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PREFACE

My thesis started by chance by leafing through the book *Women Designers in the USA, 1900-2000: Diversity and Difference* while at a silver symposium at the Winterthur in the fall of 2008. In the chapter titled “‘Three Strikes Against Me’: African American Women Designers,” I was stunned by the quote: “The history of black women’s responses to Arts and Crafts ideals and activities, as amateurs and professionals, has yet to be written.”¹ I had studied the Arts and Crafts movement and there was never any mention of the participation of black people, male or female. Although the focus of my thesis is different, that quote was its genesis. I would like to thank the scholars, Pat Kirkham and Shauna Stallworth for sowing the seed that became my thesis.

There are strong connections in the shared ideals of “the dignity of labor” and social reform between African-American industrial education and Arts and Crafts Movement leaders and participants. Arts and Crafts luminaries that include Gustav Stickley and Elbert Hubbard expressed great interest in African-American industrial education at Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes, but these institutions did not appear to have the same interest in the Arts and Crafts Movement. So, I still have a nagging question: how to define participation in the Arts and Crafts movement? Therefore, in spite of definite connections, I have stopped short of declaring that African Americans were part of the Arts and Crafts movement. I do hope future research and scholarship will shed more light on African Americans and their relationships to the Arts and Crafts movement.
INTRODUCTION

Although virtually no history of African-American involvement in the Arts and Crafts movement has been documented, there is a significant connection between African Americans and the movement through industrial education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This thesis will help document this rarely acknowledged aspect of the Arts and Crafts movement in America.

In Gustav Stickley’s magazine, The Craftsman, the most prominent publication of the American Arts and Crafts movement, there are several references to Booker T. Washington and his model of industrial education for recently emancipated African Americans. The magazine cited Tuskegee Institute, established by Washington, and Hampton Institute, his alma mater, as exemplary models of industrial education. The magazine also positively anticipated Washington’s sequel to his popular autobiography, Up from Slavery, titled Working with the Hands, which recorded his experiences establishing Tuskegee Institute, its curriculum, and the institution’s positive impact. The title of the first chapter in Working with the Hands is “Moral Values of Handwork.” The Craftsman also examined the “negro problem” and the “negro question.”

The “negro problem” gained attention in the years following the end of the Civil War, a period of unprecedented change—social, economic, political, and technological—encompassing Reconstruction and Jim Crow, the Gilded Age and the Progressive Era. Robber barons and the proliferation of “big business” or industrial corporations, vast economic and social inequality, immigration, migration, and urbanization were hallmarks of the period. In the United States, for the first time, a system of public education was
being called for at the national level, but as the Constitution does not provide for national education, its provision was left to individual states with varying results. Newly freed African Americans were eager to obtain an education, the overwhelming majority having been denied even basic literacy during slavery. While the immediate economic concerns outweighed educational goals, these issues were intertwined. It would be even more difficult to achieve economic progress without an education. Also many of the skills African Americans used in servitude would not enable them to prosper in a world in the throes of modernization and industrialization.

Beginning almost a century before, the Industrial Revolution was changing the social and cultural fabric of Great Britain. Technological advances such as water and steam power led to the mechanization of many industries, first among them the textile industry, leading to the gradual deskilling of the work force. The need for a powerful source of water led to the concentration of industries near rivers and bodies of water. Opportunities for steady employment caused a shift in population from rural areas to burgeoning cities. Advances in transportation, namely the railroad, provided manufacturers with access to markets beyond their localities. Increased capital and investment also led to rapid industrialization, and wealth was no longer concentrated solely among land owners as in the feudal system. All these changes contributed to the rise of the factory system, leading to other issues, one of which was tensions between capital and labor, or owners and investors and workers and employees. While the effects of industrialization were not all bad—rising steady wages, surpluses of food and products, a wider variety of goods at cheaper prices—others were not. Industry was largely unregulated and resulted in the exploitation of workers, many of them women and
children, long working hours, environmental pollution and deforestation, and many
dangerous working condition often causing serious injury and sometimes death.
Conspicuous consumption, which drove the demand for new and novel products for
people from all walks of life, not just the well-to-do, also an effect of industrialization,
was a new development. Social ills also increased—prostitution, alcoholism, slums,
disease.

Another major change caused by industrialization was the division of labor. There
is much writing in the period about the dehumanizing effects of industrialization, the
transformation of skilled workers into “‘mere feeders of machines.’” There was much
debate about the merit and effects, even the “morality,” of goods being produced from
these machines. In this environment the Arts and Crafts movement arose in Great Britain.
A reaction to the effects of industrialization, the Arts and Crafts Movement was first and
foremost a reform movement. While aesthetics were important, labor, social, and
educational reforms were also top priorities.

In the United States, prior to the Civil War, industrialization was concentrated in
the North. Industrialization on a national scale occurred after the Civil War, which, in the
words of Frederick Douglass, enabled “‘Northern industry, Northern capital, and Northern
civilization to flow into the South. . .’” The South would again cultivate cotton and
tobacco, and in addition iron, steel, and coal industries developed, but these industries
were now controlled by Northern and foreign capitalists. But the economic devastation
and societal upheaval in the South in the aftermath of the Civil War and Emancipation
combined to produce a precarious situation, especially for the newly-freed African
Americans who now needed to support themselves financially and compete with white
labor. With the vast majority of African Americans in the South having been denied even an elementary education, the building of schools also became a priority. Economic necessity and educational aspirations were intertwined for African Americans. African American industrial education programs were created to meet these needs.

**The Rise of the Arts and Crafts Movement**

A reaction to the rapid industrialization and modernization of Great Britain, the Arts and Crafts movement looked to the past to reform what was wrong in the present. Reform of all kinds was the zeitgeist of the period. Social reform, labor reform, and design reform, which had its roots in the national embarrassment that England experienced during the Great Exhibition in London’s Crystal Palace in 1851. Despite Great Britain’s status as an imperial power, many of its products displayed at the exposition paled in comparison to those produced in countries considered “primitive” by western standards. The movement’s seminal leaders included John Ruskin and William Morris who looked back to medieval times for what they believed had been lost in the modern, industrialized world: craftsmanship, art, beauty, truth, morality, honest toil, and pride in work and the fruits of one’s labor. Their influential writings included classic texts, such as Ruskin’s *The Stones of Venice* (1851), that inspired and served as the philosophical foundation of the Arts and Crafts movement.

The movement spread to the United States where it lost much of its potency as a reform movement. A significant exception was the settlement house movement, in which social reform continued as the foundation. Toynbee Hall, the first university settlement house, founded in 1884 in London, was the model on which many settlements in the
United States were based. A direct descendent of Toynbee Hall, Hull House in Chicago, founded in 1889, sought to preserve immigrant craft traditions as well as teach them practical skills to make a living. Settlement houses also sought to help immigrants assimilate into American culture, while at the same time preserving an ethnic identity through native crafts.\(^5\)

A generation earlier, four million enslaved African Americans gained their freedom. Their future and fate was a major concern in many sectors of society. Work, education, and socialization were the primary focus in this new era of freedom. There was much debate about how these goals could or even should be accomplished. Because the majority of the African-American population remained in the South after Emancipation and the end of the Civil War, many of the educational institutions were located in this region. The first post-secondary school in the South for African-Americans was the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, still in existence as Hampton University, founded in 1868 by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong (1839-1893) with the support of the American Missionary Association.

While much of Armstrong’s philosophy of education for blacks was based upon what he deemed their deficiencies, his “system” would be embraced and perpetuated by African-American leader Booker T. Washington (1856-1915) and many others as the vehicle by which African Americans could reach their fullest potential and achieve economic power, to be followed by political power, through the fruits of their own labor denied them in slavery.

This study is organized as follows: Chapter 1, “The Dignity of Labor,” examines this important ideal in which African-American industrial education and the Arts and
Crafts movement intersect. Chapter 2, “Training Head, Hand, and Heart,” will examine African-American industrial education programs and curricula and their proponents and detractors. Chapter 3, “African-American Industrial Education Beyond School Grounds,” will explore African-American industrial education outside the campus, through the participation of these institutions in international exhibitions in the early twentieth century in the United States and abroad, including the 1900 *Exposition Universelle* in Paris and the 1901 Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York, in which both Gustav Stickley and Charles Rohlfs exhibited. This chapter will also discuss the impact of Tuskegee Institute founder, Booker T. Washington’s international travels in promoting industrial education. Chapter 4, “Working with the Hands,” will examine objects and the built environment at the historical Tuskegee Institute.

This thesis will demonstrate that African American industrial education and the Arts and Crafts movement shared a foundation of social reform based on a common objective of the elevation of labor. For African Americans, industrial education sought to redeem labor from the degradation associated with slavery. The Arts and Crafts movement sought to reclaim and restore respect for labor in the face of industrialization and capitalism, which diminished and dehumanized the worker. Both sought respect, dignity, and a better life for those who labored. In African-American industrial education, labor reform and educational reform, and Arts and Crafts and African Americans, converge and the ideals and ideology of dignity of labor were put into practice.

Very little scholarship has examined African Americans and the Arts and Crafts movement. In 2000, Pat Kirkham and Shauna Stallworth noted the lack of scholarship African American women and Arts and Crafts. There is scant of scholarship on African
Americans in general, male or female, and the Arts and Crafts movement. To date, art historian Michael Bieze’s 2005 essay, “Ruskin in the Black Belt: Booker T. Washington, Arts and Crafts, and the New Negro” establishes the most direct connection between African Americans and Arts and Crafts ideals. The goal of this thesis is to contribute scholarship to the largely unacknowledged and unexplored connections of African Americans to the Arts and Crafts movement.
CHAPTER 1: ‘The Dignity of Labor’: Work and Social Reform

Slaves worked. . . . So central was labor in the slaves’ experience that it has often been taken for granted.

--Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan, *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas*

In his classic autobiography, *Up from Slavery*, Booker T. Washington (1856-1915), the influential and controversial African-American educator (fig. 1), wrote: “From the time I can remember anything, almost every day of my life has been occupied in some kind of labor.”8 Labor is inseparable from the history of African Americans. Labor is also inseparable from the history of the Arts and Crafts movement, but the focus on the connoisseurship of the objects produced by the movement’s participants often obscures this fact. This is not a recent development. In the March 1902 issue of *The Craftsman*, writer and socialist A.M. Simons stated:

. . . William Morris is known fully as well for his activity in the political socialist movement, as for his efforts in the revival of artistic work. But his followers today have very generally forgotten the most essential portion of his teachings, and know absolutely nothing of the actual laborers and the labor movement. It would be an easy but ungracious task to point out specific instances of the degradation of the movement brought about by this isolation from what should be its foundation. . . . it has lapsed into vagaries, and has often strayed so far from its original paths as to be well-nigh lost in dilettantism and eccentricity.9

For Arts and Crafts luminary William Morris (1834-1896), art was inextricably intertwined with labor (fig. 2): “The first step,” he declared, “towards the new birth of art must be a definitive rise in the condition of the workers.”10

In more recent scholarship, independent scholar Michael L. James, in his essay, “Charles Rohlf’s and ‘The Dignity of Labor,’” attributes the focus on the objects of the Arts and Crafts movement at the expense of its ideological roots to the 1972 exhibition at the Princeton University Art Museum, which started “this preoccupation with objects
[that] has relegated the movement's philosophical tenets . . . to a position of secondary interest and importance.”¹¹ James explores Rohlfs’s view on the dignity of labor and states that “[t]he principles that guided his work are fully aligned with the movement’s mainstream ideals.” Although Charles Rohlfs (1853-1936) did not have a national following (fig. 3), he was well known in the Buffalo, New York, region where he, as well as Arts and Crafts leader Gustav Stickley (1858-1942) (fig. 4), lived and worked. James declares that Rohlfs “deserves the position of respected spokesman of the arts and crafts movement that was accorded to him during his lifetime.”¹² Although Rohlfs did not coin the phrase “dignity of labor” as James implies in his essay (there is mention of John Ruskin’s use of this terminology in the mid-1870s), Rohlfs’s philosophy reflects the influence of Ruskin and Morris. Of Rohlfs’s interpretation of the “dignity of labor,” James writes:

Briefly stated, the foundation of Rohlfs’s life and work was his strong belief in what he termed ‘the dignity of labor.’ This concept he delineated in several prepared talks, has two aspects. First, he viewed labor itself as having great inherent value and satisfaction, more as a process than simply as a means to an end. This held true for all types of labor, from industrial to artistic. ‘Work is the great thing,’ he maintained, and he took pride in the fact that he worked in his shop more than ten hours a day until he was well into his seventies. More important is the aspect of work that gives dignity to the labor performed. According to Rohlfs, there is always one thing that an individual can do better than anything else. . . . Only then could an individual realize the dignity, as well as the joy, of labor.”¹³

In a 1909 article in the Buffalo Times, Rohlfs comments on his “determination to succeed in every smallest thing undertaken,” and what James describes as Rohlfs’s “belief in total commitment to work,” inspired by Rohlfs’s education at Cooper Union.

Rohlfs’s views and experiences parallel the importance of education and its role in shaping Booker T. Washington’s view of success. Washington had faith “that any man,
regardless of color, will be recognized and rewarded just in proportion as he learns to do something well—learns to do it better than someone else—however humble that thing may be. . . . I believe that my race will succeed in proportion as it learns to do a common thing in an uncommon manner; . . .”

James asks and answers important and relevant questions regarding Rohlf's, “the dignity of labor,” and the Arts and Crafts movement: “Did Rohlf's accurately perceive the role and intent of the arts and crafts movement? Are his views in alignment with the philosophy of the mainstream?” James believes so and compares Rohlf's views to those of John Ruskin (1819-1900), the prolific author, philosopher, poet, artist and critic (fig. 5), in whom “the modern arts and crafts movement had its original source.” Ruskin advocated: “Let manual skill be cultivated, let the dignity of labor be once again appreciated, let the hard day of toil be lightened by some hope or pastime, and a new economic career will be prepared for our country, untroubled by strikes, and worthy to serve as a new historic precedent.”

Oscar Lovell Triggs (1865-1930), co-founder of the Morris Society in Chicago, described Ruskin’s dedication to manual labor: “He was not above street-cleaning or road-making, as was shown by his forming a company to keep a certain length of London street ‘clean as the deck of a ship’ for a given season, and by his joining in with Oxford undergraduates in mending the Hinksey Road.”

Ruskin’s seriousness about the importance of labor and possessing a practical skill verged on obsession. He declared that those who would not work should not eat:

So what can you do that’s useful? Not to ask too much at first; and, since we are now coming to particulars, addressing myself first to gentlemen,—Do you think you can make a brick, or a tile?

You rather think not? Well, if you are healthy, and fit for work, and can do nothing better, --go and learn.
You would rather not? Very possibly: but you can’t have your dinner unless you do. And why would you so much rather not?

“So ungentlemanly!”
No; to beg your dinner, or to steal it, is ungentlemanly. But there is nothing ungentlemanly, that I know of, in beating clay, and putting it in a mould.\textsuperscript{18}

Triggs stated that it was Ruskin’s embrace of a spiritual “element, the moral, that differentiated Ruskin from other art teachers and marked him thus early for the mission of social reform.”\textsuperscript{19} While art was central to Ruskin, it was a means to a greater end, a way to improve and transform society. Ruskin told his students “that the main business of art was its service in the actual uses of daily life, and that the beginning of art was in getting the country clean and the people beautiful.”\textsuperscript{20} The “gospel of the toothbrush,” an essential element of instruction used by Booker T. Washington and his mentor, General Samuel Chapman Armstrong (1839-1893) (\textbf{fig. 6}), parallels Ruskin’s statement. This “gospel” emphasized personal hygiene and appearance.\textsuperscript{21} Washington related: “In addition to the usual routine of teaching, I taught pupils to comb their hair, and to keep their hands and faces clean, as well as their clothing. I gave special attention to teaching them the proper use of the toothbrush and the bath. In all my teaching I have watched carefully the influence of the toothbrush, and I am convinced that there are few single agencies of civilization that are more far-reaching.”\textsuperscript{22} Washington’s rationale was “that people would excuse us for our poverty, for our lack of comforts and conveniences, but that they would not excuse us for our dirt.”\textsuperscript{23}

Wholesale reform, aesthetic, as well as social and educational, was the aim of the Arts and Crafts movement. The goal of design reform was to uplift society, not just to produce more attractive things. In \textit{The Art that is Life}, Wendy Kaplan stated:
William Price’s phrase ‘the art that is life,’ used as the subtitle of his periodical *The Artsman,* was a succinct expression of the ideal underlying the Arts and Crafts movement. Convinced that industrialization had caused the degradation of work and the destruction of the environment, Arts and Crafts reformers created works with deliberate social messages. Their designs conveyed strong convictions about what was wrong with society and reflected prescriptions for living. Passionately committed to solving social ills, groups of English and American reformers chose art as their medium.  

Yes, art was their medium, but not their entire message. Also in *The Art that is Life,* writer and curator Robert Edwards stated: “At the core of Arts and Crafts philosophy lay the concept that work should be the creative and joyful essence of life rather than a mere act of sustenance.” Much of what was written by Arts and Crafts practitioners were social critiques regarding the effects of industrialization and capitalism.

For Washington and his mentor, General Armstrong, their “medium” for achieving social change for African Americans was work. In his autobiographies, *Up From Slavery* and *Working with the Hands,* Booker T. Washington speaks passionately, eloquently, and often, of the “dignity of labor,” the same terminology used by high-profile members of the Arts and Crafts movement.

