



THE LIBRARY OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF  
NORTH CAROLINA



THE COLLECTION OF  
NORTH CAROLINIANA

C378  
UK3  
1910V

UNIVERSITY OF N.C. AT CHAPEL HILL




00039136540

FOR USE ONLY IN  
THE NORTH CAROLINA COLLECTION

---





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2010 with funding from  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill



## ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT F. P. VENABLE

The University was re-opened in 1875—just thirty-five years ago. It had suffered greatly in the Reconstruction Period. The old faculty was dismissed, a semblance of instruction was given to diminishing numbers of students, dwindling also in age and preparation until the end was reached and the doors were closed. Sorrowfully the months went by and the storms beat on the untenanted buildings, shorn now of their glory, and with only the memory of the many noble sons who had once thronged their halls and gained there the strength and inspiration which made them great in their country's service. The winds and the rustling leaves whispered of Wilson, the devoted missionary; of Bishops Green and Otey and their great work for church and education; of James K. Polk, who had ruled the nation; of Leonidas Polk, the beloved Bishop-General; of Graham, who had so wisely ordered the opening of Japan; of Benton, the great Senator; of King, the Vice-President; of Murphey and Yancey and Wiley, who had wrought for the education of all the people; of Gaston and Badger and Ruffin, the great jurists; of Pettigrew and Vance and a host of others whose names now cluster as stars on the walls of Memorial Hall.

All were gone, the campus deserted, the buildings open to storms and wandering strangers, apparatus broken or carried off, and this mother of generations of noble sons sat desolate in the ashes of her past.

How long were these halls to lie silent to the tread of eager youth who would follow in the footsteps of their fathers? How long could the people of the State afford to have the training school of their leaders empty? How could the sons who loved her see their mother in helpless and shameless neglect? These were the cries that echoed throughout the State. The doors must be opened and the work begin again, was the answer. Out of the war stricken poverty her sons gave for her restoration, and out of a looted treasury the people of the State contributed to her support, and

the mother of the century past took up her work again that she might become the mother of the centuries yet to be.

And so, in 1875, with some half dozen strong, unselfish teachers, and little more than half a hundred students, the University began to rebuild its fortunes and to occupy again its sphere of service. Its equipment was very limited, and those were days of poverty and most rigid economy. We rejoice that he who so wisely, skillfully and lovingly directed the progress of the struggling institution is still with us in hale and hearty old age. I know of no one else who could have borne the burdens and safely weathered the difficulties of those trying days.

There were at least three reasons why the process of rebuilding was slow. In the first place, there was unwise opposition on the part of some who felt this to be demanded of them by loyalty to other institutions. This rose from a mistaken idea of competition and conflict of interests. It has taken many years for the truth to come out clearly that this is not competition in the unworthy sense, but rather an emulation in service which should be only noble and generous. As President Alderman once said, these institutions are like light houses sending out streams of light into the darkness of night. In the work of saving and the fight against the darkness of ignorance there is no time for unkind rivalry, but only for thankfulness that others are engaged in the glorious work. And another fact has become clearer with the years. The church institutions have not failed or suffered because of the re-opening of the University and its growth. On the contrary, they have prospered with the prosperity of the University, and as it grew and its influence strengthened, they, too, have grown until their halls are overflowing with those who seek in them their training. Personally I rejoice in their prosperity, and would bid them God-speed in their work. The University welcomes their aid in this work—a work so great that, as President Alderman has said, the very angels might envy men such service.

A second obstacle to the growth of the University, interfering with its proper support by the State, was the slowness on the part of the people to appreciate the value of education, and to realize that it was well worth paying for. The people were so poor that the



type of statesmen found most favor with them who summed up their highest state-craft in the opposition to all expenditure. Gradually they learned that they were too poor not to pay for an education, and a new generation of business men arose who understood that the success and prosperity of an individual depended upon the wise expenditure of money rather than the mere saving of it.

