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INTRODUCTION

The 1920s controversy between Carter G. Woodson, founder and director of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH), and Thomas Jesse Jones, chief executive of the Phelps-Stokes Fund was indicative of the early twentieth century philanthropic struggle that often occurred between the giver and the recipient. The conflict, which pitted Woodson against Jones, one of his white benefactors, represented the vigorous and more aggressive black leadership that emerged during the post-World War I years. New and vibrant ideas for the direction of black America developed during this time and coalesced into what was termed the New Negro Movement. This broad-based and multi-faceted movement, which was political, cultural and intellectual, also included black revitalization efforts espoused in part by the Harlem Renaissance and the philosophies of Marcus Garvey’s back to Africa movement.¹

By 1921, Woodson had founded the ASNLH, authored several books including The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861 (1915), A Century of Negro Migration (1918), and the History of the Negro Church (1921), and had created the Journal of Negro History, a scholarly review published quarterly. Additionally, Woodson contributed numerous articles and single handedly managed and edited the Journal. Woodson recognized the tremendous expense of scientific research and publication and desired sustained funding to maintain the integrity of his scholarship.
Woodson was introduced to Jones largely through his efforts to obtain funding for the ASNLH. With hopes of appearing more palatable to the philanthropic community, Woodson appointed Jones to the Executive Council of the ASNLH in 1917. At that time, Jones was immensely popular among philanthropists and championed the cause of white moderates, who favored moderate black progress, such as elementary and normal school education, but opposed higher education, equal job opportunities, civil equality and political rights for blacks. The appointment of Jones and like-minded individuals to the executive council improved the image of the ASNLH with the philanthropic community and ultimately resulted in additional funds from foundations, including the Phelps-Stokes Fund. Consequently, Woodson was awarded two twenty-five thousand-dollar grants for his research efforts from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in 1921 and 1922, respectively.

Jones, the Welsh born and Columbia University-trained sociologist, began his professional career as a professor at Hampton Institute, where he authored the Hampton Social Studies (HSS), America’s first modern social studies curriculum. The colonialist styled curriculum was centered on white supremacy and accommodationism and was designed to socialize the oppressed races and to prepare them to perform the more menial tasks required in an industrialized society. When Booker T. Washington, the founder of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama and foremost advocate of industrial education for blacks died in 1915, Jones emerged as a national figure, leading and articulating the collective vision of industrial education for blacks shared by the interlocked philanthropic boards.

By 1921, Jones rose to international prominence in both Africa and America as a result of two controversial reports, *Negro Education: A Study of the Higher Schools for*
Colored People in the United States (1917) and Education in Africa (1921). These similar studies called for the consolidated efforts of philanthropic foundations to support manual and technical training for black schools in Anglophone Africa and in America. Both reports were widely read and highly praised by colonialists, northern industrialists, philanthropists and southern white moderates. Negro Education and Education in Africa solidified Jones’s position as an expert on Negro education in both colonial Africa and America.4

By the 1920s, Jones wielded significant influence over the direction of philanthropy. By this time, he and Woodson had angrily parted ways when Jones used his position and influence to prevent Max Yergan, an African American, from assuming an appointment in South Africa. The black community was outraged. Frustrated by Jones’s controversial policies, conservative tendencies and alleged dictatorial presence, race leader and black intellectual W. E. B. Du Bois labeled Jones the “evil genius of the Negro race.” Woodson criticized Jones’s obstructionist efforts in Africa, and denounced them as, “a manifestation of the spirit of Beelzebub,” and abruptly dropped Jones from the Executive Council of the ASNLH in 1921.5 Jones, angry and vengeful, attempted to use his influence to disrupt Woodson’s financial base. Jones charged that his dismissal reflected a shift in Woodson’s policies from scientific and objective scholarship to race propaganda, agitation, and radicalism. Jones conducted a systematic and covert campaign to discredit Woodson and to prevent his colleagues in philanthropy from further contributing to the ASNLH.6

Despite Woodson and Jones’s personal contentions, they were inextricably linked through philanthropy and debated over the race problem. To understand fully the
controversy between Carter G. Woodson and Thomas Jesse Jones, the first chapter of this study examines the historic role of philanthropy in the affairs of black organizations. Additionally, the chapter provides a historical background of Woodson and traces the first two years of the Journal of Negro History and its struggle to secure funding.

Chapter two considers the life and times of Thomas Jesse Jones and defines his relationship to philanthropy, Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH. Finally, chapter three analyzes Woodson and Jones’s controversial relationship during the 1920s, which ultimately resulted in the loss of philanthropic support to the ASNLH.


5 Sister Anthony Scally, “Documents: Phelps-Stokes Confidential Memorandum for the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund Regarding Dr. Carter G. Woodson’s attacks on Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones,” *JNH* 56 (Winter, Spring, Summer, Fall 1991), 58.

Beginning in the early 1860s and continuing for nearly three-quarters of a century, philanthropy largely shaped and determined the destiny of black institutions and organizations. Generally, the fate of black institutions and organizations relied upon the benevolence of three philanthropic groups: northern white missionary societies or missionary philanthropy, black religious organizations or black philanthropy, and industrial philanthropy, which included large corporate foundations and the largess of wealthy individuals.¹

White missionary societies, the first of the three philanthropic groups to be examined, consisted of various agencies including the American Missionary Association (AMA), the Freedmen’s Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the American Baptists Home Mission Society (ABHMS) and the Presbyterian Board of Missions for Freedmen. These missionary societies consisted of northern white liberals, most of whom descended upon the post-Civil War South, bringing their talents and their money, in an effort to improve education and training in that region. Missionary societies generally supported liberal arts education and higher education as a means to train the
In the 1880s, when many southern white moderates and conservatives advocated industrial education for all blacks, northern missionaries, in general, and the AMA in particular, defended African Americans’ right to a higher education. Reverend Roy, secretary of the AMA in 1891, argued that it was, “too late in the history of civilization to impose any repression upon any class of people.”