Labor was the door to opportunity for Washington, who believed that labor would play the same role for African Americans in freedom. In an often told story, Washington recounted that his “entrance examination” to Hampton Institute was the cleaning of a room. Despite being too poor to pay for his education at Hampton, Washington journeyed there in 1872 and was committed to doing anything to enroll. Washington worked as a janitor at Hampton to pay for his board. He attributes passing this “examination” to his experience of working for Mrs. Viola Ruffner, a wealthy white woman in his hometown of Malden, West Virginia, who became his friend and patron. Washington described her
as “a woman of wealth, who lived many years in the South, although she had been born and educated in Vermont. She had a high respect for manual labor, showing actively her appreciation for the dignity of honest work well done, and, not withstanding her own position and culture, she was not afraid to use her hands.”\(^\text{27}\) In Working with the Hands, Washington recalled an early experience with Mrs. Ruffner that helped shape his attitude toward labor:

When I saw and realised that all this was a creation of my own hands, my whole nature began to change. I felt a self-respect, an encouragement, and a satisfaction that I had never before enjoyed or thought possible. Above all else, I had acquired a new confidence in my ability actually to do things and to do them well. And more than this, I found myself, through this experience, getting rid of the idea that had gradually become a part of me, that the head meant everything and the hands little in working endeavour, and that only to labor with the mind was honourable while to toil with the hands was unworthy and even disgraceful.\(^\text{28}\)

Washington also explained how he “learned to love labor” while studying at Hampton Institute under General Armstrong, which shaped his educational and personal philosophy. He also spoke his belief in the essential role of work—manual labor—in concert with education, in the progress of African Americans after Emancipation:

[A]t Hampton, for the first time, I learned what education was expected to do for an individual. Before going there I had a good deal of the then rather prevalent idea among our people that to secure an education meant to have a good, easy time, free from all necessity for manual labor. At Hampton I not only learned that it was not a disgrace to labor, but learned to love labor, not alone for its financial value, but for labor’s own sake and for the independence and self-reliance which the ability to do something which the world wants done brings.\(^\text{29}\)

Washington respected and was influenced by the members of the all-white teaching staff at Hampton Institute for their adherence to the principal of the dignity of labor. Hampton’s early teaching and administrative staff was composed primarily of recruits from the American Missionary Association and well-to-do Northerners. Many
teachers and workers who went south to Hampton stayed for a few years, but there were several that remained for decades. Helen Wilhelmina Ludlow, “daughter of a New England Presbyterian clergyman,” worked at Hampton for thirty-eight years. In addition to teaching English, Helen Ludlow “edited the Southern Workman, aided in fundraising activities, and accompanied the Hampton Student Singers on their numerous tours as special tutor.” Ludlow also wrote several books and articles about Hampton, including \textit{Hampton and Its Students} (1874), co-written with Mary Frances Armstrong, General Armstrong’s sister-in-law. Ludlow remained at Hampton until her death in 1924 at eighty-four years old.\textsuperscript{30} Two other long-time employees, Mary Fletcher Mackie (fig. 7) and her sister Charlotte Mackie of Newburgh, New York, both worked at Hampton for almost two decades. Charlotte “worked for Hampton Institute from 1870 to 1887 as steward, matron, and housekeeper of the Teachers Home.”\textsuperscript{31} Prior to coming to Hampton in 1871, Mary Mackie had been a mathematics professor at Vassar College for two years. Mary Mackie taught mathematics and also served as assistant principal for almost two decades.\textsuperscript{32} Washington had a special regard for Mackie and her commitment to the dignity of labor. Mackie was the woman who had admitted him to Hampton and also hired him as a janitor, which helped pay for his room and board:

Miss Mackie was a member of one of the oldest and most cultured families of the North, and yet for two weeks she worked by my side cleaning windows, dusting rooms, putting beds in order, and what not. . . . [S]he took the greatest satisfaction in helping to clean them herself. . . .

It was hard for me at this time to understand how a woman of her education and social standing could take such delight in performing such service, in order to assist in the elevation of an unfortunate race. Ever since then I have had no patience with any school for my race in the South which did not teach its students the dignity of labor.\textsuperscript{33}
The dignity of labor was also a theme often explored in *The Craftsman*, the foremost Arts and Crafts periodical in the United States, published by Gustav Stickley, one of the United States most prominent proponents of the movement. In the October 1914 issue, an article described the “unusual interest to *The Craftsman* to find the following sermon on the dignity of labor, as a leading editorial in the *New York Herald* for September 6th.” The sermon was by John Haynes Holmes (1879-1964), a controversial Unitarian minister, who helped found the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples (NAACP) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The introduction to the reprinted sermon stated: “For the last thirteen years we have been preaching the importance of labor as a means of physical and spiritual development, and it is with the greatest pleasure that we see the *Herald* lining up in this movement—a movement which probably contains the very essence of democratic progress.” *The Craftsman* stated outright its continuing commitment to the ideal of the dignity of labor.

An essay in the third issue of *The Craftsman*, published December 1901, was “offered in the hope that it may awaken in those who may chance upon it, a personal desire to aid in restoring the dignity of labor and the pleasure that formerly accompanied the life of toil.” Toil obviously meant meaningful, useful work and not mindless drudgery. The theme of this issue was medieval gilds, which belonged to a time “when every craft was an art, when the hand that labored was honored equally with the hand that wrote, and when the merchant was often a diplomat—sometimes even a statesman.”

Scholar Eileen Boris’s essay in *The Art that is Life* examines the inseparability of work and art, the social and the aesthetic, in the ideological foundation of the Arts and
Crafts movement. Boris states, “Arts and Crafts reformers called for redesigning work rather than eliminating it, making work more like art. Thus Ellen Gates Starr (fig. 8), co-founder of the Hull House social settlement in Chicago, chose ‘to go out from among [the mass of men] and live a rational life, working ‘in the spirit of the future’ – that future which shall make common the privilege now exclusive of doing the work one loves to do and expressing one’s self through it, which, as Morris so often said, is art.” Boris adds that Starr “became convinced of the necessity to unite mental and manual labor in her own life.”[^38]

In the March 1902 issue of *The Craftsman*, writer A.M. Simons expressed similar views on the degradation of labor as Booker T. Washington, although Simons attributed the cause to commercialism and capitalism: “On every hand, performance of the essential labor of society is looked upon as an evil to be avoided, and few indeed who are actually concerned with it, ever think of looking there for something pleasurable, artistic, enjoyable.”[^39] In *Up from Slavery*, Washington attributed this degradation of labor, for both blacks and whites, to the economic system of slavery:

> The hurtful influences of the institution were not by any means confined to the Negro. . . . The whole machinery of slavery was so constructed as to cause labor, as a rule, to be looked upon as a badge of degradation, of inferiority. Hence labor was something that both races on the slave plantation sought to escape. The slave system on our place, in a large measure, took the spirit of self-reliance and self-help out of the white people. My old master had many boys and girls, but not one, so far as I know, ever mastered a single trade or special line of productive industry. . . . The slaves, of course, had little interest in the life of the plantation, and their ignorance prevented them from learning how to do things in the most improved and thorough manner.[^40]

Washington wrote of the difference between labor during slavery and after Emancipation. He believed that blacks needed to recognize and embrace this change in order to prosper. Their labor had the potential to be an asset rather than a burden:
The great lesson which the race needed to learn in freedom was to work. There is a vast difference between working and being worked. Being worked means degradation; working means civilization. This was the difference which our institution wished to chiefly emphasise. We argued that during the days of slavery labour was forced out of the Negro, and he had acquired, for this reason, a dislike for work. The whole machinery of slavery was not apt to beget the spirit of the love of labor.

Because these things were true we promised to try to teach our students to lift labour out of drudgery and to place it on a plane where it would become attractive, and where it would be something to be sought rather than something to be dreaded and if possible avoided.

More than this, we wanted to teach men and women to put brains into the labour of the hand, and to show that it was possible for one with the best mental training to work with the hands without feeling that he was degraded.

A comment by Oscar Lovell Triggs mirrors Washington’s statement about the difference between working and being worked. Triggs believed that “[t]he emancipation of labor is accomplished by changing the character of labor. No one desires to be free from work, but to be free and self-directed in his work.”

Triggs traced the importance of labor to Arts and Crafts ideology to the influence of Scottish author, historian, and social critic, Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) (fig. 9), who was a close friend and mentor of Ruskin. Triggs succinctly summarized Carlyle’s philosophy of labor: “Work is the first and chief duty of man.” Carlyle observed “that the new age was industrial, that the organization of labor was the universal problem of the world.” Carlyle also saw industry as a force for good, if it could be harnessed and directed positively. Carlyle paints a romantic picture of the effects, both positive and negative, of industrialization:

‘Manchester, with its cotton fuzz, its smoke and dust, its tumult and contentious squalor, is hideous to thee. I think not so: . . . Hast thou heard, with sound ears, the awakening of Manchester, on Monday morning, at half-past five by the clock; the rushing off of its thousand mills, like the boom of Atlantic tide, ten thousand spools and spindles all set humming there—it is, perhaps, if thou knew it well, sublime as a Niagra, or more so. Cotton spinning is the clothing of the naked as a
result; the triumph of man over matter in its means. Soot and despair are not the
essence of it: they are divisible from it.\textsuperscript{45}

In his introduction to \textit{The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin}, editor
George Allan Cate wrote: “Indeed, though in 1850 Ruskin was the prophet of art and
Carlyle was the prophet of morality, they were not so disparate as one would suppose, for
they were both preaching the salvation of humanity. . . .” Cate continues his comparison
of Carlyle and Ruskin: “Beneath Carlyle’s invective against society and beneath Ruskin’s
exhortations upon art lay a mutual desire to better mankind’s condition—to bring about
the spiritual and intellectual potentialities of every man, and to destroy all barriers, both
social and personal, to that development.”\textsuperscript{46} Cate goes on to describe the evolution of
Ruskin’s from aesthetic concerns to a focus on morality.

The moral aspects of the dignity of labor were a primary concern of Booker T.
Washington and General Armstrong. Armstrong was born in 1839 on the Hawaiian
island of Maui to American missionary parents. During his youth in Maui, his exposure
to the natives as well as his education there acquainted him with manual labor. After the
death of his father, Armstrong returned to the United States to attend Williams College
and subsequently voluntarily entered the Union Army during the Civil War, where he
came in contact with “contraband,” escaped slaves from the Confederacy, and
commanded black troops. After the war, Armstrong worked for the Freedmen’s Bureau,
which assisted newly-emancipated African Americans. These experiences inspired
Armstrong to address the educational needs of former slaves by founding the Hampton
Normal and Industrial Institution in Hampton, Virginia, in 1868, with the support of the
American Missionary Association. Armstrong’s familiarity with the curriculum at the
Hilo Manual Labor School in Maui, and his belief that the Native Hawaiians and African
Americans shared similar qualities convinced him that academics combined with manual labor was the correct approach for educating newly-freed blacks in the American South.\textsuperscript{47}

General Armstrong, who believed in “[I]labor as a moral force,” greatly influenced Booker T. Washington.\textsuperscript{48} Part of Armstrong’s overarching goal at Hampton was to use teachers as “builders of a better civilization.” Armstrong wrote: “These [teachers] will teach not only spelling and arithmetic, but the more important lessons of respect for labor, . . . The Negro has been taught to work, not to despise it; he has the habits of labor, but no enthusiasm for it; . . . We wish to spread the right ideas of life and labor; . . .”\textsuperscript{49} Washington’s view that slavery degraded labor for both blacks and whites aligns with Armstrong, who also believed that the abolition of slavery and the South’s loss of the Civil War were redemptive: “The war was the saving of the South. . . . The Negro and the poor white and, more than all, the old aristocrat are being saved by hard work, . . .”\textsuperscript{50}

Many Arts and Crafts proponents invoked the concept of slavery as a metaphor for the exploitation of the worker under capitalism, but Ruskin addressed (but in one of his most important works also ignored) the institution of slavery. His views were nuanced, complex, and idiosyncratic. Ruskin, an elitist, did not espouse equality: “My continual aim has been to show the eternal superiority of some men to others, sometimes even of one man to all others; and to show also the advisability of appointing such persons or person to guide, to lead, or on occasion to even compel and subdue, their inferiors according to their own better knowledge and wiser will.”\textsuperscript{51} Ruskin believed in the “impossibility of equality among men,” the result of a natural social hierarchy based on his belief in the inherent or natural intellectual capabilities of different individuals. But
he believed each person could positively contribute to society no matter his station in life, “each in his place and his work.”

Ruskin claimed “that slavery is not a political institution at all, but an inherent, natural, and eternal inheritance of a large portion of the human race,” though he did not state that this inferiority was based on race. “In common parlance, we idly confuse captivity with slavery.” Ruskin made a clear distinction between his definition of slavery, which he advocated, and trafficking in human beings, which he professed to be unequivocally against:

Parenthetically, may I ask you to observe, that though I am a fearless defender of some forms of slavery, I am no defender of the slave trade. It is by a blundering confusion of ideas between governing men, and trading in men, and by consequent interference with the restraint, instead of only with the sale, that most of the great errors in action have been caused among the emancipated men. I am prepared, if the need be clear to my own mind, and if the power is in my hands, to throw men into prison, or any other captivity—to bind them or beat them—and force them for such periods as I may judge necessary, to any kind of irksome labor: and on occasion of desperate resistance, to hang or shoot them. But I will not sell them.

As an art critic, Ruskin was curiously silent on the content of one of his prized paintings by one of his favorite artists, J.M.W. Turner’s The Slave Ship (Throwing Overboard the Dead and Dying, Typhoon Coming On) (1840) (fig. 10), now in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. In his important work, Modern Painters, Ruskin praised Turner’s talent and technique in The Slave Ship, but ignored the subject of slavery altogether.

Interestingly, William Edward Burghart (W.E.B.) Du Bois (1868-1963) (fig. 11) possessed a hierarchical view similar to Ruskin, and referenced Social Darwinism in his influential essay “The Talented Tenth.” Du Bois, a rival of Booker T. Washington, was
an influential and controversial intellectual, educator, and black leader whose many
distinctions and accomplishments included being the first African American to receive a
Ph.D. from Harvard University. In the “The Talented Tenth,” published in 1903 in The
Negro Problem, which also features an essay by Washington, Du Bois asked:

Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised
than by the effort of and example of this aristocracy of talent and character? Was
there ever a nation on God’s fair earth civilized from the bottom upward? Never;
it is, ever was and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The
Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth saving up to their vantage
ground. This is the history of human progress, . . .56

Du Bois described an elite class of educated African Americans that were to “have lead
and elevated the mass” of poor and lower-class blacks through “natural selection and the
survival of the fittest,” a process that Du Bois believed was undermined for Blacks by
chattel slavery.57

In a critique of capitalism, Morris could have been describing the institution of
slavery:

The workers, therefore, we repeat are not a part of capitalist society, since they do
not share in the wealth produced for it; they are but its machinery, and are not
protected or sustained by it; for them it has ceased to be a society, and has become
a tyranny; and it is a tyranny whose subjects are not an inferior race of feeble and
incapable persons, but the useful part of the population.

Such a society (so called) dominating populations, the useful part of which
is outlawed, cannot be stable; it holds within itself the elements of its own
dissolution; it can only go on existing by the repression by force and fraud of all
serious and truthful thought and all aspirations for betterment.58

Under capitalism, Morris believed that “workers are the wage slaves of the
employers.”59 Morris even addressed how victimized peoples could fight back without
violence, in strikingly prescient terms: “At the same time, we know that it may be
necessary to incur the penalties attaching to passive resistance, which is the true weapon
of the weak and unarmed, and which embarrasses a tyranny far more than acts of
hopeless violence can do, turning the apparent victories of the strong and unjust into real defeats for them.” A strong social consciousness and concern for labor permeated the rhetoric and writings of Arts and Crafts leaders in England.

In the United States, Irene Sargent (1852-1932), a writer and editor of *The Craftsman*, wrote about the denigration of labor and how Ruskin’s and Morris’s messages were relevant for Americans at the turn of the twentieth century. Manual labor as well as small-scale commerce was devalued. She stated that “the crafts are largely dishonored among us, and the mercantile man, if his name be not written over a great department store, is ignored. And these facts do but prove that false ideas prevail. For the past is ever an earnest of the future, and economic truths are as stable as the world itself.”

She continues to describe the foundation of the economic stability and growth of Medieval Florence as being the merchant classes, whom she claims “nameless though they are to-day, accomplished more for progress and civilization than the most famous popes and emperors of the same period, . . . A little people of merchants and craftsmen ruled the peninsula and inspired the respect of the greater European sovereigns.” Sargent believed that this productive class should be a model for her century. She also cites Ruskin’s “dignity of labor” rhetoric. Her analysis was that commerce in addition to manual labor had been degraded. This denigration of the small business owner, was brought about, in Sargent’s words, by the “ignorant misjudging [of] the acumen, forethought and patience required, in these days of fierce competitive strife, to gain even a modest place in the commercial or industrial world.”

Even in their strong belief in the dignity of labor and working with one’s hands, Arts and Crafts leaders and proponents of this philosophy recognized the difficulty in the
realization of this goal. A challenge to dignity and joy in labor was (and continues to be) the question of whether all labor could truly be satisfying. Ruskin addressed the difficulty of living up to this ideal:

> We cannot, at present, all obey this great law concerning labour, however willing we may be; for we may not, in the condition of life in which we have been brought up, have been taught any manual labor by which we now could make a living. I myself, the present Master of the Society, cannot obey this, its second main law; but then I am only a makeshift Master, taking the place till somebody more fit can be found. Sir Walter Scott’s life, . . . with his literary work done by ten, or at the latest twelve in the morning; and the rest of the day spent in useful work with Tom Purdie in his woods, is a model of wise moral management of mind and body, for men of true literary power; . . .

In a 1904 essay in *The Craftsman* titled “The Indian Woman as Craftsman,” writer Constance Goddard Du Bois (no relation to W.E.B. Du Bois) blamed an industrialized economy for the disappearance and difficulty of individuals finding joy in their work:

> In vain do our educators anticipate, as a result of the socialistic uplifting of labor, the modern workman’s conscious joy in the digging of a ditch. A man can take only so much satisfaction in his labor as shall correspond to the personal intention which it expresses.

> The Pima Indian knew that joy, when years before the coming of the white man, he dug his irrigating ditch, and watched the life-giving water flow from level to level as his inventive skill had decreed.

> To stand shoulder to shoulder with other hired laborers digging a trench under the direction of a ‘boss’ can give a man no possible cause for satisfaction. This condition is a mental result and cannot be induced from without.

Ms. Du Bois also discussed the impact of white civilization and “the introduction of the white man’s industrial arts” on the California Mission Indians’ craft traditions and economy. She acknowledged the double-edged sword of “progress” that came with industrialization, from a woman’s point of view. There is some nostalgia in DuBois’s assessment and the extinction of American Indian crafts, but she sympathized with the
Indian women, truly appreciated their skills, and found the “civilized,” but unskilled, elite women wanting in comparison:

It need surprise no one who realizes that civilization is not an uninterrupted advance upward; but that, on the contrary, we lose much in order to gain more. The race gains at the expense, to a certain extent, of the individual. Degeneracy, insanity, and crime increase on one hand; the individual qualities of courage, self-expression, original invention, insight into the workings of nature, sincerity and fidelity to an idea are lost or diminished: all these qualities being found, perhaps, in an ignorant old Indian basket-maker; while the average society woman many possess not one of them.

Thus, it is easier for the hand trained for generations to acts of individual expression to acquire new arts than for the idle fingers of the rich to excel as quickly in similar occupations.66

It is interesting that a short excerpt from Booker T. Washington’s Working with the Hands followed Ms. Du Bois’s article in The Craftsman. The juxtaposition of an essay about American Indians and Washington’s excerpt reminds one that finding joy and dignity in labor would be much harder for ethnic groups and minorities. And how were they to find this dignity? For Washington and his followers, industrial education was the solution. Washington wrote of “the work of training the head, the heart and the hands” and the “education of head and hands together” in Working with the Hands.67

African American industrial education and the Arts and Crafts movement shared the common objective of elevating labor. For African Americans, industrial education sought to free labor from its associations with slavery. The Arts and Crafts movement sought to restore respect for labor in the face of the dehumanizing effects of industrialization and capitalism. Both sought respect, dignity, and a better life for workers. Chapter 2, “Training the Head, Hand, and Heart,” explores the specifics of industrial education, where labor reform and educational reform, and Arts and Crafts and
African Americans, converge and where the ideals and ideology of dignity of labor were put into practice.
CHAPTER 2: ‘Training Head, Hand, and Heart’: African-American Industrial Education

African Americans and Arts and Crafts ideals intersected in industrial education and labor reform. These issues connected with race and the “negro problem” at African-American industrial educational institutions, of which Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes, the oldest in the South, were the most influential.

What is Industrial Education?

