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ABSTRACT

Tuskegee, Achimota and the Construction of Black Transcultural Identity

Pamela Newkirk

Over the past four decades numerous scholars from a diverse range of fields, including history and comparative education, have turned to the transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model from the United States South to British colonial Africa to explore issues of global educational transfer and borrowing; nation-building; character education; and British colonial education policies. The primary goal of my dissertation is to consider this instance of educational transfer as a means of exploring the broader issues of black transcultural identity and black agency in education policy formation and implementation in the U.S. and in the Gold Coast.

The two black actors who figure prominently in this case study are Booker T. Washington, the president and founder of Tuskegee Institute, and his African counterpart, James E.K. Aggrey, a co-founder of Achimota who together became the public face of the model on two continents while they quietly nurtured a elite cadre of black professionals and activists beneath the façade of industrial education. Using education as a site of social, political and economic transformation, this dissertation will require attention to both the explicit and subtle activities of Washington and Aggrey beneath the façade of accommodation to the prevailing ideology of white elites.

This dissertation builds on emerging interdisciplinary scholarship on the African Diaspora that requires a new interpretative lens to assess the agency of subjugated blacks
who used myriad techniques to negotiate a dominant white ideology committed to black subordination to advance a broader black nationalist agenda.
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Introduction

While hundreds of African American schools offering traditional liberal arts courses sprung up following the Civil War, by the second decade of the new century industrial education emerged as the principal model prescribed for black students. Leading white educators, philanthropists, and government officials enthusiastically embraced what became known as the Hampton-Tuskegee model. Booker T. Washington, the most influential black leader of the era, became the leading proponent of a model that W.E.B. Du Bois and other black intellectuals insisted insured the continued subordination of African Americans. Still, in the prevalent discourse of white elites, industrial education was hailed as the most pedagogically sound way to instruct African Americans. Embedded in the arguments of white elites was the prevalent assumption that African Americans were socially, morally and intellectually inferior to whites. Indeed, much of the scholarship by those then considered the nation’s foremost authorities on race maintained that blacks, whether in Africa or the United States, trailed whites on the evolutionary scale of civilization.

“Negro Education: A Survey of Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States,” published in 1917 by the U.S. Education Bureau and the Phelps-Stokes Fund Education Commission, would for several decades influence the course of education for American blacks who overwhelmingly lived in the South. Based on an exhaustive survey of seven hundred and forty-seven African American schools in the South, the two-volume “Negro Education” concluded that many of the schools offered black students courses in Latin, history and mathematics that were irrelevant to their social reality. The report, written by the fund’s education director Thomas Jesse Jones, instead proposed a model that stressed
manual and industrial education with an emphasis on agriculture. The report coined the term “adaptive education” to describe the type of instruction believed most applicable to the environment, social status and ability of African Americans. It argued that adaptive education “requires decreasing emphasis on educational courses whose chief claim to recognition is founded on custom and tradition.”

The report ignored historical events, most notably more than two centuries of slavery and legally mandated illiteracy followed by the emancipation of a largely uneducated and landless lot without capital who were subjected to intense racial hostility and rigid racial barriers, for the inferior social status of blacks. The study instead attributed the social conditions of blacks to a distinct and presumably innate racial character that only a specific brand of education could address:

> The high death rate of the colored people, their ignorance and disrespect of simple physical laws, their perplexing economic and social status, establishes the claim of these subjects [sanitation, elementary science, history and civics] to a large place in the curriculum of their schools.”

It added:

> Modern educational practice recognizes without argument not only the economic but also the educational value of hand training. The economic value to the colored people is emphasized by the comparative poverty of the race, while the education result is even more necessary for the Negro than for the white since the Negro’s highly emotional nature requires on balance as much as possible of the concrete and the definite.

The report insisted that it was more important for black students to learn farming techniques than algebra; and sanitation than citizenship. “It is not so important that the pupil know how a president is elected as that he shall understand the duties of the health officer in his community.” It argued that while math instruction was essential, it questioned how necessary and how much was appropriate for black students.
To emotional groups, prone to action without adequate thought, thorough
practice in mathematical processes is essential ... The points of
doubt are on such questions as: How much time shall be devoted to the
various branches of mathematics. ... It is probable that the wise course for a
majority of these schools would be to require thorough knowledge of
fundamental arithmetical processes with sufficient skill for practical use,
special proficiency in the applications of arithmetic to the pupils'
occupations, with a limited amount of algebra and geometry to aid in
arithmetical processes.

It also stressed the scheme’s economic benefit to the South, saying:

To a people 73 percent rural, agricultural instruction is of vital importance.
Since 40 percent of all persons engaged in southern agriculture are colored, it
is apparent also that effective education of these people for rural activities is
essential to the welfare of the South.\(^8\)

Du Bois assailed the report in \textit{The Crisis}, the journal of the National Association for
the Advancement of Colored People, saying that schools like Hampton advise “young men
not to hitch their wagons to a star but to hitch them to mules.” Du Bois lamented the
enthusiastic reception by British officials who believed the findings might be applicable to
Africans in British colonies. “The English associations,” said Du Bois, “got the idea that Mr.
Jones represented expert scientific opinion in America and are placing great faith in his
decisions.”\(^9\) As an indication of the report’s sway, Woodson, the founder of \textit{The Journal of
Negro History}, later said the it set back Negro education for at least a generation and
“contributed to the rise of [Thomas Jesse Jones,] a man who has done the Negro almost as
much harm as Thomas Dixon did with the “Klansman.”\(^10\)

Jones and his acclaimed “Negro Education” were feted in the United States and
England and the report was followed five years later by the publication of a second Phelps-
Stoke Fund-financed study, “Education in Africa,” also authored by Jones and
commissioned by British authorities. Like the first report, “Education in Africa”
characterized blacks whether in the United States or Africa, as a monolithic, uncivilized, child-like race, predestined to perform manual labor. The report conversely posited Europeans as duty-bound apostles of civilization.

No permanent settlement of the African people or the very diligent problem of the Middle East – no settlement, indeed of the conflict of national ideas and social conceptions between civilized people – can be hoped for unless the civilized governments of the world, who are responsible for the education of their citizens, establish common machinery for adjusting in some measure their educational systems for considering even such matters as school curricula and text books, and above all, for coordinating the effect of these systems upon more backward peoples.”

Echoing prevalent sentiments that were purportedly rooted in science, the report portrayed as innovative its prescription for the education of colonized African subjects:

The time has passed when the old thesis can be successfully maintained that a curriculum well suited to the needs of a group on a given scale of civilization in one is necessarily the best for other groups on a different level of advancement in another country or section. This was the critical mistake generally made by New England in dealing with the Negro in the southern states of America immediately after emancipation.

These seminal reports influenced education policy for blacks in the United States and in the British colony of the Gold Coast in West Africa, culminating in 1927 in the official opening of the Prince of Wales College which infused its curriculum with many of the prescriptions set forth in Jones’ commission reports. Gold Coast Governor Gordon Guggisberg saluted the college, informally called Achimota after the town in which it was located, as the British colony’s educational masterpiece.
**Statement of the Problem**

Over the past four decades numerous scholars from a diverse range of fields, including history and comparative education, have turned to the transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model from the United States South to British colonial Africa to explore issues of global educational transfer and borrowing; nation-building; character education; and British colonial education policies. The primary goal of my dissertation is to consider this instance of educational transfer as a means of exploring the broader issues of black transcultural identity and black resistance and agency in education policy formation and implementation in the U.S. and in the Gold Coast. The two black actors who figure prominently in this case study are Washington, the president and founder of Tuskegee Institute, and his African counterpart, James E.K. Aggrey, a co-founder of Achimota who together became the public face of the model on two continents. To pursue this study, I look to emerging interdisciplinary scholarship on the African Diaspora that requires a new interpretative lens to assess the agency of subjugated blacks. Sheila Walker, for example, asks us to consider techniques of camouflage and dissimulation used by black subjects to negotiate over, under and around a dominant white ideology committed to black subordination. Walker calls our attention to “dissimulative resistance to imposed assimilationist efforts” in which black actors appear to conform on the level of visible behaviors, but “with different intentions, meanings and goals,” from the empowered.

Using education as a site of social, political and economic transformation, this dissertation will require attention to both the explicit and subtle activities of Washington and Aggrey beneath the façade of accommodation to the prevailing ideology of white elites.

This instance of global transfer invites a consideration of black identity beyond political,
cultural, and geographic boundaries and bridges the discontinuities of African subjects in Diaspora. Many scholars have explored black identity formation in Diaspora, including St. Clair Drake who saw the transatlantic slave trade, colonialism, and voluntary migration as necessary components of an African Diaspora consciousness. Joseph Harris similarly defined the emergence of a black identity based on African origin, dispersion, slavery, colonialism and social conditions. George C. Bond and Angela Gilliam posit social construction as “crucial elements in the process of domination, subjugation, resistance and collusion.” Earl Lewis understands identity formation as “a complex personal and social calculus in which people simultaneously add, subtract, multiply, and divide aspects of themselves in other than a predetermined manner.” All of these conceptualizations help us understand black transcultural identity as constructed, and as both externally imposed and as appropriated or otherwise negotiated as an act of resistance. For this inquiry, black transcultural identity will be examined through the prism of the Hampton-Tuskegee model and the way Washington and Aggrey perceived its efficacy for black people on two continents.

These considerations of identity can be applied in two ways: to probe the explicit identification of blacks with one another across geographical and class boundaries unified by historical oppression and a mutual quest for social, political and economic advancement. It can also apply to the appropriation of an externally imposed identity based on skin color and assumed inferiority, in order to devise a counter-hegemonic strategy. Identity formation, then, is a dynamic and elastic process that assumes agency and self-interest. Against this backdrop, I seek to answer the following questions:

- How did black American and African educators negotiate the black transcultural
identity that was externally imposed on them through the discourse and actions of white elites in the U.S. and British colonial Africa; and did they appropriate that identity as a counter-hegemonic strategy?

- How did black educators in the U.S. and the Gold Coast influence the formation and implementation of the industrial education model at Achimota and Tuskegee Institute, and in what ways did they perceive this implementation to be in their own interests?

This line of inquiry into black transcultural identity and agency may help us locate instances of subversion by black educators that have not been sufficiently explored in much of the scholarship on industrial or “Negro” education. It may help explain why, by 1930, the curricula at both Tuskegee and Achimota bore little resemblance to what had been outlined in school literature and in the discourse of philanthropists, government officials and black educators on two continents.

**Import and Rationale**

Paying closer attention to the ways the industrial education model was conceptualized by its white framers and transformed into practice by blacks in the United States and the Gold Coast will deepen our understanding of the agency of subjugated people. A close examination of activities at Tuskegee and Achimota heighten our understanding of these schools, and the role Booker T. Washington and Aggrey played in the development of colonial and American education policies on two continents early in the 20th century. This inquiry will build on the extensive scholarship on industrial education for blacks but will pay more sustained attention to the ways in which the industrial education model was negotiated by blacks through the adoption of the discourse of white elites. By peeling back the outer
layers of industrial education to unveil the inner-workings at these schools, this dissertation
problematizes the meanings associated with the Hampton-Tuskegee model in much of the
scholarship by historians and education comparatists, alike.

This exploration of black agency and transcultural identity will require an
examination of policy formation and implementation, and the tension between them, at
Tuskegee and Achimota. It will privilege the actions over the discourse of Washington,
Aggrey and their surrogates who played a lead role in promoting the model and its
international transfer to Africa. Given Washington’s towering role as the founding principal
of Tuskegee Institute, and the most prominent black American at the turn of the century, his
work at Tuskegee will be the focal point of the inquiry. In his time, the former slave was
widely celebrated by white elites for advocating to blacks the value of industry, thrift, and
accommodation to white social and political dominance. At the same time, for many blacks
across the Diaspora, he served as a vivid example of black self-empowerment. Aggrey, an
American-educated African minister and educator, echoed Washington’s “accommodationist”
rhetoric and, as a member of the Phelps-Stokes Fund’s Education Commission, aggressively
promoted the adaptive education model to a skeptical African public. In recent decades both
men have been widely characterized in the literature examining the global transfer as
problematic figures who compromised black advancement to curry favor with white elites.

Aggrey, the only black member on the Education Commission, became the co-
founder and assistant vice principal of Achimota, the highest position accorded a black
educator in the colonial system. While Washington died twelve years prior to Achimota’s
official opening, and Aggrey shortly thereafter, both men greatly influenced the character and
philosophy of the school. Following Washington’s death in 1915, he remained the public
symbol of industrial education and continued to figure prominently in three Phelps-Stokes Fund reports on education for blacks in the United States and Africa published between 1917 and 1922.

Through a close textual analysis of official discourse, personal statements and historical accounts I will explore the socio-economic-political realities that influenced the discourse on industrial education for blacks; how closely the public rhetoric of Washington, Aggrey and their subordinates mirrored policy implementation at Achimota and Tuskegee; and how closely the policy implementation advanced the goals espoused by leaders of explicitly political African Diaspora movements of the time. This line of inquiry will help uncover whether the public support of industrial education for blacks by Aggrey and Washington was, in reality, carefully constructed artifice which allowed them to create schools that facilitated the academic, economic, spiritual and political development of the African Diaspora. There are indications that the two men may have merely appropriated the rhetoric of accommodation to secure resources while clandestinely advancing a counter-hegemonic educational, political and economic strategy for blacks. This line of inquiry might prove particularly fruitful in the case of Washington whose ambiguity has long baffled scholars. Louis Harlan, Washington’s biographer and editor of his papers, once argued that Washington “was so complex and enigmatic, that historians do not know what to make of him. We have lost the thread we used to believe would guide us through this labyrinth.”

This dissertation attempts to rediscover and follow that thread. This inquiry seeks to deconstruct a model that scholars have liberally characterized in ways that oversimplify and obscure the role Tuskegee and Achimota played in the education and overall progress of blacks on two continents early in the twentieth century.
Meanwhile, existing scholarship on industrial education for blacks typically limits its scope to the U.S. South. Much of the scholarship that explores the transfer of the model from the U.S. to Africa focuses on how philanthropists and other white elites constructed a model that conformed to prevailing theories of black inferiority while sustaining white hegemony. By hegemony, I turn to Antonio Gramsci, who defined it as the dominance of one social group over another through a combination of coercion and a degree of consent from the subordinated through persuasion and the internalization and adoption of the dominant group’s values and ideology. However, in much of the literature exploring this instance of global transfer, Washington’s internalization and adoption of the ideology of white elites is assumed, while little attention is paid to his resistance and the ways in which he may have appropriated that ideology to serve the interests of blacks.

To delve more deeply into the educational activities of Washington and Aggrey beneath the façade of their discourse, I will interrogate the tension between their words and their actions, while highlighting their ties to explicitly counter-hegemonic leaders and movements that have been eclipsed by their rhetoric. Existing scholarship typically privileges the rhetoric of accommodation by Washington and Aggrey that has served to overshadow their ties to Pan African sentiments and actors. Much of the literature either posits them as simplistic pawns of the white elite, or as sophisticated operators who embraced an inferior model due to their conservative beliefs or self-serving interests. Few consider the plausibility that they merely appropriated rhetoric in the progressive pursuit of black social, political and economic transformation; and even fewer consider what actually occurred at Tuskegee and Achimota beneath the façade of industrial education. This is particularly curious given the extent to which Washington has been portrayed by numerous scholars as a politically
cunning and deceptive “wizard.” 24 Even those scholars have suggested that Tuskegee, and the schools modeled on it, were overwhelmingly devoted to the teaching of manual skills. Nor does much of the literature adequately investigate or successfully reconcile the dichotomy between the rhetoric of accommodation of Aggrey and Washington, and the extent to which they inspired leading Pan Africanists, including Marcus Garvey, John L. Dube, and Kwame Nkrumah. To that end, this inquiry seeks to reconcile the widely diverging characterizations of the men and the education models they helped popularize on two continents. It is only through a close examination of their words and deeds, and the actual activities at their schools, that one can hope to observe their resistance beneath the façade of accommodation to the ideology of white elites.

**Periodization: 1900 - 1930**

The years between 1900 and 1930, when the industrial model was vigorously debated by British colonial and United States government officials, black and white civic leaders and philanthropists, transferred from the United States and adapted during its implementation at Achimota College in colonial Ghana, is a particularly useful period in which to locate this study of black transcultural identity and agency. This period saw the ascent of anthropology as a professional discipline that both shaped and was shaped by prevalent racial attitudes. 25 As such, this period gave rise to the proliferation of scientifically endorsed theories of racial hierarchies that affirmed the superiority of whites and inferiority of blacks. These ideas lent credence to the popularization of disparaging cultural representations, discriminatory social policy and violence against blacks who were denigrated on stage, screen and in literature including in best-selling books like *The Negro a Beast* (1900); *A Leopard’s Spots* (1902); and
The Clansman: An Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan (1907). The film “The Birth of a Nation” (1915), based on The Clansman, glorified the Ku Klux Klan’s reign of terror on newly emancipated blacks, and was for three decades the nation’s highest grossing film ever. It was within this context that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded in 1909 to combat racial prejudice and secure full equality for blacks in the attainment of education, employment, housing, political and judicial rights. This organization also challenged media representations of blacks both through public campaigns and on the pages of its influential publication, The Crisis.

The period also witnessed the height of the progressive education reform movement in the United States that set off rigorous debates about how best to socialize former slaves and the huge influx of European immigrants into the nation’s workforce and democracy. The twin problems inspired concentrated attention by white officials, philanthropists and leading educators on the circumstances and educational needs of newly emancipated blacks and the largest influx of immigrants in the nation’s history. Within the greater reform efforts during the first three decades of the century was the social efficiency movement that maintained that education curricula should be differentiated and align with the aptitude and social roles of the students. Some of the leading lights of education, including John Dewey, debated the merits of a hierarchical system of differentiated, caste-like curricula that served as the intellectual underpinning of the Hampton-Tuskegee model.26

The period bears the indelible stamp of two of the century’s most influential African American educators, Booker T. Washington (1856 - 1915) and W.E.B. Du Bois (1867 – 1963) who together significantly framed the debate over how best to educate blacks in the U.S. and Africa. The fame of both men peaked at the dawn of the new century, Washington
in 1901 with the publication of *Up From Slavery* (1901) and Du Bois in 1903 with the publication of his *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) in which he challenges Washington’s leadership of the race.

On a global plane, the period followed the partition of Africa into new states during the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, which sparked calls for unity among Africans from different cultures and regions who began to see themselves as Africans rather than merely as members of different regions or tribes. This is a period of intense international attention to Africa, and the role Europe and the United States would play in the “civilizing” of its people. This civilizing mission was underscored in the covenant of the League of Nations when it was incorporated in 1919. The covenant explicitly made provisions for the administration of “backward peoples.” This civilizing mission was echoed in Phelps-Stokes reports, including “Educational Adaptations: Report of Ten Years Work of the Phelps-Stokes Fund 1910 – 1920,” which said:

“The survey of Negro education is an answer to the world challenge, ‘How is American democracy to meet this test of its wisdom and idealism? Will the people of the United States work out an educational policy that will inspire the world to a more real sense of interrresponsibility?’”

The early years of the twentieth century were also marked by fluid transnational activity by leaders across the African Diaspora who sought to address the political, economic, educational and social needs of black people the world over. The first Pan-African Congress in 1900, convened in Paris, demonstrated the quest by African descendants to mobilize around their common plight and identity as oppressed people in African colonies and across the trans-Atlantic. Three more congresses in 1919, 1921 and 1927 also influenced the direction of education policy in the U.S. and in Africa. In 1912 Washington would hold
his own International Conference on the Negro. During his keynote address he stressed the fruitfulness of African and African-American relations. Among the conference participants were representatives from the Gold Coast, East Africa, Liberia, Nigeria, Rwanda, and South Africa. Washington’s plans to tour Europe to initiate talks between African and colonial leaders were aborted by the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

Numerous groups and individual leaders also emerged during this time, including William Lee Hansberry and William R. Steen who organized the Ethiopian Research Council in the United States; C.L.R. James, who organized the International Friends of Ethiopia in London, with branches in the United States and the Caribbean; George Padmore, of Trinidad and Ras Makoneten, of Guyana, who organized the International African Service Bureau in London. This transnational Pan African activity was fueled in part by the global activities of Europeans, particularly the Treaty of Versailles which officially ended World War I and resulted in the massive realignment of African states and cultures that had been German territories. The treaty made the colonies of Germany the common property of the League of Nations, which gave control of East Africa and part of Cameroon to Great Britain; Togoland to France; and Namibia to South Africa.

This period also saw close contact between black students from both continents. During the early years of the twentieth century dozens of African students, mainly supported by missionaries, went to the United States to attend black schools in the South. Aggrey and Kwame Nkrumah, the future president of newly independent Ghana, the former Gold Coast colony, were among them. This influx of African students presented a unique opportunity for transnational contact between blacks on both continents. Before this time, the average African American and African were separated by several generations and had limited contact
with one another. Other movements, including Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association, emphasized unity and pride among black people the world over. Garvey was among the African Diaspora leaders inspired by Tuskegee and Washington’s self-help message. The impact of these and other events and movements on black transnational consciousness, and thus on transcultural identity and education policy formation and implementation, is important to consider given that blacks on both continents embraced education as a means of social, political and economic transformation.

**Conceptual Framework**

As already noted, this dissertation is largely informed by emerging interdisciplinary scholarship on the African Diaspora. This scholarship insists that Africans and African Americans be situated as central and self-defined actors beyond nationally or socially constructed boundaries and outside the conventional frame of historical knowledge that marginalizes or renders invisible African people. Robin D.G. Kelley highlights the myriad forms of resistance by oppressed black actors that has typically eluded political history. Kelley sheds light on the social spaces, forged by oppression, segregation, and cultural memory that provided a place for African descendants to plan and hide. Kelley expounds on the benefits of these spaces while expanding our understanding of resistance that encompasses everything from “footdragging to sabotage, theft at the workplace to absenteeism, cursing to graffiti.” This more expansive definition of resistance allows us to pay closer scrutiny to inconsistencies and half-truths by oppressed black actors that have previously confounded scholars. Borrowing from anthropologist James C. Scott, Kelley stresses the vital importance of the “hidden transcript” manifested in folklore, songs, and
cultural practices that constitute “infrapolitics” or the intentionally evasive acts of resistance by the oppressed. Decoding this transcript requires what Kelley and Scott call “history from below” that pays sustained attention to commonly overlooked forms of resistance outside of the traditional notion of organized political institutions. “If they [historians] had looked deeper beyond the veil, beyond the public transcript of accommodation and traditional protest, they would have found more clamor than silence,” Kelley argued. Tuskegee, a segregated school with all black teachers and administrators, can be seen as one of these elusive social spaces that requires a close reading of both its hidden transcript and infrapolitics. Much of the scholarship instead privileges the public transcript, one that might intentionally conceal the goals and actions of oppressed actors. “[T]he political history of oppressed people cannot be understood without reference to infrapolitics, for these daily acts have a cumulative effect on power relations,” said Kelley.

Walker too contends that this broader perspective on black actors “has made visible, noticeable, and significant what had been invisibilized, gone unnoticed, and been deemed insignificant.” This wider lens and acute attention to less overt signs of resistance invites a reinterpretation of a wide swath of literature that forms the basis of our knowledge of Booker T. Washington, James E.K. Aggrey, the Hampton-Tuskegee model, Negro education in the United States South and British colonial Africa, and African American agency and resistance. Walker too considers agency beyond the overt actions of black actors. For example, she asks us to consider techniques of camouflage and dissimilation used to negotiate a dominant white ideology committed to black subordination. She argues that Africans and their descendants cloaked African Diaspora meaning in “Eurogenic garb” as a
strategy to deceive the powerful into believing they had acquiesced to their ideology. This framing is particularly useful for revisiting the words and actions of Washington and Aggrey.

Heightened attention to Walker’s strategy of “dissimulative resistance” allows us to reconsider the appearance of conformity to a dominant white ideology by Washington and Aggrey, but with different intentions than the white framers and patrons of industrial education for blacks. Similarly, in his theory of hybridity, Homi Bhabha cautions that, when analyzing the actions of the colonized, we must account for their apparent conformity and political ambiguity as the by-products of coercion. Said Bhabha:

Hybridity shifts power, questions discursive authority, and suggests that colonial discourse is never wholly in the control of the colonizer. Its authority is always reinflected, split, syncretized and to an extent menaced by its confrontation with its object.37

So rather than view the actions of oppressed actors at face value, one must be mindful of the constraints that inspire their actions, and assume that forms of resistance, however evasive, somehow defy authority. Furthermore, Kelley implores scholars to reject the kind of essentialism that ignores the cultural hybridity and complexity of African Americans and the African Diaspora.

When examining the agency of black actors in Diaspora, historian Earl Lewis also reminds us to look beyond obvious signs of resistance. Only then might we unearth the ways blacks negotiated the limitations of subjugation. “‘Agency,’” argued Lewis, “has come to mean not only unbridled resistance but also slow, irregular patterns of advance and regress, each in a dialectic working toward a synthesis.”38 Agency, then, will be explored by closely analyzing the way Aggrey and Washington appropriated prevalent perceptions of the industrial education model and black people to shape and implement policy at their schools.
This wider frame allows a fuller picture of the way black actors negotiated white supremacy and racial subordination to advance the social status of blacks in the U.S. and the Gold Coast, even as they appeared to conform to white supremacist ideals. Likewise, in recognition of the under-explored agency of black actors, industrial education will be reconsidered less by the way it was imagined by white actors, and more by the aims and intentions of black actors themselves.

Kelley, Bhabha, Walker, Lewis and other scholars recognize the need to delve beneath the surface of apparent conformity by colonized subjects to uncover evidence of their underlying resistance to their oppression. So rather than assume the public transcript reveals their politics, we need to consider the social, economic and political environment of oppressed actors, and the realm of possibility given their specific circumstances. Or, as Kelley said: “Politics is not separate from lived experience or the imaginary world of what is possible: to the contrary, politics is about these things.” 39 Much of the scholarship on Washington and Aggrey has privileged the public transcript while ignoring or not adequately addressing the infrapolitics influencing their actions. This dissertation, then, will attempt to situate the actions of Washington and Aggrey in the context of their lived experiences, while attempting to unearth and decipher their hidden transcripts from below.

Embedded in the scholarship on blacks in Diaspora is a recognition of converging, diverging and overlapping realities, identities and cultural meanings that will be applied to my dissertation. 40 A trans-Atlantic, transnational, African Diaspora framework privileges ideas, attitudes, cultural meanings, strategies and innovations that have rarely received prominent or sustained attention in the scholarship examining this global transfer.
The arguments in this study will draw on the dominant theories that informed education policy in British colonial Africa and the United States early in the 20th century. As such, this dissertation will require a review of some of the prevalent ideas and social theories that shaped education and social policy in Europe in the United States early in the century. These theories, including social efficiency, functionalism and Lewis Henry Morgan’s evolutionary scales, were promoted by many of the celebrated scholars of the day including G. Stewart Hall, David Snedden, Franklin H. Giddings, and John Dewey. Most of the theories were rooted in the ideology that Europeans and their descendants were at the forefront of civilization and that “Western” notions of capitalism and industrialism were desirable, universal and transferable. These theories also saw change as linear and progressive– with Europe at the apex of progress and civilization, and Africans and their descendants at the base. I will attempt to show how these theories, promulgated by social conservatives and progressive elites alike, depicted Africans and their descendants as inherently inferior, child-like and uncivilized due less to historical events and social conditions than biology and Darwinian notions of evolution. Many of the scholars who gained prominence at the turn of the century were swayed by some aspect of social Darwinism and differed mainly over whether Africans had the same potential as Europeans to reach an idealized state of civilization. Much of the literature on industrial education written during this period by leading white educators from the Untied States and Great Britain was rooted in this worldview of race – a worldview that was used to justify slavery, colonialism and, industrial education for blacks on both continents.

The Phelps-Stokes Fund Education Commission, led by Thomas Jesse Jones, promoted the view that African people were backward but, unlike more conservative elites,
also believed they had the potential to overcome their immorality and cultural deprivation if they followed the tenets of Washington. The commission stated:

The service of Booker Washington reveal the possibilities of men of African blood, qualities of mind and soul they may attain and the peculiar value of their contribution to human welfare. Booker Washington’s life and work personify the methods, principles and the ideas necessary for those who would work for Africans.”

Critical to my study is an appreciation of the dominant ideology rooted in European supremacy and African subservience, and the ways in which black actors negotiated and contested that overarching ideology on two continents. Louis Althusser defined ideology as “a socially embedded phenomenon that translates into the imagined relationship of individuals to their real conditions of life.” Althusser contended that ideology supersedes the role of the family and underlies all ideas and action. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron uncovered the role education played in the perpetuation of domination and inequality under the guise of reason and fairness. In *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture, (1970)*, they argued that individuals interact with their social world through their “habitus” – their inculcated values, beliefs, and cultural capital – and argued that schools aim to preserve the dominant class and legitimize and replicate inequality. Bourdieu also located the tensions between human agency and the structural restraints that bound and constrain it. These concepts of schools as sites of social reproduction, help frame industrial education as conceived by its framers, rather than by how black educators negotiated that conception.

In this study, I will explore the role white ideology played in the framing of black transcultural identity, while focusing on the ways in which this identity was negotiated by black actors. Allison Blakely argues that the social construction of a distinctive black racial
group was engineered by Europeans; not the descendants of Africa. The construction in European oral and written traditions emphasizing skin color was followed by the stigmatization of blackness, and the promotion of racism through scientific theories. Sociologist Benjamin P. Bowser cautions scholars not to remove these scientific theories or the academy from a neutral space, but to place them in a political and economic context. He argues that the social sciences advanced in England and the United States at the turn of the century were founded on a defense of the newly evolving industrialism, colonialism and racial subjugation. Many of the popular ideas in the academy relied on the conservative economic and social theories promoted by Locke, Montesquieu, Hume, Smith and Spencer. These conservative views, he maintains, supported societies that were economically dependent on colonialism and racial subjugation. This worldview was explicitly spelled out in the Phelps-Stokes study entitled “Educational Adaptations:” that said:

The education of the Negro is being increasingly recognized as a public duty. A statement issued by the Southern University Race Commission clearly recognizes that "the South cannot realize its destiny if one-third of its population is undeveloped and inefficient." Similarly Dr. [C.T.] Loram contends in a weighty chapter that not only the dictates of humanity and of Christianity, but the moral, social and economic interests of the white race require the education of the native population of South Africa. The educational task will in the future require the effective co-operation of three factors: the State, missionary and philanthropic effort, and the contribution of the Negro race."

The economic imperative of African education was also noted in “Education in Africa,” which said: “Civilization, exhausted by the destruction of war and the confusion of an unsettled world, looks to Africa to help replenish its resources.” Similarly, the Report on Negro Education maintained:

To a people 73 percent rural, agricultural instruction is of vital importance. Since 40 percent of all persons engaged in southern
agriculture are colored, it is apparent also that effective education of these people for rural activities is essential to the welfare of the South.49

Moreover, Robin D.G. Kelley reminds us that political motivations co-exist alongside issues of economic well being, safety, and freedom of mobility. The specific social, economic and political realities of blacks and whites in the U.S. South and in British colonial Ghana therefore provide essential context for this study. This context helps illuminate the motivations and intentions of the strategies employed by Washington and Aggrey.

Research Methodologies

My study examines the ways in which black actors negotiated hegemony beneath the façade of compliance. Antonio Gramsci defined hegemony as the indirect domination of people through political and legal power, but also relations of production and forms of consciousness and agency.50 By highlighting the tension between the public and I will seek to determine whether Washington implemented the policies as conceived by white elites, as much of the literature assumes, or if he mimicked the dominant discourse while subverting industrial education policies at Tuskegee. I will draw on historical accounts and archival material including correspondence, journals, newspapers, school records and bulletins to analyze the educational discourse of colonial and education officials, philanthropists and other framers of education policy in Great Britain, the Gold Coast and the United States. I will consult volumes such as Who’s Who of the Colored Race, published in 1915; school archival material, alumni records, biographies and other accounts by Tuskegee and Achimota students, faculty and administrators to review the curricula and assess the outcomes of students who attended the respective schools between 1900 and 1930.
Research and Methods of Analysis

For early records on Achimota, I reviewed archival material at Rhodes House Library at Oxford University, and the National Archives and Achimota School, both in Ghana. For the correspondence of James Aggrey, I consulted the archives at the University of California at Berkley; the James Aggrey Papers at Howard University Moorland Spingarn Library, and the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library. The Schomburg Center also had the nearly complete set of annual reports for Tuskegee Institute between 1888 and 1930 along with the records of the Phelps Stokes Fund; along with the letters of many influential blacks, including Aggrey, Du Bois, Garvey, Arthur Schomburg and John Bruce. I also reviewed the Booker T. Washington Papers, which include his speeches, correspondence, and other published and unpublished writings. In addition I read a wide range of literature related to Washington, Aggrey, Negro education, and black social movements during the period under review.

Through a close textual analysis of official discourse, personal statements, and historical accounts I will attempt to locate the agency of Washington and Aggrey by highlighting subtle and explicit signs of resistance to the dictates of their elite white patrons. I will also look for clues that may help determine whether Washington, Aggrey and their subordinates worked to appropriate an externally imposed identity to advance the cause of Africans and African Americans. I will attempt to answer questions such as:

1) How closely did the policies at Achimota and Tuskegee mirror the public rhetoric of Booker T. Washington and J.E.K. Aggrey?
2) How closely did the actual instruction at Tuskegee and Achimota follow the education policies publicly articulated by Washington and his patrons?

3) What contradictions between Washington and Aggrey’s public and private behavior suggest the possibility of subversion?

4) How did Pan African leaders perceive Tuskegee, and what connections, if any, did Washington and Aggrey have to the Pan African movement?

5) Who attended Tuskegee and Achimota?

6) Did Washington and Aggrey embrace or appropriate an externally imposed identity?

By the conclusion of this inquiry, I hope to illuminate how black educators fashioned and implemented education policy at Tuskegee and Achimota beneath the veil of the Hampton-Tuskegee model.

Validity Issues

To avoid bias and selective use of texts, I attempted to review a wide range of scholarship and primary documents that both support and invalidate my own theories and preconceptions. I specifically strove to include scholarship and letters that challenged my own conclusions or threaten the validity of my findings. When reviewing the correspondence of Aggrey and Washington, I attempted to include any letters that challenged my findings. I also attempted to review accounts of events from as many sources and perspectives as possible by consulting journals, memoirs, diaries, newspaper accounts, and correspondence.
Limitations of Study

My dissertation examines the global transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model from the United States to the Gold Coast, and the activities of Washington and Aggrey as leading proponents of industrial education for blacks. I seek to explore how they and their subordinates implemented policy at Tuskegee and Achimota, between 1900 and 1930. My findings will not apply to other industrial schools, nor can the arguments apply to other black supporters of industrial education during the period. Further research would be necessary to determine whether there were instances of subversion by other educators during the formation or implementation of the model at other schools; or during other periods.
Chapter 2

Hampton, Tuskegee and the Making of a Model

For nearly a century scholars have commonly cited Hampton and Tuskegee as exemplars of what is commonly referred to as the Hampton-Tuskegee model. In this chapter I will explore the development of these schools and the way scholars have typically framed the model attributed to them. By teasing apart the principals, the schools, and the periods and socio-political realities that shaped them, I hope to show why it is necessary to view Hampton and Tuskegee independently and beyond the limited historical role ascribed to them. Both are understood to function primarily as schools that offered black students teacher training and manual instruction to prepare them for work in agriculture and trades. However, viewing the schools as interchangeable archetypes of the vocational education model has prevented scholars from exploring what actually transpired at Tuskegee, or the commonalities and differences between the school that Armstrong created in 1868, and the one that Washington founded thirteen years later.