Black religious organizations comprised one important sector of philanthropy to African Americans. Similar to the northern missionaries, who advocated political and legal equality, black religious organizations pushed for racial and economic justice as well. Black Baptists and Methodists, the largest religious denominations within the black community, took the lead in philanthropic giving. Leading black religious philanthropic organizations such as the African Methodists Episcopal Church (AME), the Colored Methodists Episcopal Church (CME), and the African Methodists Episcopal Zion Church (AMEZ) worked diligently in the post-Civil War era to establish and finance black education and push for racial equality.

The AMEZ Church founded Livingstone College at Salisbury, North Carolina, and the AME Church financially sustained such institutions as Allen University of Columbia, South Carolina, Morris Brown College of Atlanta, Georgia, and Wilberforce College of Xenia, Ohio. These religious organizations, which opposed the Hampton-Tuskegee philosophy of manual and industrial training, collectively articulated the educational and social voice of the black community. However, these black religious organizations operated on such a small budget, and less than fifteen percent of the total number of black college student were enrolled in these institutions.
The final group of philanthropic agencies that largely determined the fate of African-American institutions and organizations will be referred to as industrial philanthropy, for those agency founders were, for the most part, wealthy industrialists and capitalists. Industrial philanthropy played a significant role in the affairs of Carter G. Woodson and the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH).

Industrial philanthropy differed from both missionary and black philanthropy in that the former promoted an educational curriculum more reflective of the new industrial South. This new political economy necessitated a black working class trained in industrial labor and subservience to white leadership. The industrialists labeled the programs of missionary philanthropy and black philanthropy futile and misguided for their support of higher education for African Americans. Wallace Buttrick, an official of the General Education Board, maintained that white missionary and black philanthropic agencies financed African-American schools with relevant missions. However, their missions could only be carried out by black school officials well trained in industrial and manual labor and tolerant of racial segregation and inequality, leading the way.\(^5\)

Industrial foundations, like black religious agencies and northern missionary groups, began in the post-Civil War Era and similar to both groups of philanthropic foundations, helped fill the void created by the demise of the Freedmen's Bureau in 1872. Beginning in February 1867, George Foster Peabody, an investment banker, donated two million dollars to establish a fund bearing his name for the public education and welfare of the war-torn region. The Peabody Educational Fund was initially concerned with the development of white public education and teacher training. However, black education also benefited. The fund contributed money to the Freedmen's Bureau to be used toward
black education. Scholarship allocations on a sustaining basis were later made to Hampton Institute, Fisk University, Atlanta University and several lesser-known schools. The Peabody Fund, the first American educational foundation, was dissolved in 1914 after having given more than $3.5 million toward southern education. The Fund inspired the establishment of similar organizations.\(^6\)

Not until the formation of the Slater Fund in 1882 were black institutions and organizations the direct beneficiaries of philanthropic appropriations. John Slater, of Connecticut, established the fund with one million dollars for the exclusive purpose of providing Christian education and training for black teachers seeking to work among their race in the South. The agency worked closely with the Peabody Fund, which left $350,000 to the Slater Fund upon the former's termination in 1914. The Slater Fund contributed nearly two million dollars to forty-eight colleges and institutions during its fifty years of existence.\(^7\) Incidentally, a Slater Fund Fellowship for study abroad enabled W. E. B. Du Bois to study in Europe at the University of Berlin. Similarly, the Daniel Hand Fund for Colored People, founded in 1888, worked closely with the AMA and donated one million dollars to that agency, designating the funds be used to educate the descendants of former slaves residing in the states south of the Mason Dixie Line. By 1900, philanthropic foundations helped to establish 260 institutions higher of learning.\(^8\)

The turn of the century represented a point of departure for industrial philanthropy and marked a new direction in foundation philanthropy. Around 1900, white missionary philanthropy and black religious philanthropy were virtually bankrupt. The vast majority of the public schools they supported were under financed and wholly inadequate for the education of the people. The AMA, for example, launched a movement to raise $100,000
for its five black colleges. After successfully raising $100,000 for Fisk, the remaining efforts were abandoned due to the bankruptcy of the missionary agencies and the impossibility of attaining additional funds. Furthermore, the AMA went from supporting forty secondary schools in the early twentieth century to supporting one by 1950.9

Beginning in 1902, northern industrialists and capitalists began taking annual trips to the South and collaborating with the impoverished region’s officials. The industrialists established large foundations that supplanted the weakened missionary agencies and heavily invested in education and race relations. Industrial capitalists established several philanthropic foundations such as the Rockefeller Trusts, the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Julius Rosenwald Fund. The industrial capitalists wanted to protect their money invested in Southern railroads, textile and steel mills, and they desired to train and temper a black work force to operate the machines and perform other tasks required in an industrialized economy.10

Of the early twentieth-century foundations that financed black education and racial cooperation, the Rockefeller Trusts, the Andrew Carnegie Corporation, the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Julius Rosenwald Fund factored most prominently in the affairs of Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH. The Rockefeller Trusts, which consisted of the General Education Board (GEB), the Rockefeller Foundation and Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM)), spent millions funding individual research, furthering private and public education, constructing buildings, purchasing equipment and underwriting endowments. Rockefeller monies also financed various agencies including the Southern Regional Council and the Council of Interracial Cooperation (CIC), the latter, established in 1919 to quell explosive post-war race relations. The CIC wielded
considerable influence over the distribution of funds of the interlocked philanthropic boards.11