Industrial education is a broad term encompassing related philosophies and approaches to what is now called vocational education. Manual training and industrial arts fall under this umbrella. Different terms have been used interchangeably further blurring the boundaries. In A Survey of the Movements Culminating in Industrial Arts Education in Secondary Schools, author Ray Stombaugh cites an example from a 1916 bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Education: “‘Among the forms of so-called practical training to which the term ‘Industrial Education’ is sometimes applied are manual training, sloyd, mechanical drawing, mechanic arts training, printing, book binding, metal work, etc.’”68

In History of Industrial Education in the United States, author Melvin L. Barlow also discusses the use of terminology of varied terminology as well as “the duality of industrial education,” which make it difficult to define:

[T]he generic term ‘industrial education’ has been thought of as having two parts. Part one consists of Manual Training, Manual Arts, and Industrial Arts. Part two consists of Trade and Industrial Education, and Technical Education. In effect the two parts became a continuum providing industrial education experiences from the elementary school through two years of post-high school educational experience. . . . But the historical record has a habit of clouding the issue at times,
making clear cut delineations of the two parts impossible. To make the situation even more difficult both parts were derived from the same roots; at certain historical periods we are concerned with identical twins and at others with members of the same family group.”

Barlow asked the following questions: “What was industrial education like around the turn of the [twentieth] century? Was it educational? Intellectual? Vocational? Apparently it was all these and more. The writers of the period didn’t always take the trouble to explain, but then, such was the nature of the industrial education movement.”

Barlow categorized Hampton Institute, whose formal name was the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, as “[o]ne of the first private trade schools” where “trade training was combined with the elements of a liberal education in order that the Negro might improve his character and status.”

Sloyd, a progressive educational system, fell under the industrial education umbrella. Sloyd, whose origins were in Sweden, was a teaching method founded in the 1870s, developed to teach eight- to fifteen-year-old children. It was later adapted for use in the United States. Its unique curriculum consisted of making a series of wooden models. Despite its specialized approach, it shared a common objective: “To instill a taste for, and love of labour in general,” “to develop independence and self-reliance,” and “to train habits of order, exactness, cleanliness, and neatness;” and “to accustom to attention, industry, perseverance, and patience.” Sloyd was based in woodworking. J. Liberty Tadd (1854-1917) (fig. 12), a principal of the Philadelphia Industrial Art School, who found some fault with sloyd’s lack of drawing instruction and its rigid format, adapted the system to include drawing. Tadd’s school provided a “system of manual and industrial training” used in England and influenced by William Morris, whom the founder of the school, Charles Leland (1824-1903) (fig. 13), had been acquainted with in
England. Tadd would later pioneer a method of teaching ambidextrous drawing. While this method focused mainly on aesthetics combined with drawing, a common theme it shared with industrial education was both Leland’s and Tadd’s concern with the vocational and practical applications of their instruction.

Influential educator and social reformer John Dewey (1859-1955) (fig. 14) also stressed the practical elements of education. Dewey, a philosopher, sought to unite the intellectual and moral development with practical instruction and experiential learning. Dewey, like Booker T. Washington, was against the acquisition of knowledge divorced from life experience. But Dewey warned against a vocational education that would, in his words, “would become an instrument in the feudal dogma of social predestination.” This was also a concern of the opponents of industrial education who believed that learning a trade and performing manual labor would relegate blacks to continued second-class citizenship.

In his influential book, Democracy and Education (1916), Dewey emphasized the importance of work: “To find out what one is fitted to do and to secure an opportunity to do it is the key to happiness. Nothing is more tragic than failure to discover one's true business in life, or to find that one has drifted or been forced by circumstances into an uncongenial calling.” Dewey described chattel slavery in terms of economic loss as well as a loss of human potential that could have benefited society and likened its effects to the losses to society from the many people who never find fulfilling work. Dewey also warned that the “oppositions” and “dualisms” inherent in society threatened any system of meaningful and practical education, and by extension, work:

Traditionally, liberal culture has been linked to the notions of leisure, purely contemplative knowledge and a spiritual activity not involving the active use of
bodily organs. Culture has tended, latterly, to be associated with a purely private refinement, a cultivation of certain states and attitudes of consciousness, separate from either social direction or service.

So deeply entrenched are these philosophic dualisms with the whole subject of vocational education, that it is necessary to define the meaning of vocation with some fullness in order to avoid the impression that an education which centers about it is narrowly practical, if not merely pecuniary. A vocation means nothing but such a direction of life activities as renders them perceptibly significant to a person, because of the consequences they accomplish, and also useful to his associates. The opposite of a career is neither leisure nor culture, but aimlessness, capriciousness, the absence of cumulative achievement in experience, on the personal side, and idle display, parasitic dependence upon others, on the social side.  

Dewey recognized that education could be transformative or “an instrument of perpetuating unchanged the existing industrial order of society.” Dewey also differentiated vocational education from trade education. But by Dewey’s definition, industrial education at Hampton and Tuskegee was both. For students at these institutions learning a trade was a tangible and intangible service to their communities. Even the Tuskegee Bible School students learned a trade. Graduates and former students taught their skills to others and used their skills to improve poor African-American communities.

**African-American Industrial Education**

In *Black Vocational Technical and Industrial Arts Education*, author and educator Clyde W. Hall traces the roots of African-American industrial education to the arrival of the first enslaved Africans in Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619, and their training and apprenticeships as part of the plantation system. Hall identified six industrial schools established for blacks in the North before the Civil War. Hall cataloged nine private industrial post-secondary institutions, nineteen private post-secondary institutions with
industrial education departments, more than twenty public institutions of higher education, many of them land grant colleges, and numerous industrial secondary schools and secondary schools with industrial education programs for African Americans established during the Reconstruction era. The first was the Hampton Normal and Industrial Institute.

A new era of African-American industrial education started with Hampton Institute, established in 1868, three years after the end of the Civil War, by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong with support from the American Missionary Association (AMA). Founded in 1846, the AMA was a statement by pro-abolitionist missionaries who felt that their organizations’ stances against slavery were not strong enough. Armstrong’s vision for Hampton’s educational “system” was influenced by his experiences as the son of missionary parents in Hawaii, his command of black troops during the Civil War, and his work for the Freedmen’s Bureau after the Civil War. As a child in Hawaii, through his father’s work in education, he was exposed to the Hilo School for native Hawaiians where all students were required to perform manual labor. This experience resonated and stayed with Armstrong: “As he upon the development of the plan [for Hampton Institute], the Hilo Manual Labor School for Native Hawaiians often occurred to his mind as an example of a successful industrial education for an undeveloped race, and he remembered that it turned out men ‘less brilliant than the advanced schools, but more solid.’ But he saw that the cases of the Hawaiian and the Negro, though similar, were not parallel, and their needs not identical.” After the Civil War, Armstrong believed in the need to equip newly emancipated African Americans with practical skills. Although he was a sincere proponent of education for African
Americans, he still possessed many of the racial prejudices of the era. His belief in the similarities between two “primitive” peoples, the Hawaiians and African Americans, inspired Armstrong’s “system” of education based on manual training and the establishment of an institution “adapted especially to the needs of ex-slaves.” While Armstrong also envisioned helping poor Southern whites, this part of his plan was not realized. The institution’s charter did not limit the school to solely educating blacks, but provided for “the instruction of youth in the various common schools, academic and industrial branches, the best methods of teaching same and best mode of practical industry in its application to agriculture and the mechanic arts.’ The breadth and scope shown by this charter, including every race, industry, and method, indicates clearly that the founder realized the possibilities of his school and wished to hamper its future by no limitations.”

It was the racial climate that confined the student body to African Americans. Despite this environment, one of Armstrong’s greatest legacies, in addition to Hampton Institute, would be his mentorship of the African-American educator and leader, Booker T. Washington, a Hampton graduate, the future founder of Tuskegee Normal and Agricultural Institute, and influential and controversial black leader. Armstrong helmed Hampton from its inception until his death in 1893. General Armstrong was buried among his students in Hampton Institute’s graveyard.

Tuskegee Institute became the greater focus of media attention for African-American industrial education, even though Hampton was the older school and the model for Tuskegee. Washington stated that much of Tuskegee’s success was due to the efforts of General Armstrong, who introduced him to potential donors and patrons in the North and also accompanied Washington on a trip to “New York, Brooklyn, Boston,
Philadelphia, and other large cities” to fundraise for Tuskegee. According to Washington, this generosity also benefitted Armstrong’s own institution, Hampton: “He [Armstrong] knew that the people in the North who gave money for the purpose of helping the whole cause of Negro civilization, and not merely for the advancement of any one school. The General knew, too, that the way to strengthen Hampton was to make it a center of unselfish power in the working out of the whole Southern problem.”

The unique circumstances of a successful African-American-run educational institution also added to the interest in Tuskegee. Max Bennett Thrasher (1860-1903), a publicist for the Institute, wrote in *Tuskegee: Its Story and Its Work* (1900): It should be remembered that at Tuskegee not only are all of the students Negroes, but also all of the teachers. There is no one connected with the school, except some members of the Board of Trustees, and one or two persons not resident at Tuskegee, who is not of the race which the school is designed to educate.” Thrasher was one of the “one or two people” he described. Thrasher was one of the “one or two people” he described.

Robert Russa Moton (1867-1940) (*fig. 15*), who would succeed Washington as principal of Tuskegee, also described this difference in *Tuskegee and Its People: Their Ideals and Achievements* (1905):

The personnel of the two institutions is different. Hampton has always been governed and controlled by white people, and its teachers have come from the the best families of the North. Tuskegee was founded by a Negro, and its teachers and officers have come from the best types of the American Negro and from the best schools open to them. . . . Hampton is a magnificent illustration of Anglo-Saxon ideas in modern education. Tuskegee, on the other hand, is the best demonstration of Negro achievement along distinctly altruistic lines.

Washington, “Hampton’s most distinguished graduate,” was recommended by General Armstrong to head the titular Tuskegee Normal and Agricultural Institute. Upon
arriving in Tuskegee, Alabama in June 1881, Washington found no infrastructure for the school. While he did not actually found the school, it was established by George Campbell, a businessman and former slave owner, and Lewis Adams, a tradesman and former slave, in essence, he “built” the institution from almost the ground up starting with an inaugural class of thirty students and himself as the sole instructor. While the Alabama state legislature had appropriated funds for the salaries for teachers at the school, no arrangements had been made for buildings. Washington was able to obtain on loan from members of the local black community for “a rather dilapidated shanty near the colored Methodist church, together with the church itself as a sort of assembly room. Both the church and the shanty were in about as bad a condition as was possible.”

Washington recounted his and others’ continued early efforts to build the school in a chapter in his autobiography, *Up from Slavery* titled “Teaching School in a Stable and a Hen House,” which was no exaggeration, he did teach in a stable and a hen house: “The stable was repaired and used as a recitation-room, and very presently the hen house was utilized for the same purpose.” From these humble beginnings, the Institute still exists, now as Tuskegee University.

At Tuskegee, Washington instituted the industrial education system of mentor General Armstrong, focusing on education African Americans to be self-sufficient and self-respecting. Washington discussed his interpretation of difference between industrial education and manual training and came down firmly on the side of industrial education:

*The average manual-training school has for its main object the imparting of culture to the student; while the economic element is made secondary. At Tuskegee Institute we have always emphasised the trade or economic side of education. . . .

We have, therefore, emphasised the earning value of education rather than the finished manual training, being careful at the same time to lay the foundation*
of thorough moral, mental and religious instruction. . . . Industrial education takes into consideration the economic element in production in a way that manual education does not, and this is of great value to a race just beginning its career.98

This economic focus was essential because Washington firmly believed that it was first necessary for blacks to earn a living. He stated “that the problem of bread winning should precede that of culture” and with the basic needs of “shelter, food and clothing settled, there is a basis for what are considered the higher and more important things.”99 In spite of this focus on economics, Washington stated the “the element of teaching should be made the first consideration, and the element of production secondary” and that a school should also inspire in students “abiding interests in the intellectual achievements of mankind in art and literature, and must stimulate his spiritual nature.”100

The socialization component of the industrial education provided at Hampton and Tuskegee, which General Armstrong dubbed “[t]he gospel of the toothbrush,” were equally as important as the practical and academic skills taught. The students were taught how to brush their teeth, care for their bodies and their clothing, and even to sleep in a bed with two sheets.101 General Armstrong succinctly stated his goal for industrial education: “A rounded character rather than mere technical skill is our point.”102 In his dissertation, “‘We Gave Our Hearts and Lives to It,’” Angel David Nieves profiled Jennie Dean, an African-American woman, who despite being illiterate, founded the Manassas Industrial School for Colored Youth on a portion of a Civil War battlefield in Manassas, Virginia in 1893.103 Inspired by Booker T. Washington, Dean described the work of her school in terms of “the gospel of the toothbrush:”

We train them morally and physically as well as mentally. We teach them manners and self-respect and the dignity of labor, developing their manhood and
womanhood and making intelligent, self-reliant citizens, competent to not only better their own condition, but to better the conditions of others also … If there were a school of this kind in every county or in every congressional district of the south the negro problem would soon be solved.\textsuperscript{104}

Both Armstrong’s and Washington’s (and Dean’s) views echo John Ruskin’s vision of a “moral education,” which “consists in making the creature we have to educate, clean and obedient [and] practically serviceable to other creatures.”\textsuperscript{105} Ruskin scholar Sara E. Atwood extracts Ruskin’s components of an ideal education from a passage from \textit{Fors Clavigera}: “the cultivation of the land; bodily exercise, music, and dance; the practical arts, such as spinning, weaving, and sewing; self-sufficiency; natural history and local knowledge; obedience and accuracy; gentleness (compassion, mercy) to all creatures; the example of figures and events from past history.” Atwood also discusses Ruskin’s prioritizing of “those subjects that will teach not only practical skills but personal discipline and right conduct.”\textsuperscript{106} Scholar Francis O’Gorman describes Ruskin’s principal objective for education as “the assimilation of knowledge with values,” a description that also applies to Armstrong and Washington.\textsuperscript{107} Ruskin, Armstrong, and Washington all emphasized the moral and character-building aspects of education in concert with practical skills in order to be of service and use to society.

\textbf{Hampton and Tuskegee Curricula}

In \textit{Working with the Hands}, his sequel to his autobiography, \textit{Up from Slavery}, Booker T. Washington further recounted the founding of Tuskegee, and his debt to General Armstrong for his role in Tuskegee’s success, and to Hampton as the model for Tuskegee’s “system.” An important component of both institutions was the night school, which was designed to meet the needs of very poor as well as older students who needed
to work during the day. The majority of night students worked at Tuskegee and received credit toward room and board plus nominal wages. Tuition was free to students as a result of extensive fundraising by both Armstrong and Washington for their prospective institutions.\textsuperscript{108} This “work-study” arrangement was mutually beneficial; the institutions were able to defray many operating and building costs and helped the students pay educational expenses.

After graduating from Hampton in 1875, where he studied masonry or bricklaying, Booker T. Washington returned to his hometown of Malden, West Virginia.\textsuperscript{109} He returned to Hampton in 1879 to serve as a “‘house father’” to American Indian students, and later supervised the night school. Washington stated that this work “seems to have come providentially, to help prepare me for my work at Tuskegee later,” and considered the night-school “one of the permanent and most important features of the institution.”\textsuperscript{110}

In Working with the Hands, Washington listed the industrial subjects taught at Tuskegee:

Agriculture, basketry, blacksmithing, bee-keeping, brick masonry, plastering, carpentry, carriage trimming, cooking, dairying, architectural, free-hand and mechanical drawing, plain sewing, dress-making, electrical and steam engineering, founding, harness-making, house-keeping, horticulture, canning, laundering, machinery, mattress making, millinery, nurses’ training, painting, saw-milling, shoe-making, printing, stock-raising, tailoring, tinning, and wheelwrighting.\textsuperscript{111}

While the curriculum at Tuskegee emphasized the building trades and agriculture—there were “thirty-seven industrial divisions” in 1904—a variety of subjects were taught including academic and religious subjects.\textsuperscript{112} A report card for student Robert Darnaby dated Spring, May 25, 1905 reveals a broad range of courses taught at
Tuskegee (fig. 16). Darnaby’s course load for the semester consisted of language, reading, bible study, arithmetic, history, geography, vocal music, mechanical drawing, theory class, and labor. Other courses offered included English literature and composition, bookkeeping, psychology, gymnastics, free-hand drawing, cooking, basketry, and several others totaling twenty-eight subjects.

The classes offered at both Hampton and Tuskegee reflected a balance between trade and academic education. In fact, by 1910 at Hampton, “[o]nly those are allowed to enter the Trade School who pass satisfactorily in academic studies.” The 1896-1897 Hampton school catalog described “thirteen three-year trade courses – ‘carpentry and joinery; bricklaying and plastering; machine work; blacksmithing; wheelwrighting; painting; cabinetwork; tinsmithing; steam engineering; tailoring; shoemaking; harnessmaking and carriage trimming; printing;’ and a three-grade course in dressmaking was also outlined.” Dr. Hollis Frissell, General Armstrong’s successor, stated: “It is intended that no student shall be admitted to the Trade School until he has demonstrated his aptitude for a trade and has sufficient knowledge of English, mathematics, and physics to make his work intelligent.” “A part of the day was given to ‘academic study, including mathematics, physics, and English’ and a part was given to mechanical and free-hand drawing.” The object of industrial education was much more than teaching a trade. It encompassed academic and religious studies, as well as work and exercise in order to shape the whole person, mentally, morally and physically.
Black Women and Industrial Education

Both Hampton and Tuskegee accepted women from their inceptions.

“Coeducation” was for General Armstrong “second only to manual labor as an educational force for the Negro.”

In 1886, carpentry was taught to male and female students at Hampton: “Lessons of two and a half hours are given to classes from six to ten pupils, including both young men and women. . . . The entire senior class of fifteen has two weekly lessons. . . . All are taught the use of the hammer, the plane, the saw, and the chisel, also the simple principles of house building and hoe to make useful articles for school use.”

Washington embraced and expanded the parameters co-education for female students at Tuskegee. Following a European tour in 1899 that included a visit to the Swanley Horticultural College, an “agricultural college for women at Swanley, England,” Washington was inspired to add an agricultural program for women in addition to the existing domestic training.

The fact that the students were “intelligent cultured women who [were] mostly graduates of high schools and colleges” impressed Washington. In a letter from London to the editor of the Indianapolis Freeman, Washington described the work of the students: “We found them in the laboratory, studying agricultural chemistry, botany, zoology, and applied mathematics, and we saw these same women in the garden planting vegetables, trimming rose bushes, scattering manure, growing grapes, and raising fruit in hot houses and in the field.” During his visit, the International Council of Women was meeting in London, where the topic of discussion was “‘Farming in its various branches as an occupation for women,’” which explored “dairying, poultry farming, stock breeding, bee-keeping, silk culture, veterinary
surgery, horticulture, gardening as employment for women and the training of women as gardeners.”