Such an inquiry requires acute attention to the different historical periods, as well as the divergent worldviews and aspirations of Armstrong and Washington based on their respective races, social status and experiences. The depiction of Tuskegee as the antithesis of liberal arts colleges, and Washington as wholly acquiescent to the white South, has framed much of the scholarship on Negro education. A reconsideration of that prevailing view requires the kind of interpretative framework advanced by Sheila Walker. She draws attention to techniques employed by African American subjects, including *dissimulative resistance* “to conform on the level of visible behaviors, but with different intentions,
meanings, and goals from those intended by their enslavers.”¹ It is this dissimulative resistance in relation to education policy formation that I seek to highlight.

**Hampton Institute**

On April 1, 1868, Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute opened with fifteen African American students in Hampton, Va. Samuel Chapman Armstrong (1839 – 1893), the school founder and principal, was a former Union Army officer who after the war was appointed an agent for the federal Bureau of Refugees, Freemen and Abandoned Lands. The agency, commonly called the Freedmen’s Bureau, had been created by President Lincoln in 1865 to help resettle blacks and stabilize the war-ravaged South.² Among the primary missions of the agency was to provide emergency food and aid, and to establish schools for the largely destitute and uneducated black populace.

Armstrong established Hampton with the support of the Freedmen’s Bureau and the American Missionary Association, an abolitionist and inter-denominational organization that had already founded or supported 285 anti-slavery churches and the opening of 500 schools for blacks. While Hampton was not the first industrial school, it was the first successful one devoted to teaching former slaves the value of hard work, buying land, thrift, Christianity and learning trades.³ Armstrong believed such an education could help combat the race’s “shiftlessness, extravagance, and immorality,” while preparing them for their role as laborers in the southern economy.⁴

Armstrong belonged to the conservative wing of the southern Reconstructionists who supported black disfranchisement, segregation and civil inequality. In *The Southern Workman*, the paper he created as the school’s official newspaper, he derided black
politic
rians and voters, arguing that they were morally deficient and ill-prepared to retain
offices or voting rights. But while many Southern planters also wished to deprive blacks of
a formal education, Armstrong saw Hampton as a way to both socialize blacks and provide
the South with a more highly skilled and productive workforce. “The Eastern states have the
capital and experience while the South has the cheap labor,” he argued. “To bring the two
together is to cement a real peace between their sections.”

Hampton opened during a period that was pregnant with promise for African
Americans. That year, ratification of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution overturned the
U.S. Supreme Court decision denying them citizenship. Eleven years earlier, in Dred Scott
vs. Sanford, the U.S. Supreme Court voted 7-2 against granting a man the right to sue on the
grounds that as an African American he was not a citizen. In his majority opinion, U.S. Chief
Supreme Court Justice Roger B. Taney based his decision on his interpretation of how blacks
were regarded by the framers of the Constitution:

“They [blacks] were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class
who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and had no rights or privileges
but such as those who held the power and the government might choose to grant
them. They had for more than a century been regarded as beings of an inferior
grade, and so far inferior that they had no rights which the white man is bound to
respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his
(the white man’s) benefit.”

Still, immediately following the Civil War African Americans began to assert their freedom
by running and being elected to state legislatures across the country. However by 1877, the
doors of opportunity that had cracked open in 1863 slammed shut as a ferocious backlash
ignited a wave of anti-black violence and intimidation. The period known as Reconstruction
effectively ended in 1877 when President Rutherford B. Hayes ordered the withdrawal of
federal troops that had protected black voters from violence and intimidation. With the black vote suppressed, white majorities regained control of state legislatures and immediately set about the task of erasing the rights blacks had gained after the war. That same year Lewis Henry Morgan (1818 – 1881) would root a prevailing view of black inferiority in science with his seminal *Ancient Society* in which he laid out his theory of human progress along an evolutionary scale. At one end of the scale were Anglo Saxons, who were considered the most evolved, and at the opposite end were, Africans, who were characterized as savages. Chinese and Indian people were labeled barbaric, and placed in the middle.\(^7\) Charles Darwin, among others, considered Morgan America’s most eminent social scientist.\(^8\) As an indication of his stature, Friedrich Engels, in his influential *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* would include as a subtitle “based on the findings of L.H. Morgan.”

By 1881 thousands of blacks, many brutally coerced into peonage, had begun to flee the rural South.\(^9\) Alabama passed a series of laws that criminalized black life, including one against vagrancy, and another that mandated black men seeking new employment to obtain discharge papers from their previous employer.\(^10\) The revelation of widespread re-enslavement triggered a congressional inquiry and President Garfield, in his inaugural address that year, vowed to ensure “so far as my authority can lawfully extend” that blacks enjoyed the “full equal protection of the Constitution and the laws.”\(^11\) However, he was assassinated on July 2, 1881 – just one hundred and twenty days into his presidency – and died eleven weeks later. His successor, President Chester Arthur, in his first address to Congress, supported measures to exclude illiterate blacks – or the majority of southern blacks – from voting. It was within a climate of terror and retrenchment that Booker T. Washington, a former slave, Hampton alumnus and Armstrong protégé, opened Tuskegee Institute in
Alabama’s Black Belt in 1881. In the sixteen years since the end of the Civil War, Alabama was recovering from $500 million in losses, widespread bankruptcies, the crippling loss of slave labor, and virulent white rage that found expression in vigilante gangs, organized militias, and state-sanctioned involuntary black servitude.\textsuperscript{12}

**Tuskegee Institute**

Tuskegee was the brainchild of Lewis Adams, an African American blacksmith who operated an informal trade school for black youth in the center of town. Washington described him as “the leading colored citizen in Tuskegee who enjoys the highest respect and confidence of the citizens of both races.”\textsuperscript{13} Adams was concerned that young blacks were not being taught trades, including blacksmithing and masonry, that their ancestors had dominated for decades. The positions were increasingly being filled by the new immigrants pouring in from Europe. When Adam’s shop was no longer large enough to meet the demand for training local youth, he leveraged his ability to turn out the black vote for two white Democrats on the Alabama State Legislature, in exchange for their support of a trade school for African Americans. Once elected, W.F. Foster and A.L. Brooks, made good on their promise to secure an annual appropriation of $2,000 to operate a school for blacks. On November 16, 1880 Brooks introduced the bill appropriating the money to pay the salaries of teachers of the new school, which passed in the House in December and in the State Senate in February 1881 and signed into law by Governor Rufus Cobb.

When asked to suggest a principal for the new school, Armstrong recommended Washington, his former student and twenty-five-year-old protégée. Four months later, in June 1881, Washington arrived to the picturesque town characterized by colonial mansions and
businesses that catered to the town’s wealthy and former slave-holding barons. It was nestled in the Black Belt, a stretch of fertile cotton farmland that spanned from South Carolina through Georgia and Alabama to Mississippi and Louisiana. A white reporter describing the town in 1895 wrote:

A few hours south of Atlanta, you will find a beautiful little Southern town so situated on the uplands that the old cotton planters built themselves fine mansions there as summer resorts from the plantation heat, for, be it known, it takes heat to grow cotton – heat long and fierce. There they established a flourishing seminary for young ladies and a court house, market place and churches, as well as tall pillared houses, all testifying to the aristocratic atmosphere of the place.\(^{14}\)

Washington also noted Tuskegee’s beauty and affluence:

“I find Tuskegee a beautiful little town, with a high and healthy location. It is a town such as one rarely sees in the South. Its quiet shady streets and tasteful and rich dwellings remind one of a New England Village.”\(^{15}\)

But in the shadow of affluence were rows of shacks occupied by former slaves.

“The huts in which they dwelt were often but little better than pig-styles, their food was scant and poorly cooked, they lived as they had in the days of slavery, an entire family in a cabin in a single room,” wrote Washington.\(^ {16}\) Of the racial climate, he said:

“The discussion of the Negro as a menace to civilization was common in conversation as well as in the press … Numerous theories obtained as to the ultimate result of this, none of which was favorable to the unfortunate blacks.”\(^ {17}\)

Furthermore, Washington arrived to find that no land, buildings, equipment or funding to procure them, had been set aside for the school. Adams arranged for Washington to use a 40-ft. by 14-ft. dilapidated shanty near the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church and on Monday, July 4, 1881 Tuskegee Normal School for the Education of Colored Teachers opened with thirty students and one teacher.\(^ {18}\) It was just two days after President James
Garfield’s assassination had plunged the nation into a period of mourning and prayer.

“There were about 25 or 30 for examination that morning,” recounted William Gregory, of his first day of class. “They were all very old too. All of them were teachers, who had been teaching in the little towns.”

The following week the school was moved to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church (later called Butler Chapel A.M.E. Zion Church), and the student body expanded to about forty students. In August, Washington was joined by Olivia A. Davidson, a graduate of Hampton Institute and Framington Teachers College in Massachusetts. Washington considered Davidson, who he later married, a school co-founder.

Tuskegee quickly grew, beginning with the purchase that fall of an abandoned 100-acre plantation about a mile from town. General J.F.B. Marshall, the treasurer of Hampton Institute, loaned Washington the $250 down-payment, with the remaining $250 due within a year. Said Washington:

“I lost no time in getting ready to move the school on to the new farm. At the time we occupied the place there were standing upon it a cabin, formerly used as the dining room, a old kitchen, a stable and an old hen-house. Within a few weeks we had all of these structures in use.”

Construction of the first building, a three-story frame boarding house, commenced on July 1, 1881 and was occupied by mid-1882. Named Porter Hall in honor of benefactor Alfred H. Porter, it housed, in addition to dormitories, a library, reading room, administrative offices, a chapel, six recitation rooms, dining room, kitchen and laundry. The first service was held in the chapel on Thanksgiving Day, 1882, before the building was fully completed, in part by student labor. Porter Hall was followed in 1884 by Alabama Hall, a dormitory for 100 girls that was completed and occupied in 1885. Constructed of brick, the 43 by 76-foot, four-story
building housed a kitchen, laundry, parlor, and reading room. Just as they had at Hampton, Tuskegee students actually made the bricks and built the hall, with the assistance of Washington.

“We worked day and night,” recalled William Gregory. “Even Mr. Washington went down and worked in the bricks whenever we had back luck.”

Tuskegee’s greatest expansion occurred between 1886 and 1900 with the construction of twenty-one buildings, including Armstrong Hall (1896), Phelps Hall (1892), Thrasher Hall (1893) the Chapel (1896) and the stately 283-ft. by 315-ft. brick Armstrong-Slater Memorial Agricultural Building (1897). During that time Washington also established the Annual Tuskegee Negro Conference and a hospital in Greenwood Village, the adjoining hamlet.

**Washington’s Public Face**

By 1884 Washington was already a prominent educator following his address to four thousand members of the National Education Association in Madison, Wis. When Armstrong died in 1893, Washington, by then a successful fundraiser and orator, became the chief proponent of the Hampton-Tuskegee model. That year, the popular magazine *Outlook* published Washington’s picture with an article on the nation’s leading college presidents. He appeared alongside Charles William Eliot of Harvard, Timothy Dwight V of Yale, and William A. Potter of Princeton. But it was his speech in 1895 that made him the most celebrated African American of his time. In a speech that Du Bois indelibly branded “The Atlanta Compromise,” Washington urged blacks to forgo their immediate pursuit of legal, educational and civil equality with whites and instead focus on hard work, manual training and thrift. He credited the South for allowing blacks to compete in the
commercial world and said:

Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the production of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life and shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper until it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.”

Referring to the mass exodus of blacks, Washington advised “cast down your bucket where you are,” and famously proposed: “In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to social progress.”

At the time the speech was widely hailed by blacks and whites, alike, but it has in recent decades been highlighted as evidence of Washington’s acquiescence to the white South. Scholars have repeatedly turned to the speech to prove Washington’s adoption of a submissive, and some would say shameful, racial ideology. Even those scholars with a more generous appraisal of Washington note his emphasis on patience and racial conciliation. Speaking before the National Education Board in 1896, he said:

“To right this wrong, the Russian hurls his dynamite, the Frenchman applies the torch as in the French Revolution, the Indian flies to his tomahawk; but the negro must be patient, must forgive his enemies, and depend for the righting of his wrongs upon his midnight moans, upon his sons, upon his four-day prayers, and upon an inherent faith in the justice of his causes.”

In that same speech, he gave many of his contemporary and future critics ample ammunition by saying that blacks went into slavery pagans and came out Christians, and “we went into slavery without a language, we came out speaking the proud Anglo Saxon tongue.” Of
course, the same sentiments were shared by some of the leading Pan Africanists of the time, including Alexander Crummel, Edward Blyden and William H. Ferris, who wished for blacks to be called “Negro-saxon.” Also, Washington’s seeming disparagement of his African ancestry overshadowed the totality of his speech, in which he also said:

“We went into slavery with the slave chains clanging about our words, we came out with the American ballot in our hands. Progress is a law of God and progress is going to be the negro’s eternal guiding star in this fair land.”

Still, Washington’s provocative rhetoric sparked controversy and disgruntlement among blacks offended by his stereotypical portrayals. In a letter written on Oct. 29, 1896, the educator and activist Thomas Junius Calloway warned Washington that some in Boston’s black community were disenchanted with his approach. He wrote:

“Mr. W. H. Scott, the president of the Racial Protective Association has pronounced himself so pointedly as opposed to the Tuskegee Method and your speeches in general.”

Alexander Crummel, a leading clergyman and intellectual, in his inaugural address as president of the American Negro Academy said while industrialism is a universal need, “there is no need of an undue or overshadowing exaggeration of it in the case of the Negro.” The rift between Washington and northern intellectuals widened as Washington’s popularity and the Tuskegee model predominated.

In 1901, Washington’s fame peaked when his autobiography *Up From Slavery* was published. The book, a national bestseller, traced Washington’s rise from a slave on a tobacco farm in West Virginia, through his work as a coal miner, to his exploits, at age 16, raising money to travel five hundred miles to Hampton Institute, in West Virginia. Once there, he fell under the spell of Armstrong who he described as “a great man – the noblest,
rarest, human being that it has ever been my privilege to meet.” He wrote:

“The older I grow, the more I am convinced that there is no education one can get from books and costly apparatus that is equal to that which can be gotten from contact with great men and women. Instead of studying books so constantly, how, I wish that our schools and colleges might learn to study men and things.”

Washington went on to note with awe the revelation of regular meals, tablecloths, napkins, bathtubs, a toothbrush and bed sheets, all of which were introduced to him at Hampton. In addition to learning hygiene and social graces, Washington studied the Bible and learned debating skills while he marveled at the Yankee educators’ deep commitment to the uplift of his race. He wrote:

“They worked for the students night and day, in season and out of season. They seemed happy only when they were helping the students in some manner. Whenever it is written—and I hope it will be— the part that the Yankee teachers played in the education of the Negroes after the war will make one of the thrilling parts of the history of this country.”

While the book was an inspiring story of one man’s triumph over adversity, it also gave Washington’s critics ample ammunition to characterize him as a man beholden to the white South whose industrial education program was anathema to racial equality and black progress. In the book, Washington affectionately portrayed his former master and mistress and depicted blacks as passive and forgiving. He wrote:

As a rule, not only did the members of my race entertain no feelings of bitterness against the whites before and during the war, but there are many instance of Negroes tenderly caring for their former masters and mistresses who for some reason have become poor and dependent since the war.”

He also generously characterized slavery, “notwithstanding the cruel wrongs inflicted upon us,” saying “the black man got nearly as much out of slavery as the white race did.”
He said slaves “in many cases had mastered some handicraft and none were ashamed, and few unwilling, to labor.”

The book’s introduction by Walter H. Page described Washington as “a new kind of man in the colored world.” Page found it unusual that Washington, who was neither a politician nor a minister, had managed to become a formidable black leader. “A new kind of man surely if he looks upon his task as an economic one instead of a theological one,” Page said.

**Construction of the Hampton-Tuskegee Model**

In 1903, in one of his meditations on race in *Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois outlined the contours of the debate over how best to educate African Americans. In “On Booker T. Washington and Others,” a chapter rich in metaphor and literary allusions, “Du Bois challenged Washington’s advocacy of industrial education and said his program “practically accepts the alleged inferiority of the Negro races.” Du Bois, who in 1895 became the first African American to earn a doctorate degree from Harvard University, instead proposed the kind of college curriculum “that was laid before the Pharaohs, that was taught in the groves by Plato.” He wrote:

“In a half-dozen classrooms they gather then, -- here to follow the love songs of Dido, here to listen to the tale of Troy divine; there to wander among the stars; there to wander among men and nations—and elsewhere other well-worn ways of knowing this queer world. Nothing new, no time-saving devices – simply old, time-glorified methods of delving the truth, and searching out the hidden beauties of life, and the good of living.”

Alluding to Tuskegee, he wrote:

“The function of the university is not simply to teach bread-winning, or to furnish teachers for the public schools or to be a center of polite society; it is,
above all, to be the organ of the fine adjustment between real life and the growing knowledge of life, an adjustment which forms the secret of civilization.”

Throughout the essay, Du Bois emphasizes the sharp contrast between the kind of high-minded liberal arts education provided by schools like Atlanta, Fisk and Howard universities, and the more practical vocational model offered by Tuskegee. In summarizing the role of black schools, he wrote:

“The function of the Negro college, then, is clear: It must maintain the standards of popular education, it must seek the social regeneration of the Negro, and it must help in the solution of race contact and cooperation. And finally, beyond all this, it must make men.”

By the end of his essay, Du Bois leaves readers with the distinct impression that Tuskegee neither maintained the standards of popular education, aided in the social uplift of African Americans, nor “made men,” an apparent critique of Washington’s submissive rhetoric. This view of Tuskegee as an institution devoted exclusively to teacher training and trades instruction, persisted in the public debate and much of the scholarship that followed.

In the popular imagination, the primary debate pitted the inferior Hampton-Tuskegee model, against the superior classical model that was championed by the likes of Du Bois, Woodson, and Horace Bumstead, the white president of the historically black Atlanta University. Bumstead (1841 – 1919) was in the minority of white elites who passionately defended the higher education of blacks. The son of a prosperous Boston white merchant, he had attended Boston Latin School and Yale College, from which he graduated in 1863. He became a Congregationalist minister and during the Civil War was commissioned as a major for the 43d Regiment of the U.S. Colored Troops. He then joined the faculty at Atlanta
University and served as its second president from 1888 – 1907. “The power of rational thought is one which the past history of the race has not tended to cultivate,” he said. “It is the lack of this power which constitutes one of the chief weaknesses in the Negro today. The students of the usual college curriculum are especially fitted to develop it.”

Thomas Jesse Jones

Thomas Jesse Jones (1873 – 1950) was born in Wales but arrived in the United States in 1884 at the age of eleven. Raised in Ohio, he attended Mariella College; Union Theological Seminary where he earned a Bachelor of Divinity Degree; and finally Columbia University where he received a master’s degree and a Ph.D. in Sociology. Jones closely followed the teachings of his teacher and mentor, Columbia University Professor Franklin H. Giddings, who ranked racial groups by intelligence and believed the Anglo Saxon was a superior race. In his dissertation, Jones applied his racial theories to a range of ethnicities:

“Every possible agency should be used to change the numerous foreign types into the Anglo Saxon ideal. The impulsiveness of the Italian must be curbed. The extreme individualism of the Jew must be modified. The shiftlessness of the Irish must give way to perseverance and frugality.”

Upon his graduation in 1902, Jones became the associate chaplain and an economics instructor at Hampton Institute where his view of blacks as a backward race aligned with Armstrong’s. He was promoted to department head, school chaplain and professor. He introduced a new curriculum at Hampton and on his first syllabus for social studies, wrote:

“The aim of the study of sociology is to gain understanding of 1) Race differences as shown in physique, health, birthrate, illiteracy, economic conditions and crime; 2) Race differences, mental and moral, as shown in the efficiencies of such organizations as the home, the church and the club; 3) The relations of these differences to the progress of the Negro and Indian races, and especially their bearing upon the social situation in the
Jones, as a white educator at a historically black school, was considered an authority on issues related to Negro education. While Du Bois had already, in *Souls of Black Folk*, articulated his vision for education equality irrespective of race, he directly challenged Jones’ philosophy in 1906. Speaking at a conference organized by Jones at Hampton, Du Bois called for an education “higher and more important and infinitely more meaningful for the world and its wide ideals than any other kinds of important but subordinate training which men must have.” He said Hampton was “determined to perpetuate the American Negro as a docile, peasant and peon … and the center of an education heresy.” Jones dismissed Du Bois as “an impractical idealist.”

In 1912, the General Education Board, founded by northern reformers in 1902 to improve southern schools, commissioned a major study of secondary schools with generous support of the Phelps Stokes Funds. Jones was appointed to chair the Committee on Social Studies. From his prominent perch, Jones led a national campaign to adopt the Hampton curriculum at all black schools. His committee’s recommendation for social studies instruction advocated a hierarchical system with a humanities track for Anglo Saxons and a vocational one for African Americans and new immigrants. The curriculum, which Du Bois said would “made Socrates and fool and Jesus Christ a fool,” was widely implemented in 1916.

In 1917 Jones was the lead author of the study “Negro Education: A Survey of Private and Higher Schools for colored People in the United States,” which was also commissioned by the U.S. Education Bureau and the Phelps-Stokes Education Commission in 1912. The
report formally proposed its “adaptive education” model that emphasized manual and industrial education at all black schools.

A depiction of Tuskegee as a model industrial school, and Washington as submissive and uninterested in the pursuit of social equality for blacks, gained traction in many of the books published around this time. In the introduction to *The Life and Times of Booker T. Washington* by Benjamin F. Riley, D.D., published in 1916, Edgar Y. Mullins, D.D., concluded:

“…Washington was remarkably sane and balanced in his views as to the place and future of the Negro. He cherished no illusions as to social equality between the Negroes and the white people of the South. Indeed, the subject of social equality did not interest him.”

Francis Greenwood Peabody in *Education for Life: The Story of Hampton Institute*, published in 1919, draws similar conclusions:

“The filial loyalty of Tuskegee is, thus, not merely institutional, but personal … Hampton and Tuskegee can never be rivals; they are associated in the domestic unity of an affectionate parent and a rapidly maturing child.”

That same year, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, Carter G. Woodson’s survey of black schools, was published. Woodson, an African American graduate of Harvard University, traced how industrial education gained influence but does not probe to see if schools that called themselves industrial schools offered liberal arts classes. He wrote:

“Having before them striking examples of highly educated colored men who could find no employment in the United States, the free Negroes began to realize that their preparation was not going hand in hand with their opportunities. Industrial education was then emphasized as the proper method of equipping the race for usefulness.”
In *The Mis-education of the Negro*, published in 1933, Carter G. Woodson surveyed Negro education post-Reconstruction and again depicted industrial and traditional schools as performing antithetical tasks. In the end, he contended that neither industrial nor classical training had produced great thinkers among African Americans.

“The number of Negro mechanics and artisans have comparatively declined during the last two generations … On the other hand, in spite of much classical education of the Negroes we do not find in the race a large supply of thinkers and philosophers.”

However, in 1949 an article by historian Stephen J. Wright tracing the development of the Hampton-Tuskegee model, provided an important social context that was often underplayed in much of the literature on industrial education. Wright highlights the mass poverty, homelessness and illiteracy of blacks, along with the staunch opposition to education for recently emancipated slaves, which defined the period. He said ninety percent of the four million blacks in the South were illiterate, and many were destitute and disorganized “on a scale which challenged the best efforts of the Federal Government and the many private agencies organized at that time to deal with the situation.”

He added to this the mindset of white southerners, who viewed Negroes as uneducable, a stance undoubtedly linked to the need for a compliant black labor force. General O.O. Howard, head of the federal Freedmen’s Bureau, described the hostile reaction to Negro education, saying:

“The opposition to Negro education made itself felt everywhere in a combination not to allow the Freedmen any room or building in which a school might be taught. In 1865, 1866, and 1867, mobs of the baser classes at intervals and in all parts of the South occasionally burned school buildings
and churches used as schools, flogged teachers or drove them away, and in a number of instances, murdered them.”

He said opposition by whites to high schools for blacks “was mollified by calling these establishments ‘Industrial Schools’ when they were neither ‘Industrial’ nor ‘High.’” Said Wright: “As [Mabel] Carney points out, the South was willing to embrace the suggestion of ‘industrialized’ schools when it was unwilling to tolerate the idea of secondary schools for Negroes.”

He added: “The Negro high school, disguised with an industrial title, began its phenomenal growth.”

Wright does not specifically address whether Washington employed this strategy to conceal a liberal arts curriculum at Tuskegee, but his attention to the erection of artifice at schools that offered liberal arts instruction to blacks, illuminates how educators negotiated the resistance to education for blacks in the South. However, the account implies that white southerners supported industrial education for blacks.

Still, many scholars continued to consider Tuskegee and Washington at face value, and perpetuated the idea that Tuskegee was primarily a school for future manual laborers. In _Booker T. Washington and the Negro’s Place in America_, published in 1955, Samuel R. Spencer writes:

“Washington took with him to Tuskegee not only educational methods but basic assumptions about the Negro race in America. An intimate knowledge of his own people had convinced him, first, that emancipation had not brought the millennium and, second, that the freedman could not hope to step immediately into a position of equality with his favored white neighbors. He recognized that the Negro was inferior – not innately so, but in the cultural, social, and economic heritage necessary to compete on favorable terms in a white man’s world.”

He added:
“Washington, following the Hampton model, proposed to take the young men and young women from the farm, educate them in agriculture, and send them back to the backbone of a solid and prosperous citizenry … Here was the basic justification for the ‘industrial education’ gospel which Washington preached for the next thirty-five years. Primarily it was education of a strictly utilitarian nature designed to prepare the student for a gainful occupation in agriculture or trade.”

By the late 1950s and 1960s scholars of African American history looked to larger social movements, as a source of inquiry. It was within this context, and against the backdrop of the Civil Rights Movement, that historian August Meier traced the intellectual tradition of African Americans in *Negro Thought in America 1880-1915*, published in 1963. Meier chronicled how industrial education for blacks gained the support of some abolitionists during the late eighteenth century, and intensified with the emergence of militant abolitionism and the Negro Convention Movement in the 1830s. Interest in the model by blacks was fueled by their exclusion from apprenticeships in the trades, growing competition from European immigrants, and a rising emphasis on racial self-help through economic development.

By the 1880s industrial education was en vogue at both black and white schools, although many white elites increasingly promoted it as the only suitable type of education for blacks. Meier argued that African Americans had long advocated industrial education as a means of self-help and racial solidarity, but it was Washington who framed it as accommodation to “an oppressive white community.”

“It cannot be overemphasized,” said Meier, “that Washington’s philosophy represents in large measure the basic tendencies of Negro thought in the period under consideration.”

That philosophy entailed the abandonment of efforts to integrate into white America, the
adoption of separate, self-sufficient black economies, and “moral development,” which, over time, would earn African Americans their rights as citizens.\textsuperscript{57} Meier also drew attention to inconsistencies between Washington’s public and private positions, noting that while he discouraged black political participation he was “surreptitiously engaged in undermining the American race system by a direct attack upon disfranchisement and segregation” through his clandestine support of lawsuits and other measures.\textsuperscript{58} He said that Washington “effectively masked the ultimate implications of his policies” by crafting a non-threatening public persona, but Meier did not apply this tactic to his implementation of education policy at Tuskegee.\textsuperscript{59} Meier broke new ground in African-American intellectual history, even if he neglected to probe the gray areas between Washington’s subterranean activities at Tuskegee, and his public rhetoric. He appears to accept at face value that Tuskegee basically operated along the lines described in the Phelps Stokes studies, and by Washington himself. However, his attention to the schism between Washington’s overt and covert posture related to politics invites closer scrutiny of his educational initiatives at Tuskegee.\textsuperscript{60} In 1970, the historian Herbert Aptheker painted a damning portrait of Washington in his introduction to \textit{The Negro in the South: His Economic Progress in Relation to His Moral Development}, which had originally been edited by Du Bois and Washington and published in 1907. As evidence of Washington’s submission and racial betrayal, Aptheker points to his lectures in 1906, in which he said that blacks had changed through slavery “from a pagan to a Christian race,” and described the black race as “semi-barbarous.”\textsuperscript{61} Aptheker writes:

One finds in [Washington’s essays] an acceptance of many of the racist
stereotypes – imitative, primitive, docile, and so on—ensconced in stories and ‘jokes’ together with an embracing of the entire mythology and ideology of Horatio Alger and Theodore Roosevelt. The references to ‘preferred’ hair-styling and to the open-mouthed, reclining African ‘native’ whose exertions extend only so far as masticating … to the status of the African stemming from his failure to adopt with sufficient intensity the lessons offered him by the white man… endeared Washington to those in power.”

Aptheker neglects to note that many of Washington’s contemporaries also expressed Euro-centric notions of civilization. Even Woodson and black nationalists like Blyden had similarly described Africa as barbaric and Africans as heathens. Aptheker accepts Washington’s rhetoric at face value, without considering the plausibility of dissimulative resistance as a strategy to appease his patrons while covertly defying their wishes.

In *Booker T. Washington: The Making of a Black Leader, 1856 – 1901*, published in 1972, historian Louis Harlan presents a complex and what is considered the definitive portrait of Washington. He contended that by 1890 the ascendancy of industrial education had been established and Washington had become its most potent symbol. By 1891, every black school recognized the utility and necessity of industrial education. The Slater Fund, a leading funding source for black schools, supported almost forty schools in the 1870s; but by the late 1890s the number was no more than a dozen. By 1901, more than half of the money allocated to black industrial schools went to Hampton and Tuskegee, underscoring white patrons’ preference for the model. Harlan argued that schools that attempted to retain strong liberal arts programs found it increasingly difficult to secure funding. By 1915 Hampton had an endowment of $2.7 million and Tuskegee, $1.9 million. In contrast, Lincoln University, one of the best-endowed black liberal arts institutions, had only $700,000.
Harlan also notes the tension between teachers in Tuskegee’s academic and vocational departments. Teachers in the former were college graduates “who felt a sense of superiority to the typical industrial or agricultural teachers, self-taught or half-taught men and women whose particular skills had earned them faculty status.” The academic faculty included graduates of Harvard, Oberlin, Fisk and Atlanta universities, “men and women who read novels, wrote poetry, and played in Shakespearean drama.” But Harlan does not probe further to explore how the presence of the academic faculty influenced the character of or curriculum at Tuskegee, or why it was primarily characterized as a vocational school.

In an essay exploring his personal impressions of Washington, Harlan characterized him as being “among the less lovable major figures in American black history.” Then, in a summary of Washington’s mission derived more from his rhetoric than his actual activities, he said:

“It was in agriculture, the sickest industry in America, and in the South, the nation’s sickest region, and in certain obsolete trades such as blacksmithing that Washington sought to work his economic wonders. All that was less clear in his day, however, and besides he had an emotional commitment to ‘keep them down on the farm for he hated and feared the city.’

Eleven years later, Harlan’s The Wizard of Tuskegee 1901-1915, the first book that made full use of Washington’s personal papers, characterized Washington as a crafty “wizard” who traded black political and social equality for economic advancement. While Harlan exposes instances of Washington’s deception and duplicity, he, like other scholars, relies on Washington’s rhetoric to characterize Tuskegee as an industrial school without sufficiently examining the actual curriculum and education outcomes of the school. Moreover, the account wildly deemphasizes the pervasive climate of terror in rural Alabama
that rigidly defied the kind of moral reasoning espoused in the North.

In an essay in which he shares his personal impressions of Washington Harlan emphasizes the contradiction between Washington’s rhetoric and his actions. He graphically illustrates how Washington operated behind the scenes to wield political power, while publicly advocating that blacks pursue economic stability over political rights.

Wrote Harlan:

“In his civil rights activity he presented himself publicly as a social pacifist and accommodationist, while secretly he financed and generalied a series of court suits challenging the grandfather clause, denial of jury service to blacks, Jim Crow cars, and peonage. Working sometimes with the black lawyers of the Afro-American Council, sometimes through his own personal lawyer Wilford H. Smith, and sometimes with sympathetic Southern white lawyers, Washington took every precaution to keep his collaboration secret.”

Harlan, then, characterizes the tension between Washington’s words and deeds as a historical mystery, rather than as a sign of the irregular patterns or subtle acts that might signal resistance, as suggested by Walker, Lewis and other contemporary African Diaspora scholars. He instead suggests that Washington was, at best, consumed with a thirst for power or that, at worst, a monster or someone with a personality disorder. He writes:

Perhaps psychoanalysis or role psychology would help us solve Booker T. Washington’s behavioral riddle, if we could only put him on the couch. If we could remove those layers of secrecy as one peels an onion, perhaps at the center of Washington’s being would be revealed a person with a single-minded concern with power, a minotaur, a lion, a fox, or Brer Rabbit, some frightened little man like the Wizard of Oz, or, as in the case of the onion, nothing – a personality that had vanished into the roles it played.”

He added: “Washington ‘jumped Jim Crow’ with the skill of long practice, but he seemed to lose sign of the original purposes of his dance.”

Harlan notes Washington’s hiring of black scholars with elite academic credentials, but
never delves more deeply to explore their impact on the school curriculum and academic environment. He also highlights the contradiction between Washington’s rhetoric and the education of his daughter at Wellesley, which he exposes as Washington’s hypocrisy, rather than as evidence of his actual support of higher education for blacks. He quotes a newspaper account that read:

“‘He [Washington] has always warned the negroes in the South against the folly of forcing themselves into the company of the whites,’ said the New York American. ‘That is good advice for others and is really good counsel for Booker Washington.’”  

Harlan’s accounts both earned the Bancroft prize, and the latter, a Pulitzer Prize, and would for many scholars validate an impression of Washington as politically conservative, beholden to white elites, power-hungry and untrustworthy. His accounts also continue to depict Tuskegee as a vocational school. Perhaps comparatist Edward Berman provides the most succinct summary of the common perception of Tuskegee perpetuated in much of the scholarship:

“In brief, the Tuskegee philosophy sought to ensure that the black man in the southern United States would be trained as a semi-skilled, semi-literate and a docile member of a burgeoning class, whose manpower would be utilized to help industrialize the reconstructed south.”

Neither Meier, Harlan nor Berman probed more deeply to consider whether the industrial model was implemented along the lines of the stated policy, or if Washington’s rhetoric concealed a strategy of resistance. However, their insights into Washington’s political maneuverings and duplicity inspire fresh avenues of inquiry into his activities at Tuskegee beneath the façade of industrial education.
While the view of Washington as a both a schemer and passive pawn of white elites calcified in much of the literature on black intellectual and political history, in 1970 Harold Cruse, in *The Crisis of The Negro Intellectual*, criticized the rush by scholars to embrace the macho but essentially integrationist strategy of Du Bois, while rejecting what was a more black nationalist movement represented by Washington. “The important influence of Booker T. Washington’s philosophy on the rise of black economic nationalism has not been generally acknowledged,” wrote Cruse in his survey of black intellectual history. “This omission of the role of nationalism leaves much of the analysis common to Negro historiography open to question.”74 His critique, however, did not effectively change the course of the depiction of Washington in much of the scholarship.

In *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860 – 1935*, published in 1988, James Anderson surveys black education from Reconstruction to the Great Depression and goes further than previous scholars to place Negro education within a political, economic and cultural context. He argues that blacks were pushed into a system that assumed their subordination and that the substance of their education was largely controlled by white elites. Anderson, like previous scholars, assumes that Tuskegee, like other industrial schools, primarily reflected the values of white elites.