The first of the Rockefeller Trusts, and the most robust of all contemporary philanthropic foundations was the GEB, established in 1902 with an initial gift of one million dollars from John D. Rockefeller. The GEB, which supplemented the income of other philanthropic organizations such as the Anna T. Jeanes, Slater, and Peabody Funds and the Southern Education Board, virtually monopolized African-American philanthropy through their influence and large donations. Prominent Southerners such as Dr. J. L. M. Curry, former Confederate Army general and a member of the Confederate Congress, and philanthropists such as George Foster Peabody ran the Foundation. William H. Baldwin, Jr., who was bitterly opposed to higher education for blacks, was elected the first president of the General Education Board.12

The GEB contributed millions of dollars to black education. Between 1902 and 1914 the GEB spent sixteen million dollars toward improving and promoting education without distinction of race, sex, or creed, however, only $700,000 went to black schools. Throughout the existence of the GEB, which was dissolved in 1960, blacks and black schools received fifty-six million dollars, equal to a fourth of what was awarded to white institutions. The GEB's assistance extended to all lines of educational endeavors, both private and public including the establishment or endowment of many elementary schools, industrial and technical schools, normal schools, high schools, colleges and universities, medical schools, libraries, and educational associations.13

The sister agency of the GEB was the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, created in 1918, also by John D. Rockefeller, in memory of his wife. The memorial was
initially established to aid social and child welfare organizations. However, officials of the LSRM were unable to refrain from addressing the race problem, and in 1924 they formally announced their intention to study racial issues. During its brief eleven-year existence, the young and philosophically liberal officers of the LSRM spent more than twenty-five million dollars on social science, child development and race relations research that supported and urged the fair treatment of African Americans within the confines of a southern segregated system. A LSRM grant provided Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH resources to employ researchers for various projects including historical studies on antebellum free blacks and blacks during Reconstruction.

Unlike the LSRM, the Julius Rosenwald Fund did not support research projects as a means to solving the race problem. Rosenwald, who organized the fund in 1917, felt that research failed to address racial issues. He supported a more direct approach, therefore, his fund was established as a charitable enterprise for the economic, medical, and cultural advancement of blacks in America. Rosenwald, born of German-Jewish descent in Illinois in 1862, sympathized with the plight of black Americans. His humanitarian spirit was partly encouraged by his reading of Booker T. Washington's autobiography *Up From Slavery* and *An American Citizen-the Life of William Henry Baldwin, Junior*. Washington's autobiography, published in 1900, traced his rise from the depths of American slavery to become the symbol of dignity and pride for his race. Additionally, *An American Citizen* supported the notion that the two races must occupy one country and master the art of living together with decency and forbearance. As a result of the readings, an inspired Rosenwald soon became a benefactor and trustee of
Rosenwald gave generously to African-American causes.\textsuperscript{16}

Rosenwald’s philanthropy supported black institutions and organizations including a $25,000 gift to Booker T. Washington, in 1912, to distribute among industrial schools that adhered to the Hampton-Tuskegee philosophy of industrial education. For many years Rosenwald money supported the work of Howard University scientist Ernest E. Just, who was awarded an $80,000 grant over five years in the 1920s. Rosenwald contributed $2,170,000 over the course of twelve years to help erect fourteen black YMCA buildings and he substantially supported medical education at Meharry Medical College of Nashville, Tennessee.\textsuperscript{17} In explaining his support for African Americans, Rosenwald noted in 1911, “whether it is because I belong to a people who have known centuries of persecution or whether it is because I naturally am inclined to sympathize with the oppressed, I have always felt keenly for the colored race.”\textsuperscript{18}

The growth of industrial philanthropy coincided with increased racism and white supremacy that swept the nation by the turn of the century. This racially tense period witnessed the systematic deprivation of the black franchise. Black intimidation, segregation in schools and public accommodations along with widespread violence and racial unrest, characterized what became known as “the nadir” for black Americans. Historian Eric Foner noted that in the late nineteenth century:

Blacks were persistently stereotyped as criminals, savages, or comic figures. They were superstitious, lazy, violent, immoral, the butt of humor, and the source of danger to civilized life. In the relentless surveying of racist iconography and literary images, in distortions of black history and indifference to lynching, race riots, and disfranchisement, popular culture in effect legitimated and naturalized the system of political and economic subordination.\textsuperscript{19}
With the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the most stringent segregation of the races in transportation. The doctrine of Anglo-Saxon superiority by which the United States justified and rationalized American imperialism in the Philippines, Hawaii, and Cuba differed in no essentials from the race theories by which the states justified white supremacy in the South.\(^{20}\)

Paradoxically, "the nadir" of American race relations coexisted with the Progressive Era, which represented social progress, equality and reform. While progressive reformers sought ways to improve American society in the first decade of the twentieth century, the social, political and economic status of African Americans steadily declined. Racism, perpetuated through propaganda, stereotyped African Americans as criminals. As a result, African Americans were exploited, disenfranchised, segregated, discriminated against, and lynched. Historian C. Vann Woodward argued that progressivism was for whites only and blacks were the blind spot in the progressive's record.\(^{21}\)

Through various forms of propaganda, white scientists, scholars, novelists and filmmakers utilized their respective mediums to perpetuate imperialistic ideology and white supremacy during the Progressive Era. An outpouring of racist publications, like D. W. Griffith's *The Birth of a Nation*, attempted to provide a scientific justification for slavery, racial segregation and exploitation. Like similar writings of the period, *The Birth of a Nation* argued that freedom fed the barbaric nature, criminality and immortality of blacks.

*The Birth of a Nation*, released in 1915, was the first feature length motion picture, based on the novel *The Clansman* (1905) and the book *The Leopard’s Spots*
(1903). *The Birth of a Nation* effectively utilized the new medium of motion picture, to idealize the role of the Ku Klux Klan during Reconstruction; consequently, it spurred a wave of white heroism and black protest within communities throughout the country. The motion picture recaptured the story of the Civil War and Reconstruction from the white southern point of view. One Southern historian claimed that Dixon probably did more to shape the lives of modern Americans than have some presidents.  