It was necessary, too, that out of that little band who gathered here at the re-opening, such men as Alderman, McIver, Aycock and Joyner, should come forth furnished for the service of the people that they might recognize the incomparable returns which could come from the insignificant expenditure in dollars and cents which their training had cost the State. The service of one such man, if it could be measured in terms of money, far outweighs all that the University may have cost the State. And instead of one, there are dozens, aye hundreds, of strong men who have been trained here for her service.

The third reason for meagre support was that the State was very poor and had little to give from her empty treasury. Those were hard and trying days, but they made for manly grit and strength and the simple virtues. The untiring industry and devotion of the President, the self-sacrificing labors of the faculty, the loyalty of the students were beyond all praise.

The first Constitution of the State declared that "all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities." More than a century later, the people of the State, descendants to the third and fourth generation of the brave men who won our freedom and framed this constitution, were facing the problem as to how this provision was to be carried out. The century had brought changed conditions and larger ideals. Scientific and practical training in agriculture and the technical trades and arts were demanded if we were to compete on equal terms with our neighbors and the higher education of women was their simple right which men had long denied them. Was there to be one University or more?

The one already established was struggling with poverty. Considerations of economy might have led to a strengthening of this

one, combining and concentrating all educational work at one centre, thus avoiding duplication and possible waste. There would have been abundant precedent for such action in the useful and growing institutions established in other States. Still the question was an open one. In some States the combination had not proved a success, and the University, aided by the Land Scrip Fund, on its re-opening had struggled in vain with the problem of developing the side of Agricultural Science.

Whatever were the considerations, the State decided to develop independently these three branches of education, one at Raleigh, and one at Greensboro, in addition to the one already established at Chapel Hill. I am convinced that it was a wise and far-sighted policy. I do not for a moment believe that the development which has been attained could possibly have been reached if concentrated at Chapel Hill. The State has contributed generously out of its limited means, and three men instead of one have given every thought and energy to this building up. The duplication, if any, has meant slight loss compared with the great gain in strength and purpose and power.

These three, the Normal College for Women at Greensboro, the Agricultural and Mechanical College at Raleigh, and the University at Chapel Hill constitute the State's Greater University, and the wise constitutional provision of the forefathers has been fulfilled. It is important that the people of the State and the institutions themselves should realize their oneness of purpose and destiny, their essential unity in everything except name and immediate control. They have been established that they might provide instruction in all useful learning for all the people. And back of these institutions is an extensive and costly system of primary and secondary schools.

Now, this is a large contract for the State to undertake, and involves a heavy financial burden. Let us look at it for a moment and see whether it is necessary for the State to do this. Every good business man would submit the proposition to a rigid questioning, and unless the State's affairs are conducted on business principles, all statecraft is in vain.

Our Government is of the people, by the people, and for the

people. Can those who believe in Democracy and hope for its success, face calmly the possibility of an ignorant people with untrained leaders? What would save them from the quack, the charlatan, the demagogue? How long would they remain a free people in the presence of designing and ambitious men? And can it be denied that while ignorance itself is not a vice, it is at the root of much of it? Our people's government can rise no higher than the people who compose it, and our liberty is absolutely dependent upon the enlightenment of the governed. If this is doubted, consider the relative possibilities of a republic in Winconsin and Liberia.

Then, too, in the sharp competition of the present, destined to be still more rigorous in the future, what hope would there be for North Carolina to keep up in the race with an untrained citizenship? Will any State deliberately choose to be the lowest rung on the ladder, a hewer of wood and drawer of water for the others, laboriously furnishing the raw material for the more skillful fingers and more ingenious brain to fashion into useful form? It surely is not necessary to delay further over these arguments, made familiar in every corner of the State by the recent campaign of education. No! we are all agreed now that the people, all the people, must be educated and trained to the fulfillment of the promise of all of their God-given powers.