In 1993, historian David Levering Lewis provides the definitive account of Washington’s most vocal critic in *W.E.B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race*. Lewis traced the growing influence of Washington through the rise of the industrial model, and the waning support for schools that offered liberal arts. The Fisk Free Colored School in south Nashville was founded in early 1866 with the pledge of four thousand dollars from the American Missionary Associations. It began by teaching two hundred ex-slaves to read, write and count
on the first day and a year later took in one thousand students a day. Admission standards rose steadily in the two decades after Fisk’s founding. The president Erastus Milo Cravath, who hailed from an upstate New York abolitionist family set out to make Fisk the flagship school of American Missionary Association higher education. However by 1877, with the withdrawal of federal troops from the South, schools like Fisk, Atlanta University, and Talladega were deplored by many southern whites as misguided.

“Higher education – Latin, philosophy, science, and history – was denounced as an academic perversion inimical to that order,” Lewis said. The account builds on the narrative of previous scholars who contrasted schools like Fisk and Atlanta with those that followed the Hampton-Tuskegee model. The Pulitzer Prize-winning account does not address whether schools like Tuskegee offered Latin, philosophy, science and history, but implies that they did not.

More recently, in The Education of Booker T. Washington, published in 1996, Michael Rudolph West acknowledges that Washington’s strategy involved “a mixture of ideas and earnestness, pandering, and dissembling,” which he said came at a cost.

“He became not a leader of black men and women, but a creature of the power of white politicians, editors, and influential editors; he became Negro leader, beholden not to the democratic consent of those who ostensibly raised him upon their shoulders, but to the favors of white public opinion makers.”

Once again, the emphasis is placed on Washington’s rhetorical acquiescence to white elites, and suggests that Tuskegee embodied that orientation. The point here is not to debate the cost or even the appeal of Washington’s strategy. Nor is it my intention to challenge the depiction of Washington as consumed by power. Rather it is the characterization of Washington and Tuskegee as primarily beholden to white elites, and not serving the best
interest of blacks -- an idea that has largely shaped the scholarship of a generation -- that I seek to challenge. I aim to interrogate the myth of Tuskegee as merely an expression of white elite paternalism by highlighting how Washington behind a mask of compliance, sought to advance a black agenda through the aegis of Tuskegee. By doing so, I neither support nor condemn his strategy but merely draw attention to the activities at Tuskegee that run counter to Washington’s rhetoric, or the depiction of Tuskegee in much of the scholarship. In the end, it is the lingering impression of Washington as a one-dimensional agent of white elites, and Tuskegee as purely a mass manufacturer of manual laborers, that I seek to address.

The critique of Washington must be viewed alongside his actual deeds, and with a more expansive interpretative framework for assessing the actions of black subjects during this period. The social realities of the South and harsh reprisals against blacks who dared to question their social status require us to look beyond rhetoric to the reality of what Tuskegee actually contributed to the education of blacks. It is instructive, it is in fact critical, to view Washington in the context of his time, which the historian Robert Norrell attempts to do in *Up From History: The Life of Booker T. Washington*, published in 2009. Noting the pervasive characterization of Washington as an “Uncle Tom” by many historians, Norrell rightly asserts:

“A significant portion of those wielding the brush were historians who should have been alert to the fallacy of anachronism, of applying 1960s expectations of protest to a man who had lived two generations earlier.”  

Norrell anchors Washington’s submissive statements in the broiling unrest in Alabama in the years following Reconstruction. During this same period the lynching of African Americans soared, and books like *The Negro Beast* and *The American Negro*, which called for the extermination of Negroid beliefs and practices, were reviewed in leading newspapers.
Thomas Dixon Jr.’s *The Leopard’s Spots*, which romanticized slavery and depicted Reconstruction as a threat to whites, sold a million copies. *In Slavery by Another Name*, the historian Douglas A. Blackmon found evidence that in Alabama alone, thousands of African Americans were falsely arrested and sold by the state to work in mines, lumber camps, farms and factories between the end of the Civil War and World War II. The company U.S. Steel was a major beneficiary of this widespread practice. Blackmon chronicled the federal investigation into the systematic re-enslavement of blacks in Alabama, and quoted a Secret Service investigator saying: “this peonage system is more cruel and inhuman than the slavery of ante-bellum days.” His account helps to contextualize what has been described as Washington’s *accomodationist* behavior.

On the other hand, Norrell’s account does not sufficiently address why black leaders like Du Bois challenged Washington’s leadership. He neglects to disclose some of Washington’s more offensive rhetoric, and concludes that his detractors acted out of jealousy and self-interest, rather than legitimate concerns over Washington’s racially inflammatory discourse. Only by examining some of Washington’s more offensive rhetoric can one understand his critics, or how Washington used rhetoric to camouflage his true intentions. Instead, Norrell summarized the conflict between the men as follows:

“Du Bois had a romantic racialism at odds with Booker’s practical assimilation. Perhaps his exposure to Goethe’s romanticism and European nationalism in Germany made Du Bois believe more firmly in racial characteristics.”

Like many scholars, Norrell oversimplifies the debate between Du Bois and Washington, and ascribes Du Bois’s assimilationist platform to Washington, while disregarding Washington’s nationalist orientation. It was Du Bois who advocated the
integration of blacks into America’s mainstream while Washington supported black
separatism and unity. The debate between Du Bois and Washington not only addressed
practical social issues and matters of assimilation, as he suggests, but also deeper notions of
black identity and racial pride. Instead of presenting the range of strategies black leaders used
to challenge racism and overcome their oppression, Norrell depicts Du Bois as naïve, jealous
and irrational, and Washington as rational, pragmatic and wise. Norrell, then, reduces their
competing approaches to either/or propositions, as if blacks did not benefit and forge their
identity from both leaders’ distinct approaches. Even Washington’s black contemporaries
who supported him had problems with his rhetoric, as indicated by this passage from a July
20, 1901 editorial in the Cleveland Gazette:

“We are also mindful of the fact that some of the methods [Washington] pursues
to accomplish his wonderful results are very hurtful indeed to the Afro-American
of the North.”

By minimizing the valid concerns over Washington’s rhetoric, Norrell diminishes the
role black actors rightfully played in shaping their own identity, an identity forged from
overlapping theories, perspectives and approaches. Also, it is only by highlighting the tension
between Washington’s public and private actions, and the complications resulting from his
duplicity, can one hope to fully recognize his brand of resistance.

Moreover, Norrell does not focus on the curriculum at Tuskegee and limits his gaze to
Washington’s work in the United States and thereby does not draw attention to how the
model was actually implemented at Tuskegee, or the parallel debates on two continents. As a
result he does not address how black actors on both continents adapted an industrial model
created by white elites, while adopting the discourse of accommodation to advance a counter-
hegemonic strategy.
The literature underscores the need to expose and interrogate how the Hampton-Tuskegee model was actually implemented at Tuskegee. Only then can we attempt to locate agency in the form of “irregular patterns of advance and regress, each in a dialectic working toward a synthesis” as defined by Lewis, or the kind of dissimulative resistance suggested by Walker. This void in the scholarship illuminates the need for a trans-Atlantic, black Diaspora orientation which challenges scholars to not only reconsider Washington’s rhetoric but also his subterranean actions. As early as 1974 historian Manning Marable brought such a perspective to his exploration of Washington’s influence on South African black nationalists during the early part of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{80} Marable contended that African students who traveled to Tuskegee in the 1890s and 1900s found an institution that could prove essential to nationalist ideals because of its espousal of self-help and economic and social uplift.\textsuperscript{81} Despite Washington’s \textit{accommodationist} rhetoric, Marable said African leaders found Tuskegee to be “an island of black defiance to the traditions of the white South.”\textsuperscript{82} Marable contended Washington’s work was crucial to the South African protest movement and “helped create a nationalistic, proud and dynamic elite of black people,” on both continents.\textsuperscript{83}

Like these African students, Marable moved beyond Washington’s rhetoric to expose instances of resistance and subversion cloaked in submissive rhetoric.

“South African black nationalists owe much to Booker T. Washington,” argued Marable, noting how they embraced Washington’s pro-capitalist orientation as the key to achieving economic and political independence. Washington assisted with plans for the first Pan African conference and encouraged blacks to boycott segregated streetcars. He straddled two worlds: in Togo both German colonial officials and black nationalists, turned to Washington for guidance.
“It would be a mistake,” argued Marable “to consider Washington’s influence on the modern African mind by simply reviewing his direct associations with colonial administrators or his friendship with capitalist enterprises … An astounding amount of the correspondence of Washington, his secretary Emmett Scott, and his advisor, sociologist Professor Robert Park, with black nationalists implies Tuskegee’s guarded support for black militant endeavors.”

While Marable limits his study to Washington’s influence on African National Congress leaders in South Africa, his reconsideration invites closer scrutiny of Washington’s program at Tuskegee and the role it played in the movement towards black political, economic, and social advancement in the U.S. and Africa in the early part of the 20th century.

An understanding of dissimulative resistance and other subtle strategies employed by black leaders in Diaspora may move us closer to comprehending how the dominant discourse and reality of black social, political and economic standing, coupled with the recognized need for white support, influenced their public behavior, but not necessarily the intentions and outcomes of their strategies. While much of the scholarship focuses on Washington’s accommodationist public posture, few scholars have delved beneath the discourse to uncover what occurred at Tuskegee behind the scenes, or to consider how the black masses interpreted his public posturing.

Transfer and Borrowing in Comparative and International Education

Scholars in comparative education have attempted to identify and analyze global trends in education, including privatization, decentralization, choice and standards by exploring the borrowing and lending of policies across national boundaries. In addition to addressing why
educational policies are imported or exported, they have also traced how those policies have been locally adapted. David Phillips constructed a conceptual framework for studying transnational “policy attraction” in education. By observing British interest in German educational policies over a period of time, he identified the four stages of education policy transfer and borrowing. The stages begin with 1) the “foci of attraction” which could include political upheaval, international dissatisfaction, or political change; which is followed by 2) the decision to borrow which could be theoretical in nature, followed by 3) the implementation of the model in the foreign context and, finally, 4) the internalization or “indigenization” of the model.

The stages that relate to my study are implementation, which involves the adaptation of the foreign model, and “internationalization” (or indigenization) that involves the synthesis of the model in the local context. However, in the case of Achimota, this theoretical frame is problematized by the colonial context and the conflicting aims of colonizers who framed the education policy and the colonized for whom it was framed. Phillips’s theory does not consider the dynamic created by the colonial context.

In 2000 Niklas Luhmann’s “theory of self-referential systems” which attempts to explain external references to models when local ones exist, was applied to the Achimota case by Gita Steiner-Khamsi and Hubert O. Quist. In their article, “The Politics of Educational Borrowing: Reopening the Case of Achimota in British Ghana,” Steiner-Khamsi and Quist argue that the transfer to Africa of the Hampton-Tuskegee model was encouraged by the Phelps-Stokes Fund through its education commission chairman Jesse Thomas Jones who argued: “[T]hough village conditions in Africa differ in many respects from those in America where these activities [of Hampton and Tuskegee] had great influence on the
improvement of rural life, the described may be adapted to colonial conditions in Africa.”

Steiner-Khamsi and Quist characterize as “remarkable” and “striking” that the British colonial empire transferred a model that was heavily debated in the United States. They reason that colonial officials decided to borrow the contested model because it was promoted by Washington, a prominent black American who could help sway Africans. The model also served the interests of the colonial empire that needed to train its population for work in the agricultural industry.

Steiner-Khamsi and Quist maintained that the educational philosophy of Tuskegee, Hampton and Achimota “these three monuments of adapted education, were firmly rooted in the belief that blacks should be trained for a life of manual labor and should stay away from studies that were too ‘bookish’ and academic.” However, they go on to note that Achimota offered both an elite academic education for the gentleman scholar while also providing what they characterized as the Hampton-Tuskegee model. By presenting Hampton and Tuskegee solely as industrial schools, they ignore earlier scholarship that indicated that, despite the rhetoric surrounding industrial education, a traditional academic program co-existed alongside an industrial one at Tuskegee as it subsequently did at Achimota.

By neglecting to examine the duality that existed at Tuskegee, they miss the opportunity to illuminate striking similarities between Tuskegee and Achimota, and to explore the reasons black educators might have exploited the industrial education model. As noted earlier, the concomitant liberal arts and industrial curricula at Tuskegee and Achimota could be the basis to consider the appropriation by blacks of the industrial education discourse of philanthropists to secure resources. It is also useful to recognize the value of training Africans in trades and fields such as architecture that could be applied to a black
nationalist agenda. Such an orientation would require scholars to recognize the agency of Aggrey, Washington and other blacks beneath the radar of white hegemony. A transnational, African Diaspora lens challenges scholars to consider the activities of African Diaspora actors on their own terms, separate and apart from the perspectives and goals of white subjects. This orientation prods scholars to appreciate that blacks could mimic hegemonic discourse while subversively advancing a counter-hegemonic strategy. It must also be acknowledged that these strategies might simultaneously function to advance both white and black economic interests. The slow but steady transition from industrial schools to dual and later purely academic models could be an example of what Lewis called “irregular patterns of advance and regress, each in a dialectic working toward a synthesis.”

Steiner-Khamisi and Quist noted the many achievements related to the “Africanization” of the curriculum. For example, the college incorporated Gold Coast languages, including Ga, Twi, Fante and Ewe, as mediums of instruction at the lower levels, and succeeded in having local languages officially accepted for matriculation at elite British universities. Still, Steiner-Khamisi and Quist argued that much of the adapted model fostered a romanticized view of tribalism and was "devoid of any prospects for political independence and economic growth." This interpretation left little room to recognize the role Africans played in the model’s adaptation, or to consider, from an African Diaspora perspective, the significance of “Africanization” as a form of resistance to hegemony.

Steiner-Khamisi and Quist argued that Achimota perpetuated the stereotype of the rural, tribal and backward natives and failed to stress academic knowledge that "seriously limited the access of African students to the privileges of Europe and Western progress." Despite this view, Steiner-Khamisi and Quist contended that the Africanization of the curriculum was
re-emphasized in postcolonial Ghana under African nationalist Kwame Nkrumah. While Nkrumah’s plan was associated with progress and independence, the colonial objective, they maintained, "was devoid of any prospects for political independence and economic growth." Because they concentrate on rhetoric and notions of progress from a purely colonial perspective, they neglect to explore how the adaptation of the model by blacks at Achimota and Tuskegee may have been infused with counter-hegemonic aims.

Steiner-Khamisi and Quist also characterized Aggrey as a pawn of the colonial empire and white American philanthropists. However, they did not explicitly indicate what role he played in the adaptation of the model at Achimota where he was the assistant vice principal. They also never seriously explore whether Aggrey, who held a master’s degree from Columbia University where he had also was completing his doctoral dissertation at the time of his death, may have similarly appropriated the rhetoric of white philanthropists while working towards Africans’ intellectual and economic development. Such an inquiry would warrant more attention to his actions and intentions than to his public addresses. Such a consideration would also require scholars to assume African agency and recognize the limitations of the rhetoric of oppressed actors within a colonial context. Steiner-Khamisi and Quist do not sufficiently explore the agency of Aggrey or how he may have masked African Diaspora goals for African political, economic and social advancement with appropriated rhetoric.

In her 2003 dissertation “Global Discourse and Local Response in Educational Policy Process: The Case of Achimota School in Colonial Ghana (Gold Coast), Shoko Yamada explored the politics of negotiating different interests and agendas of missionaries, British colonial officials and Africans during the formulation of educational policies for British
Africa on the Gold Coast. She rightly posits Achimota as a battleground pitting Africans and Europeans, and their conflicting political interests in education, against one another. Challenging Steiner-Khamsi and Quist’s contention that Achimota did not prepare students for anti-colonial struggle, she argued that many Achimota alumni from lower-socio-economic backgrounds became leaders in various fields by the time of independence of Ghana. She also argued that Africans were “not mute receivers of policies brought from outside, but they exercised strong influence on policy formation.” Yamada stressed the role of African nationalists in the formation and implementation of education policy in colonial Africa.

While Yamada emphasized the role of African agency in the adaptation of the model at Achimota, she does not consider the possible role of subversion on the part of Aggrey and Washington, nor does she examine how black American and African perspectives influenced education policy formation and implementation in the U.S. and Africa.

**British Colonial Education: The Construction of Black Transcultural Identity**

In the decades after the founding of Achimota, a number of memoirs, which were largely descriptive and written by alumni or former teachers, were published. But beginning in the 1960s scholars began to more critically analyze interest during the early part of the century in transferring the industrial education model from the United States South to Africa. In 1969, Kenneth J. King described the development of the idea that Negro educational institutions in the South were directly relevant and transferable to Africa. His study focused on the first four decades of the 20th century and on the work of J.H. Oldham, an English missionary, and Thomas Jesse Jones, “the American expert on Negro education.” King traced the early
interest by the British in the industrial model by noting a tour of Hampton in 1901 by the English Board of Education’s advisor, Michael Sadler. A letter from Sadler to Washington and a special report, “The Education of the Coloured Race,” noted Hampton’s relevance to West Africa. A year later Gold Coast Governor J.P. Rodger visited schools in the southern states and decided to alter his educational system. In 1908 Sir Harry Johnson made a similar tour and later published his critique of Negro liberal arts colleges, while praising Tuskegee and Hampton. Officials in Rhodesia, South Africa, Nigeria and Kenya similarly noted that Washington had abandoned classical academics for trades-oriented systems that could be applied to Africa.

In 1910, during the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, for which Oldham was organizing secretary, industrial education was framed as “especially urgent” for Africa. During that meeting the commissioners remarked that the value of industrial and agricultural training for “the negro race is abundantly proved by the experience” of the model at Hampton and Tuskegee.

In 1917 a book by internationally renowned educator C.T. Loram supported the necessity of African education modeled after the Hampton-Tuskegee model. That same year “Negro Education,” another Phelps-Stokes study authored by Thomas Jesse Jones, was released. King argued that the study, “established [Jones’s] reputation as the leading authority on American Negro education, demonstrating unmistakably in the process his belief in the superiority of the Hampton-Tuskegee mode.” Jones, a British subject born in Wales, had studied sociology at Columbia University early in the 20th century and, as indicated earlier, worked as the research direct at Hampton Institute. He later worked for the U.S. Bureau of Education as director of racial groups. For his report on Negro education, he was
awarded Columbia University’s Great Squires Prize for “original investigation of a sociological character carried on during the five years proceeding the award.”

Oldham drew the two streams of thought together in a seminal review article of their findings. The two reports stressed the inappropriateness of the literary school for blacks in Africa and America, and “proclaimed a new doctrine of educational adaptation.” Argued King: “The language which would later slip into the official policy of the British Advisory Committee on Education in Africa was already here in Oldham’s assessment of 1918, and was itself merely a précis of Hampton and Tuskegee’s creeds.” King argued that white elites framed blacks in the U.S. and Africa as having a single transcultural identity.

In 1971 Edward H. Berman explored the role the Phelps-Stokes Fund Education Commissions played in the shaping of African education. Like King, Berman argued that fund officials believed the model addressed the parallel social realities of blacks in African and the U.S “This premise,” argued Berman, “underlay the approach of the two Phelps-Stokes Education Commissions in their investigations of African education.”

James Emman Kwegyir Aggrey

Aggrey does not figure prominently in much of the literature on industrial education. Often when he does appear he is viewed from the standpoint of the white framers of industrial education with the assumption that he acted in the interest of white elites. Kenneth King noted how Africans and African Americans, including Du Bois, resisted the model and that fund officials, to counteract critics, recruited Aggrey to publicly support it. However, while Aggrey was viewed by colonial officials as “the Good African,” he was also, for blacks, a symbol of racial solidarity and independence. “[I]n addition he personified the Pan-
African movement … as he, a West African, preached race pride to mass audiences throughout Africa.”

Berman, on the other hand, posits Aggrey as a one-dimensional pawn of Phelps-Stokes officials and never considered the possibility of a counter-hegemonic strategy or subversion by means of appropriated rhetoric. Instead, Berman presents Aggrey’s rhetoric as evidence of his submission to hegemony. Wrote Berman:

Echoing the words of Booker T. Washington, Aggrey told the students at the South African Native College at Fort Hare that as black people they must learn to accept help wherever they found it, to work with those who were willing to work with them, and to remember that the Anglo-Saxons, whatever their faults, had been more successful in dealing with backward races than any other people in history.”

In another instance, Berman cited a letter written by Charles T. Loram, the Fund’s South African representation, which underscored the commission’s expectations of Aggrey. Loram wrote:

“We do not want Aggrey only as a teacher of education. We want him as a living example of the black man who lives the Christian life …, who has trod the steep path to civilization and has not tried to get there by shortcuts, who knows the weaknesses of the Blackman and can interpret them to us. We want him as an example of what can be done by work and prayer.”

Berman did not consider the limitations of rhetoric on the part of Aggrey given the political, economic and social realities of blacks, and the expectations of their white sponsors. To secure funding for black schools, black educators had to appear to conform to their patrons’ preference for the industrial model. Nor does Berman consider the possibility that black educators subversively provided a more traditional liberal arts model even as they appropriated an inferior black transcultural identity through hegemonic rhetoric.

*Aggrey of Africa*, a biography written by Edwin W. Smith with the support of the
Phelps Stokes Fund, paints a portrait of Aggrey that places him and his academic ambitions in stark contrast with the ideals of the industrial education model promoted for Africans. Aggrey was born in 1875 into the Fanti tribe in Cape Coast on the Gold Coast. The Fanti tribe was the largest and most influential on the Gold Coast and Aggrey could trace his royal ties. Aggrey was the fourth child of eight children born to Abna Andua and Kodwo Kwegyir, who, after an invasion by the Ashanti tribe between 1873 and 1874 moved to Cape Coast. Kodwo Kwegyir worked as a Gold Taker – which means he measured the gold dust used as currency -- for a wealthy African trader. Smith characterizes him as an influential and revered elder statesman.

At the age of seven the young Aggrey attended the Wesleyan Methodist School at Cape Coast, the site of an active slave trade for several centuries. He continued his studies and in 1888 was one of twenty youngsters taken into the palatial Mission House by the Rev. Dennis Kemp. In addition to rigorous academic and religious instruction, Aggrey was trained in grooming and housekeeping, who, in addition to a rigid academic and religious program, trained the youngsters in grooming, housekeeping and trades, which likely laid the groundwork for his own work as an educator. By the age of fifteen, Aggrey was assigned a Sunday School of up to forty boys where he taught for a year. He returned to Cape Coast and Mission House where he remained for seven years. Between 1887 and 1896 the Wesleyan Mission expanded its membership from 5,600 to 7,600 and its junior members from 1,000 to 5,000, and more than fifty chapels were built.

Aggrey taught at the Wesleyan Centenary Memorial School, built in 1891. Thirsty for education, Aggrey gave the missionaries Fanti language lessons in exchange for lessons in French, Latin and Psychology, which he then taught his students. By the age of sixteen
Aggrey was permitted to preach, which he did in English and Fanti and by the age of twenty he was second in command of the Wesleyan Centenary Memorial School. And had passed his Teacher’s Certificate examination that enabled him to teach in any comparable school in the British colony. This portrait of Aggrey as a leader and scholar is absent from much of the literature on industrial education, and provides a new way of considering his educational philosophy and aspirations.

Smith characterizes Aggrey as not only academically ambitious, but also socially conscious. He notes how Aggrey, as recording secretary of the Aborigines’ Rights Protection Society, had actively campaigned against an attempt by the British colonial government to control the sale of land on the Gold Coast. “On one occasion he performed the splendid achievement of walking, in the course of a single day, thirty-six miles to Mansu to send an important cable to London on behalf of the Society,” Smith wrote. Aggrey also wrote articles for the Gold Coast Methodist Times against the Public Lands Bill, which was defeated.

Aggrey left the Gold Coast in 1898 for the United States, lured by the opportunity to train as a missionary at Livingstone College in Salisbury, North Carolina John Bryan Small, who was bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church which Aggrey was associated with the next twenty years. Livingstone College, organized in 1882, was original lead by Dr. J.C. Price, a young African American who had trained at the Ecumenical Methodist Conference in London, and had graduated at Lincoln University, a prominent black college. The white citizens of Livingstone provided a thousand dollars and forty acres of land to build the school, which was built by the students. The college was named for the Robert Livingstone, a nineteen-year-old Union soldier who was held in a Confederate prison camp outside Salisbury. Smith said that Price won the respect of white citizens of Salisbury.
and proved, as Aggrey did later “that in the South a man need not be white to win recognition as a man of worth. He agreed with some other Negro leaders in advocating an education which included the culture of the head, the hand, and the heart; but industrial training was not introduced into the college until later, and it never received serious attention.”105 This perspective on Livingstone and Aggrey’s orientation is important as it provides a fresh perspective on the emphasis his mentors placed on an education that gave a limited space to industrial education. Aggrey’s own emphasis is underscored by Smith’s detailed description of his academic coursework. During his freshman year he took Greek, Latin, English composition, rhetoric and history, along with geometry and geography. During his second term he read Homer’s *Iliad* and Virgil’s *Aenid*, followed by his sophomore year where he read the second and third books of the *Iliad*. Aggrey’s curriculum included a critical study of Shakespeare, Milton, Tenyson and Browning; trigonometry, ancient history, and zoology.

Smith portrays Aggrey as a gifted student who in 1902 graduated with a B.A. at the top of his class, and who delivered a Latin salutatory at commencement. “He had already distinguished himself by delivering the first Greek oratory ever heard in the college,” he said. In 1912 Aggrey was awarded a master’s degree from Livingstone College and the Doctor of Divinity Degree from Hood Theological Seminary. Aggrey was appointed registrar and financial secretary of the college and taught New Testament Greek and economics, among other courses. In 1924 he was offered the presidency of Livingstone College but by then he was already serving on the Phelps Stokes Education Commission. That year he was also offered a position at Achimota College. “In the United States Livingstone stands first in my heart … but in the whole wide world, Africa, my Africa, comes first,” he said.106 Smith also quotes Aggrey as saying:
I want all my people to be educated in the larger sense, in heart, hand and head, and thus render Africa indispensable in spiritual, intellectual and commercial products to the world.

This portrait of Aggrey as a committed leader devoted to Africa’s development is crucial to a reconsideration of his role in the transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model to the Gold Coast. Smith undermines the simplistic depiction of Aggrey as a one-dimensional pawn of white elites committed to black subjugation. He also problematizes a characterization of Aggrey’s educational philosophy by highlighting his own elite academic training. As a scholar and teacher, Aggrey taught his students Latin and other classical subjects.

A trans-Atlantic, African Diaspora perspective invites a reinterpretation of Aggrey’s activities and discourse. While Berman, King and other scholars have characterized Aggrey as a handmaiden of white hegemony, Smith’s account provides a more multidimensional depiction that challenges that assessment. Furthermore, Joseph E. Harris, an African Diaspora scholar, described Aggrey as an important figure “who influenced many African Americans and others to devote themselves to African causes.”

Harris also credits Aggrey with the founding of Achimota and notes that it pursued a Pan-African agenda. While he does not provide support for his assessment, he inspires comparatists to reconsider Aggrey’s role in the transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model to the Gold Coast. By adopting a trans-Atlantic, African Diaspora frame, this dissertation will closely examine Aggrey’s development prior to joining the Phelps Stokes Fund and interrogate the contradiction between the colliding perspectives and goals of British colonial officials, and Africans; and between Aggrey’s words, and actions. It is telling that after
Thomas Jesse Jones invited Aggrey to serve on the commission, Aggrey wrote him to say, “this is the psychological moment for Africa, and I believe you are destined metaphorically to stoop down and kiss the Sleeping Beauty Africa back into life from her centuries of sleep.” However, Jones paternalistically dismissed Aggrey’s assessment of the commission’s work as “the fantastic imagination of an emotional African. Much as I believed in Aggrey, I could not share any of his forecasts.” These colliding perspectives and aims are important in our reconsideration of Aggrey’s role on the commission. The incompatible objectives of Aggrey and white philanthropists and officials can also be gleaned by reading the many letters Aggrey wrote to his wife and fellow Pan Africanists. In a telling letter to his wife, he wrote about his work on the commission. He said the characteristic of a Christian is to do more than he is commanded to do. He added:

I can bear witness that turning the right check wins ultimately. Rightly does Shakespeare make the critical Iago – Shakespeare’s consummate Satan – the critic of critics, pay sweet-souled Desdemona this most excellent tribute: ‘She holds it a vice in her goodness not to do more than is requested.’ … I go forth, Rose, first to serve my God, our God Who has appeared to me by the side of the mountain and asked me to go lead my people away from the Egypt of ignorance and maltreatment … I go to serve my people.”

These and other letters suggest that Aggrey’s primary commitment was to fellow-Africans, and not to white elites and the Education Commission, as much of the scholarship in comparative education has indicated.

**Gaps in the Literature**

Absent from the literature is an examination of the actual curriculum at Tuskegee, and the role of subversion on the part Aggrey and Washington who are widely assumed to embrace the educational philosophy of elite whites. A trans-Atlantic, African Diaspora frame
would enable us to consider the myriad ways that blacks negotiated an externally imposed transcultural identity by employing strategies to influence education policy formation and implementation in the interest of black people. This orientation highlights black agency, cultural meanings, and perspectives, by privileging policy implementation over rhetoric when examining Negro education. This reorientation inspires scholars to consider the possibility that Washington and Aggrey merely appropriated the rhetoric of white elites but privately nurtured a counter-hegemonic agenda. Given that many southern schools adopted this strategy, it is conceivable, even likely, that Tuskegee and Achimota did as well. While Meier and Harlan each expose the inherent contradictions between Washington’s public espousal of industrial education for blacks and his enrollment of his own daughter at Wellesley, neither explicitly explore whether his public stance was merely artifice to appease the South -- a counter-hegemonic strategy cloaked in the rhetoric of black inferiority theories. Marable’s study of Washington’s role in South Africa offers insight into the way his program was perceived by African independence leaders and invites a reconsideration of the efficacy of his program in the U.S. and on the Gold Coast. Marable does not specifically address the curriculum at Tuskegee.

Walker’s attention to “dissimilative resistance to imposed efforts by appearing to conform on the level of visible behaviors, but with different intentions, meanings, and goals” is particularly applicable to Washington and Aggrey. A reassessment of the way that they perceived or implemented the vocational model might expose the slow, irregular pattern of advance and regress articulated by Earl Lewis, that, if spotlighted, could illuminate a subtle form of resistance and subversion often overlooked by scholars.
Chapter 3

**Booker T. Washington, Tuskegee Institute and Rhetoric vs. Reality**

We wear the mask that grins and lies,  
*It hides our cheeks and shades our eyes,—*  
This debt we pay to human guile;  
*With torn and bleeding hearts we smile,*  
And mouth with myriad subtleties.  
*Why should the world be over-wise,*  
*In counting all our tears and sighs?*  
Nay, let them only see us, while  
We wear the mask.

- Paul Laurence Dunbar, 1896

A review of Booker T. Washington’s correspondence, addresses to students and school annual reports between 1888 and 1915, reveal the tension between the dictates of Tuskegee’s white patrons, and Washington’s own closely guarded academic mission. These documents set in high relief the challenges Washington faced as he attempted to negotiate his northern patrons’ explicit directive for Tuskegee to exclusively offer vocational instruction, the vehement southern opposition to all Negro education, and his own broad educational and social mission. These documents compellingly show that, despite its industrial reputation, as early as 1895 Tuskegee awarded an equal number of academic and vocational diplomas. By 1930 Robert Moton, Washington’s successor, finally began to ardently defend the school’s liberal arts curriculum in response to patrons’ concerns.

Such a review underscores why it is essential to interrogate the dichotomy between Washington’s public and private actions. Only then might we unearth subtle manifestations of agency, or what Bourdieu posited as the conflict between human
agency and the structural restraints that bound and constrain it.² Bourdieu’s definition of
agency suggests that boundaries do not eradicate agency, but rather create the need to
negotiate the space around them, which Washington and later his successor appeared to
do. An African Diaspora perspective as envisioned by Walker, Lewis, Kelley, Marable,
and others, draws attention to the stark contradictions between Washington’s words and
deeds at Tuskegee that many scholars have previously minimized, ignored or
misinterpreted. Here, these inconsistencies are mined to expose the machinations of a
subordinated actor working in the interest of black people beneath the radar of hegemony.

Negro Education and Southern Discomfort

Before examining Washington’s activities at Tuskegee, it is important to place his
educational mission in the context of the white South. Much of the scholarship presents
the debate over Negro education as one that simply pit industrial education against
classical liberal arts instruction; Washington’s purported philosophy against that of Du
Bois; and the North against the South. However, it is important to underline the virulent
resistance of many southern whites to all forms of Negro education. Washington operated
in the epicenter of a virulent backlash against any movement towards black
independence. So as northern critics like Du Bois accused Washington of placing the
interests of the white South above black advancement, Washington faced hostile
resistance from southern and some northern whites who understood the inherent threat
that Tuskegee posed to those who relied on a servile and dependent black populace.
Many scholars, however, privilege Washington’s northern critics while ignoring or
undervaluing the prescience of southern whites who viewed Tuskegee and other black
schools as a potent antidote to white supremacy and black subjugation. Even Meier, who highlighted the dichotomy between Washington’s public stance on black political participation, and his covert support for legislation and lawsuits that advanced black civil rights, perpetuated the perception that Washington sought to placate the white South. Explaining the silence that greeted the centennial of Washington’s birth, Meier wrote that Washington “was associated with a policy of compromise and conciliation toward the white South that is not in keeping with the trend of our times.”³ This statement, however, mischaracterizes the way that Washington and Tuskegee were actually perceived by southern whites and thereby understates the racial climate in which the school operated.

As indicated earlier, by the 1880s many philanthropists who supported black education began to insist on a vocational curriculum, and organizations like The Slater Fund linked its support to schools that emphasized the trades. In The Education of Blacks in the South 1860-1935, James Anderson underscored the economic incentives behind the support of northern philanthropists of the industrial model for blacks. William H. Baldwin, a railroad tycoon, original trustee of the Southern Education Board, and first president of the General Education Board, argued that with proper training, blacks were ideally suited to help revitalize the southern economy.

“The potential economic value of the Negro population properly educated is infinite and incalculable. In the Negro is the opportunity of the South. Time has proven that he is best fitted to perform the heavy labor in the South States. The Negro and the mule is the only combination, so far, to grow cotton. The South needs him; but the South needs him educated to be a suitable citizen. Properly directed he is the best possible laborer to meet the climatic conditions of the South. He will willingly fill the more menial positions, and do the heavy work, at less wages, than the American white man or any foreign race which has come to our shores. This will permit the southern white laborer to perform the more expert labor, and to leave the fields, the mines, and the simpler trades for the Negro.”
Robert C. Ogden, a clothing magnate, and George Foster Peabody, a Wall Street banker, also used their influence to promote the industrial education for blacks. (Peabody, insisted that blacks were “children in mental capacity” while Ogden agreed they had “childish characteristics.”) While Baldwin served on Tuskegee’s board, Ogden and Peabody served on Hampton’s. Wrote Anderson: “Like Ogden, [Peabody] succeeded in arousing a great deal of enthusiasm among northern millionaires for the Hampton-Tuskegee pattern of industrial education.”

Anderson added that the northern philanthropists saw black industrial education as beneficial to the urban industrial economy as well, saying “that for them economic and educational concerns fused as part of their broader vision of southern development.”

During this same period a number of measures aimed at tackling illiteracy and poverty in the South exacerbated racial tensions as many whites believed black education diverted needed resources from them. Charles Henry Smith, known as “Bill Arp,” was the South’s most popular writer whose Atlanta Journal Constitution column, “The Country Philosopher,” was reprinted in hundreds of papers. The former slave-holder often attacked Negro education and suffrage. In one column, he wrote, “The Negro is physically ordained for labor, muscular labor, and he likes it. A college life is his utter ruin as a man and a citizen.”