Racism and the Progressive Movement was the driving force behind the funding policy of industrial philanthropy that differed so significantly from its philanthropic contemporaries. The conflicting ideologies, strategies, opinions, and ideas on race, philanthropy and interracial cooperation espoused by missionary philanthropy and industrial philanthropy was indicative of the Carter G. Woodson and Thomas Jesse Jones controversy that paralleled the philanthropic conflict of the late nineteenth century. An analysis of industrial philanthropy and the race problem will provide a better understanding of the era characterized by racial violence and caste, which produced Carter G. Woodson and the *Journal of Negro History.*

Woodson was born December 19, 1875, on a small farm in New Canton, Virginia, just ten years after another famous Virginian, Robert E. Lee, surrendered at Appomattox and five years after Reconstruction was overthrown in that state. He was the youngest of nine children born to former slaves, James Henry and Ann Eliza Riddle. Woodson grew up poor in Buckingham County, the poorest of all the counties in Virginia. In later life he seldom missed an opportunity to share the details of his early struggles. He once explained, “it was necessary for me to retire early on Saturday night that my mother
might wash out the only clothing that I had that I might have something clean to wear the following day."^{24}

Woodson's poverty was reflected in the one-room county school he intermittently attended as a child. Planting, sowing and daily chores on the family farm kept him out of school at least eight months out of the year. However, largely through hard work and self-instruction, he was able to master the fundamentals of education. Since Virginia did not offer high school education for black children, Woodson moved to West Virginia, in 1872, with his older brothers to pursue a secondary education. Even after he arrived in West Virginia Woodson's high school education was briefly delayed by three years as economic circumstances forced him to obtain several menial jobs. He once drove the garbage wagon for his town, and for six years he toiled in the coalmines of Fayette County. Despite his humble beginnings, Woodson, at the age of twenty, finally enrolled in Frederick Douglass High School on a part-time basis. He quickly completed the course work in less than two years and was graduated in 1896. Four years later, Woodson returned to his alma mater as principal and remained employed there until 1903.\(^\text{25}\)

While serving as principal of Frederick Douglass High School, Woodson enrolled part-time at Berea College in Kentucky in the winter of 1896. Berea, a Christian-based institution, was founded in 1855 by abolitionist John Gregg Fee and the AMA as an experiment in interracial education where students of different races and religions studied together. However, in 1904, the year after Woodson graduated with an A.B. (Artium Bacclaureus), comparable to a two-year degree, the State of Kentucky outlawed interracial education within its borders and blacks were excluded from Berea. The AMA
and Berea College protested the segregation law and after a series of appeals, the Supreme Court upheld separate education in Kentucky.26

Between 1902 and 1912, Woodson’s continued desire for education took him to the University of Chicago, the University of Paris at Sorbonne and Harvard University. At these prestigious institutions, he received formal training in the scientific methods of historiography and developed lasting relationships with preeminent scholars who influenced, inspired, and later endorsed his works. He began taking courses at the University of Chicago as early as 1902, while still a student at Berea. In 1905, two years after graduating from Berea, Woodson enrolled part-time at the University of Chicago. He devoted his summers to study and was awarded the B.A. degree on March 17, 1908 and the M.A. degree the following August.27 With strong recommendations from his professors, Woodson was admitted to Harvard University in 1908, one of the country’s premier institutions for graduate work in American history. While at Harvard, he studied under renowned professors, including Albert Bushnell Hart, who served as his primary advisor and later worked with Woodson on the Executive Council of the ASNLH.

Woodson’s graduate study was interspersed with teaching and travel through which he received an education equaled by few of his contemporaries. With the end of the Spanish American War, in 1898, the Philippines was brought under American jurisdiction. This defining moment marked the first time the United States controlled territories outside of its borders. As a result, thousands of Americans, including Carter Woodson, seized the opportunity to serve educational and missionary causes on behalf of their country while enjoying the tropical paradise of the islands. The War Department hired Woodson in 1903 to teach courses in English, health, and agriculture to the
Filipinos. After only several months of service, he was quickly promoted to supervisor of schools and charged with training and evaluating Filipino teachers. However, failing health cut Woodson’s stay short. On February 5, 1907, after four productive years of service, Woodson resigned from his second tour of duty to return to the United States.

Woodson’s return to the United States was delayed by a year as he toured around the world, visiting parts of Africa, Asia and Europe. During his European travels, he spent a semester studying and researching at the University of Paris at Sorbonne, the prestigious institution founded in 1253, and considered among Europe’s most important universities. While at the Sorbonne, Woodson gathered primary source material for his graduate thesis, which centered on the French diplomatic policy toward Germany in the eighteenth century. The research covered the corrupt administration of Louis XV and the French efforts to partition Austria during the War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748. The faculty and staff of the University of Chicago accepted the thesis in 1907, and in August, the following year, at the age of 32, the degree of Master of Arts was conferred upon Woodson. Soon thereafter, Woodson left Chicago and settled in the nation’s capital where he began his life’s work. There he launched the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History and founded and edited the Journal of Negro History.

