Michigan Legislature, and it passed an act virtually reducing the price of the Michigan University lands to \$1.25 per acre. The Regents urged the Governor to veto the act, which he did, and in his able message, he denounced the action of the Legislature in terms so appropriate, that it never attempted to pass the act over the veto. That Governor will be honored as long as Michigan University has a history. Unfortunately for us we had neither such a Board of Trustees, nor such a Governor. But in 1840 nearly five thousand acres of the Michigan University lands were sold at the low rate of \$6.21 per acre by act of the Legislature, on the plea that actual settlers (well knowing the lands belonged to the University) had squatted upon them. Soon afterwards sales were made at \$17, \$18, \$19 and \$15 per acre; in 1841 the minimum price was fixed at \$15, and in 1842 at \$12.

The Michigan Legislature, like our own, interfered with the contract of the purchasers of the lands, losing to the University \$93,000. Had it adhered to the first minimum price of \$20, the townships would have brought \$921,000 instead of \$450,000, the amount realized from the Congressional grant.

The University of Michigan, for these errors of the Legislature, asked liberal donations for these losses. With what greater justice could our University make a like claim.

As an act of indemnity for these errors, the Legislature of Michigan in 1875 provided a permanent fund for the University in the shape of an annual tax of *one-twentieth* of a mill, but not to exceed \$50,000 in any one year. But the high prosperity of Michigan University was a strong incentive to this just and liberal course, but there exists no such incentive here.

The amount of interest now received annually from the lands sold by Michigan University is about \$39,000, while that received by Indiana University annually is from \$7,000 to \$8,000.

The following table will show the acres sold of the Gibson and Monroe townships, the amount refunded to the Vincennes University, and the amount from the lands given by Congress in lieu of the Gibson township.

From the Auditor of State's report for 1844:

Gibson township	Acres	23,093.30
Sold by Commissioner	"	16,848.95
Sold prior to 1827	"	4,055.60
Unsold	"	1,588.75
Monroe township	"	22,972.11
Sold by Commissioner	"	20,504.87
Sold of the three reserved sections	"	2,426.24
Unsold	"	41.00
Total loans		\$139,568.71
Refunded to Vincennes University		81,162.98
Leaving for Monroe township		\$58,162.98
Amount of lands sold in lieu of Gibson township,		76,686.00
Total		\$134,848.98

From Auditor's report for 1881, the total fund is \$136,694.52, yielding an annual interest of about \$8,000. As \$8,000 is to \$39,000, so is the mismanagement here to the better management of Michigan University in the selections and sale of the lands.

2. The second cause of the difference in the prosperity of these Universities is found in the knowledge and consequent appreciation of public instruction by the citizens of Michigan. A review of the means adopted to infuse this knowledge, will be as useful as it is interesting.

Michigan began its territorial existence in 1805. In 1817 its Legislature provided for a system of public instruction. At its head and under its control, was a University having power to establish a college in each county, now represented by our high schools. Thirteen departments were to compose the University, as follows: That of Literature, Mathematics, Natural History, Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, Chemistry, the Medical Sciences, the Ethical Sciences, Military Science, History, the Intellectual Sciences, etc. Common schools were also provided for. The University Act was most remarkable in its broad views. It is supposed to have been prepared by Judge Woodward, of the Supreme Court. As no existing collegiate institution in the United States furnished a model for it, it is thought that it was taken from a then recent report in France for such

an institution. The acting President of Michigan University, in his report of 1880, made a reference to it, which, in its proper connection, I will bring to the notice of the reader.

As the population of Michigan in 1817 was about 6,000 only, it will easily be seen that this act was premature so far as a speedy establishment of a University was concerned. Its immediate good is to be found in another direction—the early discussion of the subject of public instruction in all its branches. To aid this discussion, the Legislature of 1817 appointed two persons, at a salary of \$300 each, to deliver lectures to the people, and by these means they acquired a thorough understanding of the advantages of public instruction over private schools, or those under sectarian control. Among those zealous for public instruction was the Catholic priest at Detroit. His successor, I believe, was following his precedent, but he was speedily removed, lest his broader duties as a citizen might overcome the sectarian allegiance to his Church.

Many years ago, when Judge Kinney was selected to prepare a bill for the action of the Legislature for the reorganization of our common schools, I wrote an article on the subject, published in the Indianapolis Journal, and in its preparation I examined the common school systems of several of the States. To my great surprise, I found that Michigan had greater practical success than any other State—greater even than Massachusetts. The cause of it I could not then ascertain, and not until recently did I obtain the knowledge of these early efforts and their success in behalf of public instruction.

The people of Michigan were chiefly from New York and New England; the first class unacquainted with instruction in any form; the second, as it was united to sectarian institutions and directed by them. My native State of Pennsylvania, like New York, had not yet considered the subject of public education, and when it did, it found many sectarian schools for higher instruction, and to these it gave liberally. But now, although an old and wealthy State, with great industrial and commercial interests, it has no collegiate institution known at all outside of the State, except its medical schools in Philadelphia. This barren result was occasioned by that scattering policy, which wasted the appropriations in dead brick and mortar; the opposite policy of that pursued by Michigan. To a few individuals, therefore, like Judge Woodward, is Michigan indebted for that policy of concentration, so full now of great results.

In thus building up its public instruction, so successfully, the State of Michigan has given to the University \$570,000, and its real and personal property has a value of \$681,442. It has received generous gifts from individuals, which ours has not, because it is without success, and hence can not give assurance that any donations will be of permanent benefit.

But if Indiana had no public men in the early history of our University

to direct the minds of the people to the policy of public instruction, we find in the law of 1852, relating to the University, the following provision:

"One member of the Faculty to be designated by a majority thereof, of which the Secretary of the Board shall be informed, shall by himself or competent substitute, deliver a public lecture on the principles and organization of the University, its educational facilities (being careful not to disparage the claims of institutions of learning in the State), in at least fifteen different counties of the State, of which he shall give due notice; and in a vacation of less duration than one month, a member of the Faculty, to be designated as aforesaid, shall deliver such lecture in at least three different counties; a brief statement of which lectures, shall, by the person delivering them, be reported to the Board of Trustees annually, to be by them incorporated in the annual report to the General Assembly; but no two such lectures shall be delivered in the same county, until all the counties of the State have been lectured in."

As there were two vacations then of a month each, and two of one week each, the number of lectures here required would have been thirty-six annually. There ought also to have been reported for the annual catalogue four "brief statements" of them; thus a wide dissemination of the arguments for public instruction would have been secured. But this law has never been observed by the Faculty, nor enforced by the Board of Trustees. Why it has not, will be stated presently.

Nor has any other means been adopted to make the University known to the people since the death of President Wylie. His able discourses delivered wherever he was asked to go, and his equally interesting baccalaureates, not sermons, but his parting counsel to the graduating class, spoken just before he conferred the diplomas, gave the institution a high character, for all these were published.

President Moss declared to a meeting of the Alumni, that printed matter had no influence with the people. Accordingly we find that none of his baccalaureate sermons have been written—not even his inaugural address. All the former I have heard, and taken full notes of them, and not one of them did I wish to see in print. Nothing emanates from the University but the annual catalogue so prepared as not to contain the annual expenditures, nor any other matter of special interest, and but partially distributed. No discourses at the annual commencements, nor at any other time, are given in behalf of public instruction; but clergymen are brought here whose discourses uphold the idea, that all instruction, not pernicious, must begin and end in the church.

Nothing goes out from the University giving information of its management and the purposes of those controlling it, and hence it is, that we of Bloomington know no more of it than do the citizens of the remotest town in our State. We are told that even the graduates are not to in-