In early 1900 Edgar Garner Murphy, a white Montgomery, Ala. Episcopal priest and Washington ally, organized a conference on the “Negro Problem,” as the circumstances of the nation’s blacks were widely viewed. As Washington sat in the audience, many expressed opposition to all forms of education for blacks. John Temple Graves, a white Atlanta newspaper editor, condemned industrial education for blacks as
dangerous to white supremacy, and supported a plan to relocate all blacks to the far West. He said:

“Carry every theory of Booker Washington to its full and perfect consummation, and you only make a new and deadlier competition between antagonistic races. The conflict heretofore has been social and political … The battle of the loaf will be the deadliest battle of the races.”

Paul Barringer, a physician and chair of the faculty at the University of Virginia, denounced industrial education because he said it taught “too little industry and too much education.” Meanwhile Walter Wilcox of Cornell University insisted that industrial education for blacks was a waste of money since blacks would become extinct due to poor health and criminality. He also argued that industrial training would be rendered moot since trade unions would not allow blacks to work anyway.

Senator Furnifold Simmons, a North Carolina Democrat, derided the “noisy propaganda for negro industrial education,” and said blacks should simply stay on the farm, while James Griggs, a Georgia congressman warned: “Educate the negro to compete with the white laboring man and you may as well open wide the door to every other avenue of thought and action.” So even as Washington was denounced for scaling back educational options for blacks to placate southern whites, many white southerners opposed even what critics considered a lesser form of education for blacks. White southerners correctly saw its potential to prepare blacks for self-sufficiency and competition with whites.

While much attention has been paid to Du Bois’ high-profile critique of Tuskegee in Souls of Black Folk, James K. Vardaman’s Mississippi gubernatorial campaign that year posed an even greater threat to Washington’s program. During the summer of
1903, Vardaman fixed a national spotlight on industrial education for blacks. Vardaman had previously run for governor in 1899 on the platform of abolishing all forms of black education. During his successful 1903 campaign he continued to deride blacks as “coons” and call for the abolishment of their education. He also stepped up his attack on President Roosevelt for inviting Washington to the White House two years earlier saying, “I hope he will be bitten by a blue-gum nigger and die of hydrophobia.”

In September, a day after Vardaman’s election, Rev. LaForest A Planving, the African American principal of Point Coupee Industrial College in New Roads, Louisiana and a friend of Washington, was fatally shot. Like Washington, Planving had encouraged blacks to buy land and work in industry. According to a September 2, 1903 New York Times article, Planving was thirty years old, spoke fluent French, and was pastor of a local church. Despite calls by the American Missionary Association for Louisiana Gov. Heard to launch an investigation, no arrests were made and editor Francis Garrison warned Washington against traveling in the southern countryside. A short time later, a beleaguered Washington traveled to Europe for a respite.

White southern opposition to industrial education persisted: it came from the pulpit, from statehouses and from members of Congress, including Georgia Rep. Tom Watson. In August 1905 Thomas Dixon’s scathing critique of Washington and Tuskegee was published in the Saturday Evening Post in which he called industrial education subterfuge for racial equality and amalgamation. Rather than teaching blacks to work for whites, as many of Washington’s black critics alleged, Dixon said it was “training them all to be masters of men, to be independent, to own and operate their own industries,
plant their own fields, buy and sell their own goods, and in every shape and form destroy the last vestige of dependence on the white man for anything.”

He added:

“Every pupil who passes through Mr. Washington’s hands ceases forever to work under a white man. Not only so, but he goes forth trained under an evangelist to preach the doctrine of separation and independence.”

Similarly, in Gainesville, Florida, a white education official denounced a visit by Washington at the invitation of the state superintendent of education, saying that Washington’s support of social equality was “inconsistent with the ideas, customs and institutions of the South.” Meanwhile white southerners resented even those northern philanthropists who sought to keep blacks relegated to the bottom of the social ladder. Ogden was rebuked as a “Negrophile” or “Negro worshipper” in the southern press.

Black northerners’ high-minded appeals for educational equality on moral grounds ignored the economic realities fueling the violence against southern blacks. Benjamin F. Riley, a white southerner whose family had owned slaves, plainly attributed racial hostility against blacks to the economic needs of southern whites. In his book *The White Man’s Burden: A Discussion of the Interracial Question with Special Reference to the Responsibility of the White Race to the Negro Problem,* published in 1910, Riley wrote:

“Emancipation with its attendant consequences – the delight of which it was hailed as a boon by the millions of the enslaved, equaled only by the dismay with which a mighty industrial system was witnessed by the original slave owner to collapse; the unpreparedness of many thousands of the late slaves to prize the meaning of freedom, and the demand for labor on the farms of the South at a critical juncture … and the sting of defeats and sense of appalling loss on the part of the planters … produced initial complications of no mean dimensions.”

It was within this context that Washington sought to minimize the perceived threat that his program posed to southern whites. Tuskegee and Washington, then, must be
reconsidered against a backdrop of a pervasive resistance to all black education, which stoked state-sanctioned anti-black violence and a fierce assault on black suffrage. Passage of the Morrill Act of 1890, which required states to provide education for non-whites as well as whites, along with a deep economic depression in the early 1890s intensified racial tensions. Forty-eight blacks were reported lynched in Alabama in 1891 and 1892 alone. A Constitutional Convention held in May 1901 to disenfranchise Alabama blacks, who comprised forty-five percent of the population, resulted in the number of black voters in the state plummeting from 180,000 to 3,000.20

Liberal Arts and the Art of Camouflage

While characterized as a man who submitted to the wishes of southern whites, in reality, Washington sought to placate white northern elites who opposed liberal arts instruction for blacks. While Washington navigated the fury of southern whites who feared that industrial education would foster black competition and independence, he vigorously sought to appease his northern white donors who exclusively supported vocational education at Tuskegee. However, the existence of liberal arts courses at Tuskegee, and Washington’s attempt to conceal them, can be gleaned from his correspondence, school catalogues, and a number of eyewitness accounts of Tuskegee. Henry Villard, a prominent journalist and railway tycoon who had controlling interest of the New York Post and the Edison General Electric Company, was among Tuskegee’s northern supporters who vehemently objected to liberal arts instruction for blacks.21 In 1897, Villard wrote Washington to note his “disagreeable surprise” to discover that Tuskegee had in fact offered students courses in physics, rhetoric, philosophy, ancient
history, chemistry, algebra and civil government.\textsuperscript{22} Noting his sense of betrayal, Villard said he had in previous conversations with Washington expressed his opposition to attempts by Atlanta University to provide for the Negro “a regular university education such as is obtained at the highest institutions of learning in the North, when they were not by previous training prepared to receive it.”\textsuperscript{23}

Villard said Washington had assured him that only elementary education coupled with training in domestic arts, agriculture and mechanical trades would be offered at Tuskegee. However, he received a letter from a Tuskegee student “which contained positive proof that the very practice I criticized is being also followed at Tuskegee.”\textsuperscript{24}

Villard said he had discussed the matter with the president of Johns Hopkins University who “expressed the strongest disapproval of the travesty of Negro education, which is being enacted at Tuskegee, and gave me some ludicrous instances of the mental confusion produced there by the pursuit of classical studies on immature minds, which he had drawn out by personal examination of pupils.”\textsuperscript{25}

The letter illuminates the tension between the broad educational mission of Washington and the more narrow vision of his white patron who Washington attempted to deceive. The letter clearly illustrates that Washington had already subverted his benefactor’s wishes by covertly offering liberal arts instruction. However, once his deception was exposed, Washington wasted no time explaining what he described as a misunderstanding. In his response dated July 15, 1897, he assured Villard that, despite evidence to the contrary, there was little difference between Hampton and Tuskegee.

“So far from encouraging what are usually termed classical studies at Tuskegee I have always opposed the introduction of such studies there, and in doing so have for a number of years received the adverse criticism of members of my race. Still I have never given way to this and expect to give my time and strength to the
keeping of the work at Tuskegee in a simple form and trying to do well what we attempt,” he insisted.\(^\text{26}\)

Contrary to what the student wrote and the course listings in the Tuskegee catalogue, Washington asserted that rhetoric was not taught, although it had been offered years ago, “but I found that the students needed the time in the study of simple English grammar and so took rhetoric out of the course.”\(^\text{27}\) He also downplayed the goals of the civil government course. “To appreciate what it means at Tuskegee, one would have to see the work done. There it means little more than the giving of the student an idea of the division of federal and state government.”\(^\text{28}\)

He said the student’s reference to singing classical music, “simply means that she is on our school choir and sometimes I presume the selections are from these authors.”\(^\text{29}\)

However, he assured Villard that the student had exaggerated and that there was no need to worry. In a feeble attempt to assuage him, he said:

“Your letter calls my attention to the fact that the names used in our catalogue are misleading in several cases and give an exaggerated idea of what is attempted in the actual instruction.”\(^\text{30}\)

He then obsequiously concluded that Villard’s criticism “has done us good and I thank you for it.”

Here one can find both evidence of Washington’s attempt to placate his white patron in a sycophantic manner long condemned by his critics, but also his agency as he clandestinely designed a curriculum that was far more academically ambitious than his rhetoric and assurances to sponsors suggested. A fresh interpretation is not intended to ameliorate criticism of Washington’s actions, but rather to highlight the difference
between his words and deeds and provide a more accurate portrait of Tuskegee’s program than Washington could.

Against a backdrop of intense southern opposition to black schooling, Washington continued to stress the dignity of labor while saying little about academics. The school’s 1888 annual report cited as Tuskegee’s aims:

“1st, To enable students to pay a portion of their expenses of board, books, etc., in labor.
2nd, To teach them how to work
3rd, To teach them the dignity of labor.”31

Nowhere in the report does Washington highlight Tuskegee’s academic mission.

By the 12th Annual Financial Report, for the year ending May 31, 1893, Washington noted the addition of a two-story brick laundry building and reported that Cassedy Hall, a three-story brick building that would house a number of industries, was nearing completion. In addition, Phelps Hall, named for one of the namesakes of the Phelps-Stokes fund, had just opened. The three-story frame building had lecture rooms for the Bible Training School and dormitories. Enrollment that year was 611 students from nearly every county in Alabama and thirteen states. Among the facilities were a saw mill, a printing office, an industrial room for garments and laundry and carpenter, blacksmith, wheelwright, harness, tin, shoe and paint shops.

“The industrial operations of the school grow more satisfactory each year,” the report maintained.32

The school’s Fourteenth Annual Report for the year ending May 31, 1895, noted the school had fifty-seven instructors and thirty-seven buildings and, underscoring the school’s manual emphasis, stressed that the students themselves had erected them. While the report highlighted the industrial offerings and provided a detailed account of the
school’s industrial facilities, it reserved a single line to note that twenty-six students had received normal and literary diplomas while another twenty-four received industrial certificates, which demonstrated that the school that embodied industrial education quietly awarded academic degrees to slightly more than half its graduates. This report was released four months before Washington would achieve national fame for his speech at the Atlanta Cotton States and International Exposition.

Evidence of the pride that Washington and others associated with Tuskegee privately took in the promotion of higher learning is disclosed in letters such as one written to Washington on Aug. 26, 1897 by Robert Charles Bedford, a British-born white clergyman who was a close associate and Tuskegee trustee. Responding to an article by Alexander Crummel in which he promoted the attainment of civilization through “higher culture,” Bedford bristled at Crummel’s suggestion that Tuskegee did not promote just that. He wrote:

“A glance among our graduates revealing such characters as Miss Bowen, Harvey Wood Lovejoy, Wilborn Harris, Canty Stewart, Kelly Baskin Kinnebrew, Robert Taylor, Long Marshall and many others show that the genius of the Tuskegee method is not to ignore the advanced education but whatever it is in a man to inspire him to it. I hope nothing will swerve you from your course.”33

As Washington increasingly became the face of industrial education, and his program gained greater scrutiny, Washington privately instructed his staff to make a special effort to draw a more direct connection between the school’s academic and industrial work, “that is, I wish the one dovetailed into the other. I wish you to be very careful to see that this is done throughout the year.”34

In a letter to a Tuskegee administrator, he said students in composition could write about making bricks or harnessing horses, while mathematical problems could be
applied to actual problems in the blacksmith shop. “The physics I think could be made to bear more on the industrial work.”

Beneath the banner of industrial education, Washington quietly nurtured an elite cadre of black students and faculty, many who went on to work in the professions and in business. The book Tuskegee, published in 1900, a year before Washington’s Up From Slavery brought him international acclaim, exposed the school’s academic pedigree. One student, Charles P. Adams of West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, was described as studying physics, algebra, grammar, ancient history, geometry and bookkeeping. Noting the school’s reputation as an industrial school, the author offered, “It should not be inferred that this side of the educational life of the Institute is emphasized at the expense of academic training.”

To wit, he said the course of study is arranged by four tracks: preparatory, junior, middle and senior. He said courses in the middle and senior levels include civics, physiology, geometry, geology, advanced physics, advanced chemistry, psychology, rhetoric, English and American classics, ethics, and pedagogy. This directly conflicted with Washington’s many assurances, including to Villard thirteen years earlier, that Tuskegee would steer clear of liberal arts instruction.

A year later, Washington’s Up From Slavery would bring him international fame, which also meant greater scrutiny for his work at Tuskegee. The school’s 23d annual report in 1901 downplayed the number of students who pursued an academic track. As controversy swirled around Washington and his educational methods, the report highlighted the school’s 666 graduates from the normal and industrial departments.

“These graduates are engaged mainly as housekeepers, teachers in the class room, teachers of industries, mechanics, and farmers; some are in professional life.”
The report devoted considerable attention to the thirty-seven industries in which Tuskegee students were trained, and the nine hundred acres of land that they cultivated.

Washington wrote:

“Our sweet potato crop alone amounted to 6,500 bushels. Our dairy herd, which has been cared for by students, contains 171 milleh cows; 16,333 pounds of butter have been made during the year.” 39

In the report Washington painstakingly explained the philosophy behind the equal division of academic and industrial courses and seemed determined to make the academic component palatable by noting its relevance to the students’ industrial training. Implicit is his attempt to placate both black and white interests, as he had endeavored to do in his speeches. He wrote:

[By dividing the academic and industrial work so that the student shall spend one-half of the time in the industries, and one-half in the academic studies is working successfully. The students seem just as willing to perform the duty that falls to them on the farm, or in the cooking class, as in the arithmetic or grammar classes.

He said serious effort had been made to make the academic department more effective by applying academics to actual problems. Contrary to evidence that advanced academic courses like physiology and calculus existed, Washington characterized the level of academic instruction as elementary and offered only as they applied to industrial training.

He wrote:

Every student is, of course, required to study in each grade of Grammar and Reading, and Mathematics; but in the four higher classes a certain range of choice is granted. This means that the course has greater flexibility to answer the particular need – especially the industrial needs – of the individual student. An important result is that students are relieved from carrying so great
a burden of studies as formerly and are enabled to center their attention upon essentials.

His attempt to minimize the academic instruction is apparent in retrospect, if not at the time:

The academic studies have been more closely and systematically correlated with the industries and the practical interests of the students. …Interest in Physics is aroused and sustained when the class-room teacher takes his class into the machine shop to see the industrial applications, the specific utility of the science; a lesson in Chemistry is fixed by a study of bread-baking in the kitchen. In short, our teaching of the book studies has a certain vividness and reality and a practical value that accord more and more closely with the spirit and purpose of our central work.”  

So Washington attempted to ameliorate concerns over academic training by couching it as merely a tool to aid the teaching of industrial and manual instruction that was central to Tuskegee’s identity, if not it’s actual curriculum. While it is possible that physics students would gain greater insight by observing a machine shop, it seems implausible that physics would be necessary for machinery instruction. It is also unlikely that students in a traditional industrial school would be required to take chemistry to learn bread baking. It seems, rather, that the reverse is true: that Washington used industrial training at least in part to camouflage academic instruction.

Meanwhile, scrutiny of Washington and his work at Tuskegee would intensify by the end of the year after his dinner at the White House with President Theodore Roosevelt provoked white outrage across the country, and calls for the lynching of blacks. Even northern supporters told Washington the episode had set back racial relations. Following that incident, in a letter dated November 1, 1901 to Hampton President Hollis Burke Frisell, Washington confided:
“The recent outbreak in the South regarding my dining with the President convinces me more than ever of the importance of broad liberal education for all people, regardless of race.”

However, Washington only conveyed his true academic vision for blacks in private letters and conversations. Amid death threats and a string of racist songs and poems condemning him and Roosevelt, Washington sought to tamp down the anger by repeatedly insisting that he did not advocate social equality for blacks. However, revelations of the dinner were followed later that month by news that Washington’s 18-year-old daughter Portia attended Wellesley, the elite college for women, which further revealed Washington’s support for traditional academic instruction. Portia was besieged by journalists, and before her father could warn her not to remain silent, had already told a Birmingham Age-Herald reporter that her favorite composer was Chopin. By December Washington requested Secret Service protection and received a cryptic warning from William Baldwin saying: “Don’t go South yet.” Publicly, Washington continued to stress the importance of manual instruction for blacks. However, the revelations of the White House dinner, coupled with his daughter’s attendance at Wellesley, was incontrovertible proof that Washington’s rhetoric camouflaged his beliefs and actions regarding the social mobility of African Americans.

Enhanced scrutiny may have contributed to the framing in 1903 of the 23d annual report that downplayed the students who pursued an academic track. As controversy swirled around Washington and his educational methods, the 23d annual report boasted of the school’s 666 graduates from the normal and industrial departments. “These
graduates are engaged mainly as housekeepers, teachers in the classroom, teachers of industries, mechanics, and farmers; some are in professional life."1

In this report Washington painstakingly explained the equal division of academic and industrial courses and seemed determined to make the academic component palatable by noting its relevance to the students’ industrial training. Implicit is his attempt to placate both black and white interests, as he had endeavored to do in his speeches. He also appeared to formulate a curriculum in response to criticism of the school’s attention to academics. He wrote:

\[ \text{By dividing the academic and industrial work so that the student shall spend one-half of the time in the industries, and one-half in the academic studies is working successfully. The students seem just as willing to perform the duty that falls to them on the farm, or in the cooking class, as in the arithmetic or grammar classes.} \]

He said serious effort had been made to make the academic department more effective by applying academics to actual problems. Contrary to evidence that advanced academic courses existed, Washington described the academic courses as elementary and only offered as they applied to industrial training. He wrote:

\[ \text{Every student is, of course, required to study in each grade Grammar and Reading, and Mathematics; but in the four higher classes a certain range of choice is granted. This means that the course has greater flexibility to answer the particular need – especially the industrial needs – of the individual student. An important result is that students are relieved from carrying so great a burden of studies as formerly and are enabled to center their attention upon essentials.} \]

Another indication that Tuskegee’s instruction was more academic than Washington’s rhetoric indicated, was a speech given by Robert Taylor, a faculty
member who was also the first African American to graduate from M.I.T. In a speech at M.I.T. on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary in 1911, he said that as Tuskegee’s director of industries, he had infused the curriculum with many of the methods he learned at M.I.T. During a speech entitled “The Scientific Development of the Negro,” he said:

Some of the methods and plans of the Institute of Technology have been transplanted to the Tuskegee Institute and have flourished and grown there; if not the plans in full, certainly the spirit, in the love of doing things correctly, of putting logical ways of thinking into the humblest task, of studying surrounding conditions, of soil, of climate, of material and of using them to the best advantage in contributing to build up the immediate community in which the persons live, and in this way increasing the power and the grandeur of the nation.

And noting the success of Tuskegee graduates, he added:

[T]here has been an ever-widening influence: one graduate of the Tuskegee Institute has done satisfactory architectural work for the United States Government, another is an architect in New York City, another is in successful practice in the State of Missouri, another is an installing and operating electrical engineer for a Southern town, another is a mechanical and operating engineer for an ice plant and water system for another Southern town. This list might be continued at considerable length and should serve as a witness of the part which the Institute of Technology is contributing to the scientific awakening of the negro. 

Although Tuskegee continued to offer a bi-furcated curriculum, it was its industrial track that was continually championed by Washington and white northerners “Negro Education,” the report published in 1917 by the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the U.S. Education Department touted Tuskegee as an example for Negro schools to emulate. It proposed a decreased emphasis on classical education and greater attention to manual and industrial education for black students:
It is probable that the wise course for a majority of these schools would be to require thorough knowledge of fundamental arithmetical processes with sufficient skill for practical use, special proficiency in the applications of arithmetic to the pupils' occupations, with a limited amount of algebra and geometry to aid in arithmetical processes.

However, it is clear from Tuskegee’s catalogue and testimonials from students, faculty and observers that the school offered far more than basic arithmetic, just as there is evidence that its curriculum included advanced courses in other academic areas as well. The duality of its curriculum was fleetingly acknowledged in Phelps-Stoke report. It said “the genius of Booker T. Washington gave to the institution world-wide fame as the exponent both of the educational value of manual labor and the correlation of academic subjects with industrial training.”

The report said that students spent three days a week in academic studies and three in the trades. However, a close review of the section that explored the faculty breakdown, shows that the highest proportion, thirty-two, were in the academic wing. (In contrast, 15 were devoted to agriculture training). So despite the rhetoric, two years after Washington’s death, academics continued to occupy a dominant place at Tuskegee, even as its industrial pedigree was advertised.

By the annual report of 1920-1921 Tuskegee’s total enrollment was 2,240 --- 1,166 boys and 973 girls. Another 622 teachers enrolled in Summer School for Teachers and there were postgraduate courses in medicine for physicians that brought the total school enrollment to 2,877. Despite the academic character of the school, many on the outside still emphasized Tuskegee’s industrial roots. The Phelps Stokes Report on “Education in Africa” released in 1922, held Tuskegee up as a model for manual training
but did not highlight its academic offerings. Instead, it touted it as a model for a
“backward” race, saying:

The time has passed when the old thesis can be successfully maintained that a curriculum well suited to the needs of a group on a given scale of civilization in one is necessarily the best for other groups on a different level of advancement in another Country or section.48

The 43d Tuskegee Annual Report for the year ending in 1924 showed an enrollment of 2,962 students, and attributed a slight drop from the previous “due largely to a more strict adherence to the entrance requirements.” The report said tougher state requirements for teacher certification necessitated higher academic standards at Tuskegee:

The last few years have witnessed steady progress in all the southern states in the development of standards of education and larger appropriations by public school authorities for increasing the effectiveness of the public school system. Most of the southern states have recently adopted higher educational requirements for teachers in Negro high schools and training schools, and for all supervisory positions. It is now impossible in most states for a man or a woman to get a teaching position in the better class of public schools without at least two years of college work, and for the highest positions, a college degree is necessary.

The report went on to elaborate the need for more rigorous training and said it had added two years of college courses beyond the regular normal courses.49 The report also cited the need for enhancements to the Academic Department, and higher salaries to remain competitive, saying:

The work of the Academic Department is still hampered in some degree by the insufficient number of teachers and inadequate facilities for the best
work. This is more apparent when attention is directed to the fact that the work of the Junior College just inaugurated is being carried without any addition to our regular staff of teachers. In consequence, our teachers have had to carry a larger amount of work involving longer hours and considerable increase in the range and volume of their activities. With this development of college work, there is immediate need of adequate provision to engage more teachers and to increase salaries to meet the competition of city and state supported schools and for the necessary equipment to do satisfactory work in these professional courses.”

So even as Tuskegee’s industrial training was promoted as a model of Negro education, the school was steadily enhancing its academic offerings. By 1920 the academic character of Tuskegee was apparent, even though the Phelps Stokes Fund and other white elites continued to promote it chiefly as an industrial school.

The following year, the report said the academic department was improved by the installation of new equipment for the teaching of science. Still, the report continued to stress the relevance of academic courses to industrial training.

For years the instruction in science has been conducted with the modest laboratory equipment in use in the earlier period of the school’s existence. This has been replaced by modern equipment for the teaching of chemistry and physics which adds considerably not only to efficiency of method but the interest of the students taking these course. It also makes possible a better correlation of these courses with the various vocational courses in agriculture, domestic science, and mechanical arts. The time is rapidly approaching when the work of this division will call for a science building devoted entirely to these activities.

The report also noted how the higher admission standards had made possible a decreased need for rudimentary courses, and a lower teacher/student ratio. It said:

Few recitation or study groups in the institution exceed twenty-five in number, and some of them less. … The increasing attention being given to Negro education by public school authorities in all the states has created a demand for thoroughly qualified teachers such as has never existed before. As a result it is increasingly hard for Tuskegee to secure the type of
teachers it has always insisted upon and qualify as difficult to hold them after a definite period of experience in the methods of the Institute.

The report cited the need for higher teacher salaries to meet the demands of higher standards of living and the general progress in Negro education. The report attributed high teacher turnover to low salaries and a demand for their services elsewhere. Still, a year later “Education in Africa,” the report prepared by the Phelps Stokes Fund Education Commission, heralded Tuskegee as a model of industrial education to be emulated. The report mirrored one done five years earlier on Negro education in the United States. It said:

The wholesale transfer of the educational conventions of Europe and America to the peoples of Africa have certainly not been an act of wisdom, however justly it may be defended as a proof of genuine interest in the Native people. Now that the futility of many of these conventions for advanced social groups has been recognized, it is not imperative that the Africans and their friends shall urge the greater injustice of applying them to the widely diverse conditions of the primitive groups in Africa?”

As British officials promoted the industrial model for Africa in Tuskegee’s name, Tuskegee continued to outwardly move towards a traditional academic model. The Principal’s Report of 1929 – 1930 marked a significant break from past reports, and was characterized by a far more strident tone and rigorous defense of the school’s academic curriculum. The report opened with a foreword calling for confidentiality, saying it was intended only for members of the Board of Trustees. It noted that the report comes in the interval between the customary annual report and marked the approaching fiftieth anniversary of the school’s founding “as well as by questions raised by members of the Board from time to time concerning the affairs of the school.”
The report, the foreword explained, “is a survey of the institution covering the work of instruction, the plant and equipment, the financial condition and the aims and policies involved in the work as a whole.” It began by charting the course of the school which was the outgrowth “of a nobly conceived effort toward the solution of a great problem thrust upon the nation by social revolution which altered the basis of civilization for this entire section, embracing in its consequences a combined population of more than 11 millions of people of both races scattered over a territory of more than 900,000 square miles.”

It noted how the ideas for industrial training were first applied by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong “whose strong common sense and prophetic vision saw in them the real emancipation of a race and the solution of a problem that baffled the Federal Government itself.” It said after the transfer of the model to Tuskegee, it had been replicated elsewhere and won admiration throughout the country. The report noted how external circumstances -- including the social and economic needs of recently emancipated slaves, public opinion of blacks, and strained racial relations had dictated the course of the school. It also stressed that the school’s successes had not been achieved without controversy, but insisted that its methods “are universally accepted as consistent with the soundest educational theory, and its program for racial advancement is regarded as thoroughly adapted to the practical considerations of a busy world.”

Stressing its progress, it said in 1881, 90 percent of the Negro population of 6.5 million resided in the South. The population had since soared to 12 million, of whom 85 percent still remained in the South. “To put it graphically, the Negro population of the
United States today equals the total population of the South when Tuskegee was established.”

The report offered a promising snapshot of black progress. It said that in 1881 Negroes owned 10 million acres of land, compared to 22 million; and where there were 10,000 Negro business owners in 1881, the number had grown to 70,000. Property holdings of the Negro had also grown in fifty years from $70 million dollars to $2.5 billion dollars, the report said. Likewise, the Negro illiteracy rate of 75 percent had significantly improved to 10 percent; and school enrollment in public schools had grown from forty-one percent to sixty-eight percent. Where there were two public high schools for Negroes in 1881, there were 500 in 1930. The number of college graduates had also swelled from fewer than 100 to 2,160. Home ownership had also mushroomed from 120,000 to 750,000, and the number of Negro teachers had exploded from 14,000 in 1881, to 50,000 in 1930. Similarly, the number of Negroes in the professions had increased from 30,000 to 100,000.

“It has been the proud privilege of Tuskegee Institute to contribute a large share toward this development which is creditable alike to the negro, to the South, and to the nation,” it said, adding that the school also had influence in other countries “with respect to the needs of retarded groups within their borders.”

The report stressed, as did previous ones, the school’s industrial foundation saying: “The development of this program offers a fine opportunity for improving the effectiveness of all our industrial training.” But in a significant break from previous reports, it stridently defended the greater emphasis on a well-rounded education and
indicated that it did not want the school to be stigmatized by a purely industrial reputation. In language that evoked the educational vision articulated by Du Bois, it said:

In all of this we want to make our young people thorough and efficient, and to develop in them a life that abounds in all the elements of wholesome character. We do not want industrial education to be a byword for ignorance and incompetency; we want our graduates to manifest the same thoroughness and discriminating intelligence as may be found among workers in any other lines of service. To this end we want to provide for them the best educational equipment that is obtainable. We want to be sure that we are really educating them and not simply carrying them through certain academic and technical processes … At the same time we want to insure them that the choice of a career in the field of industry does not mean a narrow, cramped, materialistic existence. Because our program deals so largely with material things, it is the more desirable to cultivate among ourselves those interests which extract the spiritual values from all life’s contacts and experiences.”

Equally striking was the report’s defense of one teacher for every eleven students, which it said was needed to accommodate Tuskegee’s dual system of education that necessitated two teachers for every one subject. It added:

“Attention is elsewhere directed to the fact that Tuskegee is more than a school; it is a great social agency, operating for the advancement of a race and in the solution of the gravest social problem of our time. In this it is almost unique and has a recognized place in the affairs of the nation.”

The report went on to note that of the school’s 174 teachers, 12 held master’s degrees, seventy-six bachelor degrees, and six were on leave pursuing degrees. It added:

“Within the last five years 33 of our faculty have pursued courses in other universities and today 20 of our workers are pursuing college courses within the Institute itself.”

The report said adopting a plan that provided for teacher education was “highly desirable.”

Then, in the strongest defense of its academic program, the report declared:
“Tuskegee Institute serves a steadily advancing people. The continued progress of the race will call for a corresponding expansion in the program of the institution that heretofore has stood in the vanguard of its progress. It is an interesting and compelling fact that the budget of Tuskegee Institute today is more than three times as large as the entire educational budget for the state of Alabama in the year in which Tuskegee was established. The public will demand of us efficient service and progressive methods, along with a continuous and practical interpretation of the needs of the time.”

The report, dated April 1, 1930 and signed by Moton, said it was important to restate the aims and policies of the institution. In doing so, Moton seemed torn between articulating an academic orientation, and the need to satisfy his patrons’ wish for an industrial emphasis. He said:

The name Tuskegee, more than any other perhaps, is associated throughout the world with the idea of industrial education, now called vocational education; not that the idea originated at Tuskegee, but that the Founder of the institution advocated it both as a policy of social advancement and as an educational method with such persistence and effectiveness as ultimately to win its practical and universal acceptance in both fields … Gradually, however, there has been an extension upward of the academic requirements for those receiving systematic instruction in the trades, until we finally adopted and enforced the rule that no student should be graduated from the institution who had not completed some definite trade or vocation.”

Staunchly defending its academic offerings, and its more expansive view on education that it had long sought to hide, Moton said:

So long as Negroes are skeptical or wanting in initiative in the development of their own social life, and so long as any considerable body of the public remains skeptical of the Negro’s capacity for functioning in these directions, it is desirable to have at least one spot in the world where a continuous demonstration of this character goes on. The world looks to Tuskegee Institute more than to any other place for this sort of demonstration … The popular mind still persists in associating the Negro with a limited field of activity. It remains an indispensable service
to convince the nation that there are within the race capacities for functioning in all fields, whether of economic, industrial, commercial, financial, professional, artistic or social endeavor.

The report said that over the last six years, a further step was taken to raise the vocational work to a higher academic level. Then, in a play on Jones’ call for adaptive education, the report called for “re-adaptation.” The report said:

As these measures prove effective in the advancement of race, there must of necessity be some modification and re-adaptation of the form which these activities will take; but Tuskegee Institute in perpetuating the policies of the Founder, will continue to promote certain of these activities which must have increasing value, not only for the Negro race, but for all peoples who face similar problems.”

The report said that that in 1915, two-thirds of the students enrolled at Tuskegee were below high school level, but by 1930 one-half were high school grade and above and more than one-fourth were at the college level which “is evidence of a distinct trend upward in academic levels.”

The report directly confronted critics of its academic offerings.

It has been urged that college work be purposely left to other institutions. It has already been represented that Tuskegee itself is better equipped than these other institutions to do this type of work. It is also to be remembered that Tuskegee from the beginning has been an educational entity in itself; that is to say, its courses on whatever level have been so designed as to provide its graduates with a reasonably complete equipment for meeting the demands of their time and environment. It has always been a finishing school – to employ an older terminology – never a preparatory school. With the advance in standards of equipment for service, there is no reason why Tuskegee should not keep abreast of the progress which it has so effectually stimulated. Any other course would be suicidal.
Still, Moton seemed careful to walk a fine line between pushing a more progressive curriculum and appeasing his patrons who were still committed to the school’s founding mission. He said:

[I]t is important to reiterate that Tuskegee was not departing from its traditions, and had no courses leading to a liberal arts degree, and none are contemplated. To be sure, it carries certain courses, in common with other institutions, as a part of the liberal culture which every educated man should have. But such courses will always be in the minority. The fact is that Tuskegee is pioneering in a new field of college work; that is to say, it is attempting to develop vocational courses up to the same standards of training as are required for courses in liberal arts, but they are projected, not in imitation of such courses, but according to the objectives that have all along been contemplated in the field of vocational education. 65

Moton also reported on the growth of the college, where students could pursue degrees in agriculture, home economics, teacher training and technical arts, leading to the Bachelor of Science degree. There were also two-year courses in nurse training and business practice, which he said would eventually extend to four years. By then the school no longer posed as one exclusively devoted to industrial training, even though years of rhetoric had hardened that impression, particularly in the minds of white elites in the United States and abroad.

The school’s visible movement towards a more liberal arts model prompted Du Bois to quip: “The Hampton folks of 1906 were outraged by my words. When I went back to Hampton in 1935, behold, Hampton had become a college and was wondering what to do with her industrial equipment.” 66

Behind Closed Doors

To accurately assess Washington’s educational mission, it is important to read some of his less familiar writings, and to consider the messages he conveyed to blacks,
far from the earshot of his white benefactors. In his weekly Sunday evening talks to students, he often inspired them to aspire to intellectual excellence, as he did in a talk of May 12, 1895 when he said:

“In order to keep yourself growing, you want to have the right kind of inspiration …. You want to be sure that you are a stronger man this week than you were last week.”

Then extolling the virtues of literature, he said:

“Be sure that you come in contact with the best there is in the world in whatever you read. Be sure that you get the best newspapers, the best books, and thus come in contact with the best thought and sentiment in whatever you read. No matter where you are located, be very sure that at least once a week, you come in close communion with the other world through the medium of good reading. Do not be satisfied to take anything that is second or third class. If you cannot hear the best conversation, you cannot hear the best lectures and sermons, you can, as I said, through the medium of the public prints, at least once a week, come in contact with the best our civilization affords.”

Washington’s more docile rhetoric also contrasts starkly with some of the essays he wrote in which he advocated racial pride and black solidarity. Contrary to his accommodationist reputation, Washington predated by several decades the Harlem Renaissance’s glorification of Negro art and culture. In his introduction to Progress of a Race in 1897 he wrote:

“The unprecedented leap the Negro made can never be chronicled. The world needs to know of which mettle these people are built. It needs to understand the vast possibility of a race, so much despised and so thoroughly able to prove out blare and flourish of trumpet its ability to hold its own and compete after only thirty years of life, with those of centuries of lineage.”

He added:
“From gaining the wondering curiosity of the world for a chosen, brilliant few, we are compelling its respect for ourselves as a whole, as a people upon whom the stigma of idle dreaming can no longer be laid.”