Upon Woodson’s initial arrival in D.C. in 1909, he secured employment with the Washington D.C. Board of Education and worked ten years in its public school system. Woodson taught American history, French, Spanish, and English at the M Street High School. The M Street High School was one of the nation’s most acclaimed and elite black high schools. It admitted the most financially secure and academically prepared students from Washington’s growing black bourgeoisie. Those associated with the
institution boasted of its most celebrated faculty and alumni such as Judge Robert H. Terrell, educator Anna Julia Cooper, scholar Rayford Logan, attorneys William Hastie and Charles Hamilton Houston and renowned clubwoman Nannie Helen Burroughs. This group of faculty and administrators held degrees from a variety of distinguished institutions of higher learning including Harvard University, Oberlin College, Dartmouth, Amherst, Western Reserve University, and University of Glasgow in Scotland.\textsuperscript{32}

While teaching at the M Street High School, Woodson found time to conduct research at the Library of Congress where he completed the requirement for his doctoral dissertation entitled the \textit{Disruption of Virginia}. Harvard subsequently awarded Woodson the Ph.D. in 1912, making him only the second African American, after W. E. B. DuBois, to receive this degree from Harvard. Carter G. Woodson’s accomplishments were astounding for anyone, particularly a black man from the South born in the racist post-Reconstruction era. These achievements compelled noted educator Benjamin E. Mays to say to Woodson in 1946, “only a man of rare insight and prophetic vision would have been able to predict that you would earn a M.A. at Chicago, Ph.D. at Harvard, become a historian of national renown, and achieved the facilities to speak fluently three languages.”\textsuperscript{33}

Frustrated by the politics and low pay of public education, Woodson accepted more lucrative positions on the college and university level. Between 1919 and 1921, he served as Dean of the Liberal Arts Department at Howard University and subsequently Dean of the College Department at West Virginia Collegiate Institute. Woodson faced immediate problems at Howard as tensions with the white administration developed. His differences with university president, Stanley Durkee, became public and ultimately led
to his termination. Moreover, Woodson’s controversy with Durkee served as a primer for the eventual conflict with Thomas Jesse Jones.34

Stanley Durkee, a Canadian born, Boston University trained preacher and educator, was president of Howard at a critical period in American history. The First World War had ended and the “New Negro” era was emerging. The boldness of the Garvey movement and the self-assertiveness of the Harlem Renaissance characterized this era of black revitalization. The era also stressed black pride and independence and many blacks, especially black intellectuals, sought to define their own collective consciousness.

The First World War was a catalyst for the Bolshevik Revolution that swept the Soviet Union and translated into the Red Scare in America. In January of 1920, Congressman Reed Smoot of Utah proclaimed on the senate floor that if Seventy-Six Questions on the Bolsheviks and Soviets, a book donated to Howard University, was not immediately removed from the library shelves, he would vote against any further appropriations for that institution.35 When Durkee complied with the senator’s wishes, Woodson denounced the president for buckling under financial and political pressure and proclaimed Durkee’s acquiescence a compromise of scholastic principles and an encroachment on academic freedom.

Additionally, Woodson found the tyrannical manner in which Durkee administered the institution and what Woodson considered to be Durkee’s crude and unusual handling of black professors to be problematic. Durkee was similar to Woodson’s future nemesis, Thomas Jesse Jones, in that Durkee believed that blacks were inherently inferior and needed white guidance and direction. He criticized blacks,
particularly those of the New Negro era, and considered them rabble-rousers and racial agitators. Under Durkee’s administration, several professors including Alain Locke, Kelley Miller, and Carter Woodson were fired; some were transferred and the president personally harassed others. A black scientist, Thomas W. Turner, “was once forcibly ejected from a conference by Durkee, who pounced on him and grabbed him around the shoulders, pushed him over chairs, and around the room like a mad man.”

Woodson was openly critical of President Durkee. He publicly lambasted the university president for violating academic freedom, for his inability to relate to blacks, and for his crude handling of black staff members. Woodson’s charges against Durkee reached the Board of Trustees and on June 3, 1920, the trustees notified Woodson that unless he was willing to apologize in writing to President Durkee, his employment would be terminated. Woodson refused to concede to the wishes of the white president and Board of Trustees and was consequently released. Although Durkee was later removed in 1926, for the reasons Woodson pointed out years earlier, other conclusions can be drawn from this incident. First, the conflict identifies Woodson as an active participant of the New Negro era. Although Woodson struggled to remain aloof and to protect his objectivity as a scholar, he was not oblivious to his immediate surroundings. In the wake of racism, it became increasingly difficult for Woodson to remain detached.

Secondly, the incident shows Woodson’s objection to white domination of black institutions and organizations. He condemned those organizations, which claimed to be interracial, but were dominated entirely by white philanthropy money which represented their interests. Woodson pushed for blacks to assume leadership and responsibility of their institutions and organizations. Furthermore, Woodson’s criticisms of Durkee and
his refusal to make amends, even at the expense of his own livelihood, underscored Woodson’s uncompromising spirit.

Following Durkee’s removal, Thomas Jesse Jones, who served on the Board of Trustee’s at Howard University, was active in the search for a new president. He challenged the selection of Mordeci W. Johnson, who became Howard’s first black president, as Durkee’s successor. Jones refused to accept that black institutions were ready to depart from white leadership and guidance. A similar situation occurred at Fisk University in Nashville in 1925. A student uprising, partially inspired by a fiery speech delivered by W. E. B. Du Bois, advocated a student protest and the overthrow of the white administration. Jones was also on the Board of Trustees at Fisk. He helped to bring in another white president, again arguing that blacks were not prepared to assume leadership of their own institutions. Woodson wrote of Jones in 1924:

He proceeds on the presumption that the Negro of today is the freedman of 1865. The Negro, according to his idea, must be safeguarded and directed by whites from without. You cannot leave a Negro by himself to carry out any plan, for you do not know what he will do. He may run amuck and advocate equality of justice, or demand for his race the privileges of democracy when he should restrict his advocacy to education and public health. Negro institutions, then, must be managed by white persons or Negroes who can be counted on to carry out the policy of the dictator.