Swanley Horticultural College was founded in 1889 and initially admitted male and female students. It became a women’s college in 1891. Despite negative reactions, in 1895, the first “lady gardeners” were employed at Kew Royal Botanic Gardens near London and were graduates of the college. At the time, gardening was strictly a male occupation. In fact, the first two lady gardeners, referred to in the press as “‘London’s Kewriosities,’” were made to wear men’s clothing so as not to titillate their male coworkers: “They wore shirt and tie under a heavy brown tweed suit consisting of jacket, waistcoat (complete with watch chain) and a peaked cap which they ‘found it difficult to wear becomingly (fig. 17).’”¹²² These women and others like them, and the institutions that educated them, were ahead of their time. In spite of the founding of female horticultural colleges and private schools, it was difficult for female gardeners to find employment. It would not be until World War I and a resulting shortage of male gardeners that women were fully accepted in the profession.¹²³

It is unknown if Washington was aware of the stigma of “lady gardeners.” If so, perhaps he likened it to the resistance in some quarters to the education of blacks. If he was aware, it did not dissuade him. Upon his return to Tuskegee, Washington added a two-year agricultural program for women that included training in dairy farming, poultry raising, horticulture, floriculture and landscape gardening, market gardening, livestock care (fig. 18). Washington’s comments about the benefits of working in nature and outdoor trades and his critique of the factory work mirror Art and Crafts beliefs:

There is not only an advantage in material welfare, but there is the advantage of a superior mental and moral growth. The average woman who works in a factory
becomes little more than a machine. Her planning and thinking is done for her. Not so with a woman who depends upon raising poultry, for instance, for a living. She must plan this year for next, this month for the next. Naturally, there is a growth of self-reliance, independence, and initiative. Life out in the sweet, pure, bracing air is better from both a physical and moral point of view than long days spent in the close atmosphere of a factory or store.\footnote{124}

Washington also believed agricultural training for women would reduce the number of males leaving the still mostly agricultural South for the industrialized North: “Heretofore, one great drawback to farming, even in the North, has been the difficulty of keeping farmers’ sons on the farm. With trained and educated girls enthusiastically taking up the profession of farming, the country life will take on new charms, and the exodus of young men to cities will be materially lessened.”\footnote{125} In a speech he gave at Hampton in 1909, Washington stated, “‘The South is the best place for the Negro to work out his salvation.’”\footnote{126} Washington believed that temptations and dangers awaited African-American men and women in the North.

African American women were not only students, but an essential part of the success of Tuskegee as teachers and leaders. In Up from Slavery, Washington praised teacher Olivia A. Davidson (1854-1889), one of the first teachers at Tuskegee, as a partner in its success: “No single individual did more toward laying the foundation of the Tuskegee Institute to insure the successful work that has been done there than Olivia A. Davidson (fig. 19). Miss Davidson and I began consulting as to the future of the school from the first.”\footnote{127} Davidson would become Washington’s second wife after the premature death of his first wife, Fannie Norton Smith (1858-1884) (fig. 20). He also described Davidson’s integral role in school’s financial affairs, namely fundraising, which included, for both Davidson and Washington, independent as well as joint fundraising expeditions.
in the North. Washington’s third wife, Margaret Murray Washington (fig. 21), who would outlive her husband, would play an even greater leadership role.

**African-American Industrial Education and the Negro Problem**

While there were scores of industrial education schools for African Americans as well as schools and colleges that offered industrial education programs or courses, in Reconstruction-era America, Hampton and Tuskegee were by far the most influential, and had international recognition and importance. Their commitment to industrial education was also the longest lasting. Only Hampton and Tuskegee, and one other school, Saint Paul Normal and Industrial School (now Saint Paul’s College) in Lawrenceville, Virginia, “an outgrowth of the Hampton Institute,” continued their industrial education focus after World War II. Therefore this study will focus primarily on Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes by virtue of their important legacies. Clyde W. Hall states:

> The influence of Hampton was not measured by the number of students, graduates, or teachers, but by its use as a model for scores of kindred schools that were established throughout the South. Hampton demonstrated to the country the value of the union of work and study and the fact that a manual labor school could operate successfully. The financial history of Tuskegee was an outstanding achievement, a feat which encouraged similar schools to try to do as well.”

Scholar Donald Spivey estimated that “[n]inety percent of the [Hampton] graduates became teachers, which made Hampton’s influence on the black race profound. . . . It was reported that during the school year ending in 1880, Hampton graduates had taught between 15,000 and 20,000 students.” Like Booker T. Washington, many of these students went on to found, run, or teach at similar institutions.
African-American industrial education, while widely heralded, was not without its detractors or controversies, much of which stemmed from Booker T. Washington’s status as the pre-eminent black leader of the period. Washington was thrust into the public consciousness as a result of the famous and controversial speech at the Atlanta Cotton States and International Exposition on September 18, 1895, commonly referred to as his “Atlanta Compromise” speech. This speech was a watershed moment in his career and brought Washington, Tuskegee, and African-American industrial education to the attention of the nation. Washington recounts that newspapers across the nation “published the address in full, and for months afterward there were complementary references to it.” Washington received a congratulatory letter from then-President Grover Cleveland after sending the president a copy of his speech. Cleveland later became a patron of and advocate for Tuskegee.  

In the speech, Washington exhorted the audience to “Cast down your buckets where you are.” Many people, both black and white, interpreted this to mean that blacks should remain subservient after the Civil War and that industrial education was preparing them for continued second-class citizenship. But in the speech, Washington called for all the members of the audience, black and white, rich and poor, Northerners and Southerners, to “cast down their buckets” in their own ways: for blacks, by remaining in the South, and for whites, by supporting education and economic opportunity for African Americans. For Washington, and many others, industrial education was the solution to the “negro problem.” Washington states:

To those of my race who depend on bettering their condition in a foreign land or who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: ‘Cast down
your bucket where you are’—cast it down in making friends in every manly way of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded.

Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. . . . when it comes to business, . . . it is in the South that the Negro is given a man’s chance in the commercial world, . . .

To twenty-first century sensibilities, and to some of his contemporary detractors, Washington’s tone was obsequious in his solicitude toward Southern whites (“in our humble way, we shall stand by you with a devotion no foreigner can approach”). Also, Washington did not advocate integration: “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 mutual progress.”

He also downplayed political concerns by prioritizing economic security. Washington focused on the fact that the vast majority of newly emancipated blacks would have to earn their living through manual labor:

‘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 productions 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; 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. . . . It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top.’

Washington’s emphasis on the status of labor as well as his focus on “the substantial” and “the useful” parallels the ideals of the Arts and Crafts Movement.

Unfortunately, Washington also pandered to feelings of nativism, xenophobia, and paternalism of many of the whites in his audience at the Exposition:

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, ‘Caste down your bucket where you are.’ Cast it down among the eight millions of Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labor wars, tilled your fields, cleared your
forests, built your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth, and helped make possible this magnificent representation of progress of the South.\textsuperscript{137}

Washington recalled that soon there was a backlash to his speech by some members of the black community and the black press “after the first burst of enthusiasm began to die away, . . . some of them seemed to feel that they had been hypnotized. They seemed to feel that I had been too liberal in my remarks toward the Southern whites, and that I had not spoken out strongly enough toward what they termed the ‘rights’ of the race.”\textsuperscript{138} Contemporary criticism of his speech included references to an incident in which Washington was accused of refusing to help a black man who was being hunted by a lynch mob.\textsuperscript{139} Washington’s public stance was that he would not endanger the Institute’s community by coming to the aid of an accused criminal, but his published papers reveal otherwise. A letter from Thomas A. Harris, the man referred to above, dated September 29, 1895, thanked Washington for assistance in saving his life and requests that if Washington wishes to contact him to write to him by way of another man (a Reverend C.S. Dinkins in Selma, Alabama) lest his whereabouts be discovered.\textsuperscript{140} Washington biographer Louis R. Harlan offers a cogent observation: “[A]s Washington’s private papers do reveal, that behind his public mask was not simply a conventional self-made hero but a man of protean complexity who engaged in many private activities that contradicted the public image.”\textsuperscript{141}

*The Washington Bee* (fig. 23), “one of the most influential African-American newspapers in the country,” was incensed that Washington was inheriting the mantle of Frederick Douglass (1818-1895) as “leader of the negro race,” who had died earlier that year. A brief article in the December 21, 1895 issue stated that “Mr. Douglass never was
a toady nor was he ever an apologist for Southern prejudice, demoguery [sic], and Ku Kluxism,” and called Washington “an apologist and a trimmer, pure and simple.”\textsuperscript{142} Washington declared that “later these reactionary ones seemed to have been won over to my way of believing and acting.”\textsuperscript{143} In the case of The Washington Bee, if not “won over,” their attacks ended when, as a result of the newspaper’s financial difficulties, Washington helped support its operations financially.\textsuperscript{144}

The debate about the type of education that blacks should receive was exemplified by the public conflict between Washington and William Edward Burghart (W.E.B.) DuBois (1868-1963) (\textbf{fig. 24}) who championed classical, academic education for African Americans in the post-Reconstruction years. DuBois and others believed that industrial education would relegate blacks to continued second-class citizenship.\textsuperscript{145} In his book, \textit{Schooling for the New Slavery}, scholar Donald Spivey referred to industrial education at Hampton as “a ‘peculiar’ education.”\textsuperscript{146} Another criticism was that industrial education was becoming obsolete in the face of the current state of industrialization in the United States.\textsuperscript{147} W.E.B. DuBois and colleagues made these points in \textit{The Negro American Artisan}, a report on the “negro problem,” a follow-up to a report started ten years previously to track the black progress in “the sixteen former slaves states and the District of Columbia.”\textsuperscript{148} The report’s findings included the statements: “Industrial training cannot be made a substitute for intelligence,” and “[t]echnical training for trades which are not in economic demand is not a good investment.”\textsuperscript{149}

Several scholars have attributed part of the rivalry between Washington and Du Bois to competition for patronage and funding.\textsuperscript{150} Funding for programs at black educational institutions other than industrial education became more difficult to obtain.
Foundations like the Slater Fund also helped increase industrial education programs in academic institutions, such as Howard University, (fig. 25). Later this funding was decreased as well as allotted to a smaller number of institutions: “By the late 1890’s the number of schools receiving aid had been reduced from almost forty in the last years of Haygood’s agency to ten or a dozen. Moreover, by 1901-2 over half the money allocated went to Hampton and Tuskegee. . . . Even the strong departments at Atlanta University were suspended in 1894-95 for lack of funds.”

Du Bois taught at Atlanta University from 1897-1910. Meier states: “Du Bois as late as 1917 bitterly attacked Hampton for “her illiberal and seemingly selfish attitude towards other colored schools. . . decrying their work, criticizing and belittling their ideals, while her friends continually seek to divert to Hampton the already painfully meager revenues of the colored colleges.' A large part of the ideological conflict between the two types of education in the years after 1895 seems due to competition for funds.”

In an introduction to an edition of Washington’s *Up From Slavery*, author and cultural critic Ishmael Reed wrote: “It is clear that the “Tuskegee Machine,’ often in a competition with Du Bois and his followers for white patrons, frustrated some of Du Bois’s career goals.” The moniker, the “‘Tuskegee Machine,’ [was] a derogatory name given to Washington’s organization by his enemies.”


Du Bois devoted an entire chapter to Washington in his influential book, *The Souls of Black Folk*, published in 1903. Ishmael Reed also stated that “Washington also complained to the editor of the Indianapolis *Star*
about Du Bois’s distorting his record.” Washington was not against a classical education, but believed that a purely academic education was impractical for the majority of blacks in the South, especially so soon after Emancipation. Washington answers the criticism of his promotion of industrial education: “While insisting upon thorough and high-grade industrial education for a large portion of my race, I have always had the greatest sympathy with first-class college training and have recognized the fact that the Negro race, like other races, must have thoroughly trained college men and women. There is a place and a work for such, just as there is a place and a work for those thoroughly trained with their hands.”

Likewise there was a place for both the focus on economic self-sufficiency and stability of Washington and the political action of Du Bois. Their approaches were not mutually exclusive. Both academic and industrial education were worthwhile. Both economic and political approaches were needed. It is unfortunate that Washington’s and DuBois’s approaches were considered mutually exclusive.

Washington’s “accommodationist” or gradualist views were undoubtedly shaped by his experiences with racism and violence in the South. Between 1895 and 1915 there were 1,955 documented lynchings in the United States. That it took one hundred years after Emancipation for African Americans to be fully able to exercise the right to vote, with violent opposition and legal segregation continuing until in the 1950s and 1960s, should result in some understanding for, if not agreement with, Washington’s approach. Historian August Meier commented that in the late nineteenth century, “for articulate Negroes outside of strictly educational circles; primary were the instilling of moral values and the acquisition of a definite trade.” Washington’s stance reflected the goals and reality for the majority of African Americans at the time.
Many scholars have studied this conflict that brought about a deep division in the black community and its leaders. Historian Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn cites “[a] vast historiography [that] has focused on the dichotomy between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois, gradualism and immediatism, and industrial training and higher education. While this division undoubtedly dominated public discourse, it tends to obscure subtleties of opinion, ideas, and action.” Lasch-Quinn characterizes this division as an “abstract polarization” that “has obscured the day-to-day functions of many social reform organizations, especially those in the rural South. While the Washington-Du Bois split prevailed in public discourse, their approaches mingled in an entirely new and complex recipe when put into practice.”

Although Washington’s followers were in the majority, after the turn of the twentieth century, many were questioning Washington’s vision of gradual equality. Historian David Levering Lewis explains:

The brief interval between the Atlanta Exposition of 1895 and the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1900 was one of relative harmony and collaboration within the emergent Negro leadership class, in both the North and the South. The initial unease experienced by a tiny, mainly Northern minority upon reading Dr. Washington’s race-relations prescriptions would simmer slowly at first as the century turned, erupting as full-blown, widespread skepticism only in the decade after the appearance of *The Souls of Black Folk.*

Lewis concludes, “That both formulas were tragically defective as solutions to the so-called race problem would lead to the paradox that the dominant Washington group and the Du Boisian minority blamed each other for the dismal state of race relations that was caused primarily by white America.” Du Bois himself stated similarly in one of the last interviews before his death in 1963: “‘The controversy,’ he said, ‘developed more between our followers than between us.’” Washington had “characterized the
difference between W.E.B. DuBois and himself as one of appealing to different constituencies.” At the end of his life, Du Bois spoke respectfully of Booker T. Washington and their differences:

‘I never thought Washington was a bad man,’ he said, ‘I believed him to be sincere, though wrong. He and I came from different backgrounds, I was born free. Washington was born a slave. He felt the lash of the overseer across his back. I was born in Massachusetts, he on a slave plantation in the South. My great-grandfather fought with the Colonial Army in New England in the American Revolution.’ (This earned the grandfather his freedom.) ‘I had a happy childhood and acceptance in the community. Washington’s childhood was hard. I had many more advantages: Fisk University, Harvard, graduate years in Europe. Washington had little formal schooling. I admired much about him.’

Du Bois continued: “In the early years I did not dissent entirely with Washington’s program. I was sure that out of his own background he saw the Negro’s problem from its lowest economic level.” But Du Bois did not absolve Washington, whom he believed paved the way, through his “Atlanta Compromise” speech in 1895, for the Supreme Court’s decision on Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896, which mandated that segregation was legal by virtue of “separate but equal.”

Washington and Du Bois’s life experiences were so different that their clash seems almost inevitable. Washington was born as slave in the rural South not long before the start of the Civil War. Du Bois was born and raised in the North after Emancipation in town of Great Barrington in western Massachusetts, which by many accounts was a tolerant community lacking in overt racial tensions, described by Du Bois biographer, David Levering Lewis, as “muted racism.” Du Bois attended public school and was college-educated and would go on to earn a Ph.D. at Harvard University in an era where many individuals, both black and white, were illiterate.
Although Washington and Du Bois had marked differences, the antagonism between their respective supporters represented a monumental missed opportunity for collaboration and cooperation and presenting a united front that may have elevated the status of African Americans decades earlier.

**Arts and Crafts Leaders Laud African-American Industrial Education**

In *The Arts and Crafts Movement*, Elizabeth Cumming and Wendy Kaplan state that “[b]y the turn of the century, manual training classes were widespread in American elementary and high schools, and hundreds of vocational, industrial arts and design schools had been established. The Arts and Crafts concepts of joy in labor, dignity of work and utility in design were incorporated at all levels of instruction.” Yet, Arts and Crafts leaders, such as Gustav Stickley, through his magazine, *The Craftsman*, and Elbert Hubbard (1856-1915), founder of the Arts and Crafts community, Roycroft, in East Aurora, New York, enthusiastically and specifically endorsed Booker T. Washington’s program of industrial education at Tuskegee Institute and other African-American industrial education institutions.

Elbert Hubbard not only endorsed Tuskegee’s programs, Hubbard and Washington developed a personal relationship. Hubbard and his wife visited Tuskegee Institute and chronicled the visit in “A Little Journey to Tuskegee,” published in the July 1904 issue of Hubbard’s magazine, *The Philistine*. Neither Washington nor his wife were at Tuskegee at the time of the Hubbards’ visit, for which Washington apologized profusely and thanked Hubbard for his flattering essay in a letter dated June 20, 1904. Hubbard also generously offered to send up to one thousand sample copies of the issue
free of charge upon the receipt of an address list from the Institute.\textsuperscript{171} Other correspondence records that the Institute received both Hubbard’s \textit{The Philistine} and \textit{Little Journeys} and that Hubbard received \textit{The Student}, Tuskegee Institute’s newspaper.\textsuperscript{172}

In 1908, in \textit{Little Journeys to the Homes of The Great: Teachers}, Hubbard profiled Washington and cited Tuskegee as an example of an ideal “formula of Education.” He proclaimed “Tuskegee is the place and Booker Washington is the man.”\textsuperscript{173} Hubbard was very impressed with the requirement that all students performed manual labor regardless of his or her ability to pay: “The fact that you have money will not exempt you here from useful labor. This is exactly what every college in the world should say.”\textsuperscript{174} He definitely saw industrial education at Tuskegee as more than just a program suitable for blacks in the South: “I expect that the day will come, and erelong, when the great universities of the world will have to put the Tuskegee Idea into execution in order to save themselves from being distanced by the Colored Race.”\textsuperscript{175}

In some instances, Hubbard seemed even more enamored of Washington than his institution: “But over and beyond the great achievement of Booker Washington in founding and carrying out the most complete educational scheme of this age, or any other, stands the man himself.”\textsuperscript{176} Elbert Hubbard was by far the most effusive endorser of Washington and placed in exalted company among the other teachers that Hubbard profiled, which included Moses, Plato, Pythagoras, Confucius, Erasmus, and Saint Benedict. (Hubbard’s multiple series \textit{Little Journeys to the Homes of the Great} also covered businessmen, scientists, statesmen and orators, famous women, and painters.) Hubbard’s profile is a curious mix of hagiography and derogatory racial references that
were acceptable at the turn of the twentieth century. Despite this incongruence for the modern reader, Hubbard writes glowingly of Washington calling him “one of God’s noblemen:” “Booker Washington, child of a despised race, has done and is doing what the combined pedagogic and priestly wisdom of the ages has failed to do. He is the Moses who by his example is leading the children of his former oppressors out into the light of social, mental, moral and economic freedom.”

On July 10th and 11th, 1909, Washington made addresses to Hubbard’s Chautauqua reading circle and at the Roycroft Chapel, respectively. In December of the same year, another of Hubbard’s publications, The Fra, printed an excerpt of an address, whose themes were simplicity, earnestness, and service, that Washington had delivered to students at his alma mater, Hampton Institute.