In his less familiar writings Washington advocated the teaching of black history, including the great African civilizations, in school. He noted that Tuskegee students studied Africa in their geography class. In The Story of the Negro published in 1909, Washington criticized blacks who tried to disavow or distance themselves from their racial identity. Praising the “peculiar and unique product of Negro life and civilization,” he cited music critics who found in Negro hymns and songs “the most original contributions that America has made, not only to music but to any one of the so-called fine arts.” “I would rather hear the jubilee or plantation songs of my race than the finest chorus from the works of Handel or any other of the great composers that I have heard,” he said. He also disparaged educated black men from elite schools like Harvard who were well versed in European history and languages but knew little of African and Negro history and culture, a point elaborated on in Woodson’s Mis-education of the Negro. Washington wrote:

“In regard to the people with which they themselves were most closely identified, they were more ignorant than they were in regard to the history of the Germans, the French, or the English. It occurred to me that this should not be so. The Negro boy and girl should have the opportunity to learn something in school about his own race. The Negro boy should study Negro history just as the Japanese boy studies Japanese history and the German boy studies German history.”

Washington also wrote about the effect racial prejudice had on him in words evoking black nationalism:

The effect was to drive me closer to my own people, to make me sympathize with them more intimately and more deeply, to feel toward
them as I did toward my own dear mother who had brought me into the world when she and they were slaves.

He added:

The effect has been to give them, in short, that sort of race pride and race consciousness which, it seems to me, they need to bring out and develop the best that is in them. ⁷⁴

Washington had also written about his passion, shared by many blacks, for education. In *Up From Slavery*, he wrote:

The idea that books contained something which was forbidden aroused my curiosity and excited in me a desire to find out for myself what it was in these books that made them forbidden fruit to me and my race. ⁷⁵

And of the quest for literacy among emancipated slaves, he wrote:

I can recall vividly the picture not only of children but of men and women, some of whom had reached the age of 60 or 70, trampling along the country roads with a spelling book or a Bible in the hands … the though of passing from earth without being able to read the Bible was a source of deep sorrow. ⁷⁶

He continued:

Even before the thousands of Negro soldiers had been disbanded, they inveighed their officers into becoming their school masters, and scores of Negro soldiers in every regiment were learning to read and to write and to cipher. On every plantation and in nearly every home. Whether in the town or the city, the hidden book that had been tucked away under the floor or in an old trunk or had been concealed in a stump, suddenly came out of its hiding place and was put into use. ⁷⁷

Conveyed in these writings are his unspoken passion for education that goes far beyond the woodshop and sewing classes he allegedly prized above liberal arts education. And despite criticism from northern circles, his words struck a chord with at least some southern blacks painfully aware of the racial tightrope he needed to tread. Robert Lloyd
Smith, a Texas educator, businessman and politician originally from South Carolina, in 1897 noted his appreciation of Washington’s efforts.

“The effect of your speech at Prairie View and Houston is far reaching. A good man who had an idea that industrial education was designed to contain the Negro as a hewer of wood and drawer of water have had their eyes opened and now know that it is the profoundest statesmanship and the soundest philosophy.”

Tuskegee was more than its curriculum. For many blacks throughout the African Diaspora, the school, with Washington at its helm, symbolized the possible in ways that Hampton or other white-led institutions could not. Recalled one boy who saw Washington speak at the Appalachian Exposition in Knoxville, Tenn. in 1912:

“I thought of him with awe because he was so highly honored. I thought of him with admiration because he could speak so well, and I thought of him with pride because he was a Negro.”

Even if Washington shared Armstrong’s vision for black education, he, by virtue of building an institution that was the embodiment of black achievement, had already stepped out of the shadow of his mentor and the school in Virginia many miles away. While Washington repeatedly preached the value of racial pride to blacks, he occasionally used his influence to publicly appeal to whites to accord blacks respect, as he did in a speech to the National Education Board in July of 1896:

“There is but one way to solve the negro problems. Treat the negro as a Christian gentlemen, no more, no less. If you educate his head and hand and heart, he will take care of himself.”

Mindful of the resistance of the South to black progress, he said:

“At Tuskegee we are trying to develop the hand, the head, and heart of 800 young men and women in such a way that they will be able to do what is called higher forms of work. I know in this country it is everywhere
regarded as a right for the negro to work at the lower forms of work. There is no trouble about his raising cotton in the Mississippi bottoms; but the trouble comes when the negro attempts to work the cotton – to follow it from the field through the gin up into the factory, and from there up into Massachusetts where it is woven into higher fabrics ... the door of that factory is likely to be slammed in his face.”

Washington said he wanted to “bring about such skill, such intelligence, all over this country among the black people that their labor will not be confined as it is at present to the lower forms only.” He insisted that too much time had been devoted to idle political speeches, “that could have been better spent in becoming leading real estate dealers and leading carpenters and truck gardeners, and thus have laid an imperial foundation on which we could have stood and demanded our rights.”

In addition to his personal interactions with white elites, including presidents, a number of scholars have noted his covert support of discrimination cases filed by blacks, including one that resulted in the landmark decision in Baily v. Alabama against peonage.

Dozens of letters exchanged between Washington and Whitefield McKinlay in the early 1900s, reveal his behind-the-scene role securing the appointments of dozens of blacks and whites to federal posts in the administrations of Presidents William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt.

It is also apparent that Washington advised Roosevelt on more than black political appointments. In a letter to Roosevelt dated Nov. 6, 1901, Washington urged him to remove from officer a white revenue collector in South Carolina for taking part in a lynching:

“'It would clear the atmosphere wonderfully and serve as the greatest encouragement to our race if it could be understood that this man lost his position because of having taken part in a lynching; it would be a lesson that would do the whole South good.”
Roosevelt posthumously paid homage to Washington’s political work. He wrote:

“[W]hile Booker T. Washington firmly believed that the attention of the Colored race should be riveted, not on political life but on success sought in the fields of honest business endeavor, he also felt, and I agreed with him, that it was to the interest of both races that there should be appointments to office of Black Men whose characters and abilities were such that if they were White Men their appointments would be hailed as being well above the average, and creditable from every standpoint. He also felt, and I agreed with him that it was essential that these appointments should be made relatively most numerous in the North—for it is worse than useless to preach virtue to others, unless the preachers themselves practice it; which means that the Northern communities, which pride themselves on possessing the proper attitude toward the Negro, should show this attitude by their own acts within their own borders.”

However, these are not the words and actions for which Washington is best remembered. Much of his legacy has been distilled into a single label used to belatedly characterize his speech at the Atlanta Cotton Exposition in 1895.

**Revisiting “The Atlanta Compromise”**

Washington’s standing among progressive blacks of his era has largely been overshadowed by the critique leveled by Du Bois in *Souls of Black Folk* in which he referred to Washington’s 1895 speech at the Atlanta Cotton Exposition as “The Atlanta Compromise.” That characterization has resulted in Washington being widely viewed as an *accommodationist*. While many scholars point to that speech as evidence of Washington’s conservative politics, few have reconciled that characterization with the way his speech was received by progressive blacks of the era, including Du Bois. Days after the speech, on September 24, Du Bois wrote Washington to “heartily congratulate” him. “It was a word fitly spoken,” he wrote.87 A September 18, 1895 headline in *The
New York World, the black newspaper edited by Thomas Fortune proclaimed “A Negro Moses Spoke For a Race.” The article said the speech “marked a new epoch in the history of the South” and “electrified the audience and the response was as if it had come from the throat of a whirlwind.”

Likewise, John Edward Bruce, the Pan African journalist, called his address a “great speech” and noted Washington’s alacrity in simultaneously addressing black and white interests. He wrote:

You may well feel proud of that effort. Like old wine it improves with age. I appreciate all that you say touching the embarrassments under which you labored in efforts to strike the happy mean. In the language of an Ohio politician you had did nobly!! The Negro cannot occupy relative position in the South or anywhere else until he makes himself intellectually, morally, and industrially the equal of the white man.

Bruce added:

“You hold the key to the solution of the problem of the century and you can do much toward making the Bible and the spelling book the scepters of national power and in inculcating the idea that personal worth is the one thing needful in the development of the Negro character.”

Edward Blyden, the Liberian statesman, educator and black nationalist congratulated Washington who he said was “made by Providence an instrument.” John Wesley Edward Bowen, a black professor of historical theology at Gammon Theological Seminary in Atlanta, and editor of the influential monthly The Voice of the Negro, said Washington “has done more for the Negro in that speech than has been done in a generation by a thousand political speeches.”
Meanwhile, Daniel Augustus Straker, a Howard University educated lawyer, agreed, saying, “You have uplifted the Negro race in America, aye, the World over.”

Many hailed Washington as the natural successor to Frederick Douglass, the nation’s most prominent black journalist, abolitionist and orator who had died earlier that year. However, many of the accolades he was accorded during his lifetime were forgotten by scholars who simplistically viewed him through the prism of Du Bois’ *Souls of Black Folk* critique. Washington followed his rousing speech with an article in *The New York Herald* in which he criticized the rush by blacks to political enfranchisement, which Douglass had vigorously promoted but Washington characterized as “artificial forcing.”

While Douglass led from the North, Washington operated in the South where he routinely witnessed the deadly backlash against blacks. He wrote:

> “While the experiment of artificial forcing was being tried the negro was not only alienating himself from the Southern white man, but in the great rush for office he lost sight of the fact that his life success must be conditioned on industrial ability – his ability to create something that the white man wanted, something that would make the white man to some extent depend on the Negro.”

While many scholars have, over the past half-century, characterized Washington’s stance as cowardly or racially conservative, Cruse stressed that integrationist leaders like Du Bois belatedly recognized Washington’s program of economic empowerment and self-sufficiency as essential steps towards black empowerment.

> “Without ever admitting that Booker T. Washington had indeed been closer to the truth in 1900, Du Bois switched his attention to the problem of economic self-sufficiency,” wrote Cruse. By the end of his life, the former integrationist sought refuge in newly independent Ghana.
And while Washington’s outwardly capitalist appeal appeared to place black economic self-sufficiency and racial cooperation above political participation, Meier and Harlan both illustrated that he clandestinely engineered the political appointments of blacks and supported lawsuits and other measures to advance black civil rights.

Summary

There is ample evidence that Washington attempted to address the higher educational and social aspirations of black Americans even as he mimicked the rhetoric of white elites who insisted on manual training for blacks. This is not to say that his rhetoric was not grounds for public outrage, misinterpretation, confusion and even derision from a generation of activists and scholars, but it is to underscore the importance of focusing as much attention on the reality of Tuskegee as the rhetoric surrounding it.

Washington’s rhetoric notwithstanding, Tuskegee offered traditional as well as industrial courses, the former which Washington sought to de-emphasize. Washington appeared to walk a tightrope as he tried to balance his broad educational program, with criticism of his stated philosophy by northern blacks, white hostility towards blacks in the South, and the prevailing sentiments of white northern elites who saw blacks as ideally suited for manual education and labor. However, while Washington overtly promoted black political disengagement and industrial education, there’s substantial evidence that he covertly supported black social equality, including in regard to educational opportunities.

An African Diaspora orientation draws attention to some of the black-nationalist notes sounded in Washington’s addresses and writings that have been eclipsed by his rhetoric. Once we reconsider Washington’s rhetoric as subterfuge we can begin to more
readily see the alignment of Washington’s agenda with that of more progressive black leaders. Walker argues that an African Diaspora perspective would highlight what has previously been invisible or unnoticed, including the employment of dissimulative resistance. In Washington’s case, we might consider his actions less as the work of a charlatan, opportunist or Uncle Tom, as many scholars have previously done, and more as a calculated strategy to negotiate the space around the parameters of psychological, physical and economic coercion, in the interest of black people.

Here it is also useful to consider Lewis’s note of caution. He instructs scholars considering Africans in Diaspora to deemphasize overt signs of resistance and instead highlight subtleties that might otherwise go unnoticed. In the case of Washington, it is essential to consider the dictates of his patrons, as well as the virulent and potentially fatal opposition to black education by southern whites, as structural restraints that influenced his public behavior, but not necessarily his intentions, goals and actions. So even as many historians and Washington’s contemporary critics posited industrial education as a hand maiden of black dependency and peonage, white southerners realized its potential for black liberation and the loss of white economic dominance. The actual curriculum at Tuskegee defied both the dictates of Washington’s patrons, and the impression that Washington fostered in his speeches and letters to funders.
Chapter 4

From Hampton to Achimota: The Construction of Black Transcultural Identity

In the decades following the founding of Achimota, a number of memoirs, which were largely descriptive and written by alumni or former teachers, were published.¹ But beginning in the 1960s scholars began to more critically analyze interest during the early part of the century in transferring the industrial education model from the United States South to Africa. In 1969, Kenneth J. King described the development of the idea that Negro educational institutions in the U.S. South were directly relevant and transferable to Africa. His study focused on the first four decades of the 20th century and on the work of J.H. Oldham, an English missionary, and Thomas Jesse Jones, “the American expert on Negro education.”²

King traced the early interest by the British in the industrial model by noting a tour of Hampton in 1901 by the English Board of Education’s advisor, Michael Sadler. A letter from Sadler to Washington and a special report, “The Education of the Coloured Race,” noted Hampton’s relevance to West Africa. A year later Gold Coast Governor J.P. Rodger visited schools in the southern states and decided to alter his educational system. In 1908 Sir Harry Johnson made a similar tour and later published his critique of Negro liberal arts colleges, while praising Tuskegee and Hampton. Colonial officials in Rhodesia, South Africa, Nigeria and Kenya similarly noted that Washington had abandoned classical academics for trades-oriented systems that could be applied to Africa.³
In 1910, during the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, for which Oldham was organizing secretary, industrial education was framed as “especially urgent” for Africa. During that meeting the commissioners remarked that the value of industrial and agricultural training for “the negro race is abundantly proved by the experience” of the model at Hampton and Tuskegee. In 1917 a book by internationally renowned educator C.T. Loram supported the necessity for African education modeled after the Hampton-Tuskegee model. That same year a study by Thomas Jesse Jones was released. King argued that the study, “established [Jones’s] reputation as the leading authority on American Negro education, demonstrating unmistakably in the process his belief in the superiority of the Hampton-Tuskegee mode.”

Oldham drew the two streams of thought together in a seminal review article of their findings. The two reports stressed the inappropriateness of the literary school for blacks in Africa and America, and “proclaimed a new doctrine of educational adaptation.” Argued King: “The language which would later slip into the official policy of the British Advisory Committee on Education in Africa was already here in Oldham’s assessment of 1918, and was itself merely a précis of Hampton and Tuskegee’s creeds.”

King argued that white elites framed blacks in the U.S. and Africa as having a single transcultural identity. In 1971 Edward H. Berman explored the role the American-based Phelps-Stokes Fund Education Commissions played in the shaping of African education. Like King, Berman argued that fund officials believed the model addressed the parallel social realities of blacks in African and the U.S “This premise,” argued
Berman, “underlay the approach of the two Phelps-Stokes Education Commissions in their investigations of African education.”

**J.E.K. Aggrey**

While James Emman Kwegyir Aggrey does not figure prominently in much of the literature on industrial education, when he does appear scholars often characterize him as an accommodating pawn of British colonial officials. This view is deeply embedded in much of the literature exploring the global transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model to the Gold Coast. The notion is fostered by accounts of Aggrey’s rhetoric of racial subordination and by the high regard in which he was apparently held by white elites, including Gold Coast Governor Gordon Guggisberg, Phelps Stokes Fund Education Commissioner Thomas Jesses Jones, and Achimota Principal James Fraser. It is often noted that Aggrey, the only black member of the Phelps Stokes Fund Education Commission, made dozens of speeches across Africa in support of a model that W.E.B. Du Bois and others condemned as antithetical to black advancement. So Aggrey is largely viewed through the narrow prism of black American protest and white elite backing. As a result, he is posited as an enthusiastic mouthpiece for a colonial agenda seen as anathema to African progress.

Describing Aggrey’s appearances before African audiences, historian Edward Berman invoked the image of Booker T. Washington to establish Aggrey as a stalwart steward of racial accommodation. He wrote:

> Echoing the words of Booker T. Washington, Aggrey told the students at the South African Native College at Fort Hare that as black people they must learn to accept help wherever they found it, to work with those who were willing to work with them, and to remember that the Anglo-
Saxons, whatever their faults, had been more successful in dealing with backward races than any other people in history.”

Donald Spivey described Aggrey as “a man in whom the colonial whites should have found no faults,” and said: “It may well be argued that Aggrey was the Booker T. Washington of Africa.”

In an article exploring the model’s global transfer, comparatists Gita Steiner-Khamsi and Hubert Quist also portray Aggrey as a tool of white colonial elites. They emphasize the enthusiastic reception Aggrey received from white missionaries and colonial officials during his extensive travels across Africa as a member of the Phelps Stokes African Education Commission. Describing the response to his speeches to European and African audiences across the continent, they write:

“The missionaries were so profoundly taken by his accommodating words and his clarification of the [racial] ‘misunderstandings’ that they told journalists, ‘it would be worthwhile for the white people to keep Dr. Aggrey permanently in Kenya to explain the white people to the natives. He also won the heart of the colonial governor of Kenya, who felt that Aggrey’s ‘constructive statesmanship’ […] was more effective than a regiment of British soldiers.’”

They maintain:

“The admiration was by all means mutual. Aggrey, however, saved his highest praise for [Gold Coast] Governor Guggisberg, whom he regarded as the patron of education.”

Steiner-Khamsi and Quist, like other scholars, note the opposition by Du Bois and some African intellectuals to the industrial model and argued that Aggrey’s speeches “appealed to a sense of pride in what Africa had to offer the world: love for the soil and moral values.”

While these accounts are noteworthy, taken alone they create a skewed and one-dimensional portrait that utterly ignores how Aggrey was perceived by many Africans, or
the impact he had on the Pan African movement. Also ignored is how Africans may have seen Achimota, a school based on a dual model similar to Tuskegee’s. Just as southern whites were able to intuit how Tuskegee could benefit blacks, so too might Africans have considered the value of Achimota. A fuller exploration of Achimota’s curriculum along with Aggrey’s speeches and writing and the ways in which Africans perceived him could illuminate more fully his role in the global debate on education in the African Diaspora and towards the mission of African uplift. Most importantly, these accounts, by positing Aggrey as merely a pawn of white elites, neglect to explore Aggrey’s agency as a member of a subjugated group. Here it is instructive to once again consider Earl Lewis’s idea of agency as less a form of overt action, but as the “slow, irregular patterns of advance and regress, each in a dialectic working toward a synthesis.”

Here too we can consider Sheila Walker’s attention to the ways black actors negotiated the dominant political, economic and social landscape through dissimulative resistance to imposed efforts “by appearing to conform” but “with different intentions, meanings and goals” from the empowered. Also, Bhabba’s theory of hybridity reminds us to consider that the apparent conformity and political ambiguity of colonized actors are the by-products of coercion. We must then consider what Scott call’s the infrapolitics and view Aggrey within the context of the political and economic conditions that obviously influenced his rhetoric. Also, while Aggrey has been primarily judged by some of his rhetoric – or what Scott would call the public transcript -- we must turn our attention to a broader consideration of resistance and pay closer attention to the hidden transcript. For this, we must review Aggrey’s speeches alongside his private correspondence, personal affiliations, and the impact he had on Africans and African Americans, to more fully
assess how he attempted to negotiate the barriers of racial subordination.

Indeed, a fuller review of Aggrey’s speeches and private correspondence, along with accounts of him by his contemporaries, particularly African American journalists and black nationalists, and later by African biographers, problematizes what some have framed as his single-minded embrace of an inferior educational model for blacks and its wholesale condemnation by African intellectuals. This prevalent interpretation ignores compelling evidence that Aggrey was and is revered across Africa and viewed as an important contributor to modern African education, identity and self-determination. To fully assess Aggrey’s contributions, his rhetoric must also be considered alongside a comprehensive view of the Hampton-Tuskegee model outside of the narrow construct in much of the literature. As illustrated earlier, beneath the façade of industrial education the Hampton-Tuskegee model was, in reality, an amalgamation of educational philosophies that combined classical and industrial curricula, which Achimota intended to more outwardly replicate. At Tuskegee, the idea of the school as primarily devoted to vocational training was sustained by rhetoric made necessary by white elite sponsorship contingent on an industrial emphasis. This stipulation resulted in ambiguous discourse, and even subversion by black educators who sought to downplay the classical or otherwise racially empowering dimension of the curriculum. I have attempted to show that racial uplift and industrial education – which in the case of Tuskegee included instruction in architecture, the sciences, and lucrative trades – were not mutually exclusive, nor did they necessarily privilege white over black interests. Indeed, even as white philanthropists saw industrial education and the continued subjugation as blacks as beneficial to the nation’s economy, Washington and his admirers across the African
Diaspora saw how instruction in lucrative trades and professions could mutually benefit blacks in Diaspora.

There is considerable evidence that Aggrey -- despite his close ties to white elites and support for racial cooperation -- vigorously promoted aspirational African independence that could be achieved through the adoption of the *actual* Hampton-Tuskegee model. A depiction of him based solely on snippets of his rhetoric or the support he received from white elites, is problematic for several reasons. First, it ignores his agency and the plausibility of the kind of rhetorical subterfuge that enabled Washington to publicly promote industrial training while he privately nurtured a dual model. Secondly, it fails to explain Aggrey’s association with Pan African actors and organizations, and the high esteem in which he was held by many including independence leader Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana’s first post-colonial president. Thirdly, by essentializing Aggrey and Tuskegee, scholars overlook the ways in which the actual Hampton-Tuskegee model could advance post-colonial African uplift.

Even as Aggrey advocated a model that was derided by Du Bois and other black American intellectuals and African elites, he was a product of elite schools in the U.S. and Africa who reverently considered Du Bois the “Moses of his people.” Aggrey, in fact, as both an advocate of African nationalism and a beneficiary of white elite patronage, could serve as a Pan-African prototype of the dilemma of double-consciousness so powerfully conveyed by Du Bois who wrote:

“One ever feels his two-ness, -- an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder.”
However, Du Bois’s double-consciousness, rigidly cast in black and white, and in irreconcilable extremes, does not allow for the gray course of moderation and subtle resistance pursued by Aggrey. Du Bois was born in the North in the United States at the dawn of emancipation and as a scholar and activist concerned himself with racial equality and integration. Aggrey, on the other hand, was born into and worked within a colonial system in Africa and as a minister placed his faith in the work of white missionaries and progressives, black and white, who he believed were working in the interest of African uplift. He emphasized racial cooperation, often noting the black and white piano keys needed to make music.\textsuperscript{23} He often said:

“You can play a tune of sorts on the black keys only; and you can play a tune of sorts on the white keys only; but for perfect harmony you must use both the black and the white keys.”\textsuperscript{24}

His philosophy of racial cooperation is emblazoned on the Achimota School crest, which bears an image of piano keys. A product of missionaries, Aggrey often credited his success to his Christian and academic teachings:

“I was born a pagan, and am not ashamed of it. But if the missionaries had not sought and found me, I should to-day have, perhaps, a dozen wives, I should be a chief, honoured by my people. But I should know neither Shakespeare nor philosophy nor the Gospel.”\textsuperscript{25}

However, while espousing racial cooperation and Christian values, Aggrey appeared far less concerned than Du Bois with integration. Like Washington, Aggrey placed greater emphasis on nation-building than on racial integration. While Du Bois struck a pose of righteous indignation in the face of anything short of full racial equality, Aggrey took solace in gradual but steady progress toward African self-sufficiency.

Said Aggrey to a British reporter: “My people in West Africa are now getting to call the Prince of Wales’s College, Achimota, our college.”\textsuperscript{26}
He added:

“The Achimota tradition, if one may use the word of this new college, is that of service for country; cooperation, irrespective of color; and education of head, hand and heart. Our aim is to take all the best in African culture and combine it with the best in Western culture. This means that we shall, besides the academic, scientific, agricultural and manual instruction, give much attention to indigenous art, to craft, and to African music.”

In other words, Achimota would follow the course of Tuskegee by providing a hybrid program of academic and vocational training aimed at educating the “head, hand, and heart.”

The Achimota School

The Achimota School began operating in 1924 as a coeducational boarding school that also offered teacher and technical training and general secondary education but officially opened in 1927 as an elite school with the aim of training bi-cultural world leaders. Gold Coast Governor Gordon Guggisberg envisioned a showcase for all of colonial Africa with a school that spanned from kindergarten to the university level, with a college for teacher training and a state-of-the-art research center. Steiner-Khamsi and Quist said the model was based on two “very different types: on the one hand, the English ‘public’ school model, and on the other, the Hampton-Tuskegee model from the post-Civil War Reconstruction period in the U.S. South,” to provide training for “the gentleman scholar and politician” and the other for “adaptation to the rural environment, emphasizing manual labor and agriculture.” However, in reality, Achimota’s dual curriculum was based on the actual Tuskegee model that trained students for elite professions, agriculture and trades. However, summarizing the school’s mission, Steiner-Khamsi and Quist wrote:
“The Hampton Institute (Virginia) and the Tuskegee Institute (Alabama) used to be for the African American in the southern states of the United States what Achimota College (Gold Coast) now became for Africans in Africa and other colonized people under British rule – monuments of adapted education that educated their students to accommodate the limited opportunities of a racist environment.”

They added:

“The educational philosophy of these three monuments of adapted education were firmly rooted in the belief that blacks should be trained for a life of manual labor and should stay away from studies that were too ‘bookish’ and academic.”

While this description may characterize the intent of colonial officials and American philanthropists, it ignores how Washington and Aggrey envisioned the schools’ role in the advancement of blacks in professions, trades, industries and agriculture.

Located roughly six miles from Accra, the capital of the former Gold Coast, Achimota was situated on an emerald 1,023-acre campus with some seventy colonial-style buildings – including two chapels, a hospital, library, and printing press. It also boasted modern research facilities and one hundred acres of playing fields for cricket, tennis, hockey and football; a swimming pool, farm, model village, and hundreds of acres of forest reserve for timber and fuel supplies. According to its mission statement:

“Achimota hopes to produce a type of student who is ‘Western’ in his intellectual attitudes towards life, with a respect for science and capacity for systematic thought, but who remains African in sympathy and desirous of preserving and developing what is deserving of respect in tribal life, custom, rule and law.”

Like Tuskegee, Achimota’s dual curriculum offered courses in Latin, math and science, as well as agriculture, weaving, tailoring, bookbinding, metal work, and silver-
The primary level offered courses in English, geography, civics, math, nature, music, woodwork, art, and English, while the secondary curriculum included leadership training, botany, geography, history, science, math, music, art, and agriculture. At the university level, students could study the classics, history, English, and science, with an emphasis on engineering. Students across levels were taught the value of working with the hands. And just as Washington integrated African and African American history and culture into the curriculum at Tuskegee, so too did Aggrey at Achimota. Aggrey said the staff was studying the language, history and culture of West Africa and that he had personally devoted time to developing courses in West African history. In addition to courses in Gold Coast history, students would also study modern Europe. Aggrey said the African drum language, “a wonderful branch of African culture,” would be studied as well.

While some elite Africans criticized the integration of African history, languages and culture into the curriculum and insisted that courses be taught in English, it could be argued that African students took pride in learning about their own history and culture, and in their own languages. By 1940 elite British universities, including Cambridge and Oxford, recognized Ga, Twi, Ewe and Fante for matriculation. Decades later, as president of post-colonial Ghana, Achimota graduate Nkrumah also promoted the integration of African culture in the school curriculum.

The school constitution stated that Africans would have a voice in their education, and that the colonial government would play the role of patron, not controller. However, while Tuskegee was entirely segregated, with only black faculty and administrators, Achimota initially had few Africans on the staff. At the time of Aggrey’s death he was
one of two Africans on the faculty. However, under fire, colonial officials increasingly hired African teachers and administrators. By 1929, twelve of the fifty teachers were black but there were no Africans on the senior staff. Many of the teachers came from across the British Empire, including Ireland, England and Scotland.

**Aggrey’s Transnational Influence**

Aggrey maintained close ties with Pan-African actors as a member of the American Negro Academy founded by Pan-Africanists John E. Bruce, the journalist, and Garvey-ite; and Arthur Schomburg, a bibliophile who collected the art, letters and books of African descendants across the Diaspora. Both men vigorously promoted Pan African pride and self-determination. During a speech in Toronto in 1923 while a member of the Phelps Stokes Commission, Aggrey extolled the virtues of Marcus Garvey’s mission to return African Americans to Africa: “[Marcus] Garvey’s thought of the colored people’s return to their native Africa is a dream, I think, but in time, as educated colored men come as missionaries and evangelists to their people in America, men may go back to the new Africa that we hope will arise.”

Aggrey also reached out to Du Bois and sought advice on textbooks from Carter G. Woodson, a founder of the Negro Society for Historical Research and one of the fiercest critics of the Phelps Stokes Fund’s work. In a letter to Woodson dated July 13, 1927 – a little more than two weeks before his death -- Aggrey expressed a desire to join his association:

> We of African descent must bring our contribution to civilization. I want to spend some time with you to give you an idea of what we are trying to do and at the same time get your news, your suggestions, criticism and advice.”
Invoking Washington’s philosophy, Aggrey said he supported training for “the head, the hand, and the heart,” that was eventually embraced by many post-colonial African leaders. He often said: “I want all my people to be educated in the larger sense, in heart, hand and head, and thus render Africa indispensable in spiritual, intellectual and commercial products to the world.”

It is also important to consider that even as Aggrey became, after Washington’s death in 1915, the international face of industrial education for blacks, he epitomized the advantages of classical liberal arts instruction and thereby inspired legions of African youth. Not only did Aggrey attend an elite missionary school in the Gold Coast, but he held a B.A. and masters degrees from Livingstone College where he later served on the faculty; a Doctorate of Divinity from Hood Theological Seminary, a doctorate in Osteopathy, a master’s degree in sociology from Columbia University and at the time of his death had passed examinations for the Ph.D. and was completing his dissertation at Teachers College, Columbia University. Where Washington was a product of the very education model he promoted, Aggrey’s advocacy of industrial education was already contextualized by his own sterling academic achievements that served to inspire his African audiences. Wrote King: “There was in fact for many Africans in the 1920s no more persuasive illustration of the advantages of higher education than Aggrey. In his biography, Kwame Nkrumah credits Aggrey for his decision to attend college in the United States. Nkrumah received a bachelor’s degree from Lincoln University and a master’s degree from the University of Pennsylvania, where he was pursuing a doctorate. He wrote:
"It was because of my great admiration for Aggrey, both as a man and a scholar, that I first formed the idea of furthering my studies in the United States of America."  

Similarly, Nnamdi Azikiwe, the first president of independent Nigeria, attributes his decision to study in the United States to Aggrey. Azikiwe was sixteen and a student at the Wesleyan Boys School in Lagos, when he met Aggrey during the latter’s visit as a member of the Phelps-Stokes Education Commission. Contrary to the prevailing portrait of Aggrey as a proponent of lowered African educational aspirations, Azikiwe said:

"Dr. Aggrey's appeal moved me and since then I have doggedly plodded along and plugged my way to America. I became a new man and my ideas of life changed so much that I lived in daydreams, hoping against hope for the time when it would be possible for me to be like Aggrey."

Peter Mbiyu Koinange, of Kenya wrote:

“When I heard that man speak, I quit my job in Nairobi and walked twenty five miles to my home in one day and told my father, I must go to America where that wonderful African was educated.”

Aggrey also received many letters of gratitude following his talks during his Phelps Stokes Commission tour. In a letter from the “Native Members of Staff” of the Lovedale Institute in South Africa where Aggrey spoke, they wrote:

“We are proud to have a worthy representative of our race in your person. You have demonstrated to the world what God can do with a man whose life is consecrated to His service for the upliftment of mankind. We greatly regret your unavoidable departure from our shores…”

After hearing him speak in Sierra Leone, a man only identified as E. N. Jones wrote:

“As I listened to your speeches I found in you my ideal of an educated African -- one who does not slavishly copy his master nor tied down to the tradition of his father, but one who like a scribe that is instructed in the Kingdon of God who brings out of his treasure things new and old. Sir, I am no flatterer. I know what you could have done with such prodigious learning had you elected to remain in
America or Europe … To come to mother Africa is indeed a sacrifice for which we cannot fully thank you. You have inspired me to do and dare for Africa.”

In his native Cape Coast, members of the Victory Club, said Aggrey “inspired in us new hopes of Redemption of Africa, and her awakening from the lethargic sleep into which foreign influences have hypnotised her to the realization of the tremendous possibilities of progress and advancement, both Educational and Industrial, awaiting her now at her very door.”

These are but a handful of the letters of gratitude Aggrey inspired across Africa during his Phelps Stokes tour. It is clear from the letters that Aggrey was revered as a man who was devoted to the upliftment of Africa and Africans. Also instructive are letters Aggrey wrote to his own children, both of whom studied at Hampton. He emphasized their service to the race and Africa. In a letter to his son Kwegyir on the occasion of his seventh birthday, he wrote:

“I thank God for all of you and pray that many many more years may be added unto you so that you may serve your race and generation more largely, yea even more largely than your father. I congratulate you … You are my only son, Kweg, and papa has set all his hopes on you as a son. Your responsibilities are great but Jehovah is greater and able, my beloved boy, to help you and give you power equal to all your responsibilities.”

In another to his daughter Rosebud, dated Feb. 8, 1927, he wrote:

“Of course your education is not to stop with Hampton. You are to go higher and higher. You must have a university education and a university degree, then spend a year or two abroad before you take your life work. I wish together with your music you may be a doctor – a medical doctor also. Women doctors are very much needed all over the world but especially in Africa the land of promise, the land and continent of the future.”
Stressing the importance of higher education, he wrote: “In order to give you children the best education I shall count no sacrifice too much if you children will do your part as I am confident you will.”

Aggrey’s ‘Negro’ Education

Born Emman Kodwo Mensa Otsiwadu Humamfunsam Aggrey on October 18, 1875, Aggrey was the eldest of eight children born to Kodwo Kwegyir and Abna Andua, at Anamabu in the British Gold Coast. Aggrey's father Kwegyir was an influential elder in the Fante Council of Amonu IV, the paramount chief of Anamabu and was the spokesman for the Oman or Council, which gave him prominence in Anamabu. Aggrey of Africa: A Study in Black and White, by Edwin G. Smith provides a unique perspective on Aggrey’s life as it was written by a Gold Coast native with the assistance of the Phelps Stokes Fund which granted him privileged access to Aggrey’s journals and private correspondence and to members of the Phelps Stokes Commission, Achimota school officials and Governor Guggisberg, all of whom were interviewed.

In an intimate portrait of his early years in the Cape Coast region, Aggrey is portrayed as fiercely proud of his family legacy and his father. “He was well known both in Fanti and Ashanti courts and universally respected,” wrote Aggrey. “Both sides trusted him and he never betrayed his trust.”