While still employed at the M Street High School, Woodson achieved his greatest endeavor, the founding of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in 1915. In the years and months leading up to this monumental achievement, Woodson was obsessed with the idea of founding a black professional organization centered on scientific scholarship and the preservation of historical records. He felt that a systemized effort to collect and prepare black primary resource material for publication would prevent African Americans from becoming a negligible factor in the thought of the world.
Therefore, on September 9, 1915, in Chicago along with the counsel and assistance of
Alexander L. Jackson, George Cleveland Hall, William B. Hartgrove, and James E.
Stamps, Woodson organized the ASNLH. The purpose of the ASNLH as set forth by its
organizers was, “the collection of historical data on the Negro, the study of peoples of
African blood, the publishing of books in this field, and the promotion of harmony
between the races by acquainting the one with the other.”

When Woodson founded the ASNLH, it was with the idea of creating a scientific
journal. The *Journal of Negro History*, an official review of the ASNLH, was the
crowning achievement of the organization and the centerpiece of Carter G. Woodson’s
black history movement. The *JNH* was published quarterly beginning in January 1916,
with Woodson serving as Director of Research and Managing Editor. The *Journal*
closely resembled the *American Historical Review* (AHR) and other scholarly journals of
the period in style and format. Similar to the AHR, the *Journal* was an archive of
historical data chronicling the black experience in much the same manner the *AHR*
chronicled the white experience. African-American historian Rayford Logan observed
that the *AHR* was not established until nearly 120 years after the United States declared
its independence, however, the *Journal of Negro History* began fifty years after Negroes
won their freedom. Unlike the *AHR*, which operated with a lofty budget that allowed
for publication and was able to pay for its articles, the *Journal* had very little moral and
absolutely no financial support. The *Journal’s* contributors labored out of love and its
only capital was the ability and enthusiasm of Carter G. Woodson.

Woodson published the first volume of the *JNH* without introduction or
promotion. Woodson’s plans to publish a journal were kept secret until it appeared in its
published form in 1916. Charles Wesley and other associates of Woodson were unaware that Woodson was clandestinely preparing to launch the scholarly journal. Woodson informed educator and black clubwoman Mary Church Terrell in a letter dated November 7, 1916, that he deemed it, “wise in the beginning to demonstrate what could be accomplished in this field before making an appeal to the public.” Woodson later explained:

It was thought best to call a national meeting to form an organization. This plan was abandoned, however, for the reason that it was believed that a large number of persons would pay any attention to the movement until an actual demonstration as to the possibilities of the field had been made.

The Journal constituted a significant landmark in American historiography and a monument to black creativity and scientific scholarship. It reflected a shift in historical perspective and challenged traditionally accepted interpretations. The Journal also arrived at new conclusions on slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. Articles published in the Journal challenged racism, built black pride, and eroded white prejudices that had become institutionalized in the American social order. In addition, the JNH published various articles on the black experience from political, constitutional and military history to social, economic, and cultural life.

Within the first twenty years of its creation, there appeared some 350 articles and a series of documents of which 241 had been devoted wholly or largely to the “Negroes” in the United States. Another 109 articles and documents, nearly one-third of the total contents, chronicled the black experience outside the United States. This massive world wide study of the “Negro” included thirty-five articles on Africa, twenty-four on Great Britain and Europe, eighteen on Latin America, seventeen on Canada, ten on Haiti and Cuba, four on the Pacific Area, and one on the Near East. In a tribute to Woodson,
published in 1950, W. E. B. Du Bois noted, “few men have made so deep an imprint as Carter Woodson on thousands of scholars in historical study and research. . . Indeed his service to history was not much his books as his editorship of the *Journal*, which brought into print some of the best scholars in this branch of history.”

Woodson’s decision to bring out the first issue of the *JNH* prompted immediate condemnation from the Executive Council of the ASNLH. Unbeknownst to council members, Woodson borrowed $400 against his life insurance policy and published the first issue in January 1916. However, the decision to publish the first issue without the formal approval of the council outraged fellow council members. Several Executive Council members were so offended by what they saw as a selfish and autocratic decision that one member resigned while others threatened to do likewise.

In spite of the disapproval of the Executive Council, the first issue of the *Journal of Negro History* was well received and highly praised. The professionally printed journal presented scholarly articles and valuable documents. J. E. Spingarn proclaimed that the *Journal* was dignified in form and content and conformed in every way to the highest standards of modern historical research. Harvard University Professor Edward Channing praised the issue and submitted that he was going to ask the library at Harvard to subscribe to it. W.E.B. Du Bois commented that the *Journal* was excellent.

Highly respected journals and periodicals of the era announced the *JNH*’s appearance and extended warm welcomes. The *Southern Workman* out of Hampton Institute and the *American Historical Review* praised the issue from the earnestness of purpose and literary ability of the authors to the dignified style and excellence of paper and type. The *New York Evening Post* wrote, the *Journal of Negro History*, “does not
intend to drift into the discussion of the Negro problem, but rather to popularize the
movement of unearthing the Negro and his contributions to civilization.” The Boston
Herald recorded, “here is a historical journal of excellent scientific quality, planned and
managed by Negro scholars for readers of their own race, and preaching the doctrine of
racial self-consciousness. That in itself is a significant step forward.”