Granted the need, then, can the State with any propriety, justice or hope look to any one else to do this work of educating her people? Remember that the system is one complete whole, each part essential, and all suffering in the injury to any part. First, there are primary schools for all the children; then secondary schools for the more gifted or the more fortunate, and then a further elimination and survival of the fittest, a small chosen band is left, about one in two hundred and fifty of the original number, to enter the tri-partite University. The Greater University will have no material to train unless the schools furnish it, and the schools can have no competent teachers, nor wise supervision and guidance, nor inspiration and hope, without the University. And who can say how greatly the coming of fit schools for all the people would have been delayed had not the

University trained, inspired, and sent forth such men as Murphey, Wiley, Alderman, McIver, and Joyner?

Can the churches undertake this great task and burden if the State declines the responsibility? To anyone who understands the situation, this means, of course, white churches, and a careful statistician stated the other day that the white churches included in their membership less than fifty per cent of the adult white population of the State. If the churches abandoned all evangelistic and similar noble work which they are trying to carry on in fulfillment of their great mission, they would still be unable to do this work of education as it should be done, and it is not just nor fair to lay the burden upon them. But there is still a graver question than the financial one. While church support might seek to instill more of religious forms in education, there are many divisions in the church, and it would much more surely introduce an era of dogma teaching with just such bitter animosity and hopeless breaches as were aroused in the Dutch Republic. Then, too, what is to become of the fifty odd per cent of the population which are neither members nor adherents of any church?

Practically, the only part of the field which the churches attempt to cover today is that of collegiate education, many of the secondary or high schools which they had built having been turned over to the State for lack of funds to support them. There are in the church colleges today about one half of the youth of the State who are seeking a real college education, and yet some of the denominations are taxing themselves to the utmost to do even this part of the work, as witness the strenuous efforts on the part of several of them to increase endowments which are avowedly much below their needs. I repeat that this is a good work, and the State welcomes their assistance. How far it is the wisest expenditure of their means is a question for the denominations themselves to decide.

If the State declines to educate her people, and the churches cannot, there remains but one other agency. The great task must be undertaken by some great philanthropist or group of philanthropists. Let us ask ourselves candidly, from what source such

aid would come to North Carolina. Who will pour out the necessary millions, and if these millions are forthcoming, who will control and direct the education given? Dare we place ourselves under such an obligation, and take any chances as to the subtle poison which may be instilled into the minds of our children under the guise of education? While I gladly welcome all generous aid to us in our work at the University, I would protest against the acceptance of any gift which would even partially divorce this institution from the support, the control and the love of the people of North Carolina who have founded it for their children and their children's children.

Two things would seem to be clear then: The work of education is necessary, and this work must be undertaken by the State. As the success of the government, the progress of the people and the future of our children depend upon its being well and thoroughly done, it is folly to talk of any half way measures. At all costs, the State must bend every energy to the carrying on of this work. Nothing can take precedence of it, nothing can be so important.

We are proud of the fact that a substantial school house has been built for every day of the past five years—that nearly two hundred thousand good books have been placed in the school libraries, in every part of the State, that the school term has been greatly lengthened, that high schools have been established in every county and are crowded by some 7,000 pupils, where a few years ago they numbered only a few hundred; that capable teachers are being secured and are better paid, and that the school fund has more than doubled in ten years.

Superintendent Joyner, in his report to the last Legislature, gives the total available school fund for 1906-1907 as \$2,863,217.79, and for 1907-'08 as \$3,294,230.70. In the same years the expenditures for teaching and supervision were respectively \$1,691,942.22 and \$1,845,357.98; for buildings and supplies the amounts were \$582,064.41 and \$804,587.78. The value of all school property in 1907-08 was \$4,917,312.000. These figures refer to the primary and high schools, and do not include the colleges.

What is the inspiration which can lead to such a generous outpouring of the people's money? What has convinced the people

that they must have this thing called Education, whatever it costs? One or two ideas must be clearly grasped before we can satisfactorily settle this question. First, education must be from above downwards. The logical relation is teachers first and then the taught. Our forefathers were right in establishing the University first. There could be no common school system without it, for it was necessary that the educated should be scattered among the people to create a sentiment in behalf of education; that these leaders in every community should show by their successful careers the practical value of an education, and that some of them should serve as teachers to impart to others the education which had been given them.