Cape Coast was the capital of the British colony until 1876 when Accra became the capital. For centuries Cape Coast had been a major port of the transatlantic slave trade, first begun by the Portuguese in the 1600s, then presided over by the Dutch, and eventually the British. In addition to being an important commercial center it was, as a
chief point of contact between Africans and Europeans, a site of cross cultural exchange and European “civilization” promoted by missionaries and the proliferation of literature. English journals and books were readily available; the Wesleyan Mission began a book depot that by 1895 had annual sales exceeding one thousand pounds.\textsuperscript{53}

In *Aggrey of Africa*, Smith describes the literary boon in the Cape Coast of Aggrey’s youth:

> "Reading rooms were opened, literary societies were organized, debates were held on weighty subjects. To those who could not attend school during the week, reading and writing were taught at Sunday school. ‘Examination picnics’ became the vogue, when under a reverend umpire spelling and reading marches were the order of the day. Education and Christianity advanced hand in hand."\textsuperscript{54}

At the age of seven Aggrey was baptized in the Methodist Church and he was given the Christian name of James. His father, who could not read nor write, sent his sons to the Wesleyan Methodist School at Cape Coast, where Aggrey was one of twenty boys who received instruction in English, science, logic and religion. At the age of fifteen, Aggrey was selected to serve as a temporary teacher and headmaster at Abura Dunkwa, a school for some forty boys located twenty miles from Cape Coast. Aggrey fondly recalled his time as a teacher and headmaster. He wrote:

> One of the things that kept me up was the faith my old teachers, black and white, had in me. Those white missionaries felt I could not fail. They believed that Africans, though untutored, could be redeemed and join the angelic train. And I prayed god to help me never to disappoint them."\textsuperscript{55}

Upon his return to Cape Coast, Aggrey was appointed assistant teacher at Wesleyan Centenary Memorial School that had been established in 1891. In 1894 Aggrey began preparing for the Cambridge local examination. During that period he also offered to teach missionaries his native Fanti language in exchange for lessons in French, Latin
and Psychology, lessons he shared with his students. By 1895 he had passed the teachers' certificate examinations offered by the Department of Education that qualified him to teach at any school in the British colonies. Aggrey scored at the top of a class of 119 candidates taking the exam and was recognized by the legislative council.

By the age of twenty Aggrey was second in command at Wesleyan Centenary Memorial School and by twenty-three was the headmaster. He was among the elite class of educated and Westernized Africans in the Gold Coast who were also in the forefront for the quest for African nationalism. In 1897, when the colonial government proposed legislation that would allow it to take control of the sale of native land, Aggrey was among those to protest it. He served as secretary of the Gold Coast Aborigines' Rights Protection and carried a petition against the Public Lands legislation. He also assisted in the writing of articles published in the *Gold Coast Methodist Times* and the legislation was ultimately defeated.

On July 10, 1898 Aggrey sought to scale higher heights when he set sail for the United States aboard the S.S. Accra for England, en route to the United States. Aggrey was invited to America by John Bryan Small, a native of Barbados who served as clerk to the British Brigade in Honduras before settling in the United States where he became a minister and later bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church in York, Pennsylvania.

**Livingstone College and Aggrey’s Higher Education**

Aggrey began his American residency at Small’s home in Pennsylvania before heading to Salisbury, North Carolina to attend Livingstone College, which was the
educational arm of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. For the next two decades Aggrey remained closely connected to the church that was one of the seventeen Methodist sects in the United States. The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church was founded in 1796 by a small group of blacks who withdrew from the John Street Methodist Church in New York City. It was incorporated in 1801 as the African Methodist Episcopal Church to which Zion was later added.56

Aggrey enrolled in Livingstone on October 12, 1898 becoming one of the approximately seventy African students who by 1900 had traveled to the United States to study at predominantly black institutions in the South.57. Livingston College was originally founded in 1879 as Zion Wesley Institute at Concord, North Carolina to educate newly emancipated slaves. Classes began in 1880 but in 1882, with a donation of $1,000 from the Rowan County town of Salisbury, North Carolina, it relocated and opened in Salisbury with Joseph Charles Price as its principal. In 1887, it changed its name to Livingstone College to honor the memory of David Livingstone, the famous Protestant missionary, philanthropist, abolitionist and explorer.58

Price was born in Elizabeth City, North Carolina in 1854 and gained world renown as a gifted scholar and orator. He was the 1879 class valedictorian at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, which was established in 1854 as the nation’s first black institution of higher education. At Lincoln Price completed the three-year theological course in two years.59 In 1881 Bishop J.W. Hood, a co-founder of Livingstone, appointed Price to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church’s delegation to the Ecumenical Methodist Conference in London. Price so dazzled conveners that he was asked to remain
in England to assist with the planning for new denomination schools. While there he raised $10,000 for Livingstone College.\textsuperscript{60}

In 1898 Livingstone College was divided into three components: a grammar school for rudimentary education, a normal school to train teachers, and classical departments. The Hood Theological Seminary was also part of the college. While Price publicly supported industrial education, it was not introduced into the college curriculum until much later, and, never received serious attention.\textsuperscript{61}

At Livingstone Aggrey was placed in the classical department where during his freshman year he studied Latin, Greek, English, geometry and geography. During the second term he continued those subjects and in addition read Homer’s \textit{Iliad} and Virgil’s \textit{Aemid}. During his sophomore year Aggrey embarked on a critical study of Shakespeare, Milton, and Browning, and in English learned Parliamentary Practice, Debating and Argumentation. In addition, he took courses in German, Trigonometry, ancient history and zoology. In his junior year Aggrey studied logic, modern history, astronomy and continued German, Greek and Latin. In the second term he also began Comparative Literature, chemistry and analytic geometry. During his last year of college he studied philosophy, sociology, geology, biology and political economy. At Livingstone Aggrey distinguished himself as a model student who also contributed articles to \textit{The Charlotte Observer}, one of the South’s preeminent newspapers. H.C. Bruant, one of his editors, said of him: “He’s dark as dark, but very few in America can use English as he can. His articles go in without any blue-pencilling.”\textsuperscript{62}

In 1902 Aggrey graduated at the top of his class with a B.A. and was awarded gold medals for English composition and for general scholarship. He delivered the Latin
salutation at the commencement ceremony and following graduation was appointed registrar and financial secretary of Livingstone College where he also taught. Smith describes Aggrey and his future bride, Rosebud Rudolf Douglass as intellectuals who “discussed Cordelia and Shakespeare and other literary subjects.” Aggrey met Douglass in 1904 at the wedding of his friend William Johnson Trent for whom he was best man. Trent later served as president of Livingstone College from 1925 to 1957. He was appointed only after Aggrey was offered, and declined, the position following the resignation of D.C. Suggs.

In 1912, Aggrey was awarded a master’s degree from Livingstone College and a Doctor of Divinity from Hood Theological Seminary. By then he was a celebrated teacher and administrator at Livingstone where he was also superintendent of the college Sunday school. Said Trent, while president of Livingstone: “His influence at Livingstone, where he taught for more than twenty years, was very precious and had a great deal to do with the improvement of the moral and spiritual conditions of the whole college life.”

Aggrey’s educational philosophy was undoubtedly influenced by the practical and classical curricula at Tuskegee. Aggrey visited Tuskegee numerous times, including in 1906 as a representative of Livingstone College at the school’s twenty-fifth anniversary celebration. At the time Aggrey discussed with Washington the idea of opening a Tuskegee in Africa. He returned in 1920, five years after Washington’s death, as he prepared for his trip to Africa as a member of the Phelps Stokes Commission. “I return thinking what a great godsend a Tuskegee in Africa would be. Heaven hasten the day!” he said.

Of George Washington Carver, he wrote:
“A man like him with ample facilities could work wonders in Africa. Five years in intensive service among rural folk have grown in me a special love for the soil and my eyes have been opened to the great opportunities in soils, in field and farm and forest. Verily my people are sleeping on acres of diamonds.”

Rather than supporting a simple industrial model, Aggrey stressed the “development of the socially efficient individual” and said:

"By education, I do not mean simply learning. I mean the training in mind, in morals, and in hand that helps to make one socially efficient. Not simply the three R's, but the three H's: the head, the hand, and the heart."  

Like Washington, he also believed in co-education, and is often quoted as saying:

“If you educate a man you simply educate an individual, but if you educate a woman, you educate a family.” Of course, in the aftermath of slavery, women, as well as men, were hired to work on southern plantations and the model that was seen as beneficial to the southern economy was transferred to the colonial Gold Coast.

In 1914 Aggrey became a Doctor of Osteopathy following a correspondence course at the International College of Osteopathy in Elgin, Illinois, and that summer began taking summer courses at Columbia University. He took four courses: Educational Psychology, Diagnosis and Treatment of Atypical Children; Spanish, and Sociology with Dr. Franklin Henry Giddings, the sociologist and economist who joined the faculty at Columbia in 1892 as the new chair in Sociology and the History of Civilization. Giddings was one of the foremost writers in the social sciences in the late 19th century and developed one of the leading departments until his retirement in 1928. Early in the century he had been the professor and mentor of Thomas Jesse Jones, who may have learned from him the theory of Manifest Destiny of the Anglo Saxon. Giddings took a keen interest in Aggrey and encouraged his studies. In a letter to Aggrey dated Aug. 17,
1914, Giddings praised his contribution to his summer Seminar in Sociology and his “whole attitude and relation to the problems that so deeply concern the colored peoples.” He also encouraged him to major in Sociology.

You are in a position to do effective work toward the solution of these difficult issues. The men who retard everything are those who are in too great haste, ignoring the tremendous disadvantages presented by human prejudice, traditions and habits, and those who are too self-seeking, caring more for their own personal advancement than for the advancement and happiness of mankind.74

Aggrey continued his summer studies every year until 1917, and worked closely with Giddings with whom he took courses in Social Evolution, Democracy and Empire, and Social Systems of the English-speaking Peoples. He also took Social Institutions, United States as a Society and Educational Psychology, Primitive Methods of Education and Social Institutions.75 In a letter to Trent who was on the Gold Coast, Aggrey reported that he was the only “colored” student in his classes but said academically, “I was right there with them.”76

Aggrey matriculated in 1918 with the aim of getting a degree in sociology and education. Professor Samuel McCane Lindsay described Aggrey as “among the foremost ten percent of all the students I have known during the last twenty-five years.”77

In 1920 Aggrey became the first person of African descent to receive the Teachers’ Life Professional Certificate which was the highest education diploma bestowed by the State of North Carolina. That same year Aggrey interrupted his studies at Columbia to join the Phelps Stokes Commission.

As noted earlier, Aggrey does not figure prominently in much of the literature. Often when he does appear he is viewed from the standpoint of the white framers of industrial education with the assumption that he acted in the interest of white elites. King
noted how Africans and African Americans, including Du Bois, resisted the model and that Phelps Stokes officials, to counteract critics, recruited Aggrey to publicly support its platform. Berman posits Aggrey as a one-dimensional pawn of Phelps-Stokes officials and never considered the possibility of a counter-hegemonic strategy or subversion by means of appropriated rhetoric. Instead, Berman presents Aggrey’s rhetoric as evidence of his submission to hegemony. Wrote Berman:

“Echoing the words of Booker T. Washington, Aggrey told the students at the South African Native College at Fort Hare that as black people they must learn to accept help wherever they found it, to work with those who were willing to work with them, and to remember that the Anglo-Saxons, whatever their faults, had been more successful in dealing with backward races than any other people in history.”

In another instance, Berman cited a letter written by Charles T. Loran, the Fund’s South African representation, which underscored the commission’s expectations of Aggrey. Loram wrote:

“We do not want Aggrey only as a teacher of education. We want him as a living example of the black man who lives the Christian life …, who has trod the steep path to civilization and has not tried to get there by shortcuts, who knows the weaknesses of the Blackman and can interpret them to us. We want him as an example of what can be done by work and prayer.”

Berman did not consider the limitations of rhetoric on the part of Aggrey given the political, economic and social realities of blacks, and the expectations of their white sponsors. Nor does Berman consider the possibility that black educators found in the model a recipe for African uplift, or the possibility that they subversively crafted a model compatible to a progressive nationalist agenda, even as they appropriated hegemonic rhetoric.

A trans-Atlantic, African diaspora perspective invites a reinterpretation of Aggrey’s activities and discourse. While Berman, King and other scholars have characterized
Aggrey as an uncomplicated tool of white hegemony, Joseph E. Harris described him as an important figure “who influenced many African Americans and others to devote themselves to African causes.”

In sharp contrast to the characterization by many scholars, Harris also credits Aggrey for the founding of Achimota, arguing that it pursued a Pan-African perspective. By adopting a trans-Atlantic, African Diasporan frame, this dissertation will closely examine Aggrey’s work and interrogate the contradiction between the colliding perspectives and goals of British colonial officials and Africans; and between Aggrey’s words and actions.

The Phelps Stokes Fund African Education Commission

In 1919 the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Society met in Boston to discuss the work of the missionary societies in Africa, which by the end of the world war were seen as fertile ground for economic development. Dr. Paul Monroe, a Columbia University professor and board member, invited Thomas Jesses Jones to conduct a survey of African schools as he had done of Negro schools in the U.S. By November 1919 the Phelps-Stokes Trustees agreed to help underwrite, with the missionary societies, the study if the mission and government schools in Africa cooperated. It was Jones, the commission chairman, who decided to appoint Aggrey to the board, a decision that was initially met with resistance. Wrote Smith: “It was feared that Aggrey’s presence would cause embarrassment on the ships, in the hotels and in negotiations with Governments.”

However, Oldham, the influential secretary of the International Missionary Council, approved of Aggreys’ inclusion after meeting him. In February of 1920 Aggrey received a formal offer of $1,500 a year plus traveling expenses to serve on the commission,
which he enthusiastically accepted. The other commission members were Dr. Stanley Hollenbeck, a medical missionary of the American Board at Angola; Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Wilkie of Scotland, both missionaries of the United Free Church of Scotland; Leo A. Roy, an accountant considered a specialist in industrial education as the government supervisor of technical training for soldiers at Negro schools. Aggrey took a leave of absence from Livingstone and boarded the Adriatic in New York on July 3, 1920. The objective was “To study the educational needs of Africa, especially those pertaining to the hygiene, economic, social and religious condition of the Native people.”\(^82\)

The trip coincided with the rising tide of Pan African activity that earlier had seen the first Pan African Congress in January, and continued in August with Marcus Garvey’s international Negro Convention in Harlem where he declared “Africa for Africans.” In 1917 Joseph Ephraim Casely Hayford (1866-1930), the Fante author, journalist, educator and politician from British Colonia Ghana, had formed the West African Conference that in 1920 became the West African Congress. The goal of the Congress was to unite the British West African colonies to demand ‘self determination” and “no taxation without representation.”

In *The Life of Dr. J.E.K Aggrey*, Lawrence Henry Yaw Ofosu-Appiah said that the Africa Aggrey returned to two decades later had changed considerably from the Africa he had left in 1898.

“In West Africa, especially, there was a complete departure by the natives from the pre-1914 attitude of acceptance of the colonial status. The idea of self-determination had caught on, and President Wilson’s Fourteen Points were discussed and regarded as applicable to all the Colonial territories […]’ A new nationalism, which challenged the main assumptions of empire, had been born.”\(^83\)
From August 20, 1920 to March 21, 1921, the commission visited Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Cameroon, the Belgian Congo, Angola and South Africa. In total it travelled 25,000 miles through west, south and equatorial Africa, visiting colonial officials, African chiefs, and scores of missions, churches and schools. Aggrey believed the mission provided him an important opportunity to contribute to Africa’s ascendance. A day after he set sail, he wrote his wife a letter describing his role:

“Dr. Jones told me that my mission is to stand between the Natives of Africa and the Whites of the world – what responsibility! I am to interpret the soul, the longings, the wishes, the desires and the possibilities of the Negroes to the White Governments. I am to get all the truth and act as mediator between the two … I am to get into the soul of the Natives and help the governments to evolve great things for our people. Salisbury used to be a real mean place. Policemen knocked Dr. Goler down and Lawyer Clement who defended him would have been run out had he not been an aristocrat. Now Salisbury leads in her treatment of the Negroes. They say I am partly responsible for this change, and I am to do the same on a larger scale for 200,000,000 Natives with the governments of the world.”

In another letter to his wife, Aggrey stressed his commitment to African transcendence:

“I go forth, Rose, first to serve my God, our God Who has appeared to me by the side of the mountain and asked me to go lead my people away from the Egypt of ignorance and maltreatment … I go to serve my people, I go, too, so as to make things better, life more worth while to you and the children […] Pray for me, that I may make good and make more than good.”

In yet another letter to his wife, this time dated October 8, 1920 from Kumasi on the Gold Coast, he described his exhilarating homecoming:

“Yesterday I was thrilled. Every stop the train made there was somebody there who knew me – and the marvel of it was we did not know where we would land until the day before. This is Kumasi. I was here 24 or 25 years ago. … The neighborhood was around. Proud is not the word to express [his sister’s] feelings.”
In an insightful journal entry on February 8, 1921, Aggrey expressed his horror at the mistreatment of Africans by their Portuguese employers. The description goes far in revealing Aggrey as an empathetic member of the commission who used Western references but viewed Africa through African eyes.

“Our mind was composing a panegyric to Henry as we approached River Kukema, where a sight which soured my milk of ecstasy and snatched away my dreams. Here were men, women and children, covering themselves with one hand to keep the cold away, and rushing to and fro under command, working the road. It was not the work at all, for Africans I know are used to working the roads, but these little boys and girls were all bony as if hunger were tugging successfully at their vitals. No singing here – these men and women with the hoe. If Millet had seen them, hungry, haggard, tottering, fearful, not only unhopeful but hopeless, he would have ruined his masterpiece and painted a more terrible, horrifying picture: the fire in the eye shut in darkness to the light, but burning doubtless downward, inward, soulward.”

So while many scholars viewed the commission and Achimota through the prism of colonial officials, it is necessary to also consider how Aggrey envisioned his role on the commission, and the role Achimota could play in an African renaissance.

**Commission Findings**

The commission report, findings and recommendations, written exclusively by Jones and published in 1923, echoed the fund’s earlier report on Negro Education in 1917. However, this report emphasized the potential of Africa to rise above its current state. “Africa is not the ‘Great Dark Continent,’ but the ‘Continent of Misunderstandings,’” it said. The most “unfortunate and unfair” of the misunderstandings, it said “is to the effect that the African people do not give promise of development sufficient to warrant efforts in their behalf.”
However, like its earlier report of Negro schools in the U.S., it condemned the classical curriculum at many African schools and recommended industrial and agricultural education based on the Hampton-Tuskegee model. It is significant, however, that it stressed the importance of a dual model that provided a utilitarian and agricultural focus for the masses, and the training of teachers, religious workers and professionals in medicine, engineering and law for an elite class.

It maintained:

The time has passed when the old thesis can be successfully maintained that a curriculum well suited to the needs of a group on a given scale of civilization in one is necessarily the best for other groups on a different level of advancement in another Country or section. This was the critical mistake generally made by New England in dealing with the Negro in the southern states of America immediately after emancipation.\textsuperscript{89}

Ignoring the potential efficacy of the dual model, which was, in actuality, replicating Tuskegee’s dual curriculum, King argued that the report “marked a watershed” in African education and added:

“The Fund played a key role in reinforcing and perpetuating the belief that the educational methods which had been hammered out for the freed slaves in the postbellum period were particularly useful and relevant for black Africans in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century”

The report was rooted in European supremacy and consistently described Europeans as civilized and Africans as backward and primitive. Of Africans in the Gold Coast, it said:

Their condition ranges from barbarism to a civilization that reflects the influence of European nations.”\textsuperscript{90}

The Gold Coast, the site of a centuries-long slave trade, was described in gauzy terms while the global call for black self-determination was characterized as misguided:
“Numerous coast fortresses of large dimensions and romantic architecture record the dramatic struggles of various European nations to possess the mineral and human resources of the country from the fifteenth century to recent times. It is generally agreed that European colonization has had a more beneficent influence and a greater degree of success in the Gold Coast than in any other African colony.”

To answer the call for African self-determination, it proposed recognition of “Native customs and qualities” while introducing European methods “as the African conditions demand.” Jones’s commitment to education adaptation was recognized in the report’s acknowledgements.

“[Jones’s] constant emphasis on relating education to the actual needs of the people for whom it is intended is a point on which the commission was so united and enthusiastic that it will appear on almost every page. Dr. Jones is a great believer in ‘educational adaptations’ and it is this wise gospel that this report carries with so much conviction.”

There is indication that Jones had reached many of his conclusions before he and the other members set out on the African mission. A.W. Wilkie, one of the commissioners, wrote J.H. Oldham on December 8, 1920 to complain about Jones’ methodology. He said:

“Jones is splendid on his own subject. He has, however, a rather pronounced tendency to prejude; to assume that certain characteristics will be present and then to discover them! I was rather shocked when he began to write a report on the Gold Coast, with recommendations, when he had visited only one outpost – Kumase.[stet]. And all along, I have to try to get him to defer judgment until he has actually seen work.”

He added:

“One rather disturbing characteristic is a reluctance to study documents! And its effect is that later on he finds out that certain methods are already adopted which he thought were absent.”
 Nonetheless, the report was well received by British colonial officials, even as they were widely criticized by many Africans who insisted on education that mirrored what was offered to British students. In 1923 the colonial office requested the Phelps Stokes Fund to prepare a study of East and Central Africa. The second African Education commission included Aggrey and Jones, but there were notable additions which indicated the esteem accorded the mission. The new members were Hanns Vischer, the chair of the colonial office Advisory Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa; and James H. Dillard, president of the Jeanes Fund and a Phelps Stokes Fund trustee. The new commission sailed for East Africa in 1924 and during six months visited Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, Nyasland, Mozambique, and Southern and Northern Rhodesia. Not surprisingly, it echoed many of the findings in the first African commission, and the report on Negro education.

Before and after his commission trips, Aggrey maintained correspondence with Pan African activists including Bruce, the journalist and Garvey disciple. In a letter to Bruce dated June 28, 1922, Aggrey affectionately referred to Bruce as “Daddie Bruce” as he reported his efforts on behalf of Africa. He wrote:

“I can never forget you. Your loyalty to the race is genuine. I know it. I have known it all the while, and we who have associated with you for at least eight years hope to carry on the good work which lies so close to your heart […]You may not have the permission to say much about me in your paper, but Dad, I want to report to you time and again, so as to cheer your heart, and to show you that God is more ready for us than we are ourselves, that Christiandom means to redeem Africa in a generation, and that your son Aggrey shall keep true to the ideal of helping his country through arousing Christians of all races to combine in a grand cooperative movement to raise Africa. I wish I could convince my people that cooperation of all the best of al races were the best method of helping God’s Kingdom.”
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Aggrey’s commitment to African uplift can also be gleaned from his enthusiastic letters to his white patrons. In a letter dated November 11th, 1925 to Thomas Jesse Jones, he wrote:

“Five years ago not many thought seriously about Africa along other lines than purely missionary adventures. To-day many are every year going to America to study her schools in order to benefit Africa. Thanking of it all, I am grateful to exclaim, ‘What hath God wrought!’”

There is also indication that Aggrey prompted some whites to question a narrow industrial education focus for blacks. In a letter from the South African educator C.T. Loram to Thomas Jesse Jones dated April 16, 1921, he wrote glowingly of Aggrey and noted how his example undermined an exclusively industrial course for Africans. Loram, in addition to serving as director of Native Education in South Africa, served as the South African representative on the Phelps Stokes Fund Education Commission. Of Aggrey, he wrote:

“I have never met a more saintly man. Jones, that man has taught me more of Christ’s humility than any other man. Now I see why the meek shall inherit the earth. […] Surely he is the best answer to your opposition to the classics! His Latin and Greek have coloured his thinking, but he has still found time for sociology, economics and politics. As a speaker he is wonderful. He is at his best when he is heckled by blacks. Altogether a fine man, who I should be glad to call my friend.”

Following an interview with Aggrey during his visit to South Africa, The Natal Witness wrote: “Dr. Aggrey presents in his own person the strongest possible argument in favour of the higher education of the Native that could be desired.”

In a letter dated Dec. 4, 1926, E.N. Jones of Sierra Leone wrote of the impact one of Aggrey’s speeches had on him.
“As I listened to your speeches I found in you my ideal of an educated African – one who does not slavishly copy his master nor tied down to the tradition of his father, but one who like a scribe that is instructed in the Kingdom of God who brings out of his treasure things new and old. Sir, I am no flatterer. I know what you could have done with such prodigious learning had you elected to remain in America or Europe where talents are appraised at their true value. To come to mother Africa is indeed a sacrifice for which we cannot fully thank you.”

He added:

“You have inspired me to do and dare for Africa. … My intention is to go to the Gambia and start a school. You said in one of your speeches that you would like to see ‘Achimota’ in all the colonies. I hope to go to the Gambia to do the spade-work. In a word, I am your forerunner!”

These accounts clearly illustrate that, whatever the intention of Jones in appointing Aggrey to the commission, his influence transcended the panel’s mission and generated unanticipated support for a classical college education for blacks among Africans and some whites. By the time Achimota College officially opened in 1927 with Aggrey as its vice principal, Aggrey had gained the respect of Africans throughout the continent who were inspired by his educational achievements and his global stature. This is not to suggest that there were no critics of the model he promoted. However, many Africans clearly looked beyond the rhetoric to view Achimota as a positive, if not ideal, development for African people.

The Opening of Achimota

Gold Coast Governor, Brigadier-General Sir Gordon Guggisberg, presided over the official opening of the Prince of Wale’s College and School at Achimota in the Dining Hall on Friday, on the afternoon of January 28, 1927. Among those on the platform were Aggrey, the Chief Justice, Sir Philip Smyly, and J.E. Casely-Hayford, the
prominent Fante lawyer, educator, author and Pan African nationalist. Some two
thousand people from Europe and Africa attended the ceremony, including a number of
chiefs from across the colony.

Wrote Kwame Nkrumah a future Achimota graduate, of the school’s opening:

“The figure to whom all Africans looked that day was Dr. Kwegyir Aggrey, assistant vice-principal and the first African member of the staff. To me he seemed the most remarkable man that I had ever met and I had the deepest affection for him. . . . It was through him that my nationalism was fast aroused.”

Aggrey returned to the United States in May of that year and in July fell ill and later died
in Harlem Hospital. In a tribute to Aggrey following his untimely death in 1927, the
headline in The New York Age, a leading black newspaper, proclaimed: “Dr. J.E.K.
Aggrey Most Luminous Celebrity in Death Scroll of 1927.” In the tribute, Aggrey was
said to merit a place in the company of such black historical giants as Edward Blyden,
Frederick Douglass, and Toussaint L’Overture. “The life and works of this coterie of
intellectuals will out live tablets of stone and bronze and continue to shine as the morning
sun in the hearts of generations to come,” it said.

These impressions of Aggrey by Africans and African Americans, which have
largely been ignored by scholars in comparative education, are essential when
considering the role that Aggrey, and by extension Achimota, Washington and Tuskegee,
played in the construction of black transcultural identity and progress during the first
three decades of the twentieth century. Moreover, to accurately assess Aggrey’s
contribution to African education, scholars must look past the public transcript and
uproot what’s hidden to see how he, as an oppressed actor, negotiated hegemony.
Chapter 5

Tuskegee and Achimota: Reconciling a Legacy

Scholars have been hard-pressed to reconcile the portrait of Washington and Aggrey as submissive men who prepared blacks for subservience, with the progressive black movements, institutions and leaders in education, politics, architecture and other professions they inspired across the African Diaspora. The common depiction of the men and their schools fails to explain why they were revered by leading black nationalists of their time, or the many remarkable achievements of their alumni and faculty. This chapter will highlight the individuals, institutions and political movements that were affiliated with or influenced by Washington and Aggrey, and their schools. Consequently, this chapter seeks to build on an understanding of these men and their institutions based almost exclusively on their rhetoric and an intense and misleading focus on, and meanings associated with, the term *industrial education*.

Given Washington’s principal role in the promotion and popularity of the industrial education model for blacks in the U.S. and Africa, and his role as the architect and leader of Tuskegee, particular attention will be paid to the men and women he personally assembled to carry out his educational vision. It is a vision of black economic, political, and spiritual development that was widely replicated throughout the African Diaspora, including at Achimota. Furthermore, if we are to reconsider Washington’s legacy beyond the popular narrative of his acquiescence to the white South, an exploration of the concrete achievements of his early graduates proves essential. A survey of some of the men and women who populated Tuskegee in its early years enables
us to more fully grasp Tuskegee’s true character, while revealing the extent to which the accomplishments of Tuskegee’s early alumni have been overshadowed by the industrial stigma.

**Tuskegee’s ‘Talented Tenth’**

If, at the turn of the 20th century, one wished to survey the group Du Bois referred to as Black America’s “Talented Tenth,” Tuskegee’s campus could have served as an ideal laboratory. Its industrial reputation, notwithstanding, the school was a forceful magnet for high-achieving African Americans -- graduates from universities like Harvard, Columbia, Atlanta, and Fisk that offered just the kind of classical training applauded by Du Bois and rebuked by authors of the Phelps-Stokes Education Commission reports. While some historians, including Harlan, have noted the presence at Tuskegee of black academics from elite schools, they have typically done so in passing or to draw attention to the tensions between the academic and industrial departments. Here, the concentration of classically trained black faculty at Tuskegee during its infancy is highlighted to draw attention to the kind of rarified academic environment Washington created as he publicly touted industrial education. Such a review not only provides a clearer picture of Tuskegee’s faculty, but also suggests what actually transpired in the classroom and across the sprawling campus that regularly hosted highly accomplished African Americans who were likely to fuel the ambitions of impressionable students. Visitors included scores of inspirational figures like Reconstruction-era Louisiana Governor P.B.S. Pinchback, Frederick Douglass, W.E.B. Du Bois and civil rights activist and suffragist Mary Church Terrell, who with bachelor and master’s degrees from
Oberlin, was one of the first African American women to earn a college degree.¹ Other luminaries, including President Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie and woman suffragist leader Susan B. Anthony, also visited the campus.

Revisiting Tuskegee’s early years also serves to better contextualize Washington’s offer to Du Bois in 1894 and again in 1899 to lead the school’s research on black life. At Tuskegee Du Bois, one of the period’s most venerated scholars, would have been in the company of academics with similar credentials who, like him, were demonstrably committed to black equality and social justice. While Du Bois declined, Washington successfully lured a bevy of graduates from leading universities to serve as teachers and administrators. In 1892 Washington had already personally recruited Robert Robinson Taylor (1868 – 1942), who that year had graduated with an architecture degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.) where he earned honors in trigonometry, architectural history, differential calculus, and applied mechanics.² Taylor was born in Wilmington, Delaware where his father Henry had a prosperous business constructing cargo ships and commercial and residential buildings. The younger Taylor learned the rudiments of the building trade working with his father but became the nation’s first formally trained African American architect at M.I.T.

At Tuskegee he was an instructor of architectural drawing, director of the Department of Architecture and Mechanical Drawing and the school’s chief architect. Taylor eventually served as Tuskegee’s director of trades, and as vice president.³ He drew the plans for numerous buildings on campus, including Thrasher Hall (1893), the school’s first science building; Huntington Hall (1899); Collis P. Huntington Memorial Building (1905), the largest building on campus; and White Hall (1909). He also
constructed the school’s 2,500-seat chapel (1898), which he considered his architectural masterpiece and that was destroyed by fire in 1957. During his three decades on the faculty Taylor was also known as a champion of other African-American architects. In 1929, with the support of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the Liberian government and Firestone Rubber, he travelled to Liberia to devise a program for the proposed Booker T. Washington Institute.

In 1898 Washington also recruited Wallace Rayfield to Tuskegee following his graduation from Columbia University with a B.S. in architecture. Rayfield (c. 1874 – 1941), believed to be the nation’s second formally trained African American architect, was the son of educated parents. His mother worked as a maid but had graduated from Atlanta University and his father taught at the Ballard Normal School in Macon, Ga., which Rayfield attended. Rayfield then graduated from the classical department at Howard University in 1896. While in Washington, D.C. he worked for A.B. Mullet, who had been the supervising architect of the Treasury Building, and who encouraged him to study architecture. Following his advice, Rayfield attended Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, which awarded him a certificate in 1898. A year later he received a B.S. degree in architecture from Columbia University.

While at Tuskegee Rayfield helped build the burgeoning program that he directed until 1901. During that time he compiled and published *Mechanical Drawing Book* that comprised exercises for students, and met his future wife, Jennie Hutchins of Clarksville, Tennessee, a student in the industrial department. He then launched a successful architectural firm: he was elected superintending architect for the Freeman’s Aid Society and official architect of the national African Methodist Episcopal Church. He went on to
design numerous homes and churches in Birmingham, including Trinity Baptist Church and the historic 16th Street Baptist Church (1911) that was the target of an anti-black firebombing that killed four black girls on September 15, 1963. The church had been a popular site for gatherings by Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. and other civil rights activists. Hundreds of Rayfield’s structures, primarily churches, can also be found across the country, including Ebenezer Church in Chicago, and the First Congregational Church at Talladega College. Rayfield also had a lucrative mail order business through which he sold thousands of his designs across the United States and overseas.6 Rayfield hired at least three Tuskegee graduates, Alphonso Reverson, Angel Whatts Echavarria and Jose Zarzuela Falu, all from Puerto Rico and the class of 1912, to work at his firm. Reverson and Falu returned to Puerto Rican, Reverson to work as a building inspector and Falu opened his own architectural firm.7

Among Tuskegee’s most promising students of architecture was William Sidney Pittman, (1875-1938), one of the era’s most successful architects. Pittman graduated from Tuskegee in 1897 and, with a loan from Washington, attended Drexel University’s Institute of Art, Science and Industry from which he graduated with a degree in architecture in 1900. Pittman returned to Tuskegee to serve as head of architectural drawing from 1900 to 1905. In 1907, the same year he married Washington’s daughter Portia, he became the first African American to win a federal commission when he was selected to build the Negro Building at the National Tercennial Exposition at Jamestown, Va.

Pittman was also active in Washington, D.C. where his many commissions included the Garfield Elementary School and the 12th Street YMCA. He served as
president of the Brotherhood of Negro Building Mechanics and is believed to be Dallas’
first black architect. Among his many structures there is the Knights of Pythias Temple
(1915-1916), a designated landmark that once served as the social, cultural and
professional center of the city’s African American community.\textsuperscript{8}

Pittman was succeeded as department director by Walter Thomas Bailey (1882 –
1941), who in 1904 became the first black student to graduate from the University of
Illinois with a bachelor’s of science degree in architecture. The school later awarded him
an honorary master’s degree and he is believed to be the state’s first black architect.\textsuperscript{9}
From 1905 to 1914 he served as the head of Tuskegee’s Mechanical Industries
Department, during which time he also designed several campus buildings, including
White Hall (1908). He went on to work as an architect in Memphis, Tenn. and Chicago.\textsuperscript{10}

William Augustus Hazel (1854-1929), an experienced architect who had spent
seven years working in a prestigious Boston firm and representing a New York firm in St.
Paul, Minn., directed the program from 1914 to 1919. The North Carolina native, whose
specialty was stained glass, was first hired as an instructor in 1909.\textsuperscript{11} He left Tuskegee in
1919 to direct the architecture program at Howard University.

During Washington’s tenure, eighteen instructors taught in the Department of
Architecture and Mechanical Drawing. By 1899 the program had already earned a
national reputation and housed three hundred and twenty students in the student-built
Slater Armstrong Memorial Trades Building that had been designed by Taylor.\textsuperscript{12}

In her book \textit{From Craft to Profession: The Practice of Architecture in the 19th
Century}, historian Mary Woods said this of Tuskegee:

“The Tuskegee synthesis of craft training, architectural education, and
building experience was unique in American architectural education …
Few American architects were as thoroughly trained and experienced in both architecture and building before they left school as Tuskegee graduates.”

It’s also worth noting that Washington’s grandson and namesake, Booker T. Washington III, (1915 – 1994), of Tuskegee’s Class of 1938, also became an architect and was involved in the planning and design of the Metropolitan Opera House at Lincoln Center, and the Pan Am Building, both in New York City.

Washington did not rest on the success of his architecture program. He seemed to scour the country for highly accomplished African Americans for his faculty. In 1890 Arthur Ulysses Craig, (b. 1871) became the first black American to graduate with a degree in electrical engineering when he earned a Bachelor of Science from the University of Kansas. He joined Tuskegee’s faculty in 1896 and taught physics and electricity until 1901. During his tenure he helped design the first automobile manufactured by F.B. Stearns & Co. Henry F. Cardozo (b. 1879), of Topeka, Kansas had completed a two-year course in horticulture at Cornell University and earned a certificate from Oxford University before he joined the faculty teaching horticulture, which he did for four years. Thomas Junius Calloway, the vice principal of Tuskegee from 1897 to 1899, earned a B.A. from Fisk, and went on to earn a law degree from Howard in 1904.