Despite the Journal of Negro History’s warm reception, an expanded subscription
list, and additional contributions, the increased revenue did not alleviate the financial
debts, operating expenses, or costs of publication. In order for Woodson to maintain the
quality of scientific research and the integrity of the Journal, he needed sustained
funding. To keep his enterprise solvent, Woodson donated more than one half of his
$2,000 annual teacher’s salary to the JNH during the first three years.51 Woodson also
paid for copies of the Journal to be sent to wealthy and prominent individuals and
magazine publishers while Robert E. Park, later president of the ASNLH, paid for one
hundred copies to be shipped to libraries across the country. Woodson’s nearly two
hundred appeals to philanthropists went largely unheeded and brought him a mere
fourteen dollars.52

As early as 1915, months before the first issue of the JNH was published,
Woodson made several attempts to establish relationships with benefactors who
contributed to African-American institutions and organizations. In 1915, Woodson
courted the approval of Booker T. Washington hoping to gain the support of Tuskegee
Institute and the Negro Business League benefactors for his personal endeavors. As part
of an introduction of himself and his work, Woodson sent Washington a copy of his 1915
publication, The Education of the Negro Prior to 1865. Washington praised the work,
noting his particular interest in the chapter dealing with vocational training and the facts brought out concerning the efforts to establish schools for industrial training in the period before the Civil War.\textsuperscript{53} Shortly thereafter, Washington died ending any chances of a mutual relationship between the two men. Following Washington’s death, Woodson published a complimentary portrait of Washington’s life in the first issue of the \textit{JNH}. Woodson praised Washington for his contribution to his race and humanity. However, Tuskegee’s benefactors, the GEB and Julius Rosenwald, eventually denied Woodson’s request for grants for the \textit{JNH}. The GEB expressed doubt as to the longevity of such a small operation, and Woodson’s appeal to the independent philanthropist Julius Rosenwald garnered sympathy but nothing more. Without the assistance of any significant outside aid, Woodson managed to publish the second issue of the \textit{JNH} in April of 1916.

Woodson was able to persuade Jesse Moorland of the YMCA Colored Department and Tuskegee affiliate Robert E. Park to help secure the support of Julius Rosenwald for the ASNLH. Rosenwald, a benefactor and trustee of both Tuskegee Institute and the YMCA Colored Department, agreed to support Woodson and the ASNLH. In 1916, after favorably reviewing a sample copy of the \textit{JNH}, Rosenwald agreed to give $100 per quarter to support the JNH. With Rosenwald’s commitment, he became the first, and for the first five years, the largest donor to support the \textit{Journal of Negro History}. On a separate occasion, he contributed $1,000 and the Julius Rosenwald Fund made a one-time appropriation of $2,500 to the ASNLH. Rosenwald constantly refused to increase his contributions maintaining that he was not much interested in the
printer's ink method of helping blacks because it offered no immediate solution for their situation.54

Over the next few years, individual subscriptions and personal donations to the JNH continued to grow. Annual contributions of $200 and $300 were received from Morton D. Hull and Harold A. Swift, while Cleveland H. Dodge, the YMCA's national president, pledged $400 annually beginning in 1918. However, due to the high cost of research and post-World War I inflation, the additional funds were scarcely enough to permit the Journal to continue to operate efficiently.55 Woodson pointed out that the funds the JNH operated on for ten years, the AHR had at its disposal for one year alone. With an overwhelming debt, Woodson appealed to donors and philanthropic agencies that the Journal would be discontinued if nothing happened to alleviate the financial distress. Woodson, to no avail, appealed to benefactors to increase their contributions and he continued to make up the JNH's deficit with his own salary.

Woodson implored ASNLH affiliates to do more in the area of fundraising. He convinced Robert Russa Moton of Tuskegee to contact philanthropists such as George Peabody and urge the philanthropists and his contacts to donate thousands of dollars to save the Journal.56 Robert Park and Jesse Moorland, secretary-treasurer of the ASNLH, urged Woodson to link the organization with one of the black universities, preferably Howard, and publish the Journal under its auspices. Additionally, W.E.B. Du Bois, editor of the Crisis, having learned of the Journal's fiscal problems, proposed that Woodson bring the Journal under the sponsorship and partial subsidy of the NAACP.57 After serious consideration of both alternatives, Woodson decided to maintain his
autonomy. He elected to alter his fund raising strategy to appear more palatable to various philanthropic foundations.

In an effort to appear more acceptable to foundation officials and southern moderates, Woodson reorganized the Executive Council of the ASNLH in 1917. At the suggestion of Jesse Moorland, Woodson dissolved the all-black executive council and appointed an interracial group consisting of prominent whites and blacks associated with the Hampton-Tuskegee network or the YMCA Colored Department. Of the new appointees to the Executive Council in 1917, Thomas Jesse Jones was the most controversial. Jones, of Welch descent, was chief executive of the Phelps-Stokes fund and author of the contentious report *Negro Education*. Jones's report threatened the survival of black liberal arts institutions. Despite the unfavorable opinion that black leadership held toward Jones, Woodson believed that his significant influence over the direction of corporate philanthropy made him acceptable for the Executive Council. Ultimately, Woodson would learn that Jones's conservative strategies, presumptuous views on blacks, and dictatorial manner in which he dealt with the black leadership stood contrary to the mission and purpose of the ASNLH.
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CHAPTER TWO
THOMAS JESSE JONES AND THE PHELPS-STOKES FUND,
1917-1921

From the outside, to both critics and the intellectual community, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) appeared strong and vibrant. From within the organization, however, it was easier to perceive the financial uncertainty. Inadequate fundraising coupled with the economic depression resulting from World War I stifled donations and financial contributions. The black community, which was the ASNLH’s chief economic base in 1917, struggled to support the organization. To alleviate the financial burden of individual donors and subscription holders, Woodson expanded and reorganized the Executive Council of the ASNLH in 1917. For Woodson, the reorganization had a two-fold purpose: first, the reconstitution of the council would shift the overwhelming financial responsibility from individuals to foundations. Second, Woodson theorized that the appointment of more whites than blacks to the executive council would appear more palatable to philanthropic foundation officials.¹

In order for Woodson and the ASNLH to be seriously considered for foundation grants, a separate set of criterion had to be met. Foundation officials, generally, scrutinized black organization’s political and racial ideology and philosophies more closely than their purpose. Only black organizations that appeared interracial, promoted
moderate agendas, favored a gradual and non-aggressive approach to the race problem, and worked cooperatively within the racially stratified South generally received funding.