In the January 1903 issue of Gustav Stickley’s magazine, The Craftsman, Oscar Lovell Triggs, co-founder of the Chicago’s Morris Society, wrote about industrial education and cited Hampton as an example of a “genuine integral education.” Coincidentally, in 1903, Dr. Hollis B. Frissell, who succeeded General Armstrong as of Hampton Institute, described the inter-related nature of the trade education at the school: “A student in carpentry is given, in addition to a thorough course in that subject, some knowledge of painting, tinning, and bricklaying, so that he is fitted to build a house, when necessary, without the aid of other mechanics. . . . The problems in arithmetic are taken from the shops and the farm. The work in English has to do largely with the everyday experiences of the student. Agriculture and geography are closely connected. The art instruction is related to the work of the manual-training courses.”
By this time there were hundreds of institutions offering industrial education programs yet Triggs states: “Except in certain schools for Indians and negroes it is not possible to-day to receive instruction in the fundamentals of industrial education.” Triggs cites a report praising Hampton’s program as “‘the finest, soundest, and most effective educational methods in use in the United States are to be found in certain schools for negroes and Indians and in others for young criminals in reformatory prisons.’ Can it be that Hampton Institute, founded for instruction of negroes in the fundamental employments is the model institute for America! Such may prove to be the case.”

Triggs described a model of industrial arts school that differs in many ways from the industrial education model at Tuskegee and Hampton. As could be expected, Triggs’s curriculum did not include agricultural training or building trades. Workshops in media, such as metal and leather, and printing were focused on design. For Triggs, “[p]rinting would be associated with composition, free-hand lettering and page decoration, illustration, the related processes of paper making and bookbinding.” Printing at Tuskegee focused primarily on typesetting and printing presses. Many of the academic offerings were similar: history, geography, the English language and literature, physics, chemistry, mathematics, and music. Despite these differences, there was a common goal “to equip a workman with ideas and render his work intelligent.” Industrial education at Tuskegee was unified and practical and embodied Oscar Lovell Triggs’s ideal of a “general integral education.” Historian John Jenkins describes the Institute’s holistic approach:

Each industry was not isolated, but joined together in a single purpose. When a new building came under planning all the industries were coordinated toward completion of the project. The drawing department drew up the plans. The saw mill cut logs, taken from the school farm, into boards. The brick making division
turned out bricks for the students in masonry to set into walls. The wagons made in the wheelwright department hauled the materials, with the draft animals being controlled by harnesses made in the harness shop. As the buildings went up students engaged in plastering the interior, and others set woodworking in place. The tin shop turned out the roofing. The plumbing, with the fixtures made in the foundry, was installed. And finally, the work clothes and shoes worn by the student workers may have been made at the school.188

While African-American industrial education curricula does not focus on craft, a quote from General Armstrong reflects the themes of reform, meaning and purpose, and an “integrated” life that would have appealed to Art and Crafts sensibilities: “‘‘We are not here merely to educate students, but to make men and women out of individuals belonging to the down-trodden and despised races; to make of them not accomplished scholars, but to build up character and manhood; to fit the best among them to be teachers and apply the best educational methods, for the work is a rounded one, touching the whole circle of life and demanding the best energies of those who take it up.”’189

Despite sharing many of the racial prejudices of the age, leading members of the Arts and Crafts movement expressed interest and concern for the plights of African Americans and American Indians and endorsed the Hampton and Tuskegee models of industrial education for all. This attention to one of the era’s most pressing societal issues speaks to the foundation of the Arts and Crafts movement roots in social reform. These connections between the Arts and Crafts movement and African Americans have been almost universally ignored in current scholarship.

African American industrial education and the Arts and Crafts movement would again intersect, this time on a grassroots level, in the settlement movement. African Americans, inspired by the mission of Hampton and Tuskegee Institute, would adapt settlement house activities, which assisted poor immigrant communities predominantly in
urban areas, to meet the needs of poor African-American communities in the rural South. Nationally and internationally, in the same ways that Arts and Crafts practitioners would use their societies and clubs to promote their ideals, Booker T. Washington and his allies would promote industrial education, and the progress it yielded for African Americans, in the public forums of international expositions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Chapter 3: “Exposure and Influence: African-American Industrial Education on the World Stage,” examines these activities.
CHAPTER 3: Exposure and Influence: African-American Industrial Education Beyond School Grounds

Exposure and Influence

As discussed in Chapter 2, Booker T. Washington’s address at the 1895 Atlanta Exposition thrust him, Tuskegee Institute, and African-American industrial education to national prominence. Another exposition, five years later in Paris, would put African-American industrial education on the world stage. Other expositions in Buffalo, New York, in 1901, and Jamestown, Virginia, in 1907, would continue to bring African-American industrial education to the public’s attention in the United States. The international expositions served as a platform for social change for African Americans who used them to highlight their progress and raise their status domestically and internationally. The “Negro Exhibits” were an important vehicle that enabled African Americans to present themselves and their images as they wanted to be seen and on “their ‘own terms.’”\(^{190}\) In addition, Washington would travel extensively in Great Britain and the European continent in his fundraising and “friend-raising” for Tuskegee Institute and to further the cause of African-American progress.

Closer to home, the Tuskegee Institute would adapt settlement work, whose roots were in the Arts and Crafts movement, to improve the plight of poor, black communities, in the South, through the work of their staff and students, graduates, and followers.

African-American Industrial Education at the 1900 Paris Exhibition

Thomas J. (Junius) Calloway (1866-1930) (fig. 26), an educator and lawyer organized the Negro Exhibit (formally “The Exhibit of the American Negroes”) at the
Paris *Exposition Universelle* of 1900 (fig. 27). Calloway was appointed upon the recommendation of Booker T. Washington as “special agent in the department of education and social economy to take up the work of compiling data and collecting material for an exhibit of the progress of the American negroes in education and industry.”

In a letter to Washington, Calloway expressed the widespread frustration among African Americans about the era’s negative stereotypes about blacks and their status and treatment:

> Everyone who knows about public opinion in Europe will tell you that Europeans think us a mass of rapists, ready to attack every white woman exposed, and a drag in civilized society. This notion has come to them through horrible libels that have gone abroad whenever a Negro is lynched, and by constant reference to us by the press in discouraging remarks.

> How shall we answer these slanders? Our newspapers they do not subscribe for, if we publish books they do not buy them, if we lecture they do not attend.

> To the Paris Exposition, however, thousands upon thousands of them will go and a well selected and prepared exhibit, representing the Negro’s development in his churches, his schools, his homes, his farms, his stores, his professions and pursuits in general will attract attention as did the exhibits at Atlanta and Nashville Expositions, and do a great and lasting good in convincing thinking people of the possibilities of the Negro.

African Americans lobbied heavily to participate in these prestigious events, from which they were initially excluded. International exhibitions may have been even more important for race relations in America as a result of segregation. Calloway continued in his letter to Washington:

> Not only will foreigners be impressed, but hundreds of white Americans will be far more convinced by what they see there than what they see, or can see every day in this country, but fail to give us credit for. Hundreds of Southern white people were amazed at the evidences of culture and progress they saw in the Negro Exhibits in Nashville and Atlanta, and yet you know that if they would only visit the churches and the homes of our best families in those cities alone they would see and exhibit, far more
pronounced, of the culture of the race. But this they will not do and we must prove our cause in other ways.  

W.E.B. Du Bois would also help conceptualize and organize the exhibit in Paris and would coordinate the State of Georgia’s portion of the exhibit. While Calloway’s official report listed ten objectives of the exhibit, Du Bois considered these four aspects of African-American culture most important to convey: “(a) The history of the American Negro. (b) His present condition. (c) His education. (d) His literature.”

The Negro Exhibit was located in the Palace of Social Economy and Congresses Pavilion (fig. 28) which featured international examples of “advances in social and industrial progress” of workers, women and children, and the poor and unfortunate. Germany’s exhibit represented their social safety net and highlighted insurance funds and hospitals for workers. A British exhibit featured maps delineating wealth, poverty, and class in London. There was a Russian exhibit on temperance and an Italian cooperative banking exhibit. Other American exhibits included models of New York City tenements and photographs of workers from companies such as Heinz and Westinghouse, and the Prudential insurance company, which highlighted employee benefits, and “social betterment” organizations such as the Salvation Army and the YMCA.

The Negro Exhibit featured a photographic exhibition capturing the progress of the blacks in the thirty-five years after Emancipation in the United States, and in which Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes featured prominently. Hampton’s portion included 150 photographs by the eminent photographer, Francis Benjamin Johnston (1864-1952) who “was the only American woman invited to attend the Third International Photographic Congress, held as an adjunct to the Exposition. . . . Her work won the Grand Prix, medals, world acclaim and the fair repute of Hampton.” Hampton’s display in the exhibit was
comprised of only photographs due to space constraints. Some of these photographs presented African Americans as respectable and dignified and contrasted the “old” and the “New Negro” (figs. 29, 30).

Scholar Shawn Michelle Smith’s analysis of the photographs in the Negro Exhibit compares the Hampton Institute photographs taken by Frances Benjamin Johnston, a white female, and the unknown black photographers used by W.E.B. DuBois for the Georgia portion of the exhibit. Smith discusses Johnston’s “assimilationist images” in which her subjects never look at the camera: “In Johnston’s photographs, Hampton students never meet the camera with curious, approving, or challenging eyes; instead they are depicted as the objects of a scrutinized gaze, one that has been invited to evaluate their ‘progress and present condition.’” Smith notes “the absence of even a documented glance in the direction of the camera.” Smith contrasts Johnston’s photographs and their “invisible ‘white gaze’” with the photographs Du Bois curated for the exhibit. Photo historian Deborah Willis attributes these differences to the black photographers engaged by Du Bois for these components of the Negro Exhibit. While both sets of photographs depicted the progress of African Americans in the United States since emancipation and undermined negative racial stereotypes, Types of American Negroes, Georgia, U.S.A. and Negro Life in Georgia, U.S.A., collections of photographs curated by Du Bois show marked differences from Johnston’s images (figs. 31-35). Smith compares Johnston’s formality and the lack of differentiation within the group photographs with the intimacy and individuality present in the black photographers’ images in Du Bois’s collection (figs. 36-40): “Unlike Johnston’s formal photographs of students at the Hampton Institute, Du Bois’s snapshots convey a sense of spontaneity and immediacy. The subject
and scenes of these images are diverse, and many of the photographs suggest an interaction between unnamed photographers and subjects, through variously questioning, surprised, laughing and smiling faces that greet later viewers.”

Smith further contends that what most powerfully differentiate Du Bois’s collection from Johnston’s work are the formal, individual portraits that introduce each volume of *Types of American Negroes.*” Smith describes these photographs (figs. 41-42):

The portrait series presents individuals posed for two portraits each, one a frontal image, the other a profile or semi-profile. Each pair of photographs is presented on a separate page, and the first two volumes of *Types of American Negroes* consist almost entirely of such portraits (there are well over two hundred of them. Unlike Johnston’s group photographs, constructed uncannily around the ‘unnoticed’ presence of the camera, and as the viewer progresses through the albums, she is met with the gaze and likeness of one individual after another. The subjects of these formal portraits engage the gaze of the photographer and later the viewer, forcing white viewers to recognize what bell hooks has called a resistant, ‘oppositional gaze,’ a gaze that confronts and challenges the privileged position of the white viewer, a gaze that makes that position apparent.

Du Bois and other African Americans used photography as a vehicle for social change, creating “an image of self-empowerment.” Photo historian Deborah Willis states: “Du Bois’s use of photographs at the Paris Exposition, remarkable, in his words, for the variety of their ‘delicate beauty [and] tone,’ show his understanding of the power of photography to create a new and revised self-image for African Americans.” Willis states that” Du Bois’s ‘American Negro’ photographs disrupt the images of African Americans produced ‘through the eyes of others’ by simultaneously reproducing and supplanting these images with a different vision of the ‘American Negro.’” Smith sees these photographs as a form of resistance “against dominant, white-supremacist images of African Americans perpetuated both discursively and in visual media at the turn of the [twentieth] century” and “open[ed] up an important space for African American
A striking contrast to these images is a cartoon-like rendering of an anonymous black man of undetermined nationality in an illustrated journal describing his experiences at the Exposition (fig. 43). This journal was translated into French.

The Negro Exhibit’s photographs differed drastically from the era’s common caricatures and stereotypes depicting of African Americans. These images refuted some of the beliefs that many whites used to justify the second-class citizenship of African Americans. These photographs not only showed white Americans an expanded view of African American life, they helped African Americans see themselves in a different way. The photographs also documented the accomplishments of African-American industrial education—respectable homes, solid institutions, and its “civilizing” influence on its students and alumni.

In addition to photographs, the Negro Exhibit featured maps, numerous charts, additional photographs, and nine model displays illustrating myriad facets of African-American advancement, from increases in population and literacy to literature written by and patents earned by blacks (fig. 44).

The exhibit was well-received. In addition to the Grand Prix for the Hampton University display (fig. 45), the Negro Exhibit won 16 other medals whose recipients included Tuskegee Institute, as well as individual medals for W.E.B Du Bois, James J. Calloway, and Booker T. Washington. While African-American publications covered the exhibit extensively, coverage in the mainstream media, including The New York Times, The Chicago Tribune, and Outlook magazine, was minimal, but positive. W.H. Tolman, author of an article in the October 6, 1900, issue of Outlook magazine, wrote:
“Some arrangement should be made for keeping this Negro Exhibit in tact, for the mass of information represents too much labor to have its value impaired.” In a *New York Times* article, Howard J. Rogers mentioned the American Negro Exhibit and stated: “One of the most valuable features is a careful study of the negro problem as illustrated in the State of Georgia, and is the result of careful study and investigation by W.A. [sic] Du Bois, a well-known Harvard graduate.” The literary portion of the exhibit garnered special attention. *The Colored American*, a weekly newspaper, proudly mentioned an article in a British literary publication, *The Academy*, which commented on the “negro authors” section of the exhibit. *The New York Times* devoted an entire article to this portion of the exhibit when it was displayed at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo the following year.

**The Negro Exhibit and Arts and Crafts at the 1901 Pan-American Exposition**

The Negro Exhibit from the 1900 Paris Exposition was remounted at the 1901 Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York. The Negro Exhibit “was located in the Manufactures and Liberal Arts building, a large structure featuring displays of arts and crafts, the latest manufactured food stuffs, and representatives from hundreds of companies and corporations.” Arts and Crafts leaders, Gustav Stickley and Charles Rohlf, participated in the Exposition and their exhibits were also displayed in the Manufactures and Liberal Arts Building (fig. 46). “Gustave” Stickley and Rohlf are both listed on page 107 of *The Pan-American Official Catalogue and Guide Book to the Pan-American Exposition*, published by Charles Arhart, as “art manufacturers”: Stickley of “fancy wood and leather work” and Rohlf of “art furniture.” Their works were displayed
in the Interior Court of the building. It is worth speculating if Stickley’s interest in and endorsement of African-American industrial education institutions and programs in his magazine, *The Craftsman*, was influenced by a possible visit to the Negro Exhibit.

Writer Sarah Ruth Offhaus commented about the comparatively small amount of information about the Negro Exhibit, which was not included in the official guide to the Pan-American Exposition. While the Negro Exhibit not was listed in the guide, the African-American educational institutions featured in the exhibit were. Among them were Fisk University, the Colored Industrial Institute of Blue Bluff, Arkansas, and Hampton Institute. A factor that may have affected the amount of coverage of the Negro Exhibit, and other exhibits as well, was the assassination of President William McKinley at the Pan-American Exposition on September 6, 1901. Offhaus noted:

> Compared to other aspects of the Pan-Am, there is not much information about the Negro Exhibit. Many guidebooks published exclusively for the Exposition don’t even mention it. Charles Ahrhart’s “Official Catalog and Guide Book to the ‘Pan-American Exposition’ lists all the exhibitors, but the Negro Exhibit is not present. Based upon the amount of existing information, it would seem that the Exhibit certainly did not receive the same amount of coverage as ‘Darkest Africa’ or ‘The Old Plantation’. Buffalo’s African Americans had achieved their goal of including the Negro Exhibit, however white audiences still did not appear to embrace the message.”

Prior to the Exposition, there were newspaper articles in local newspapers, such as *The Buffalo Evening Times*, about the local black citizens’ campaign for the inclusion of the Negro Exhibit in the Pan-American Exposition. While the citizens were obviously successful in bringing the progressive Negro Exhibit to the exposition, it had to compete with the negative stereotypes in the “Darkest Africa” and “The Old Plantation” exhibits, which depicted blacks as primitive and romanticized the antebellum South, respectively (figs. 47, 48, and 49). Scholar Paul Greenhalgh documented the long history of
"tableaux-vivants" or “living pictures” at international expositions and exhibits which cast people of color and ethnic minorities as exotic inferiors or “others” at international expositions. Greenhalgh described such exhibits as “human showcases” in which “human beings were transformed into objects.” Greenhalgh contends that these exhibits, influenced by “the rise of eugenics and social Darwinism,” helped rationalize racism and imperialism and “were among the most significant of negative forces in race relations.” These hugely popular “anthropological displays” began to wane after World War I. Also, in 1915 African Americans began mounting their own expositions, which highlighted African-American achievement and progress, to celebrate and commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Emancipation.

As mentioned above, a review in *The New York Times* on September 21, 1901, focused on the literary portion of the Negro Exhibit. The unnamed reviewer declared the exhibit’s significance was its source, rather than its literary quality:

We may as well be entirely frank in our appraisal. Much of it is rubbish. None of it is very great. There has been no negro Homer, Shakespeare, or Dumas—no American counterpart of the great French mulatto. But a great deal of this work has better qualities than the world has reason to expect, when it remembers the condition of its origin. Its chief value, the one think that makes it worthy of attention, has no concern with the graces of literary form, but lies in the fact that here is the world’s best record of the evolution of the negro recorded by the negro himself.

The reviewer did praise some of the works, which included the poems of Phillis Wheatley and Paul Laurence Dunbar, William Still’s history of the Underground Railroad, and *First Lessons in Greek*, by Wilberforce University professor William Sanders Scarborough.
The 1907 Jamestown Exposition

The 1907 Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition was convened to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the Jamestown Settlement (fig. 50). The Negro Building at the 1907 Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition was a point of pride for blacks as the building was developed, designed, and built by African Americans, from the development company to the architect and contractors who endured many challenges bringing the project to fruition, including obtaining permission to represent themselves at the Exposition (fig. 51). The exhibit consisted of 9,926 exhibits from thirty-six states and the District of Columbia.\textsuperscript{226} The Negro Development and Exposition Company (fig. 52), co-founded by Giles B. Jackson, which spearheaded the Negro Exhibit, estimated in its final report that between “three thousand and twelve thousand people visited it each day” and felt they were not exaggerating when they described the exhibit as “‘the central figure of the Exposition.’”\textsuperscript{227} Of the three million visitors to the Exposition, 750,000 visited the Negro Building. Surprisingly, white males were the largest demographic visiting the Negro Building.\textsuperscript{228} Although at least 28,000 visitors to the exhibit were black, the organizers of the exhibit expressed regret that “so few our people were able to see it.”\textsuperscript{229} And sadly, the Negro Building was the only building at the Exposition that blacks could enter.\textsuperscript{230} On June 10th President Theodore Roosevelt visited the Negro Building and gave the following impromptu remarks:

‘I can simply say one word of greeting. It is a great pleasure to go through this magnificent building and to see the unmistakable evidence you are making as shown by the exhibits I find here. I congratulate you upon it. I congratulate the whole country upon it. May good luck be with you. Those who have argued from the outset that a high grade exposition of what the Negro has accomplished in his
three centuries of struggle and achievement would go far to vindicate his title to the full panoply of citizenship, have unquestionably won their case. . . ."  