John Robert Edward Lee (1864 – 1944), who graduated with high honors from Bishop College in Marshall, Texas, taught math at Tuskegee from 1899 to 1904 then left to become a professor of math, Latin and history at Benedict College in Columbia, South Carolina. He returned to Tuskegee in 1906 as academic director, a position he held until 1915. From 1904 to 1909 Lee was founding president of the National Association of
Teachers in Colored Schools – later the American Teachers Association – which addressed the challenges of black students and educators. In 1918 Wilberforce University recognized Lee’s humanitarianism by awarding him an honorary L.L.D. Howard University followed suit, noting his “outstanding contributions to Negro Education.” In 1924 Lee became president of Florida A&M in Tallahassee, Florida, a position he held until his death in 1944.

In 1902 Washington recruited Roscoe Conkling Bruce (1879 – 1950), who had just graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Harvard, to head the academic department. Bruce was the son of the legendary Reconstruction-era U.S. Senator Blanche Kelso Bruce (1841 – 1898), who in 1875 began his six-year term and became the first African American to serve a full term in the U.S. Senate. After leaving the Senate, the older Bruce was appointed register of the treasury by President Garfield and later served as the Recorder of Deeds in Washington, D.C. from 1891 – 1893 and again from 1897 until his death in 1898.

Hailing as he did from one of the nation’s most elite African American families, Bruce brought to Tuskegee an aura of aristocracy matched only by his Harvard degree. His parent’s marriage in 1878 was a major event reported by The Washington Post. Of Josephine Bruce, the paper said, “her entry here as a Senator’s wife is likely to create a sensation.” The newlyweds sailed to Europe for a four-month honeymoon, during which they were honored at receptions and greeted by officials in Belgium, Holland, Germany, Switzerland and France. While in Paris, Senator Bruce met with former President Ulysses S. Grant. In 1903 the younger Bruce was joined at Tuskegee by his new bride, Clara Burrill, a graduate of Radcliffe College. Two decades later Clara Burrill Bruce would be
elected editor-in-chief of the Boston Law Review and graduate from Boston Law School with honors.22

Bruce would attract other Harvard classmates to Tuskegee, including Gordon David Houston, (1880 – 1940) who graduated cum laude in 1904, the year he joined Tuskegee’s faculty as an English teacher and head of the English Department. Houston, a Harvard classmate of future President Frederick Delano Roosevelt with whom he remained friends, had graduated from the Latin High School in his native Cambridge, Mass. At Tuskegee and elsewhere he earned a reputation as an “excellent drill master” who taught English composition in the Harvard style.23 At Tuskegee he married Washington, D.C. native Dora Mayo Lawrence, a 1903 Tuskegee graduate who worked as a stenographer and filing clerk in the school’s administrative department. The couple remained at Tuskegee for three years, until 1907 when Houston became an English teacher at the Frederick Douglass High School in Baltimore. He later held a teaching post at the M Street School in Washington, D.C. and as chairman of the English Department at Howard University. His 1938 book, Basic English Grammar, was adopted by the Washington, D.C. public school system.24

Houston’s last position, from 1926 to 1940, was as principal of the Armstrong Manual Training School in Washington, D.C. that was based on the Tuskegee model, named for Washington’s mentor, and dedicated by Washington in 1902.25 Among its graduates was Duke Ellington (1899 – 1974), the accomplished composer who studied art and design.
It was likely Houston who recruited Harvard classmate Leslie Pinkney Hill (1880 - 1960) to teach in the English department. Hill, of Lynchburg, Va., enrolled in Harvard in 1899 and graduated cum laude in 1903, the same year that he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. A year later Hill graduated with a master’s degree in education from Harvard, and that fall joined the Tuskegee English faculty where he remained until 1907. His work as an essayist, poet and dramatist reveal his commitment to the cause of black equality and social justice. Like other members of the so-called “New Negro” movement popularized during the Harlem Renaissance, he celebrated the history of blacks in Diaspora as he did in his most famous play, “Toussaint L'Ouverture: A Dynamic History” (1928), about the life of the Haitian independence leader. Hill would later hold leadership posts at the Industrial Institute in Manassas, Va. and the Institute for Colored Youth (now Cheyney University) in Cheyney, Pa. In 1944 he founded Camp Hope for underprivileged children in Delaware County. In 1907 Hill married Jane E. Clark, a graduate of Oberlin College who was lady principal and dean of Tuskegee’s women’s department from 1902 to 1907.

Further evidence of Washington’s high regard for elite academic credentials coupled with a predilection for African American uplift, was his hiring and mentorship of Charles Winter Wood (1871 - 1953) who for three decades taught English and drama at Tuskegee where he headed both departments. He also at various points served as Tuskegee’s librarian and football coach. When he joined the faculty in 1905 he had already earned a B.A. in Greek from Beloit College in Beloit, Wisconsin, and a doctorate of divinity degree from Chicago Theological Seminary. While at Beloit, he became a renowned actor by playing the lead role in the Greek tragedy, Sophocles’ “Oedipus the King.” That was 1895, the same year he won the Wisconsin state Oratorical Contest.
According to an account in *Round Table*, a local paper, his performance at Beloit’s Wilson Opera House was interrupted several times by applause, and brought audience members to tears.27

Evidence of Wood’s contribution to Tuskegee’s cultural life can be glimpsed in a May 15, 1900 item reported in *The Tuskegee Student*, the school newspaper. It said a rendition of “Othello” would be performed that evening at Washington’s new residence to benefit the Cemetery Fund. Wood would play Othello and Emmett Scott, Washington’s secretary, Iago. “This is the first pretentious effort to give private theatricals at Tuskegee,” the article said.28 In 1901, Wood was personally recommended by Washington to receive the John Crosby Brown scholarship at Columbia University from which he received a master’s degree in the philosophy of education in 1903. His graduation, and the role Washington played in his scholarship, was chronicled by *Press and Horticulturalist*, a Riverside, California newspaper on July 3, 1903 under the headline “Negro Bootblack Graduates at Columbia,” a reference to Wood’s childhood occupation fifteen years earlier.29

In 1935 he became famous for his role in the hit Broadway play “Green Pastures” and later taught English and drama at Bennett College. Upon leaving Tuskegee, he characterized his time there more as a calling than a job when he wrote:

> My Big Job is done; thirty years in the Black Belt of Dixie, Tuskegee Institute where I labored, served my God, my Country and my Black People thru the inspiration and training I received at Beloit.”30

Since 1947 Beloit College has honored his memory by annually bestowing Charles Winter Wood merit scholarships to members of underrepresented minority groups.
Dr. Alonzo H. Kenniebrew, Tuskegee’s resident physician and physiology teacher, perhaps best embodied Washington’s lofty ambitions for his students and faculty. Kenniebrew, a native of Tuskegee, graduated from Tuskegee in 1891, then earned a degree from Central Tennessee College in 1894 followed by a medical degree in 1897 from Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn. which in 1876 became the first medical school founded solely to educate blacks. It appears that Washington continued to support Kenniebrew during his medical training. In a letter to Washington dated March 25, 1897, Kenniebrew reported that he passed the medical exam but said he would still look to Washington for financial aid as he completed his hospital residency and a post-graduate course. Following graduation he worked as an assistant surgeon at Freedmen’s Hospital in Chicago and in 1898, after completing post-graduate work at Harvard Medical College, returned to Tuskegee as the medical director, a position he held until 1902. During that time he taught physiology, married Leonora Love Chapman, Tuskegee’s lady principal, and also served as Washington’s personal physician.

Kenniebrew went on to become a celebrated surgeon who in 1909 opened what became the famous New Home Sanitarium in Jacksonville, Illinois. The facility, which treated black and white patients alike, was recognized as the first surgical hospital in the world operated by a black physician. It expanded from a six-room cottage with one doctor and one nurse, to a facility with thirty-three rooms, two operating rooms, three surgeons, eight associate surgeons and seven nurses. Kenniebrew, who was inducted into Jacksonville’s Hall of Fame, operated the facility until 1930.

Samuel Courtney who was born a slave in 1861, later attended Hampton Institute following the advice of his teacher and mentor, Booker T. Washington. Courtney was
then hired by Washington to teach math and drawing at Tuskegee. He left in 1888 to
attend Harvard Medical School and became a prominent physician in Boston. The first
chaplain of Tuskegee, Rev. John W. Whittaker (1860-1936), of Atlanta, Ga., was a
graduate of Atlanta University and Livingstone College Divinity School, an AME Zion
historically black school in Salisbury, North Carolina. He worked at Tuskegee until 1928
and went on to become a prominent congregational pastor first in New Orleans and then
Savannah, Ga. He was succeeded by Rev. Harry V. Richardson, a graduate of the
Harvard Divinity School. Richardson, in addition to serving as chaplain, taught American
and European history for a year.

Tuskegee’s Women

Given Tuskegee’s founding during the Victorian era when elite schools like
Harvard and Princeton were single-sex and exclusively populated by male professors, the
prominent status of women on Tuskegee’s faculty and staff is especially noteworthy. By
1896, there were already thirty-eight women on the faculty and staff. Among the early
prominent female members of the faculty was Adella Hunt (1863 – 1915) who joined
Tuskegee’s faculty in 1883, two years after graduating from Atlanta University. Hunt,
who was active in the women’s suffragist movement, taught English and social sciences
and was also the school’s first librarian. Hunt was known to hold mock political debates
in her classes and led discussions on suffrage issues during monthly meetings of the
Tuskegee Woman’s Club. In 1885 she succeeded Olivia Davidson as lady principal
when Davidson married Washington, and went on to earn a master’s degree from Atlanta
University in 1905. (Davidson, who would die four years later, was herself a 1879
graduate of Hampton University and then the State Normal School where she was an
honor student). At Tuskegee Hunt met and married Warren Logan, Washington’s classmate at Hampton Institute who he recruited to join him at Tuskegee in 1882. Logan became one of Washington’s closest confidantes and during forty years at Tuskegee served as the treasurer and also taught bookkeeping.38 The Logans, who were part of Washington’s small and close-knit inner-circle, had nine children, six of whom survived childhood.39

Hallie Tanner Dillon (1864 - 1901), the sister of internationally acclaimed artist Henry O. Tanner and a graduate of Women’s Medical College of Pennsylvania, became the first African American woman to practice medicine in Alabama when she was hired in 1891 as resident physician for girls.40 During her three-year tenure she also taught one to two classes a year. In 1894 Dillon married Rev. Dr. John Quincy Johnson, a Tuskegee math teacher and 1890 graduate of Fisk University who in 1898 earned a doctorate of divinity degree from Morris Brown College. Prior to joining the faculty at Tuskegee he had for two years done post-doctoral work at Princeton University’s Theological Seminary. After leaving Tuskegee Johnson went on to become president of Allen University in Columbia, South, Carolina, and later served as pastor of an A.M.E. church in Nashville, Tenn.

In 1892 Washington recruited Hallie Quinn Brown, (1845 – 1949), a noted lecturer who travelled throughout Europe and earned a bachelor of science degree from Wilberforce University, to serve as the dean of women. She left a year later to teach in the Dayton Public School System and was the co-founder and president of the National Association of Colored Women.41 She returned to Wilberforce and earned a master’s degree in 1890. She was a professor of elocution from 1900 – 1903. Josephine Bruce, the
widow of former U.S. Senator Blanche Bruce, served as lady principal from 1897 to
1902. Born in Philadelphia but raised in Cleveland, Bruce was the daughter of a
prominent dentist and writer. She was herself an accomplished linguist who had attended
racially mixed Cleveland schools where she became the first African American teacher in
the public school system. Her elder brother, Leonides, was a successful lawyer who
married the sister of his white partner. In Washington, D.C. the elegant and poised
Bruce, as the wife of a U.S. Senator, was a leading society woman who presided over a
number of organizations committed to African American uplift.

Ionia Whipper (1874 – 1953), a 1903 graduate of Howard Medical School,
became Tuskegee’s resident physician and also taught classes. Whipper, born in
Beaufort, South Carolina, but raised in Washington, D.C., hailed from an accomplished
family. Her father, William J. Whipper, was a circuit court judge and member of two
Constitutional Conventions, and her mother Frances Anne Rollin a talented writer and
author of The Life and Public Service of Martin R. Delany, the first full-length biography
written by an African American. It chronicled the life of the Harvard-trained physician
and activist. Rollin was also a close friend of Frederick Douglass. Ionia’s brother, Leigh
(1876-1975) was a graduate of Howard University Law School but became a leading
stage and screen actor whose film, “The Oxbow Incident,” was nominated for an
Academy Award. Ionia Whipper went on to co-found what became the Ionia R. Whipper
Home for Unwed Mothers in Washington, D.C. that for four decades assisted scores of
unwed African American mothers and is now a home for abused and neglected girls of all
races. It is also an official landmark on the U.S. Department of Parks and Recreation’s
African American Heritage Trail.
As noted earlier, Jane E. Clark, the dean of women and lady principal from 1902 to 1907, had graduated from Oberlin College before joining Tuskegee’s faculty. She also served on the school’s executive counsel and was a close friend to Washington. She escorted his daughter Portia on her trip to Europe. Given the prominence of women on Tuskegee’s faculty and staff, suffragist leader Susan B. Anthony was likely impressed during her visit to the school in 1903. She also made an impression on Tuskegee’s young students, including Carrie Stewart who, according to Adele Logan Alexander “flourished at Tuskegee. She mastered a body of traditional materials in the classroom but also absorbed progressive ideologies, including the prosuffrage messages expounded by her mother’s friend Adella Logan and illustrious visitors such as Susan B. Anthony.”

The Board of Directors

Even Tuskegee’s board reflected Washington’s esteem for higher education. While most members were white elites, like Columbia University President Seth Low, and President Theodore Roosevelt, Cornelius N. Dorsette (1852 – 1897), Alabama’s first black licensed physician, also served on the board. A graduate of Syracuse University and the University of Buffalo Medical School, Dorsette owned a building that housed his pharmacy and a concert hall, and later founded the Hale Infirmary in Montgomery, the state’s first hospital for blacks. Edgar J. Penney, a graduate of Atlanta University, was a trustee and dean of the Bible School until he resigned in the midst of a scandal in 1907.

These examples of Tuskegee’s early faculty, staff, and board underscore the caliber of the men and women who animated the school and illustrate that Washington’s
educational aspirations for blacks were far loftier than his rhetoric and the industrial reputation of his school suggest.\textsuperscript{46}

\textbf{The Fruit of Tuskegee}

Perhaps the best indication of the academic character of a school is the achievements of its graduates. Given its roots as a normal school it is hardly surprising that Tuskegee produced scores of educators, many who adopted their school’s self-help mantra. By 1916, Tuskegee graduates had established seventeen schools from Louisiana to Washington, D.C., and Washington, to insure their viability, dispatched teams of Tuskegee teachers to assess their teaching methods, physical plant, and finances.\textsuperscript{47} Among Tuskegee’s progeny was Cornelia Bowen, who was born in Tuskegee in 1870 and graduated in 1885. She then attended Teachers College and became principal of the Mount Meigs Institute in Waugh, Alabama. She was also president of the State Federation of Women’s Clubs and “sold many farms to colored people.”\textsuperscript{48} William Henry Holtzclaw (c. 1874 – 1943), an 1898 graduate who in 1903 established the Utica Normal and Industrial Institute for the Training of Colored Young Men and Women in a farming village in southwestern Mississippi. The school, which is now Utica Junior College, was the first institution of higher education for African Americans in Mississippi. Holtzclaw, the fifth of fifteen siblings, was born into poverty in Randolph County, Alabama. After graduating from Tuskegee he taught in Alabama for four yeas, all the while determined to open a school in Mississippi where he believed his services were most needed. He managed to secure two thousand acres of land for his school and primarily hired Tuskegee-trained graduates for the faculty and staff, including his wife Mary Ella
Patterson Holtzclaw of the class of 1895. Of his success, he wrote: “Whatever I have been able to do myself here in Mississippi for my people has been due, first, to the teachings of my mother, and, second, to the all-important life-example and matchless teachings of Booker T. Washington.”

In 1908, ten years after he left Tuskegee, Holtzclaw earned a master’s degree from Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical Institute and for a decade continued to attend summer sessions at Harvard University. Holtzclaw chronicled his work in Mississippi in his book *Black Man’s Burden*, published in 1915 for which Washington wrote the introduction.

Meanwhile, Isaac Fisher, born in 1877 on a cotton farm in East Carroll Parish, Louisiana, graduated from Tuskegee in 1898, and went on to teach in Aiken, South Carolina. He became principal of a school in Montgomery, Alabama, and later served as president of the State Branch Normal College at Pine Bluff, Ark. Among the many other Tuskegee graduates who went on to become teachers, are James M. Canty (Class of 1890), Emma J. Boyd (1891), Rosalie Bradford (1893), Irene M. Thompson (1894), Lizzie Browning, and Moses Charles Franklin Purifoy (1895). Walter Solomon Buchanan (1882 - ), graduated from Tuskegee in 1899; and Harvard’s Bussey Institution, in 1906. In 1909 he was appointed president of the State Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes in Normal, Alabama.

W. J. Edwards, of Snow Hill, Alabama, upon graduating from Tuskegee in 1893, returned to his hometown to open the Snow Hill Normal and Industrial Institute. In 1897 he also organized the Snow Hill Negro Conference, modeled after the annual Tuskegee Negro Conference, to address the needs of farmers. “Here we listen to educational,
religious, moral, and financial reports from many sections,” he wrote. Farmers, he reported “return to their farms more determined to succeed than ever before.”

He also organized the Black Belt Improvement Society whose “object shall be the general uplift of the people of the Black Belt of Alabama; to make them better morally, mentally, spiritually, and financially.”

In 1905 he reported that a revolution is taking place in Tilden where many blacks were purchasing land and owning homes.

“John Thomas, one of our graduates, Class of ’01, has gone into this place, induced the people to buy thirty acres of land, on which they have erected a spending building having two rooms, and the school is being conducted seven months in the year. Many farmers in this section are now owning homes, some of them owning as much as 400 acres of land. This improvement is steadily going on in all sections where the influence of our school has reached.”

One of his graduates was Arthur W. Mitchell (1883 – 1968), who entered Tuskegee in 1902 at the age of 14. He attended Tuskegee for one year and then went to on to Snow Hill. After a time working in rural education, Mitchell attended Columbia University for a short time before qualifying for the bar. He studied law in Washington, D.C. and in 1934 became the first African American Democrat elected to Congress. While in Congress he introduced anti-lynching legislation and in 1941 won a favorable ruling in the U.S. Supreme Court against the Illinois Central and Rock Island Railroads. The court, in an important ruling, decided that the company had violated the Interstate Commerce Act by forcing him to travel in a segregated car. After retiring Mitchell operated a twelve-acre farm in Virginia.

Thomas McCants Stewart, Jr. (1877-1919), was born in Brooklyn to a father who was a prominent lawyer, civil rights activist, and Washington confidante. His mother, Charlotte L. Harris Stewart, had graduated from Wilberforce University. The younger
Stewart entered Tuskegee in 1893 at age 16, graduated in 1896 and returned to New York and attended New York University where that year he earned a law certificate. After working for his father’s firm for a short time, he attended the University of Minnesota Law School where he excelled academically and was secretary of the senior class. He was joined there by Jay Moses Griffin, a Tuskegee classmate. Stewart received an LL.B in law in 1899 and was sworn into the Minnesota bar. Two years later he became the first African American to receive the LL.M. from the University of Minnesota Law School. While still a student Stewart, citing a 1897 state civil rights law, filed a successful discrimination lawsuit against a Minneapolis restaurant that refused to serve him.

In addition to working as a lawyer Stewart was one of the co-founders of the Portland Advocate, the city’s second black newspaper that was first published in 1903. In 1906, in Taylor v. Cohn, he also successfully defended a black Pullman car porter who was required to sit in the balcony of a Portland theater. Stewart won the case on appeal in Oregon Supreme Court.

Stewart’s younger brother Gilchrist graduated from Tuskegee in 1895 and went on to study dairy science at the University of Wisconsin and teaching at the South Dakota Agricultural College before returning to New York City where he too became a lawyer and activist. In 1906 he was dispatched to Texas to investigate the notorious Brownsville affair during which black soldiers were accused of fatally shooting a white man. Gilchrist Stewart concluded that the black soldiers were innocent, but they were summarily discharged without a trial. The Army reopened the investigation and reversed the order in 1972.

George Williamson Crawford (1877 - ), of Tuscaloosa, Arkansas, headed to Yale
Law School after graduating from Tuskegee in 1900. He received his LLB from Yale in 1903 and would go on to become the director of the NAACP, a trustee of Talladega College, and the author of several books, including *Prince Hall and His Followers: Being a Monograph of the Legitimacy of Negro Masonry*.58

Similarly, following his graduation from Tuskegee’s preparatory school in 1897, William Clarence Matthews went on to Phillips Andover Academy and then Harvard University, which he attended from 1901 to 1905. During that time he played short stop for the school’s baseball team and was recognized by *McClure’s* magazine as “the best there is in a college athlete.”59 During his senior year Matthews took courses at Harvard Law School, and later earned an LL.D. at Boston University while working as an athletic instructor at Boston High Schools. He passed the bar exam in 1908 and in 1913, with Washington’s support, was appointed special assistant to the U.S. district attorney in Boston. Seven years later he served as legal counsel to black nationalist Marcus Garvey.

Vertner W. Tandy (1885-1949) of Lexington, Kentucky, attended Tuskegee for just one year, during which time he was a prized student in the architecture department. A year later, in 1905, he transferred to Cornell University and graduated from the School of Architecture in 1908. He became the first licensed African American architect in New York, where his buildings included St. Phillips Episcopal Church in Harlem, the mansion of Madam C.J. Walker in Irvington-on-Hudson, and the Ivey Delph Apartments in Hamilton Heights, which is on the National Registry of Historic Places. In 1906 while at Cornell, Tandy was also one of the founders of Alpha Pi Alpha, the first African American Greek letter fraternity, and he became the first African American
commissioned officer when he became a first lieutenant in the New York State National Guard.

A Tuskegee alumna who perhaps best personified the school’s self-help mantra was Joseph Jacob Simmons, Jr. (1901 – 1981) who Washington recruited to the school but who graduated in 1919, four years after Washington’s death. Simmons went on to become an international oilman and eventually partnered with Phillips Petroleum Company and Signal Oil and Gas to open oil fields in Liberia, Nigeria and Ghana. In 1969, he became the first African American appointed to the National Petroleum Council.

While scholars often cite the times Washington stressed agricultural and industrial training, the achievements of these students were not at odds with the vision he expressed in his speeches and writings. Less emphasized is his public advocacy of blacks entering professions that required the kind of education he purportedly eschewed. At times he cunningly deemphasized his support of classical education by lumping together the idea of blacks pursuing manual trades alongside more elite professions like architecture and pharmacy. In an interview that illuminated the kind of duality that characterized his rhetoric, he stressed the importance of blacks becoming “carpenters, bankers, merchants, pharmacists, architects. In this way the race becomes both a larger producer and a larger consumer and enters more and more into the commercial and industrial life of the country.” Many Tuskegee graduates did just that.

David Lee Johnston, who was born sometime after the Civil War in Macon County Alabama, graduated from Tuskegee in 1889 and went on to study pharmacy at Meharry Medical College, from which he graduated at the head of the class in 1896 and became a successful Birmingham, Alabama pharmacist. “I sit here at my work and think of
Tuskegee, of the songs we used to sing, and of what it has done for me. I love the place,” said Johnston. Albert Baumann (b. 1881), after graduating from Tuskegee, attended Flint Medical College in New Orleans and in 1910 became proprietor of a pharmacy in New Orleans. George W. Lovejoy, (Class of 1888), an Alabama farm laborer, became a practicing lawyer in Mobile, Alabama in 1892. Claude McKay (Class of 1912) went on to become one of the leading writers during the Harlem Renaissance. Similar success stories of Tuskegee’s early graduates abound.

Rural replicas

In addition to raising prodigious amounts of money for Tuskegee and Hampton, Washington also solicited the support of his wealthy friends to build hundreds of rural schools throughout the South. Between 1904 and 1909, Tuskegee built forty-six rural schools but the number soared as a result of a partnership between Washington and Julius Rosenwald (1862 – 1932), the philanthropist and part owner of Sears, Roebuck & Co. Washington invited Rosenwald to join Tuskegee’s board in 1912 and the two initially embarked on a plan to construct six Tuskegee-operated schools in rural Alabama that opened in 1913 and 1914. Their partnership planted the seed for the establishment in 1917 of the Rosenwald Fund. Between 1915 and 1932 the Rosenwald Fund, working with Tuskegee, provided millions of dollars in matching funds for the construction of 5,000 schools for blacks throughout the South.

Industrial Education
George Washington Carver, a former slave born sometime before the Civil War, joined the faculty in 1896 with bachelor and master’s degrees from Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts and single handedly built the school’s global reputation for agricultural training. Carver was perhaps the most famous of Tuskegee’s faculty, and his work served to perpetuate Tuskegee’s reputation as an agricultural school that promoted the continued subjugation of black people. Less touted were those instructors whose work veered far from fields associated with manual labor. Still, Carver’s groundbreaking successes were many. He discovered more than one hundred uses for the sweet potato and three hundred products from peanuts on his experimental farm at Tuskegee, and helped invigorate the South’s ailing economy. At Tuskegee he designed the Jessup Wagon, a mobile school, and published a series of brochures to educate farmers on cultivation techniques, crops, nutrition, livestock care and food preservation. He also offered them soil and water analysis to help improve their land. He was feted worldwide and in 1916 was elected to England’s Society of the Encourage of Art, Manufactures and Commerce. He also was awarded the Spingarn Medal in 1923, and declined offers to work for Thomas Edison and consult Russian officials. He was visited by Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge, and was befriended by automobile magnate Henry Ford and Indian leader Mahatma Gandhi.

Even without Carver’s eminence, Washington’s emphasis on industrial and agricultural training deserves attention given the importance he placed on it in his speeches and writings. Speaking at Teachers College in 1897, Washington advanced his familiar recipe for black progress saying: “The colored people must mix with their religious emotion more practical economy – in short, more land, more cotton and more
In his book *Working With the Hands* published in 1904, Washington further fosters this idea by highlighting the school’s purported focus on skills like brick-, mattress-, and dress-making, and on the school’s foundry and blacksmith shop. Under chapter headings like “Cutting sugar-cane on the School’s farm;” “An out-of-door class in laundry work;” and “Hogs as object-lessons,” Washington carefully constructs an image of Tuskegee as a preparatory school for manual laborers. This impression is enhanced by photographs of Tuskegee students making furniture, cultivating a cassava patch, and sewing. But while the book overwhelmingly depicts an industrial school, Washington manages to broach the need for black engineers, scientists and architects, without noting Tuskegee’s role in realizing that goal. Referring to Haiti and its people, Washington wrote:

“Some of them should have been educated as civil, mining, and sanitary engineers, and others as architects and builders; and most important of all, agriculture should have been scientifically developed. If such a foundation had been laid it is probably that Hayti would now possess good public roads, streets, bridges, and railroads, and that its agricultural and mining resources would have made the country rich, prosperous, and contented.”

However, the greatest gap in the literature stems from an acceptance of Tuskegee as a purely industrial and agricultural school, and Washington as one who wholly embraced the model. It is a partial view encapsulated in this observation by Harlan:

It was in agriculture, the sickest industry in America, and in the South, the nation’s sickest region and in certain obsolete trades such as blacksmithing, that Washington sought to work his economic wonders. … [B]esides he had an emotional commitment to ‘keep them down on the farm’” for he hated and feared the city.”
This, of course, only characterizes part of Tuskegee’s actual work, and neglects the role it played in preparing an elite cadre of professional blacks and also preparing scores of blacks across the African Diaspora for self-sufficiency during a difficult period of transition.

**Across the African Diaspora**

While Washington is often portrayed as the antithesis of the proud black nationalists of his era, he inspired an impressive number of strident Pan-Africanist leaders from Africa and the Caribbean. In 1882, after visiting Tuskegee, the Pan-Africanist Edward Wilmot Blyden announced his intention to open a Tuskegee-type school at Liberia College. Liberia honored Washington with a knighthood in recognition of his protests against Belgium-sanctioned atrocities in the Congo, and the Booker T. Washington Institute finally materialized in 1929.

In his 1978 essay “The African Crusade for Black Industrial Schooling,” the historian Donald Spivey highlights the profound influence Washington had on numerous Pan African leaders, including Blyden; Kenyan labor leader Harry Thuko, who saw Tuskegee as a model of “black defiance” to white rule; E.D. Morel who saw it as a tool for African unity; and Gold Coast nationalist J.E. Casely Hayford, the journalist and anthropologist who called it a “spur to African nationality.” Spivey also notes the influence Tuskegee had on Marcus Garvey, who called Washington “a great inspiration” and Tuskegee Institute “a source of pride.” Yet, Spivey assumes Washington’s African admirers were naïve and unable to recognize that Tuskegee, while appearing to promote black independence, was in reality a pawn of white patronage.
“The African leader who praised Tuskegee did not understand Tuskegee,” he wrote.

Referring specifically to Blyden, Spivey reasoned:

“Blyden failed to discern the contradictions between the goals of industrial education and African autonomy. He, like many others, were unable to see beyond the Armstrong/Booker T. Washington rhetoric of self-help.”

Rather than consider that Washington deceived his patrons to eventually achieve black autonomy, Spivey argued that Pan-Africanists “were fooled by the Tuskegee image of self-help,” thereby undercutting their astuteness.

Conversely, in his dissertation on South African leader John Lagalabalele Dube, (1871 – 1946), Manning Marable depicts Dube’s wish to emulate Washington as a sophisticated strategy for African liberation. Unlike Spivey, Marable assumes Dube understood what actually transpired at Tuskegee beneath the less threatening façade of industrial education. Dubbing himself the “Booker T. Washington of South Africa,” Dube turned to white patrons to build the Zulu Christian Industrial School, which became the Ohlange Institute, the first black-directed institute in South Africa. It was also the first school in South Africa based on American educational ideals. Like Tuskegee, Ohlange sought to train blacks to become entrepreneurs, land-owning farmers and educators, and like Tuskegee, the school’s bi-furcated curriculum offered academic and industrial education. Dube also founded the Bantu Business League based on Washington’s National Negro Business League. He was also, from 1912 to 1917, the founding president of the African National Congress, the group eventually led by Nelson Mandela that overthrew apartheid.

Dube had already heard Washington speak many times when he wrote him in 1897 stating his interest in his work and his own plan to start a school “of an industrial
character.” That year Washington was on a speaking tour in New York City, where Dube resided with his wife. Marable argued that it was during this period, between 1896 and 1899, that Dube was becoming a black nationalist committed to the Tuskegee philosophy of racial self-help and economic nationalism. In 1897 Dube visited Tuskegee, which by then had 1,072 students and 2,267 acres, forty-buildings, and hundreds of mules, horses, cows, pigs, sheep and a herd of Holstein cattle. During the commencement ceremony, Washington introduced Dube to the audience and the two continued to correspond. Dube opened the Ohlange School in 1900 and, like Washington, nurtured an elite cadre of politically active young Africans who went on to assume leadership positions. Dozens of schools modeled on Ohlange opened throughout sub-Saharan Africa.

Argued Marable: “African students who travelled to Tuskegee in the 1890s and 1900s found an institution that could prove to be essential to nationalist prerogatives and independent advancement.”

Another South African inspired by Tuskegee was Davidson D.T. Jabaru who after graduating from the University of London was commissioned by the South African Minister of Native Affairs to study the methods of Tuskegee. Jabaru visited Tuskegee during the summer and fall of 1913 and returned to help establish the South African Native College at Fort Hare.

In his 1993 *Black Messiahs and Uncle Toms: Social and Literary Manipulations of a Religious Myth*, Wilson Jeremiah Moses recounted how, during a conference on Africa and the American Negro at Gammon Theological Seminary in Atlanta in 1895, Swiss missionary Heli Chatelain urged Washington to accept his destiny as a universal
leader. Rev. John W. E. Bowen, (1855 – 1933), who organized the three-day conference, had himself become a fervent admirer of Washington. A professor of historical theology at Gammon, Bowen had earned a Ph.D. from Boston University in 1887 where he had completed advanced work in Greek, Latin, Hebrew Arabic and German. Like Washington, Bowen had been born into slavery and that may have predisposed him to Washington’s outwardly conservative southern strategy. Still, on issues of social equality, Bowen was more politically compatible with Du Bois, and endorsed the Niagara Movement. Still, Bowen said Washington’s Atlanta speech had marked “the beginning of a moral revolution in America.”

William Henry Ferris (1874 – 1941), another Niagara Movement supporter who later worked with Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association, also belatedly recognized the value of Washington’s contribution. In 1908, he wrote Washington to express his regret at misjudging him. He wrote:

“When I criticized you ten and five years ago, I didn’t understand you quite as fully as I do now. I analyzed your statements then; but not your personality. But when I began to write my History of the Negro Race two years ago, I soon discovered that you were an unusual Negro. I saw that while our race had produced many scholars, theologians, philosophers, artists, painters, poets, writers, orators and politicians, it had produced few men of constructive and actual genius. Then I saw that you were a masterful strategist, a resourceful tactician and an astute diplomat. In a word you were a born general …”

Also, as numerous scholars have noted, Washington’s memoir Up from Slavery, had a profound impact on Marcus Garvey who read the book shortly after the Tuskegee International Conference on the Negro was held in 1912. The conference was attended by blacks from across the Diaspora, including, Jamaica’s education director. During the conference a resolution calling for the building of a Tuskegee in the West Indies was
passed. “It is from this event that, as he put it, his ‘doom’ of being a race leader dawned on him,” wrote Tony Martin.  

Meier too credits Washington’s self-help ideology for not only laying the groundwork for the nationalism of Garvey, but also the New Negro movement of the 1920s. Indeed, the 1895 speech that brought Washington national acclaim was titled “The New Negro.” Meir and others have also credited Washington for establishing institutional alternatives to a white cultural mainstream rooted in racial solidarity and cultural pride. In doing so, Washington exposed the political and economic potential of self-segregation that inspired not only Garvey, but also lesser known separatists who encouraged Southern migrants to establish African-American colonies in the North in what Meier refers to as “an institutionalized expression, in extreme form, of the ideological patterns of self-help and racial solidarity.”

And noting Washington’s covert support of a number of legal challenges, Harlan wrote:

“In his civil rights activity he presented himself publicly as a social pacifist and accommodationist, while secretly he financed and generated a series of court suits challenging the grandfather clause, denial of jury service to blacks, Jim Crow cars, and peonage.”

Further evidence of Washington’s influence across the African Diaspora is the number of students from Africa and the Caribbean who attended Tuskegee. In 1900, students had come from 28 states and territories, including Cuba, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, Africa and Barbados. Perhaps one of the greatest tributes to Washington came from his rival, Du Bois, who following his death wrote in The Crisis that Washington was “the greatest Negro leader since Frederick Douglass and the most distinguished leader, black
or white, to come out of the South since the Civil War." A memorial service for Washington was attended by scores of dignitaries, including President Roosevelt. Another three thousand gathered for a memorial service held in the nation’s capital at Metropolitan A.M.E. church several months later.