The light must filter from above downwards until no dark spot is left untouched. Some 1,500, or nearly 1-6 of all the teachers in the schools of North Carolina are college graduates, and one half of these are teaching in the rural schools. It is reasonable to suppose that a much larger number have had one or more years of college training.

Again, is it not true that these children are crowding into the lower schools because of the promise held out to them that they can go on from grade to grade and school to school, even through the big public school, which forms the keystone of the arch, drinking in all useful learning, and fitting themselves for the very highest service? Many will fail in this, but the inspiration is for all. Let us picture to ourselves the deadening effect if the promise failed with the high school and hope ended there.

The inspiration, the success, then, lie in the complete, rounded out system, and chiefly in the head of the system where the purposes and hopes are centered. Is it strange, then, that I am pleading that this all important head be made strong and worthy, able in every way to do its work? If the statements which we who are in charge of the divisions of the Greater University give as to condition and needs cannot be relied upon, then let others take up the work who are wiser, only do not permit the most vital interest of a great State to suffer through neglect.

What is the condition of higher or collegiate education? The three component parts of the Greater University have been estab-

lished and provided with moderate equipment. The money has, I believe, been wisely expended, and every dollar made to bring in its utmost return. The amount, however, has been much less than was deemed necessary in a majority of the other States, certainly in such as we would care to pattern after. I do not wish to stress too much the example of others, though we cannot safely ignore this. The more important question is whether these institutions have been equipped sufficiently for them to do their work properly and efficiently, and meet the demands made upon them. To neglect to do this is a positive injury to every child in the State, and a crucial mistake from a business standpoint. It is the testimony of those in charge of them that these institutions have been insufficiently equipped, and estimates of the cost of additional equipment needed have been submitted. They are simply overtaxed by the demands made upon them. Speaking for the Institution intrusted to my care, I may say that the dormitory accommodations are sufficient for a little more than one third of the present number of students, and most of these dormitories are in wretched repair. The recitation rooms are quite inadequate, and their limited number forbids the proper sub-division of the classes for the best work. New laboratories are urgently needed in several departments, and increased pay to hold the teachers already employed.

The University is suffering from its very success. Its halls are overcrowded, and the successful working of the State system of high schools means still further crowding in of those who would profit from the advantages it offers. Therefore, it has reached again a critical period in its history, and the question arises as it did at its re-opening, What are the people of the State going to do to make it possible for the work to go on? Can they afford to allow it to fail for lack of adequate support?

It is but just to the Legislatures of several sessions past to say that they have recognized the needs of these institutions and have done what was possible to meet them, considering the many demands for carrying on other work of the State, and the limitations of the State's treasury. The problem which is facing every

one now is whether this work shall be limited, other calls denied, or further means provided in some way.

In order that the financial stress of the University may be realized, and the difficulties which it has to meet in carrying on its work, I have secured for comparison, figures from one of the best known universities of the South, with which it might well be expected to compete in the character of service rendered.

	Income	Equipment
University of Virginia,	\$209,623	\$2,577,000
University of North Carolina,	146,161	798,000

These figures are taken from the Government Report for 1908-1909.

In the eighty-five years of its existence the University of Virginia has received from the State a total of \$1,894,667. In one hundred and fifteen years the University of North Carolina has received from the State for equipment and support \$892,000, only \$160,000 of which has been given for buildings, and no appropriation for a building was made before 1905.

The population of Virginia in 1900 was 1,854,184 and the assessed valuation of property in 1908 was \$541,456,220. The population of North Carolina in 1900 was 1,893,810 and the assessed valuation of property in 1909 was \$576,115,170.

In the statement of income of the University of Virginia no account is taken of the completion of its million dollars of endowment nor of the increased appropriation made by the State. This would make its income about 60 per cent greater than that of the University of North Carolina. I do not think that the figures require further comment.

I may add that the income of the University of Texas last year was \$543,977.22, or 360 per cent greater than that of the University of North Carolina.

I believe, however, that the citizens of North Carolina require no such incentive to do their plain and manifest duty to their children, and that they will grant to those who have their education in charge the means necessary for this all important work.

