Booker T. Washington also delivered an address at the 1907 Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition. He was the keynote speaker on “August 3, which the Jamestown Exposition Company had proclaimed ‘Negro Day’” in which “[a]n estimated ten thousand persons crowded in front of the Negro Building to hear him speak, one of the largest audiences of Blacks ever gathered.” Surprisingly, Washington did not mention industrial education specifically, though he did mention education in general as a means of progress for African Americans. His speech was a reassuring address on the state of race relations and the progress that blacks had made in the forty years after the end of slavery. Washington spoke of how fitting it was that blacks should be represented so positively in an exposition commemorating the 300th anniversary of the founding of the Jamestown settlement, where the first twenty enslaved Africans arrived roughly a decade after the colony’s founding. Three hundred years later there were now ten million African Americans in the New World.  

In spite of Washington’s appearance at the Exposition, Tuskegee did not have a display at the exhibit as Washington, and other black leaders and citizens, did not initially support a separate Negro Building. Many blacks felt that a separate building would legitimize racial segregation: “The opponents charged that it would be a jim crow affair—a promoter of existing segregationist policies—and at a period of time when most blacks were seeking integration into the mainstream of society. They feared that participation in such an endeavor might be interpreted by white society as support of a segregated society.” There was also concern about the treatment of “blacks visiting a
Southern state that had legally enforced segregation.\textsuperscript{236} That Washington would object to a separate building was a significant change from his stance at the Atlanta Exposition in 1895 that blacks and whites could be “[i]n all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet as one the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.”\textsuperscript{237}

Nevertheless, Washington, along with many others, praised the Negro Building and the exhibits it contained. Thomas J. Calloway, who had organized the Negro Exhibit at the 1900 Paris Exposition, co-managed this exhibition. The “Report of the Advisory Board for the Negro Building of the Jury of Awards, Jamestown Exposition” singled out “the exhibit of the Hampton Institute [as] by far the best made by the Industrial Schools” (\textbf{fig. 53 and 54}) and described the exhibit as follows:

An ample fire place flanked by inviting settees welcome visitors, an exhibit showing effectively, one of the practical industries taught at the school. About the room are neatly finished, substantial chairs, desks, and tables and show cases made by the students, and used here to display their work. Each subject taught is represented three ways—by a large fine picture of students performing the work itself, by a sample of the work itself, and by a chart outlining the course of study for that trade or industry. For example, the machinists trade is represented by a picture of the shop and an engine made by the boys, printing by a picture of students at work and by books and pamphlets turned out by that department; wheel-wrighting and blacksmithing are objectively represented by a fine delivery wagon; and harness-making by an excellent set of harness, etc. . . . A fine picture of a young man reading to two old people in their cabin, aptly illustrates the community work and missionary spirit cultivated at Hampton Institute.\textsuperscript{238}

The exhibit also featured china painting by African-American women.

China painting was widely accepted and embraced as a gender-appropriate Arts and Crafts activity for women, both as a hobby and a profession.\textsuperscript{239} In an essay by that examined African American ceramic traditions, scholar Winnie Owens-Hart discusses china painting by black women in the District of Columbia in early twentieth century. Owens-Hart states:
African Americans were invisible participants in just about every other aspect of ceramics, including china painting, an art form long associated with women with considerable leisure time on their hands. Yet, it is far from likely that Rubie (Kesiah) Booker Lucas was the only black woman in Washington, D.C.—or the country—painting scenes and decorations on premade porcelain blanks (as they are termed) in the 1920s. In fact it was recently discovered that she and her friends often gathered together to paint china in one another’s homes, enjoying the talk as much as the activity. When scholars do focus on this neglected art form, many more African Americans practitioners may be identified.240

As Owens-Hart posited, there were other black women china painters and the work of at least three, that of Frances Spencer Dorkin of Norfolk, Virginia; Mrs. Fanny Clinkscale of Topeka, Kansas; and Mrs. Mrs. Addie Byrd of Columbus, Ohio; was displayed at the 1907 Jamestown Exposition (figs. 55 and 56).241

The International Influence of Tuskegee and Hampton

Booker T. Washington said about his mentor, the founder of Hampton Institute:

“No only has General Armstrong’s belief in industrial education spread among our people in the South, but its influence is felt in the West Indies and Africa and other foreign countries, to such an extent that there are many calls coming in from these countries for industrial education.”242 In Working with the Hands, Washington stated that inquiries about Tuskegee Institute’s program was his primary reason for writing the book: “For several years I have received requests from many parts of the United States, and from foreign countries as well, for some detailed information concerning the value of industrial training and the methods employed to develop it” and that he “received most urgent appeals from both Hayti [sic] and Santa Domingo for advice and assistance.”243

James Calloway, organizer of the Negro Exhibit at the 1900 Paris Exposition, “told a report of the Express during a visit to Buffalo in December 1900 that: ‘This
exhibit attracted great attention abroad, so much so that the German government has already led off by asking Mr. Booker T. Washington to send some of the graduates from the Tuskegee Institute to the German colony of Angola. The English have under consideration the same thing.244 In 1901, there was an agricultural mission from Tuskegee to Togo at the behest of the Germany government, led by James Nathan Calloway, the eldest brother of Thomas J. Calloway, the organizer of the Negro Exhibit at the 1900 Paris Exposition.245 Also in 1901, the Zulu Christian Industrial School (now the Ohlange High School) was founded in Natal, South Africa, by John Langalibalele Dube, who corresponded with Washington and based the new school on Tuskegee Institute.246 The Booker T. Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute would be established in Kakata, Liberia in 1929.247

**Booker T. Washington’s International Travels**

On May 10, 1899, Washington, with his third wife, Margaret Murray Washington, embarked on a three-month tour of Europe with an itinerary that included destinations in France, England, the Netherlands, and Belgium. On this trip Washington and his wife would meet such luminaries as author Mark Twain, African-American ex-patriot painter, Henry O. Tanner, American ex-president, Benjamin Harrison, suffragist Susan B. Anthony, and Queen Victoria.248 Washington’s travels in Britain were chronicled in *The Times* of London and *The Scotsman* as well as American newspapers and by Washington himself.

Washington and his wife also visited the Horticultural College for Women in Swanley, Kent, an agricultural college for women, which as mentioned in
Chapter 2, would lead him to provide additional agricultural studies for women at his own institution. Washington described this visit and its effects on the Institute’s training for women in *Working with the Hands*.

During this tour, Washington made a number of public appearances. Washington’s address at a reception given for him and his wife at Essex-hall in London was reported in *The Times* of London. His lecture was described as “an address on the condition and prospects of the coloured race in America,” in which he described the effects of slavery and the current condition of American blacks in the South, and the history and progress of Tuskegee Institute, and expressed his confidence in a resolution to the negro problem. His remarks were well received as noted by mention in the article of cheers from the audience. Several of the attendees listed in the article were influential individuals in the field of education in Britain, a key focus of the Arts and Crafts movement. Member of Parliament Lord James Bryce, “as chairman of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, he participated in a major reorganization of English Schools,” whom he “endorsed [Washington’s] leadership and philosophy.” Bryce would become ambassador to the United States from 1907 to 1915.” Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, also a Member of Parliament, “among whose many philanthropic interests the support of polytechnic institutes that provided industrial training.” Hodgson Pratt “was an advocate of craft and technical training and of higher education for adult workers.” The current United States Ambassador to Great Britain, Joseph Hodges Choate, was also in attendance. During his visit to London, Washington also spoke at an awards ceremony at the Crystal Palace for the Royal Normal College for the Blind, presided over by the Duke and Duchess of Westminster.
Washington’s second trip to Europe in 1910 received much more press coverage as his reputation and prestige had grown. In the intervening years, he had published *Up from Slavery* as well as *Working with the Hands*, and numerous essays. On August 28, 1910 *The Times* of London reported that he was to “visit Denmark, Germany, France, Austria, and Italy” and “hopes also to include the Balkan regions” as part of an almost six-week journey. He was also to be a guest at Skibo Castle, one of Andrew Carnegie’s residences. Articles in *The Times* of London stated that “the object of Mr. Booker Washington’s visit is to inspect the social and industrial conditions of the working classes in England and some of the Continental countries” and “to compare the people who do the rough work in the fields, on the public works, and in the mines of Europe with the masses of the negro people who do the hard work in the southern States.”

On August 30, 1910, *The Times* again reported on Washington as the news of a major bequest to the Tuskegee Institute rumored to be $1 million by the newspaper, but estimated to be $100,000 by Washington, still a significant bequest. The largest gift to Tuskegee at the time had been $600,000 from Andrew Carnegie, whom Washington would visit the next day in Scotland. In this article, it was reported that Washington would “visit Berlin, Budapest, Constantinople, Rome, Paris, and Copenhagen before returning to America.” Washington was scheduled to speak at the National Liberal Club and Aborigines Protection Society in London on October 6 and 7, respectively. Another article in *The Times* on September 19, 1910, discussed Washington’s upcoming address to the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society and included a list of prospective attendees that included Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and his wife, titled and notable individuals.
An October 7, 1910 article in *The Times* recounted an impressive guest list for the luncheon, which included archbishops and members of Parliament, as well as a record of very complimentary regrets from important public figures, such as the Prime Minister and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The letter from the Prime Minister read:

I much regret that my engagements do not allow me to accept your invitation to be present at the luncheon which it is to give for in honour of Mr. Booker Washington. I feel sure, however, that he will be welcomed with a cordiality which his persistent and successful labours in the cause of the education of the American negro deserve, especially at the hands of Englishmen, whose difficulties in many parts of the Empire have been helped towards a solution by the results of his work.257

Washington was warmly welcomed by Mr. Herbert Samuel and Sir Harry Johnston. 258 Johnston had visited the Tuskegee Institute with the Lord James Bryce, the British Ambassador to the United States from 1907 to 1915, whose visit was prompted by the large number of students from the British West Indies that attended the school.259 An article in *The Scotsman* also reported that at Tuskegee “‘a number of South African negroes who are being trained with a view to the education of their fellows in South Africa.’”260 The previous year Johnston wrote a two-part expose for *The Times* about his one-week visit, titled “Negro in America.” The series examined Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes and race relations in America, and illustrated the author’s and the era’s preoccupation with definitions and degrees of blackness and miscegenation in the South. In part two of his report, Johnston stated: “South of the old slavery line . . . there are practically no collegiate institutions for the negro (save Hampton and Tuskegee) in which students of both sexes may obtain at very small cost sound, practical instruction in the useful arts and crafts.”261 Johnston was familiar with Hampton’s and Tuskegee’s curriculum and labeled it arts and crafts.
Washington spoke primarily about Tuskegee Institute and his speech was well received with portions cheered by the audience. Washington repeated a statement from *Up From Slavery* about the “vast difference between working and being worked” and “[t]he greatest single achievement at Tuskegee was to be found in the change that had come over millions of his race in regard to the subject of labour, for there was no hope for any race until it had learned that all forms of labour were dignified and all forms of idleness a disgrace.” Addressing criticism of Tuskegee’s emphasis on matters economic over spiritual, the response was: “They believed thoroughly in the ethical and more important side of life, but it was difficult to make a good Christian out of a hungry man.” Later that night, Washington delivered a lecture to the National Liberal Club was titled “The Economic Progress of the Negro in America.”

An account of Washington’s observations and experiences during his second trip to Britain and Europe, titled *The Farthest Man Down*, was published in 1912. In the book he compared “how the ‘man farthest down’ was living... and how this condition compared with that of the average black man in the United States.” Excerpts from the book were published as a series of essays in *Outlook* magazine. Washington described depravation, chronic unemployment, poverty, and starvation in London’s lower classes and concluded that blacks in the American South were better off than the poorest Londoners. In the book, Washington reacted to a criticism that he did not paint a bleak enough picture of the plight of African Americans in the South. He provided a pointed response:

Not infrequently, when in my public speeches I have made reference to the conditions of the Negro in the South, certain members of my own race in the North have objected because, they said, I did not paint conditions in the South black enough. During my stay in England I had the unusual experience of being
criticized in the London newspapers for the same reason, this time by an American white man. At the very moment that this man attacked me because in my public interviews I emphasized the opportunities rather than the wrongs of the Negro in the South I had in my possession the document to which I have referred, which gives the official history of fifty-two persons, one for every week of the year, who had died in the city of London alone for want of food.

I have never denied that the Negro in the South frequently meets with wrong and injustice; but he does not starve.\footnote{266}

Washington described heart-breaking examples of indifference to the poor in Edwardian-era London, where there were ten thousand homeless individuals in the East End section of the city alone, and in European cities and towns.\footnote{267}

A Lecture at a London Settlement, 1902

Interest in Booker T. Washington and industrial education extended beyond his own lecture tours. On November 10, 1902, The Times of London reported on a lecture given by M.E. Sadler “at the Passmore Edwards Settlement, Tavistock-place, W.C., [Western Central London] on ‘Mr. Booker Washington’s School at Tuskegee Alabama.’”\footnote{268} The lecturer was Sir Michael Ernest Sadler (1861-1943), who was at the time the “director of the office of special inquiries and reports in the Department of Education, where he produced reports on educational policy and practice at home and abroad, and advised the government on the development of educational policy.”\footnote{269} The article stated that Sadler spoke about the negro question and industrial education as well as Washington’s life.

It is telling that the Passmore-Edwards Settlement House in London would host a lecture on Booker T. Washington and Tuskegee University. The building on Tavistock Place, which formerly housed the settlement, and its founder, Mary Ward (fig. 57), and
patron, John Passmore Edwards, all have their own fascinating history. The Settlement, founded in 1891 still exists as an adult education center, the Mary Ward Centre, named after the founder who was a popular novelist and reformer of the period. The settlement’s former building, designed by A. Dunbar Smith and Cecil Brewster, which still stands on Tavistock Place, was custom built for the settlement in 1898 and is a superb example of Arts and Crafts architecture in London (fig. 58).  

A 1902 article in *Outlook* magazine about Mrs. Ward stated that “[t]he spirit of the settlement is expressed in these words displayed in a framed notice at the entrance to the social hall: ‘We believe that many changes in the conditions of labour are needed, and are coming to pass; but we believe also that men without any change except in themselves and in their feelings towards one another, might make this world a happier place.” The members of the settlement “[met] to exchange ideas and to discuss social questions” and “endeavor[ed] to make the Settlement a centre where we may unite our several resources in a social and intellectual home.” While craft classes were offered, there was an emphasis on services to help the poor and dispossessed, such as “[t]he Poor Man’s Lawyer,” a free, weekly legal clinic.

The Settlement also focused on educational and economic issues. Its founder, Mary Ward aka Mrs. Humphry Ward, a celebrated novelist authored a bestseller of the period, *Robert Elsmere*. She also helped transform elementary education in England by establishing “Recreation Schools or Play Centers” whose goals included a moral or character-building component in common with African-American industrial education:

The entire purpose of such Play Centers is to rescue the children of the poor from the demoralization that results in being turned out to play after school hours in the streets and alleyways, where they are subjected to every kind of vile association and influence. The effects already noted by
those in charge of the Centers are improvement in manners, in thoughtfulness for the little ones, and in unselfishness; increased regard for truth and honesty; the development of the instinct in all children to ‘make something’;\textsuperscript{273}

Mrs. Ward also established the first school for handicapped children in London, referred to in this non-politically-correct era as “‗Cripple Schools.’” When the article was published in 1909, twenty-three such schools had been established.\textsuperscript{274}

The Settlement also served adults, mostly through evening activities and clubs.

One innovative club was the “‗Coal Club’”:

The Club buys a large quantity of coal in the summer-time, when it can be obtained at its cheapest. As a large consumer, it usually gets every possible concession. The members of this Club can buy the coal in small quantities as wanted, or as they are able to pay for it, at any time during the year, at the summer price of one shilling one and a half pence per hundredweight (27 cents). If bought during the winter in the ordinary way, they would have to pay perhaps five or six pence more—a very substantial saving. Thrift is encouraged by allowing members to deposit small sums in the summer to pay against their winter purchases.\textsuperscript{275}

In addition to the Coal Club, there was a “‗Men’s Club, the Boys’ Club, the Factory Girls’ Club, and the Women’s Club.’” There was also an orchestra, a Choral Society, a Dramatic Society, a large hall that served as a gallery “decorated with the many pictures, all reproductions of the best works of art, while around the walls are placed busts in marble” of eminent men that included in marble of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Charles Dickens. “On Sunday nights there are concerts or lectures.”\textsuperscript{276} Perhaps Mr. Sadler’s lecture on Booker T. Washington was one of these Sunday night events.

Settlement work was an integral part of the Arts and Crafts movement.

Established first in England and later exported to the United States, its most visible representative in the United States was Hull House in Chicago (\textbf{fig. 59}). Scholars Monika Obinski and Brandon K. Rudd state: “Chicagoans sympathized with the British
movement from the start. England’s call for social reform through education for the poor and immigrants as well as moral and spiritual uplift through art debuted in Chicago at Hull House, founded in 1889 by Jane Addams (1860-1935) (fig. 60) and Ellen Gates Starr (1859-1940) (fig. 61) and modeled on London’s Toynbee Hall. The first university settlement house, Toynbee Hall (fig. 62), was established in 1884 in East London and was closely associated with Arts and Crafts movement through Charles Robert (C.R.) Ashbee, founder of the Guild of Handicraft, an influential Arts and Crafts organization. Toynbee Hall’s goals of social reform in Britain addressed the alleviation of poverty in London’s poorest neighborhoods. Mary Ward and both Addams and Starr all visited Toynbee Hall and were inspired by the institution.

In *The Arts and Crafts Movement*, scholars Elizabeth Cumming and Wendy Kaplan state that the settlement movement “reached its peak during the early and mid-1880s when, for example, Toynbee Hall was founded by Canon Barnett and his wife Henrietta among the working class of London’s East End, and the Edinburgh Social Union and branches of the Kyrle Society in Birmingham, Leicester and Glasgow were set up. All were concerned with the welfare of the worker and in particular with redirecting the leisure hours that reformers feared would otherwise be spent in drinking or gambling.”

Like Toynbee Hall and the Passmore-Edward Settlement in London, Hull House provided a wide range of services and programs in one of Chicago’s poorest areas, but to a largely immigrant population. Educational and cultural offerings combined with social activities such as concerts and clubs, were among the varied services at Hull House. The organization also provided health care and served as an advocate on legal issues, social
reforms, and government policy, such as labor protections and child welfare and education. Hull House also helped immigrants assimilate while retaining some of their cultural traditions, especially in the crafts. Addams was influenced by the works of Arts and Crafts luminaries, John Ruskin and William Morris, but like other women in the settlement movement, she understood that intractable social ills would not be solved by aesthetics alone. Historian Eileen Boris noted that both Jane Addams and educator and philosopher John Dewey promoted arts and crafts ideologies “without eliminating either machine production or division of labor.” Both recognized that labor concerns were a critical element in both the creation and the amelioration of societal issues.