Reassessing Achimota

Just as Tuskegee produced scores of early graduates who created or expanded political, economic and social opportunities for blacks, so too did Achimota. As an indication of Achimota’s impact on newly-independent Ghana’s political system, during the first Parliament of the second Republic of Ghana, 126 of the 140 parliamentarians were alumni of Achimota, and many alumni continue to serve in all branches of Ghana’s political system. Nkrumah (1909-1972), of course, was the first president and prime minister of independent Ghana, and the 1963 recipient of the Lenin Peace Prize. Nana William Ofori Atta (1910-1988) was among Achimota’s first class and would on to become a lawyer and in 1971 was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs. Kojo Bostsoi (1916-2001), also served as Foreign Minister from 1963-1965 and again from 1958 to 1959. He later attended Oxford University where he earned a post-graduate degree in Geography and Education and became Minister of Education. In 1960 Susanna Al-Hassan became the first female Member of Parliament, and in 2007 she was commemorated on a stamp.

Among the African leaders educated at the school are former Prime Ministers Edward Akufo-Add, Jerry John Rawlings, and Kofi Abraa Busia. The current president, John Evans Atta Mills, is also a graduate of Achimota as was William Ofori
Atta, a Ghanaian independence leader. Also, Dawda Jawara (b. 1924), the first Prime Minister and later President of the Gambia, also attended Achimota. Like Tuskegee, Achimota trained many of Ghana’s educators, including at least ten vice chancellors of the University of Ghana. Nii Lomote Engmann, a professor of anatomy and former dean of the Ghana Medical School, was also an alumna, as was John Saka Addo, chairman of Prudential Bank in Ghana and former governor of the Bank of Ghana; and Dr. Joyce R. Aryee, ceo of the Ghana Chamber of Mines and executive director of Salt and Light Ministries. Paul Boateng, the UK Ambassador to South Africa and former Treasury Secretary, also graduated from Achimota. The school also produced Dr. Susan Ofori-Atta, Ghanaian’s first female physician, as well as Charles Odamttten Easmon, the country’s first surgeon and first dean of the University of Ghana Medical School. If we are to consider Achimota as an example of the Hampton/Tuskegee model, then it follows that it was, like Tuskegee, a producer of Ghana’s professional and political elite.

Also telling is the trajectory of Lawrence Henry Yaw Ofosu-Appiah (1920 – 1990), after attending Achimota Secondary School. After graduating he returned to teach Latin and Twi, an indication of his classical and bi-cultural education. In 1944 the Achimota Council awarded him a scholarship to Oxford University, where he became the first black African to study classics. Similarly, Seth Kobla Anthony (1915 – 2008), an Achimota graduate, also returned to the school in 1937 to teach Latin, English and mathematics. In 2006 Anthony, who in 1939 became the first black soldier commissioned as an officer in the British Army, was awarded the Order of the Star, the country’s highest civilian honor. So while the debate over industrial vs. classical education played
out Achimota, like its American counterpart, offered a dual curriculum that similarly prepared students for positions in leadership and the professions.

And just as Tuskegee progressively became more openly academic, so too did Achimota. “By 1951, the beginning of Ghanaian independence struggles,” wrote Steiner-Khamsi and Quist, “Achimota’s curriculum was not much different from that of its competitors…” Argued comparatist Philip Foster:

“Achimota has remained one of the myths of Gold Coast education; it was no more a school rooted in African conditions than were Mfantsipin [an elite Gold Coast missionary school] and the other secondary schools; rather it was a secondary institution modeled on English lines but with vastly superior resources.”

So just as the myth of Tuskegee as a school rooted in the conditions of the rural south persisted, so too, according to Foster, did the myth of Achimota as one based on what is understood as the Hampton-Tuskegee model. In both cases, the reality of the curricula and the alumni outcomes was found to be far different than the rhetoric surrounding their promotion would suggest.
Chapter 6

Dissembling ‘Accommodation: Mining Strategies of Resistance

At the outset of this dissertation, I set out to answer two primary questions:

• How did Washington and Aggrey negotiate an externally imposed black transcultural identity rooted in racial inferiority theories that permeated the discourse and actions of white elites in the U.S. and British colonial Africa; and did they appropriate that identity as a counter-hegemonic strategy?

• How did Washington, Aggrey and their successors influence the formation and implementation of the industrial education model at Achimota and Tuskegee Institute, and in what ways did they perceive this implementation to be in their own interests?

I had hoped that this line of inquiry into black transcultural identity and agency could help uncover some of the strategies of resistance employed by Washington and Aggrey that have not been sufficiently explored in much of the scholarship on industrial or “Negro” education, or on scholarship examining the transfer of the so-called Hampton-Tuskegee model from the U.S. South to the Gold Coast. In the process I attempted to shift the focus away from the way the industrial education model was conceived by its white framers, to how it was actually adapted by Washington and Aggrey in the interests of blacks beneath the radar of hegemony. In so doing, I hoped to broaden and deepen our appreciation of the under-recognized agency of subjugated people. In revisiting this historical case, I also sought to situate Tuskegee and Achimota in a specific historical period to illustrate how dominant racial theories, attitudes and social, political and
economic realities influenced the particular strategies employed by Washington and Aggrey. I argue that those strategies have been commonly misinterpreted as accommodation to a dominant worldview of black inferiority, or have remained shrouded in mystery as a result of the very dissimulative tactics that were in fact designed to hide their intentions. To that end, I contend that Washington and Aggrey have, in many historical accounts, become victims of their own successful strategies of evasion, dissimulation or outright deception.

I have attempted to show how many scholars, by focusing on rhetoric – or what Scott calls the *public transcript* – have essentialized Washington and Aggrey by assuming their acquiescence to white elites, and in the process they have ignored their agency. In addition to Scott, I have drawn on the insights of Kelley, Bhabha, Walker, Lewis, Walker, Marable, Aptheker, Cruse and others who provide useful interpretative frameworks to uncover or otherwise highlight the myriad tactics oppressed blacks used to resist hegemony. By revisiting the Hampton-Tuskegee model’s global transfer to Achimota with fresh insights and through a transnational, transatlantic lens, signs of resistance that had gone unnoticed have been set in high relief, and rhetoric that had been widely interpreted as Washington and Aggrey’s acquiescence to hegemony can now at least be considered part of a counter-hegemonic strategy.

Acute attention to subtle or otherwise overlooked signs of resistance by Washington and Aggrey calls into question a wide swath of literature that forms the basis of our knowledge of them, the Hampton-Tuskegee model, and *Negro education* in the United States South and British colonial Africa. This inquiry highlighted the extensive scholarship on industrial education for blacks, or the so-called Hampton-Tuskegee model,
to show the extent to which much of that scholarship oversimplified and in some cases obscured the true nature of its actual implementation at Tuskegee and Achimota, or the role Washington and Aggrey played in the economic, political, social and spiritual transformation of the African Diaspora early in the twentieth century.

One of my central arguments is that many scholars have conflated Hampton and Tuskegee and in so doing have assumed that Washington and Samuel Armstrong, his white mentor who ardently opposed black suffrage and their equality with whites -- had the same aspirations, intentions, goals and worldviews. In so doing, scholars have also mistakenly assumed that Washington’s Tuskegee was primarily devoted to industrial education, or what many considered a substandard form of education for blacks. As indicated earlier, this view has been clearly articulated by scholars like Berman who wrote:

“In brief, the Tuskegee philosophy sought to ensure that the black man in the southern United States would be trained as a semi-skilled, semi-literate and a docile member of a burgeoning class, whose manpower would be utilized to help industrialize the reconstructed south.”

Perhaps no scholar has gone further to legitimize this view of Washington than Harlan, who wrote: “Washington ‘jumped Jim Crow’ with the skill of long practice, but he seemed to lose sight of the original purposes of his dance.”

However, once we consider Washington’s resistance through a transatlantic, transnational lens inspired by scholars like Walker, Lewis, Bhabha, Kelley, Marable and others, this impression of Washington begins to fade or disintegrate altogether. We are instead left with the vision of a man who appropriated hegemonic discourse while covertly defying his patrons to provide academic and professional training to produce
scores of future black architects, educators, politicians, doctors, lawyers, pharmacists and
other leaders of the race.

However, Harlan, mistakenly characterized Washington as a man who primarily
sought to prepare blacks for work in obsolete trades or in agriculture. However, once we
follow Scott’s lead and privilege the *hidden* over the *public transcript*, we find that
Washington’s vision was far broader and ambitious than Harlan allowed. Washington not
only covertly supported black political and civil rights, as both Meier and Harlan
revealed, but also higher education for blacks at Tuskegee and elsewhere. He guided and
stoked the ambitions of men and women who would become professionals,
entrepreneurs, landowners and leaders by covertly offering liberal arts classes along with
professional training. In addition, evidence of his endorsement, and even enthusiasm, for
higher education for blacks was his daughter’s attendance at Wellesley; his financial
support of students who pursued academic degrees elsewhere; and his hiring of scores of
academics with elite academic credentials to teach on his faculty or serve in his
administration. Washington appeared deeply committed to black economic and political
empowerment across the Diaspora and believed it was attainable through vocational and
liberal arts instruction. His broad educational mission was aimed at the elevation of
African descendants across disciplines, whether in the arts, sciences, agriculture,
business, architecture, or trades. His curriculum, which was replicated at Achimota,
among other schools, targeted self-improvement in all aspects of one’s life including
thrift, spiritual development, racial pride, agricultural innovation, home ownership, and
economic self-sufficiency. The goals and intentions of Washington and Aggrey, while
shrouded in the rhetoric of accommodation to appease their white patrons, were clearly
aimed at the social, cultural, political and economic enrichment of black people. The best indication of that are the soaring accomplishments of the schools’ early alumni.

Cruse and Marable underscored the ways in which Washington’s nationalist, economic program was far more progressive and useful for building black American communities and post-colonial nations across the African Diaspora than scholars have recognized. Cruse also pointed out that integrationist leaders like Du Bois belatedly recognized the importance of Washington’s program of economic empowerment and self-sufficiency. While Du Bois fought for integration most of his life, he spent his final years in post-colonial Ghana by which time he realized the need for black economic empowerment. Marable, meanwhile, reminded us of the many Pan African leaders, including Dube and Garvey, that Washington inspired.

While a misinterpretation of Tuskegee, Achimota, Washington and Aggrey is understandable, even inevitable, given their tactics of dissimulation, it is nonetheless important to illustrate how generations of eminent scholars, including Meier, Harlan, Aptheker and King, have essentialized not only Washington, but also the Hampton-Tuskegee model, while failing to highlight the dichotomy between the public and hidden transcripts of both. By lifting the veil on what actually transpired at Tuskegee and Achimota, we find evidence of resistance that several generations of scholars have overlooked or undervalued. Here, I especially draw inspiration from Aptheker, whose pioneering work on the Negro slave revolt, effectively challenged and then altered prevailing beliefs that slaves had passively accepted their plight. *American Negro Slave Revolts*, published in 1943, took on some of the nation’s most eminent scholars, many of whom insisted that enslaved African Americans were largely docile and content.³ In his
introduction, he noted how historians “have generally tended to minimize or deny the discontent among Negro slaves of the United States.” His groundbreaking work marked the beginning of the dismantlement of a commonly held view that had, for many historians, been accepted as fact. But by highlighting forms of resistance that had not previously been considered – including the thousands of blacks who purchased their freedom and that of loved ones; enlisted in the Army or Navy; or who fled captivity, some to find refuge in the armies of Britain in France, or to Canada, Mexico and other safe havens. Moreover, “sabotage, shamming illness, ‘stealing,’ suicide and self-mutilation, and strikes were other devices which plagued slaveholders. The carelessness and deliberate destructiveness of the slaves, resulting in broken fences, spoiled tools, and neglected animals, were common phenomena.”

Aptheker, by expanding the definition of resistance, ushered in a generation of scholars who continued to uncover the previously hidden agency of oppressed blacks. Just as the docility of slaves had been accepted by generations of renowned scholars as fact, so too has a view of Washington as an accommodationist, and Tuskegee as a training ground for manual laborers. Even Aptheker, whose work on African American resistance has inspired several generations of scholars, nonetheless characterized Washington as passively accepting the inferior status of blacks. Aptheker’s uncomplicated assessment of Washington could partially stem from his reverence for Du Bois, whose papers he edited, and who he considered a mentor. However, it can also be said that Aptheker and other scholars had reams of purported ‘evidence’ in the form of Washington’s speeches and books alone to support the view that he placated whites at the expense of black progress. Whatever the reasons for the historical lapses, the characterization of Washington as
accommodating black subjugation through his advocacy of industrial education overlooks the hidden transcripts that reveal another perspective. Those transcripts uncover resistance in the form of deception and the appropriation of accommodationist rhetoric while he covertly supported “higher” liberal arts instruction, along with black political and social progress.

It is only after exposing what Scott’s so-called infrapolitics do we see Washington more clearly. By situating Washington in the tumultuous political and social climate of turn-of-the-century Alabama, and peeling back the façade of Tuskegee as a vocational school, the true nature of the curriculum, and Washington’s resistance to the threat of violence and the dictates of his white patrons, become apparent. So while many scholars have accepted at face value that Tuskegee was primarily devoted to vocational training, there is solid evidence that liberal arts courses including physics, Latin, and trigonometry, were not just offered to a relative few, but had a central place at the school. As a result, many of Tuskegee’s early graduates went on to careers as doctors, lawyers, architects, dentists, pharmacists, entrepreneurs and other positions of achievement. “[T]he political history of oppressed people cannot be understood without reference to infrapolitics, for these daily acts have a cumulative effect on power relations,” Kelley argued.⁵

Moreover, many scholars also neglect to recognize the extent to which Washington, an international symbol of black possibility as the creator of a sprawling empire of black achievement, inspired leaders across the African Diaspora who sought to emulate his program. As Kelley argued in Race Rebels, segregated environments offered southern African Americans a place to plan and hide beneath the glare of hegemony, and Tuskegee appeared to provide just that cover for Washington.⁶ Moreover, because
Tuskegee had all-black faculty and staff; the actual implementation of the curriculum remained hidden from the scrutiny of critics of black higher education.

Over the preceding five chapters I have attempted to illustrate how Washington and Aggrey subverted the explicit dictates of white elites who wielded social, political and economic power to influence education policy for blacks in the U.S. and the Gold Coast. I argue that, based on the evidence, that they did this in the interest of people of African descent. I contend that Washington and Aggrey negotiated an externally imposed black transcultural identity that assumed black inferiority and subservience to white interests by employing myriad counter-hegemonic strategies that on the surface appeared to conform to the ideology of white elites, but that, upon closer inspection, served black interests. Among those strategies were dissimulative resistance, as conceptualized by Sheila Walker, in which Washington and Aggrey appeared to adopt an ideology committed to black subordination by mimicking the rhetoric of white elites, or by cloaking what she characterizes as African Diaspora meaning in “Eurogenic garb” but “with different intentions, meanings and goals,” from their white patrons. Examples of their resistance in the form of dissimulation or outright deception abound. While Washington publicly advocated industrial education, he covertly provided liberal arts instruction to scores of students, which, as we saw in Chapter 3, he attempted to downplay to white patrons like Henry Villard, or in public statements. While Washington touted the manual labor of his students, he appeared less eager to cast the spotlight on scores of students who went on to become physicians, architects, lawyers, businessmen and women, landowners, elected officials and other members of what Du Bois called the Talented Tenth. Providing liberal arts instruction against the wishes of his
white patrons required outright deception, or varying degrees of camouflage, such as requiring academic subjects to be paired with manual instruction. As illustrated in Chapter 3, Washington, when angrily confronted with evidence of advanced courses being offered at Tuskegee, simply denied that the classes were what they seemed.

While Aggrey publicly advocated industrial education, for many Africans he by his very example epitomized the advantages of higher education and served as a source of inspiration for an untold number of Africans. Some, like Nkrumah, followed his lead by pursuing education in the United States. Also, the dual curriculum at Achimota, which, like Tuskegee, provided academic as well as vocational and agricultural instruction, served to prepare Gold Coast students for a wide range of opportunities in post-colonial Ghana. Based on Aggrey’s speeches to African audiences, and his correspondence to family and associates, it can be assumed that he believed Achimota would serve the interest of his fellow Africans.

Also, while Achimota, unlike Tuskegee, had white faculty and administrators so was not wholly racially segregated, it did provide courses in native languages, thereby providing greater leverage for Africans to bend the curriculum to their own purposes. Those languages were later recognized for matriculation at Cambridge, Oxford and other elite British schools. While some critics and scholars viewed the adoption of African languages and cultural practices like drumming as limiting, it could also be argued that cultural relevance was as empowering for Africans as the instruction of European culture and language was for Europeans. So while some scholars privileged European notions of academics, we might also assume that Africans, by learning in native languages,
perceived the adaptation to be in their own interests. Further research into what was actually taught in Ga, Twi, Fante and Ewe might reveal African acts of resistance.

This dissertation has also critiqued the tendency by many scholars to privilege Washington’s northern critics who alleged that Washington catered to the whims of southern whites, while ignoring or undervaluing the prescience of southern whites who viewed Tuskegee and other black schools as a potent antidote to white supremacy and black subjugation. Many scholars, including Meier, Harlan and Aptheker, perpetuate the perception that Washington sought to placate the white South, while undervaluing the virulent white southern opposition to all forms of education for blacks.

The extent to which scholars have embraced a view of Washington as an accommodationist and pawn of white elites spans much of the scholarship by a diverse range of scholars in history, politics and comparative education. This view has been fairly consistent since 1903 when Du Bois portrayed Washington as an accommodationist, while ignoring the socio-political realities of the South, as well as compelling evidence that beneath the veil of white hegemony, Washington nurtured an independent, self-sufficient black elite that inspired black nationalist movements throughout the African Diaspora. Fresh insights from numerous scholars provide insightful ways to challenge a pervasive view of Washington. Michael Rudolph West, in The Education of Booker T. Washington, contends that Washington was not a leader of black men and women but “a creature of the power of white politicians, editors, and influential editors; he became Negro leader, beholden not to the democratic consent of those who ostensibly raised him upon their shoulders, but to the favors of white public opinion makers.” The work of Kelley, Bhabha, Scott, Walker and Cruse remind us that such a characterization ignores the
infrapolitics, dissimulative resistance, and other strategies oppressed blacks used to negotiate their plight. Bhabha’s theory of hybridity reminds us that the apparent conformity and political ambiguity of oppressed subjects is a by-product of coercion. Kelley challenges scholars to assume that political motivations are indelibly linked to issues of economics, well-being, safety, and freedom of mobility. As such, it is not constructive to compare the strategies of Washington and Du Bois without considering that one operated in the epicenter of Alabama and a violent backlash to black social, political and economic gains, while the other primarily operated from the North where lynching and other daily threats against black survival, were far less common. Here, Scott’s concept of infrapolitics again proves vital. Lewis and Walker urge us to be mindful of subtle forms of resistance, with Walker specifically highlighting the cloaking black intentions, goals and aspirations in “Eurogenic garb.” However, for many scholars, the strident and proud rhetoric of Du Bois was more heroic and evidently counter-hegemonic than the more subtle resistance of Washington and Aggrey.

Washington cautiously navigated white southern rage against any sign of black competition and independence that found expression in lynching and political enfranchisement, as he also sought to appease his white northern donors who exclusively supported vocational education. The vehement resistance to liberal arts instruction for blacks expressed by Henry Villard and other leading whites, along with the simmering racial climate of the South, highlights the reasons for Washington’s attempts to conceal courses in physics, rhetoric, philosophy, ancient history, chemistry, algebra and civil government, or the soaring accomplishments of his alumni. This is why it is important to
relate Bhabha’s theory of hybridity to the actions of the colonized or otherwise oppressed actors. Their apparent conformity and political ambiguity is a by-product of coercion. So rather than view the actions of oppressed actors at face value, one must be mindful of the constraints that inspire their actions, and assume that forms of resistance, however evasive, are pressing against existing constraints.

Still, abundant evidence of the existence of liberal arts instruction at Tuskegee, and Washington’s attempt to conceal it, can be gleaned from his correspondence, school catalogues, and a series of eyewitness accounts. We see that as early as 1895, Tuskegee awarded twenty-six normal and literary diplomas while another twenty-four received industrial certificates, which demonstrated that the school that was a national symbol of industrial education quietly awarded academic degrees to slightly more than half its graduates.

Tuskegee’s hidden transcript provides compelling evidence of a higher calling on the part of Washington than his rhetoric could reveal. Not only did Tuskegee and later Achimota offer dual curricula that offered both liberal arts and industrial training, but both schools produced scores of black educators, doctors, lawyers, administrators, architects, businessmen and women, politicians and landowners who defied the limited roles ascribed to black Americans and Africans early in the twentieth century. These men and women, in fact, epitomized the Talented Tenth articulated by Du Bois.

By piercing the surface of Washington’s public posture, we can clearly detect signs of his resistance – or the hidden transcript -- including attempts to deceive his white patrons about the nature of Tuskegee’s curriculum; and by his public embrace of black social and political accommodation to whites, while he subversively supported legal
challenges to racial discrimination, privately socialized with whites and enrolled his
daughter at Wellesley. At every turn, Washington defied those who insisted on black
subjugation - from his hiring of blacks with elite credentials, to his behind the scenes
maneuverings to secure political appointments for blacks. Washington used the
worldwide fame he achieved due to his public rhetoric to build an empire that quietly
nurtured an elite cadre of black leaders and professionals who mirrored the ideals of a
‘Talented Tenth,’ more than has previously been recognized. While doing so, he inspired
anti-colonial movements throughout the African Diaspora.

Similarly, Aggrey, while portrayed by some scholars in comparative education as
a pawn of British colonial officials, was revered throughout Africa for his elite academic
credentials and commitment to African uplift.

This line of inquiry into black transcultural identity and agency allows a fuller
appreciation of the resistance of Washington and Aggrey that has not been sufficiently
explored in much of the scholarship on industrial or “Negro” education, or in scholarship
examining the transfer of the Hampton-Tuskegee model to the Gold Coast. It helps
explain why, by 1930, the curricula at both Tuskegee and Achimota was antithetical to
the industrial model that had been promoted in the discourse of philanthropists,
government and colonial officials, and Washington and Aggrey.

By revisiting this historical transfer, I have attempted to provide a fuller portrait
of the ways in which Washington and Aggrey negotiated a model favored by white elites
to address the social, economic and political oppression of black people in ways that
deepen our appreciation of the agency of oppressed people. It is my hope that scholars,
when writing about Tuskegee and Washington, will unpack the meanings associated with
the Hampton-Tuskegee model that has become a shorthand that has compromised much of the scholarship of historians and education comparatists.

Decoding this transcript requires what Kelley and Scott call “history from below” that pays sustained attention to commonly overlooked forms of resistance. “If they [historians] had looked deeper beyond the veil, beyond the public transcript of accommodation and traditional protest, they would have found more clamor than silence,” said Kelley.  

Kelley also underlined how segregation helped create space for oppressed blacks to hide and plan. Tuskegee, a segregated school with all black teachers and administrators, can be seen as one of these elusive social spaces that requires a close reading of both its hidden transcript and infrapolitics. Much of the scholarship instead privileges the public transcript, one that might intentionally conceal the goals and actions of oppressed actors.

Walker too contends that this broader perspective on black actors “has made visible, noticeable, and significant what had been invisibilized, gone unnoticed, and been deemed insignificant.” This wider lens and acute attention to less overt signs of resistance invites a reinterpretation of a wide swath of literature that forms the basis of our knowledge of Booker T. Washington, James E.K. Aggrey, the Hampton-Tuskegee model, *Negro education* in the United States South and British colonial Africa, and African American agency and resistance. Walker too considers agency beyond the overt actions of black actors. For example, she asks us to consider techniques of camouflage and dissimulation used to negotiate a dominant white ideology committed to black subordination. She argues that Africans and their descendants cloaked African Diaspora meaning in “Eurogenic garb” as a strategy to deceive the powerful into believing they
had acquiesced to their ideology. This framing is particularly useful for revisiting the words and actions of Washington and Aggrey.

Heightened attention to Walker’s strategy of “dissimulative resistance” allows us to reconsider the appearance of conformity to a dominant white ideology by Washington and Aggrey, but with different intentions than the white framers and patrons of industrial education for blacks.

Furthermore, Kelley implores scholars to reject the kind of essensialism that ignores this cultural hybridity given the complexity of African Americans.

When examining the agency of black actors in Diaspora, historian Earl Lewis also reminds us to look beyond obvious signs of resistance. Kelley, Bhabha, Walker, Lewis and other scholars recognize the need to delve beneath the surface of apparent conformity by colonized subjects to uncover evidence of their underlying resistance to their oppression. So rather than assume the public transcript reveals the politics of oppressed actors, we need to consider the social, economic and political environment of oppressed actors, and the realm of possibility given their specific circumstances. Or, as Kelley said: “Politics is not separate from lived experience or the imaginary world of what is possible: to the contrary, politics is about these things.” Much of the scholarship on Washington and Aggrey has privileged the public transcript while ignoring or not adequately addressing the specific infrapolitics influencing their actions and their private transcripts. This dissertation, then, will attempt to situate the actions of Washington and Aggrey in the context of their lived experiences, while attempting to observe and decipher their hidden transcripts from below.
A trans-Atlantic, transnational, African Diaspora framework privileges ideas, attitudes, cultural meanings, strategies and innovations that have rarely received prominent or sustained attention in the scholarship examining this global transfer.

In the end, I hope I have begun the process of exploding the myth of Tuskegee as merely an expression of white elite paternalism and continued black subjugation by unveiling how Washington, behind a mask of compliance, sought to advance a black transnationalist agenda through the aegis of Tuskegee. In short, Washington and Aggrey appropriated an externally imposed black transcultural identity rooted in racial inferiority theories that permeated the discourse and actions of white elites in the U.S. and British colonial Africa as a counter-hegemonic strategy. They both created schools that appeared to focus on vocational training but that in reality created future leaders of industry, politics, medicine, and academia throughout the United States and Africa.

Meir and others have also credited Washington for establishing institutional alternatives to a white cultural mainstream rooted in racial solidarity and cultural pride. In doing so, Washington exposed the political and economic potential of self-segregation that inspired not only Garvey, but also lesser known separatists who encouraged Southern migrants to establish African-American colonies in the North in what Meier refers to as “an institutionalized expression, in extreme form, of the ideological patterns of self-help and racial solidarity.”

Summary

While Washington’s reputation has been sullied by his rhetoric and writings, and by decades of literature that have denigrated him as an “Uncle Tom,” the legacy of his school as a producer of legions of men and women who during its first three decades
excelled in education, business and in numerous professions including pharmacy, architecture, law, medicine and agriculture, is less known. Also obscured is his role as a catalyst for the construction of thousands of schools for blacks across the rural South and throughout the African Diaspora which many assume were purely industrial in nature. The many transnational movements either spearheaded or inspired by Washington, have also been overshadowed by rhetoric designed to conceal his intentions and achievements. And while many continue to view him at face value and through a 21st century lens, it is important to at least consider his actions as a subversive tactic of dissimulative resistance. This framing allows a fuller portrait of Washington and, for the purposes of this inquiry, expands and alters the perception and meaning of the so-called Hampton-Tuskegee model.

Upon closer inspection, Tuskegee’s image as a factory of manual laborers morphs to reveal its less obvious role as the employer and producer of an elite assemblage of black professionals, academics, and activists; and a beacon of possibility for black nationalists across the African Diaspora. This reinterpretation is bolstered by compelling evidence of its dynamic environment that was animated by eminent academics and the impressive achievements of its many alumni, as well as by Washington’s standing among black nationalists like Blyden, Dube, and others who looked beyond the rhetoric of industrial education to find a potent recipe for black empowerment. A clearer portrait of Tuskegee lends credence to Marable’s assertion that Washington “helped to create a nationalistic, proud, and dynamic elite of black people” on two continents. Students in its academic program were offered a curriculum of advanced courses that ably prepared scores of them for advanced education and elite professions. In addition, students in the
academic and trade programs, alike, were steeped in an awe-inspiring environment of black achievement. From the buildings and grounds, to the extraordinary example of Washington and the men and women he assembled as faculty and visitors, students were exposed daily to concrete examples of African American potential.

As an enduring testament to Washington’s legacy, dozens if not hundreds of schools have been named in his honor, and the tobacco farm on which he was born into slavery is now a national monument listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Washington was also the first African American to be memorialized on a postage stamp (1940) and on a U.S. coin (1951-1954). Also named in his honor was a bridge spanning the Hampton River near Hampton University and a state park in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Monuments to him are also located on the campuses of Hampton and Tuskegee.

While Aggrey has been similarly vilified in some of the Western literature and largely portrayed as a less than heroic figure who primarily served white colonial powers, he, unlike Washington, remains a respected figure in his native country and throughout Africa. As noted earlier, Aggrey’s many admirers included a number of important African leaders, among them Kwame Nkrumah, the first president of an independent Ghana; Nnamdi Azikiwe, the first president of independent Nigeria; and Peter Mbiyu Koinange, of Kenya, as well as African Americans like John Bruce. While scholars may long debate the pros and cons of the rhetorical strategy employed by Washington and Aggrey, its efficacy in creating schools that prepared scores of blacks for elite professions, politics and economic empowerment, is incontroversible. However, the contribution of Tuskegee and Achimota to the social, educational, and economic advancement of black people throughout the African Diaspora can only be fully
recognized when observed behind the carefully constructed artifice that has long served to obscure, perhaps ineradicably, their legacy.
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Appendix

Notable Tuskegee Alumni, Classes of 1885 – 1919:

- Cornelia Bowen, (1885): Attended Teachers College, Columbia University and became principal of the Mount Meigs Institute in Waugh, Al. and president of the State Federation of Women’s Club.


- David Lee Johnston (1889), Meharry Medical College; pharmacist.

- Thomas Nathaniel Harris (1889), Meharry Medical College, medicine and dentistry (1897), dentist and physician.

- Alonzo H. Kenniebrew, (1891); Meharry Medical College, Harvard Medical School, physician.

- Clarence Vincent Smith (1891) Meharry Medical College, physician.

- Robert Craig Williams (1891), Meharry Medical College, pharmacy (1893); medicine (1898), physician.

- Atwell Theodore Braxton (1892), Meharry Medical College, physician.

- John Rice Wood (1894) pharmacist, Montgomery, Ala.

- Jesse Lewis Adams (1895), Meharry Medical College, student, dentistry

- Gilchrist Stewart, (1895), lawyer and activist.

- Thomas Walker Wallace (1895), clergyman, editor, Took summer courses in chemistry and physics at Columbia University.

- Thomas McCants Stewart, Jr., (1896); law certificate from New York University, and first African American to receive the LL.M from the University of Minnesota Law School. Filed successful civil rights lawsuits in Minneapolis and co-founder of the Portland Advocate, the city’s second black newspaper.

- Jay Moses Griffin, (1896); University of Minnesota Law School, editor and proprietor, Twin-City American, Minneapolis.

- William Clarence Matthews, (1897); Phillips Andover Academy, Harvard University; L.L.D., Boston University; special assistant to the U.S. District Attorney, Boston. Also legal counsel, Marcus Garvey.
• Alexander Lewis White (1897), Meharry Medical College student. (Graduation not confirmed),

• Elijah Langston Faulkner (1897), Meharry Medical College student (Graduation not known).

• William Augustus Holston (1897), Meharry Medical College student (Graduation not known).

• William Sidney Pittman, (1897); Drexel University’s Institute of Art, Science and Industry. One of the era’s most successful architects and first African American to win a federal commission.

• George Williamson Crawford, (1900), LL.B., Yale University; special U.S. attorney in Massachusetts; director of the NAACP, trustee of Talladega College.

• Warren Wesley Jefferson (1899); Howard University Dental School.

• Maggie Estelle Howard (1900), Meharry Medical College, (1905), pharmacist.

• Portia Washington (1900), Wellesley College student.

• Francis Henry Cardoza (1901); Cornell University, horticulture, and instructor, Tuskegee.

• William Arthur MacIntyre (1902-03); LLB, Howard University, lawyer in Chicago.

• Vertner W. Tandy, (1904 – 1905), transferred to Cornell University. First licensed African American architect in New York. One of the founders of Alpha Pi Alpha, the first African American Greek letter fraternity, and the first African American commissioned officer in the New York State National Guard.

• Claude McKay (1912), Harlem Renaissance writer.

• Angel Whatts Echavarria, architect

• Jose Zarzuela Falu, architect in Puerto Rico

• Albert Baumann, Flint Medical College; pharmacist.

• Joseph Jacob Simmons, (1919), international oilman and first African American appointed to National Petroleum Council.
Alumni who became educators of note (partial list)

- Sharach R. Marshall, (1888), principal, Columbus, Ohio public schools where a junior high school is named for him.
- Rev. Berwell T. Harvey (1885), principal, Tuskegee Institute Training School
- Sidney Mitchell Murphy (1887), principal, Eufaula, Alabama public school, and trustee, Wilberforce University.
- Sarah Hunt (1888), instructor, Tuskegee Institute, Academic Department
- Ida Abercrombie (1889) instructor, Tuskegee Institute and Mobile, Alabama public school.
- Lottie V. Young, (1889), instructor, Tuskegee Institute
- Norma E. Walker (1889), instructor, Tuskegee Institute
- Abner Beecher Jackson, (1890), principal, Jackson Enterprise School, Newville, Ala.
- Robert Wesley Taylor (1890), principal, Pensacola Public Schools, mathematics instructor, Tuskegee Institute
- Benjamin Harrison Barnes (1891), principal, Jasper, Ala. Public Schools
- Katherine Juanita Baskin (1891), teacher, Tuskegee Institute
- Wesley Hoffman (1891), principal, Appalachicola Public Schools, Florida
- James Henry Calloway (1892), superintendent of industries, Snow Hill Institute
- Ida Thompson (1892) instructor, Tuskegee Institute
- W.J. Edwards, (1893), founder of Snow Hill Normal and Industrial Institute and the Snow Hill Negro Conference.
- Ophelia Elizabeth Clopton (1893), principal, Mt. Meigs Institute, Waugh, Ala.
- John Wesley Oveltra (1893), principal, Harriman Industrial Institute,
- William Harrison Goode (1894), principal, Troy Industrial Academy, Troy, Ala.
• Lizzie Evelyne Wright (1894), principal, Denmark Industrial Institute, Denmark, S.C.
• Laura Belle Bennette (1894), lady principal, Snow Hill Industrial Institute, Snow Hill, Ala.
• Lavinia DeVaughn (1895), student, Pratt Institute, and director of dressmaking, Tuskegee Institute
• Mary Ella Patterson (1895), lady principal, Snow Hill Industrial Institute
• Minnie Sarah Washington (1895), principal, public school, Mound Bayou, Miss.
• John Smith Hopson (1896), instructor, Tuskegee Institute
• Edward Dudley Whitehead (1896), principal, Camden, Ala. public schools.
• Mary Etta Thomas (1897); took course in School of Education at University of Chicago; teacher Tuskegee, Snow Hill Institute and rural schools in Alabama.
• William Henry Holtzelaw, (1898), founder of Utica Normal and Industrial Institute, now Utica Junior College.
• Walter Solomon Buchanan, (1899), attended Harvard’s Bussey Institution and appointed president of the State Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, Normal, Ala.
• Thornton Mervyn Jones (1900), instructor, Tuskegee Institute

*All of these students were admitted and attended Tuskegee during Washington’s tenure.
Chapter 1 Endnotes

1 Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute and Tuskegee Institute, founded in 1868 and 1881, respectively, were the foremost black schools devoted to industrial education following the Civil War.

2 See George W. Stocking, Jr., Race, Culture and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

3 Lewis Henry Morgan’s seminal work Ancient Society, published in 1877, mapped human progress and race along an evolutionary scale with Africans at the bottom.

4 U.S. Census figures for 1910 show that of the nation’s 9.8 million African Americans, 71 percent lived in rural areas, and more than 90 percent in the South.


6 Ibid.

7 Ibid, p. 23.


12 Ibid. Here it should also be noted that both Du Bois and Woodson benefitted from the strategies to educate blacks condemned in this report. Both men attended schools in New England. Du Bois was the first and Woodson the second African American to receive a Ph.D. from Harvard University.
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