**Tuskegee Institute, African-Americans, and Settlement Work**

In both *Up from Slavery* and *Working with the Hands*, Booker T. Washington mentioned the settlement work of the Tuskegee Institute. The settlement community consisted of seventy-five families of sharecroppers miles from any school. The settlement provided a day school for children and a night school for adults. In addition to teaching reading and writing, classes in cooking, sewing, gardening, housekeeping, and instruction on improved farming methods were taught at the night school. There was also a program tailored to the needs and education of mothers, called the Mothers’ Union.

A report published in *The Tuskegee Student* (fig. 63) in connection with the Institute’s twenty-fifth anniversary included information about the settlement: “A Plantation Settlement was established in the Spring of 1898, on what is known as the Russel[l] Plantation eight miles from Tuskegee. This was an original attempt, made by Mrs. Booker T. Washington, to adapt the methods of the ‘University Settlement’ to the
need of the people who in the primitive conditions that still obtain on the large plantations in the ‘Black Belt.’”

The settlement work at Tuskegee is a direct connection to the Arts and Crafts movement. Wendy Kaplan recounts that in a 1904 report for the U.S. Bureau of Labor, economist Max West used a “broad definition of Arts and Crafts, its components included not only the organizations that went by the name ‘Society of Arts and Crafts’ . . . but also utopian communities such as Rose Valley and Byrdcliffe as well as social-work activities at Hull House in Chicago and on Indian reservations.” Hampton educated American Indians and Tuskegee staff, students, and alumni performed settlement work.

The settlement activities of Tuskegee Institute and other African-American institutions and individuals served similar purposes and provided comparable programs and services to mainstream settlements that served immigrant communities. The Tuskegee Woman’s Club, which managed the settlement and did other “extension work” as well, was established in 1895 by Margaret Murray Washington. The members visited prisoners in the Tuskegee town jail leading religious services and bringing donations of food and clothing, and Christmas gifts. Mothers’ Meetings spread to eleven other communities attracting approximately six hundred participants. The members also took part in temperance and women’s suffrage activities, and “saw themselves as following in the tradition of the settlement movement.” In addition these activities served as inspiration and models for the type of service that the Institute aimed for its students to continue after graduation. Tuskegee’s other more widespread settlement activity was its
collaboration with the Slater Fund in the establishment of schools in the rural South and subsequent schools that were inspired by this collaboration.

The settlement activities of Tuskegee Institute and other African-American institutions and individuals served similar purposes and provided programs and services comparable to mainstream settlements that served immigrant communities. Scholar Elizabeth Lasch-Quinn asserts that although African Americans provided many of the same services as settlement houses and participated in many of the same activities, they have largely been unrecognized and not accepted as part of the settlement movement. Lasch-Quinn calls for “an expanded definition of settlement work that embraces those efforts among blacks incorporating the settlement movement’s dual commitment to provide a vast array of social service, educational, and recreational programs, and to usher in sweeping social change.”

Lasch-Quinn contends that a range of issues led to this exclusion. These issues include the prejudices of the era as well as the association of African-American settlement work with religion and its focus on rural areas in the South where the vast majority of African Americans still lived at the turn of the twentieth century. These factors resulted in “a secular, urban, and northern bias that systematically excluded blacks from the movement.” She adds that “many expressions of settlement activity in black communities went unnoticed by both the movement and its chroniclers. Many white leaders drew distinctions between blacks and white immigrants.”

In addition, Black settlement work was seen as religious work by many in the settlement movement, which “made a rigid distinction between religious work and settlement work.” Lasch-Quinn further argues that because “scholars have accepted uncritically the self-image developed by the settlement movement, they have not linked similar movements.”
statement can also be applied to Arts and Crafts movement scholarship. There is scant scholarship linking African Americans to Arts and Crafts ideals and activities, or to the settlement movement.

From micro-level—a lecture at a London settlement house—to macro-level—international expositions and industrial education schools in the United States and abroad—these varied connections demonstrate the interest, compatibility, and shared purposes of African-American industrial education with Arts and Crafts ideals. The ideals of “moral uplift,” social change, and service to others and the connection of these ideals to work and labor connect African-American industrial education and the Arts and Crafts movement. In contemporary scholarship, this essential social component often takes a backseat to the connoisseurship of Arts and Crafts objects. Fortunately, these objects in many cases also represent the ideals of the movement. These ideals, such as simplicity and usefulness, which are reflected in Arts and Crafts objects, are also present in the extant objects and buildings produced and built by African-American industrial education students at Tuskegee. Chapter 4: “‘Working with the Hands’: Objects and the Built Environment at Tuskegee Institute” examines objects and the built environment of the historic Tuskegee Institute.
Tuskegee University enjoys a special status. It is the only historically black college or university to contain an historic district and have the designation of a national park: “Out of more than 4,000 colleges in the United States, only 105 are ‘historically black colleges,’ and only Tuskegee* has an NPS [National Park Service] unit.”\textsuperscript{292} The Oaks, Booker T. Washington’s former home, and the George Washington Carver Museum on the University’s grounds, are owned and operated by the United States National Parks Service, a division of the United States Department of the Interior, and are part of the Historic Campus District comprised of twenty-six buildings and sites.\textsuperscript{293}

Only a few of the many objects made by students at the Tuskegee Institute survive. These few documented pieces possess the simplicity in common with many Arts and Crafts objects. Two objects attributed to student production are a table and a pew displayed in the George Washington Carver Museum on the campus of what is now Tuskegee University. The table was used at the Institute and the pew is from the school’s original chapel, which was completed in 1898, was designed by African-American architect Robert Robinson (R.R.) Taylor and built by students. The desk is made of pine (\textbf{figs. 64-66}). The rectangular top is comprised of two pieces of wood and has rounded corners. The wood is stained red. The simple construction and straightforward styling befit its probable use in a classroom. Ring turnings accent the round, tapered legs. The desk measures 88.75 centimeters high, 58.5 centimeters wide, and 78.5 centimeters in depth [approximately 34.9 by 23 by 30.9 inches].\textsuperscript{294}
The simple and elegant pew has curved arms and ends (figs. 67-69). The pew is also made from pine. The National Parks Service catalog record also states that the piece “appears to be hand made,” and “[t]he seat and backrest are made from solid pieces.” The pew features “two legs with 3-inch expanded feet support.” The pew is 99 centimeters high, 61 cm. wide and 188 cm long [approximately 39 by 24 by 74 inches]. While no date of manufacture is noted in the record, in 1900 Max Bennett Thrasher, wrote in his book, *Tuskegee: Its Story and Its Work* (1900), “The pews were built after a model designed by one of the students, and another student designed the cornices.” Thrasher was the ghostwriter of Booker T. Washington’s *Up from Slavery* and Washington later hired him as a publicist for the Institute.

Other objects made by students are exhibited at The Oaks, the former home of Booker T. Washington (fig. 70), located directly across the street from the Tuskegee University campus. A chair (TUIN 891) and a footstool (TUIN 890) in Washington’s den or home office (fig. 71) are described as Mission style. The chair (TUIN 891) and the footstool (TUIN 890) are angular in shape (fig. 72). Both were made in the Furniture and Cabinetry Shop circa 1900. The chair is covered in leather and has four horizontal back slats and flat arm rests with through tenon joints and three vertical slats on each side. (figs. 73 and 74). The footstool has angled, square legs with vertical cross stretchers and is covered in imitation leather (fig. 75). In both pieces brass tacks are used to attach the leather to their respective frames.

The Mission style sofa (TUIN 44) in the den has no attribution, but it is similar in style to the above chair (TUIN 891) and is original to The Oaks (figs. 76 and 77). As it is also unmarked, there is a strong possibility that it was also made by students. The settee
has six cushions, three resting on the back rest and three on the seat, covered in leather. The sofa, like the other pieces, is made of pine. Although the catalog record states that “[t]he sofa is constructed using dovetail joints,” the joints appear to be mortise and tenon, a joint used in much Arts and Crafts furniture for its strength as well as its aesthetics. The piece measures 80.5 centimeters high, 200 centimeters in length, and 80 centimeters deep [approximately 31.7 by 78.7 by 31.5 inches].

Period pieces and reproductions acquired for The Oaks are described in the catalog records as Mission style, and include a plant stand (TUIN 871) and settee (TUIN 946) (figs. 78 and 79). These Mission style pieces resemble styles manufactured by Gustav Stickley during the same period (figs. 80-82).

The primary interpretative period for The Oaks are the years “1911-1915 or, at least, during the residency of Booker T. Washington,” from 1899-1915. The historic period of the house encompasses “the occupancy of Dr. and Mrs. Booker T. [Margaret Murray] Washington, 1899-1925.” Mrs. Washington made only minor changes to the home after the death of her husband in 1915. Unfortunately, after Mrs. Washington’s death in 1925, the majority of the furnishings were sold at public auction and have not been able to be located. Therefore many of the items now at The Oaks are period pieces and reproductions. Only the items in Washington’s den or home office are original to the home.

Other Arts and Crafts-like furniture appear in period photographs of the Carnegie Library. Tables, chairs, and a settee are pictured (figs. 83 and 84). In the book, *Tuskegee and Its People* (1905), Warren Logan, the Institute’s treasurer, stated that both “[t]he building and the furniture are products of student labor.”
There is still much to research to be done to determine if the majority of objects made by African-American industrial education students approximated those of the Arts and Crafts Movement. But the objects produced by leading members of the movement varied stylistically, ranging widely enough to encompass “the simplicity or splendor” that characterize Arts and Crafts objects. In addition to stylistic differences, there were varying opinions on the use of technology in making objects. When Booker T. Washington stated, “My plan was not to teach them to work in the old way, but to show them how to make the forces of nature—air, water, steam, electricity, horsepower—assist them in their labor,” he was not completely at odds with Arts and Craft ideals.

Washington’s view parallels some second-generation Arts and Crafts leaders in the United States, such as Frank Lloyd Wright and Gustav Stickley and in Europe, who were in favor of using current technologies and industrial methods to decrease the drudgery of labor.

While the students at Tuskegee made the bulk of the furniture and objects that they used at the Institute, their greatest and most lasting contribution was the construction of campus buildings during the early years of the Institute.

**The Built Environment of Tuskegee Institute**

By 1901, there were forty buildings, and all but four were built primarily by students. One of these buildings was the aforementioned home of Booker T. Washington, The Oaks, which was also designed by R.R. Taylor, and completed in 1900. The Oaks was described as “an on-the-job training site for students,” during Washington’s residence. Surprisingly, in his many writings, Washington’s references to
The Oaks, the home where he spent the majority of his high-profile years, and which was the social hub of the Institute, are almost non-existent. “The home also served as the reception center of the Institute for the numerous and influential visitors and patrons of the school.”309 His sensitivity about the house is reflected in this silence. The “Historic Structure Report” by the National Parks Service states that “Washington feared that the building of The Oaks would be interpreted by some as an ostentatious display of wealth and true to his sensibilities in such matters, his books and articles are mute on the subject of his home.”310

In 1908, *The Century Magazine*, a popular illustrated monthly magazine based in New York City, published an article Washington wrote titled “Negro Homes.” In this article, Washington described with pride the homes of several successful African Americans, but the pre-eminent black leader made only an oblique reference to his own noteworthy residence: “From my home in Tuskegee I can drive in some directions for a distance of five or six miles and not see a single one-roomed cabin.”311 Washington also movingly described his early life in such a humble dwelling: “There was only one room, which served as the kitchen, parlor, and bedroom for a family of five, which consisted of my mother, my elder brother, my sister, myself, and the cat. . . . My own bed was a heap of rags on the floor in the corner of the room next to the fireplace. It was not until after the emancipation that I enjoyed for the first time the luxury of sleeping in a bed.”312 Washington believed the progress of African Americans in freedom was reflected in the improvement in their homes: “Probably there is no single object that so accurately represents and typifies the mental and moral condition of the larger portion of the members of my race fifty years ago as this same little slave cabin. For the same reason it
may be said that the best evidence of the progress which the race has made since emancipation is the character and quality of the homes which they are building for themselves to-day.”\textsuperscript{313} Washington describes the qualities of the homes—neat, clean, attractive, modern—rather than their styles. The illustrations show that many were in the Queen Anne Style, like his own home, The Oaks. Washington emphasized the role of the home in promoting family stability and “household virtues” and contrasted the featured homes with the one-room, “dingy hovels” of his childhood.\textsuperscript{314} Ironically, Washington highlighted the homes of many individuals who were what W.E.B Du Bois titled “the Talented Tenth,” educated African-American professionals—doctors, lawyers, educators, and successful businessmen.

Unfortunately, Washington did not share any details about his own tangible symbol of progress in his journey from a one-room shack to The Oaks. Even the illustration of the façade of a prosperous African-American home in the town of Tuskegee, is not The Oaks (fig. 84). Images of his home could have served as inspiration to others, in the same manner that “[t]he construction of the house served as a solid example of the educational philosophy of Dr. Washington, having had most of its materials locally manufactured and installed by students as part of their vocational training.”\textsuperscript{315}

Design decisions about The Oaks are also unknown. The Oaks’s “Historic Structure Report” states:

Whose choice the style of the Washington family residence represents is as much a mystery as other undocumented subjects herein considered. Certainly, Washington, as a public figure who led by example, had to be concerned that good judgment decide the issue. Assuming that Taylor showed him a range of possible choices, careful consideration would have been given each one to get the
right effect. . . . Furthermore, he was ever conscious that his entire generation of former slaves had known only the one room cabin in their early years.\textsuperscript{316}

Tuskegee University’s \textit{Campus Heritage Plan} offers a theory on the choice of the Queen Anne style for The Oaks: “The brick Queen Anne house is stylistically different from the rest of the campus, possibly intended to appeal to the Northern philanthropists who visited the campus and stayed with the Washingtons.”\textsuperscript{317}

The few references to The Oaks in Washington’s papers are from letters written to Washington, the writers having both positive and negative reactions to the house. One letter was from a white woman, Isabel Hayes Chapin Barrows, who was the wife of Samuel J. Barrows, a former U.S. Representative from Massachusetts, whom Washington recommended to President McKinley for the position of librarian of Congress in 1899. During a visit to Tuskegee during Washington’s absence, she saw the house under construction. In a letter dated February 4, 1899, Mrs. Barrows stated that she “was delighted to see your house going up and to know that you are to have such a substantial abode.”\textsuperscript{318} William P. Bancroft, a Quaker businessman and “civic leader” from Wilmington, Delaware, also saw the house under construction and wrote to Washington on March 27, 1899 to express his concern about its size:

When at Tuskegee lately I noticed that a \textit{very large house} was being built. In walking around the place by myself I went into it. I was told that it belonged to thee personally. If it is for thy use, and it thy private means are not very different from what I suppose them to be, this seems hard to reconcile with thy position and the needs of the school. This matter has stood in the way of my speaking of the institution as freely as I would have liked to have done. I feel very confident there is some explanation which would relieve me of my difficulties; and I have thought it best to write in this way freely to thee and state them.\textsuperscript{319}
Washington sent a copy of Bancroft’s letter with his correspondence to William Henry Baldwin, Jr., a champion and mentor of Washington, who also responded to Bancroft. Baldwin wrote to Washington on January 28, 1900 and mentioned that he wanted to enlist “some good friends somewhere to help out on the house matter. I think it will be well for you to say (and have others also) that the Trustees insisted on having a suitable house for the many Northern friends who visit Tuskegee! Nothing is too good for you—but it might seem too good for the cause, and those 2 x 4 Trustees who criticize should be encouraged!”

Louis R. Harlan, editor of The Booker T. Washington Papers, states that The Oaks “was not overly pretentious but BTW and the Tuskegee trustees had to move gingerly in the matter to avoid having the house become a source of controversy.” While “substantial,” The Oaks is not ostentatious. It is large, with fourteen rooms, including five bedrooms, some with closets, a rarity for homes of the period. The house also has three bathrooms. In his book, Pre-War Days at Tuskegee, Dr. L. Albert Scipio, a former professor at Tuskegee, stated that The Oaks was made “of native hand-made bricks from the Institute’s brickyard.”

The use of bricks was a great achievement for the students and faculty of Tuskegee. Washington described the challenges that surrounded the manufacture of bricks on campus. After three failed kilns, resulting in much disappointment in students and faculty alike, and without the funds to build another, Washington pawned a watch he owned in order to get the money to build a forth kiln, which was ultimately successful. In 1885, the students were producing approximately 10,000 bricks a day. A National Park Service report states: “After much trial and error, Tuskegee had become one of the first brick manufacturers in the region and by 1899, the students were making a million
bricks a year. Instruction included hand and machine processing. Practically all that went into The Oaks would have been the latter.” Brickmaking became one of the Institute’s most important and useful industries, a boon to the school and the surrounding community. The cost of the bricks was reduced to both the school and local residents, and students learned a valuable and marketable skill.

The campus of Tuskegee Institute differed significantly from Hampton Institute. Although many of Hampton’s buildings were also constructed by students, most were designed by white architects from the North. Renowned architect Richard Morris Hunt designed at least two buildings and a favorite firm was the New York City-based Ludlow and Peabody. Washington hired African-American architect Robert Robinson (R.R) Taylor (1868-1942) (fig. 85), who would design twenty-six buildings for the Institute, including Washington’s home, The Oaks.

R.R. Taylor was the first African-American to obtain an architecture degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT): “Taylor was the first Negro admitted to the MIT School of Architecture and the only Negro among the nineteen first-year students in the architecture atelier of the first school of architecture in the United States that had adopted the Parisian-inspired techniques de Beaux Arts.” Taylor joined the Tuskegee faculty in 1893, but left the school in 1900. He returned to the Institute in 1904 as the director of the influential Mechanical Industries Department, overseeing at that time “778 students dispersed among twenty-five trades.” Taylor would become vice-principal of Tuskegee Institute in 1925. Even his death reflected his life’s work at the Institute: “In a manner befitting an architect who had fashioned a productive career and led an upstanding life, on December 20, 1942, Taylor died from a heart attack while
visiting Tuskegee Institute and praying in a pew in Butler Chapel, his favorite building.”

The Romanesque Revival Tuskegee Chapel (fig. 86) was the second building Taylor designed for the Institute (the first was Science Hall, later renamed Thrasher Hall (fig. 87) in 1893) and was by all accounts his most impressive. In the shape of a Greek cross, it was 109 x 141 feet at its widest point and 48 feet, 6 inches at from the floor to the highest point of the ceiling, and seated more than 2,400 people. Max Bennett Thrasher, Thrasher Hall’s namesake, described how the creation and construction of the chapel exemplified the ideals and purposes of the Institute:

The building of this chapel illustrates, as well as any one instance can, the methods of the industrial training at Tuskegee. The bricks, one million two hundred thousand in number were made by students in the school brick yard and laid by the men in the brick-laying classes. The lumber was cut on the school’s land and sawed in the saw mill on the grounds. The various wood-working classes did the work which came in their departments. . . . The tin and slate roofing was put on by students, and the steam heating and electric lighting apparatus was installed by them, . . .

The chapel was the first building that the new electrical department worked on, as well as the first building in Macon County, Alabama, to have electric lighting. A fire destroyed Butler Chapel, the building Taylor “considered his masterpiece,” in 1957.

As the campus planner and architect for the Institute, Taylor shaped the built environment of Tuskegee: “Robert Taylor’s dual careers as an educator and architect and the expansion of Tuskegee Institute’s physical infrastructure are inextricably interwoven.” Many of his buildings, predominantly built by students, still stand today.

Taylor’s Southern heritage combined with his education in the North at MIT influenced the neoclassical style of the majority of the early buildings, which feature
porticos and columns reminiscent of antebellum architecture.\textsuperscript{339} In \textit{Robert R. Taylor and Tuskegee}, architectural historian Ellen Weiss asks the question “But what does it mean, then, if these forms appear on “Negro buildings?’”\textsuperscript{340} Weiss contends that “Tuskegee’s architecture and campus are not racially coded, but they grew out of racial conditions.”\textsuperscript{341} She also discusses other theories about Tuskegee’s classically-inspired buildings, which abound in light of Washington’s and Taylor’s “[s]ilence about intentions.”

Documentation on the rationales behind their architectural choices has yet to be discovered.\textsuperscript{342}

Architectural scholar Kenneth Severens offers an alternative interpretation of the Tuskegee built environment stating that “the school in many ways, nevertheless, perpetuated the history of the agrarian South.” Severens added, “His campus became hallowed ground because of its mission, and Tuskegee is as “southern” as the more traditional colleges—a plantation, in fact, to the extent that it became a self-sufficient agricultural community.”\textsuperscript{343} Perhaps in the most general sense of the word, Tuskegee appeared to be plantation. But given the connotation of the Southern plantation, Tuskegee re-appropriated a place and symbol of bondage and created an environment and symbol of possibility and progress for its students and a majority of African-Americans beyond its walls.

R. R. Taylor influenced and helped develop the second generation of African-American architects: “Taylor made dramatic changes to the curriculum, adding history and design to what was a vocational drafting and industrial arts program.”\textsuperscript{344} Architectural scholar, Dr. Wesley Howard Henderson states: “The impact of Tuskegee’s architecture program on ‘Black Belt’ of the South and on the careers of Black architects
was immense. It was a major patron of Black architects, second only to the Black church. As an awe-inspiring college campus, Tuskegee made an indelible impression on students and visitors alike, which translated into a deeper appreciation of the built environment. A student during the period spoke of the inspirational quality of the campus: “Tuskegee was as surprise to me,’ Lewis A. Smith wrote of his arrival as a student in the mid-1890s; ‘it surpassed my fondest hope. The majestic buildings, the monument to the fidelity and building skill of past classes, the well-designed landscape architecture, made me feel that I had at last found the place where I could be prepared for real life.”

Scholar and historian Dr. Angel David Nieves discusses the importance of the built environment as a foundation of social reform for black Americans in the post-Reconstruction South and cites Tuskegee as an important model. Nieves states: “The challenges of their second enslavement at the hands of their former masters made for the development of educational institutions that, many have argued, were ill-equipped for social reform. I would maintain that these former slaves turned educators effectively brought national attention to their causes and succeeded in providing the Black community with an institutional base for massive reform.” Nieves contends that “[f]or African Americans, the built environment provided them with the opportunity to physically ‘celebrate or perpetuate the memory of particular events, ideals, individuals, or groups of persons.” Tuskegee’s campus celebrated individuals essential to the institution’s success such as benefactors like the billionaire industrialist Andrew Carnegie, and Hampton founder and Booker T. Washington’s mentor, Samuel Chapman Armstrong; important institutional figures, such as renowned scientist George
Washington Carver and Max Bennett Thrasher; and national heroes, such as Frederick Douglass. But more importantly, this landscape celebrated the ideals of dignity of labor and self-sufficiency, which the all-black student and faculty conceived, designed, and built. The brick buildings would also come to represent the “permanency” that Washington envisioned as many of these building remain in use today.\textsuperscript{349}

Nieves also states that “[t]he campus quadrangle for African American architects and reformers provided a physical, social, and metaphorical space for exploring issues of self-governance, identity, and citizenship.”\textsuperscript{350} The buildings comprising Tuskegee’s quadrangle have a dignified and stately air. Huntington Hall (1899), Douglass Hall (1904), White Hall (1910), Tompkins Hall (1910) surround the quad. Carnegie Hall (1901), formerly the Carnegie Library, and the Old Administration Building (1902), known as the Office Building are at the southern boundary of the quad, separated by University Avenue, one of the main campus roads (figs. 92-94). Rockefeller Hall (1903) and Thrasher Hall (1893), the first building Taylor designed, lay east of the quad. Of the twenty-six extant buildings in the historic district, R.R. Taylor designed thirteen of them.\textsuperscript{351} Five additional buildings designed by Taylor between 1921 and 1932 still stand on the Tuskegee campus, but are not a part of the historic district.\textsuperscript{352}

Nieves also “maintain[s] that architectural education became an expression of utopianism for African Americans and allowed its practitioners and clients alike to transform structures of oppression long in place since the earliest days of enslavement.”\textsuperscript{353} This is literally and figuratively true for Tuskegee, a former plantation and all it represented, transformed into an influential center of learning and progress, conceived, designed, and built by the African-American faculty and student body. For
Nieves, Tuskegee’s educational landscape represents “Washington’s race uplift project in the built domain,” with the building themselves serving as artifacts.  

Incidentally, neither Nieves nor Severens included Hampton Institute in their respective discussions of African-American landscapes or Southern landscapes. As a visitor to both institutions, this omission seems correct. There is a marked difference in between the sense of place and history at of Taylor’s buildings at Tuskegee and the eclecticism of Hampton’s early buildings. Three of these early buildings are the Gothic Revival Virginia-Cleveland Hall (1874) and the Italianate Academy Building (1881), both designed by renowned architect Richard Morris Hunt (figs. 88 and 89), and the Romanesque Revival Memorial Church (1886) designed by architect J. Cleveland Cady (figs. 90 and 91).  

The institutions’ comparative assets may also have played a factor, but Tuskegee’s campus, planned virtually by a single architect for almost four decades, possesses a coherence missing at Hampton. These historic buildings at Hampton look like structures transplanted from the North and compete with the campus’s later buildings. At Tuskegee even the most imposing buildings, the domed Tompkins Hall and White Hall with its clock tower, relate to the smaller surrounding buildings. The use of brick, which is also used in modern buildings, is an important unifying factor. What Tuskegee’s campus may have lacked in high-profile architecture, it compensated for in unity and harmony.  

In addition to the buildings, landscaping was also an important aspect of Tuskegee’s built environment and David A. Williston, one of the first African American landscape architects, played a major part in shaping it. Williston, who graduated from Cornell University under the nation’s then most eminent horticulturist, Liberty Bailey, in 1898, in landscape gardening, first came to
Tuskegee in 1902. He returned in 1910 to spend nineteen years of his career as superintendent of buildings and grounds, in charge of maintenance. He controlled the landscape developments of the campus directly until 1929 when he moved to Washington, D.C. to enter full-time private practice of landscape architecture. Williston continued landscape planning for Tuskegee Institute on a consultant basis until 1948 . . . 356

Williston’s landscape plan “incorporated elements of the English Landscape tradition, which contrasts expanses of lawn with combinations or different textures of trees and scrubs to create picturesque patterns.” 357 Limited funding for landscaping as well as a part-time staff composed of students also influenced his designs for the landscape. As a result, Williston used many native trees, plants, and shrubs, many from Tuskegee’s own acreage. 358 While Washington did discuss a proposal to plan Tuskegee’s grounds with Frederick Law Olmsted in 1894, there is no evidence that Olmsted did so. 359 With the important exception of funding and patronage, the built environment at Tuskegee appears to have been almost entirely executed by African Americans.
CONCLUSION

In his book, *Tuskegee: Its Story and Its Work*, Max Bennett Thrasher quoted Washington: “‘From the first we have carried out the plan at Tuskegee of asking for nothing which we could do for ourselves. Nothing has been bought that students could produce. The boys have done the painting, made the bricks, the chairs, the tables and desks, have built a stable and are now building a carpenter shop. The girls do the entire housekeeping, including the washing, ironing, and mending of the boys’ clothes.’”360 Historian John W. Jenkins reiterates Washington’s goal: “Every item that could be conceivably produced at the school, was. In the early years the tables, chairs, and even the structures could not be called high quality, but with available funds, which Washington stretched to the penny, the work could be described as incredible.”361 What Tuskegee accomplished, produced, and left behind as its legacy, was “incredible,” especially in the face of the Institution’s challenges, both internal and external, through the work of their own hands.

The German term, *gesamtkunstwerk*, translated as a total or a unified work of art, is often used to describe Arts and Crafts interiors. Although this term does not technically apply to Tuskegee Institute, with Washington at the helm and R.R. Taylor as its primary architect, the faculty and students created a total environment for themselves. Nearly every aspect of their lives, from the food they ate, the clothes they wore, the furniture they used, to the buildings they learned, lived, and worked in, was the work of their own hands. This world promoted and embodied Booker T. Washington’s ideals of the dignity of labor and self-sufficiency.
Tuskegee Institute was a world created, almost literally brick by brick and piece by piece, predominantly by African Americans in an era hostile, and in region of the country even more so, to their highest aspirations. This self-created world engendered pride and demonstrated the potential of a people roughly one generation removed from slavery. This world embodied social reform and transformed the ideas and expectations of blacks of themselves, and also of many whites, both in the United States and abroad. Not only did African-American industrial education help elevate the status of labor, but also increased the appreciation of blacks of what their own labor and efforts could accomplish for themselves. African-American industrial education paralleled and connected with Arts and Crafts ideals: in the dignity of labor, in settlement activities, the proselytizing of its leaders, General Armstrong and Booker T. Washington, in its international profile and influence, and in the objects that its students created and in the buildings they built.

In their own ways, both African-American industrial education and the Arts and Crafts movement looked to the past. There was great fear among proponents of industrial education that African-Americans would be “locked out” of the trades they had practiced during slavery as a result of increased racial segregation and discrimination in the post-Reconstruction South and as well as competition from European immigrants. The Arts and Crafts movement looked to a pre-industrial past where skilled labor was valued before mechanization alienated the craftsman and artisan with the division of labor. African-American industrial education and the Arts and Crafts movement also shared some of the same criticisms and critiques, that there approaches were not suited to or practical in a modern, industrialized world.
Booker T. Washington and his followers shared the Arts and Crafts Movement’s “agenda to restore dignity to labor,” an ideal at the movement’s very foundation. African-American industrial education adapted the Movement’s emphasis on labor from “the dehumanizing conditions of modern industrialization” to the understandably negative views of labor of a people newly freed and less than a generation or two removed from slavery. Morris himself understood the importance of gainful employment and meaningful work: “Employment which would foster their self-respect and win the praise and sympathy of their fellows, and dwellings which they could come to with pleasure, surroundings which would soothe and elevate them; reasonable labour, reasonable rest. There is only one thing that can give them this, and it is art.’ For Morris art was broadly defined to include all social improvement.” For Booker T. Washington labor was “art.” For it was through labor that Washington believed African Americans would achieve all the social benefits that William Morris described.

My thesis demonstrates that there were strong connections between African Americans through industrial education to the Arts and Crafts movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and that they were documented in some the movement’s most influential publications. These connections have been virtually ignored in contemporary scholarship which very often focuses on the objects produced by the practitioners of the movement. While these objects are important and influential, they are “by-products” of the movement, not its raison d’être. The Arts and Crafts movement was deeply rooted in social reform and it is on this higher plain that the movement and African-Americans intersected. My hope is that this thesis will contribute to scholarship on this largely unexplored aspect of the Arts and Crafts movement and help correct the
unstated assumption that African Americans had no connection to the Arts and Crafts movement.
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Figure 22. Elbert Hubbard, 1904. Source: Roycroft Campus Corporation Photo Archive.

Figure 25. “Howard Univ., Washington, D.C., ca. 1900 - sewing class.”
Source: Library of Congress, Print and Photographs Division,
African American Photographs Assembled for 1900 Paris Exposition.

Figure 26. Thomas J. Calloway, ca 1900. Source:
New York Public Library Digital Gallery


Figure 30. “African American man giving piano lesson to young African American woman,” 1899 or 1900. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.
Figure 31. “Hampton Institute, Va. – a graduate (dining) at home,” 1899 or 1900. Frances Benjamin Johnston. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Frances Benjamin Johnston Collection.

Figure 32. “Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., 1899 - male and female students in Geography class ‘studying the cathedral towns,’ . . .” 1899 or 1900. Frances Benjamin Johnston. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Frances Benjamin Johnston Collection.

Figure 34. Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., 1899 - Classroom scenes –Bible history,” 1899 or 1900. Frances Benjamin Johnston. *Source:* Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Frances Benjamin Johnston Collection.
Figure 35. “Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va., ca. 1898 - field trip to marsh – studying soil formation . . .” 1899 or 1900. Frances Benjamin Johnston. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Frances Benjamin Johnston Collection.

Figure 36. “African American woman, half-length portrait, facing slightly left,” 1899 or 1900. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.
Figure 37. “Two African American women, half-length portrait, facing each other,” 1899 or 1900. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.

Figure 38. “Four African American women seated on steps of building at Atlanta University, Georgia,” Thomas Askew, 1899 or 1900. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.
Figure 39. “African American woman, half-length portrait, facing front,” 1899 or 1900. *Source:* Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.

Figure 40. “African American family posed for portrait seated on lawn,” 1899 or 1900. *Source:* Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.
Figure 41. “African American man, half-length portrait, left profile,” 1899 or 1900. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.

Figure 42. “African American man, half-length portrait, facing front,” 1899 or 1900. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.

Figure 44. “A series of statistical charts ... descendants of former African slaves ...,” ca. 1900. *Source:* Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, Daniel Murray Collection.


Figure 49. The “Old Plantation” exhibit on the Midway, Pan-American Exhibition, 1901.  
*Source:* Buffalo History Works.

Figure 50. Jamestown Exposition, 1607-1907. Norfolk, Va. Exposition Design No. 3.  
Figure 51. “Exhibits Building testifying to the progress of the African American race -- Jamestown Exposition [1907].” Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division.

Figure 52. The Negro Development and Exposition Company. Source: Industrial History of the Negro Race in the United States by Giles B. Jackson and D. Webster Davis (Richmond, VA: Negro Education Association, 1911).
Figure 53. 1907 Jamestown Exposition, Hampton School Exhibit. Source: *Industrial History of the Negro Race in the United States* (Richmond, VA: Negro Education Association, 1911).

Figure 54. Wagon made by Hampton Students displayed at 1907 Jamestown Exposition. Source: *Industrial History of the Negro Race in the United States* (Richmond, VA: Negro Education Association, 1911).
Figure 55. China painting displayed at the 1907 Jamestown Exposition. 
Source: Industrial History of the Negro Race in the United States (Richmond, VA: Negro Education Association, 1911).

Figure 56. China painting displayed at the 1907 Jamestown Exposition. 
Source: Industrial History of the Negro Race in the United States (Richmond, VA: Negro Education Association, 1911).
Figure 57. Mrs. Humphrey [née Mary Augusta Arnold] Ward, undated photograph. 

Figure 59. Hull House, 1891-1894. *Source:* University of Illinois at Chicago, University Library, Department of Special Collections, Jane Addams Memorial Collection.

Figure 60. Jane Addams, 1914. *Source:* Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division.

Figure 63. *The Tuskegee Student*, Twenty-fifth Anniversary Issue, April 28, 1906. *Source*: Tuskegee University Archives Collections. Photograph by author.

Fig. 64. *Table*. Built by Tuskegee Institute students for use on campus, pine, H 88.75, W 58.5, L 78.5 cm. (TUIN 59). *Source*: National Park Service, Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama.
Fig. 65. Table made by Tuskegee Students. Source: Photograph by author.

Fig. 66. Detail of table made by Tuskegee Students. Source: Photograph by author.

Figure 67. Pew from original chapel at Tuskegee Institute. George Washington Carver Museum, National Park Service, Tuskegee, Alabama. Source: Photograph by author.

Fig. 70. The Oaks, former home of Booker T. Washington. National Park Service, Tuskegee Institute Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama. Source: Photograph by author.
Fig. 71. *The Oaks Den*, 1999. Photograph by Eric Long. 
*Source:* National Park Service, Tuskegee Institute Historic Site.

Figure 72. Chair and footstool made by Tuskegee students. The Oaks, National Park Service, Tuskegee Institute Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama. 
*Source:* Photograph by author.
Figures 73 and 74. Chair made by Tuskegee students. The Oaks, National Park Service, Tuskegee Institute Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama. Source: Photograph by author.

Figure 75. Footstool made by Tuskegee students. The Oaks, National Park Service, Tuskegee Institute Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama. Source: Photograph by author.
Fig. 76. Mission style sofa with leather-covered cushions at The Oaks. *Source:* Photograph by author.

Fig. 77. Detail of Mission style sofa. *Source:* Photograph by author.

Figure 78. Plant stand, pine (TUIN 871), purchased for The Oaks, National Park Service, Tuskegee Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama. *Source:* Photograph by author.
Fig. 79. Mission style settee at The Oaks, National Park Service, Tuskegee National Historic Site, Tuskegee, Alabama. Source: Photograph by author.

Figure 80. Stickley room at 1903 Arts and Crafts Exhibition in Rochester, New York, 1903. Source: Photograph from the Archive and Special Collections, Library, Rochester Institute of Technology in *International Arts and Crafts* (V&A Publications, 2008).
Fig 81. Settle, Gustav Stickley, The Craftsman Workshops, oak and replacement leather upholstery, ca. 1909. Source: Art Institute of Chicago, #1971-748

Figure 82. Gustav Stickley's classic "Eastwood" chair with "Seat #725," a footstool with cross-stretcher base, ca. 1901. Source: At Home with Gustav Stickley: Arts and Crafts From the Stephen Gray Collection (Wadsworth Athenaeum Museum of Art, 2008).
Figure 83. Interior of the Carnegie Library, Tuskegee Institute, ca. 1901. © Tuskegee University. Source: Tuskegee University Archives.

Figure 84. Interior of the Carnegie Library, Tuskegee Institute, ca. 1901. © Tuskegee University Source: Tuskegee University Archives.
Figure 84. Illustration from “Negro Homes” by Booker T. Washington. Source: *Outlook Magazine*, May 1908.

Figure 85. Robert Robinson Taylor as a student at MIT, ca. 1890. Source: MIT Museum.
Fig. 86. Butler Chapel (1897), Tuskegee Institute, designed by African-American architect Robert Robinson Taylor. *Source: Alabama Department of Archives and History (ADAH) Digital Archives.*

Fig. 87. Thrasher Hall (1893), formerly Science Hall, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, Alabama. *Source: Photograph by author.*
Figure 88. Academy Building (1881), designed by architect Richard Morris Hunt. Hampton University, Hampton, Virginia. *Source:* Photograph by author.

Figure 89. Virginia-Cleveland Hall (1874), designed by Richard Morris Hunt. Hampton University, Hampton, Virginia. *Source:* Photograph by author.

Fig. 92. White Hall (1910), Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, Alabama. *Source:* Photograph by author.
Fig. 93. Tompkins Hall (1910), Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, Alabama.  
Source: Photography by author.

Fig. 94. Old Administration Building (1902), Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, Alabama.  
Source: Photograph by author.