When reorganizing and expanding the Executive Council of the ASNLH, Woodson carefully and meticulously designed his organization to meet the criteria of the foundations. In 1917, Woodson selected more whites than blacks to resemble the interracial boards of the NAACP and the National Urban League. The newly appointed blacks, by contemporary standards, would be considered conservative on most racial matters. They were connected to either Tuskegee or the Colored Department of the YMCA. In addition, the new black appointees were proven fundraisers, able donors, and maintained a good rapport with the corporate and philanthropic community.²

Several white moderates, including the Welsh born Thomas Jesse Jones, agreed to serve on the governing body of the ASNLH. Jones, appointed to the executive council in 1917, was a trustee of Hampton, Fisk and Lincoln Universities, an advisor to the General Education Board (GEB), chief executive of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and a driving force behind the interracial cooperation movement. Jones and similar moderate ideologues connected to corporate and industrial philanthropy supported the Hampton idea of limited higher education and manual training for black Americans. As a result of his highly controversial *Negro Education*, a subjective and critical examination of black schools in the South, Jones became spokesman and foremost expert on black education and philanthropy. As a result of Jones’s influence over the direction of philanthropy, he heavily influenced the curriculum and the agenda of black institutions and organizations for the next thirty years.³
Thomas Jesse Jones was born August 4, 1873, in Llanfachraeth, a small rural village of Anglesey in North Wales. Jones, the son of a saddler and the grandson of a village blacksmith, was born into a family of very modest means. The death of his father in 1884 preceded the family's immigration to America. With his widowed mother and four siblings, Jones and his family settled in New York, then later Middleport, Ohio, where Jones labored under deplorable conditions in the coalmines and iron industries. Jones was educated at Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Virginia, and Marietta College in Ohio, where he studied on a ministerial scholarship and was awarded the B.A. in 1897. Jones later turned his intellectual attention to the emerging field of sociology, where he learned to apply Christian and religious teachings to contemporary social problems. Jones studied pioneer settlements and societal formations at the renowned and reputable Columbia University, where he earned an M.A. in 1899 and a Ph.D. in 1904. Additionally, Jones received the Bachelor of Divinity degree from the nondenominational Union Theological Seminary of New York in 1900 and became an ordained minister.

Jones’s training in theology and sociology reflected his commitment to the emerging Christian Social Sciences. Jones, an advocate of the Social Gospel Theory, honed his Christian Missionary spirit of noblesse oblige while still a student at Columbia University. There, Jones served as assistant head master at the University Settlement House in New York City where he worked closely with immigrants to study and improve their social conditions. During his time in the New York settlement houses, Jones resolved that gradualism and constant contact with white Anglo Saxon Protestants was the most effective tool for socialization and proper social development of immigrants.
Jones maintained that gradualism and the socialization process would transform the ignorant, impulsive and character flawed immigrants into productive citizens. With regard to black-white relations in the Southern states, Jones maintained that gradual socialization would reinforce Anglo Saxon superiority without disturbing the existing social, political, and racial arrangements of the South.⁶

Jones’s experience with settlement work in New York and his close association with his professor and dissertation advisor, Franklin Henry Giddings, profoundly influenced Jones’s socio-political philosophy of racial hierarchies and social evolution. Giddings, a progenitor of the new scientific and empirical social science movement, was the nation’s first professor and chair of sociology. Giddings was a conservative social theorist and racial evolutionist whose own social stratification and classification schemes were heavily influenced by Herbert Spencer’s racial theories of Social Darwinism.⁷

Giddings placed blacks and other people of color at the bottom of the social hierarchy. He also maintained that these people of color had low mental power and high death rates, which he attributed to the warm climates that fostered impulsiveness, fear, and irrationality. Comparatively, Giddings argued that the vigorous Europeans and the alpine people were at the top of the social hierarchy and had high mental power and low death rates. As a result of this process of social evolution and natural development, Giddings maintained that blacks were developmentally 2,000 years behind whites. Furthermore, he insisted that social evolution was responsible for inequality and human suffering and human beings had little ability to alter, influence, or better their circumstances. However, Giddings maintained that by remaining in contact with what he
called the superior race, people of color could be prevented from relapsing into savagery. He wrote of the so-called low intellectual capacity of black people:

During the past five hundred years, to go no further, the people of the heat belt have added nothing whatever to what we understand by human advancement. Those natives of the tropics and subtropics who have not been under direct European influence have not during that time made a single contribution of the first importance to art, literature, science, manufacture, or inventions, they have not produced an engineer, or chemist, or biologist, or historian, or a painter, or musician of the first rank.

Whereas Giddings was a theoretician, Thomas Jesse Jones, his student and protégé, was the practitioner responsible for the application of Giddings’s theories and principles. Jones not only utilized Giddings theories of social evolution on immigrants at the University Settlement Houses in New York, but he also put these same theories into practice at Hampton Institute in Virginia. It was while at Hampton that Jones designed the Hampton Social Studies, which was indeed influenced by the principles of Giddings, but also foreshadowed his controversial Negro Education study.

Jones was hired at Hampton in 1902, as professor of Sociology, director of research, and as an ordained minister he served as Assistant Chaplain. Retired Civil War General and white moderate Samuel Armstrong founded Hampton in 1868. Hampton was built upon the corner stones of Christian morals and black industrial training. The curriculum and political philosophy of racial inequality advocated at Hampton later became widely known as the Hampton Idea. The Hampton Idea reinforced black disfranchisement, racial and political hierarchy, and civil inequality in order to avoid confrontation between the ex-slave and the planter regime.

Hampton was a perfect fit for Jones in 1902; its political curriculum complemented Jones’s own socio-political outlook. For Jones, Hampton served as an
experimental laboratory and provided him with the equipment and opportunity to
design and implement a set of classroom curricula that addressed the very question of
how black Americans should fit into the new Southern social order without disruption.
Jones's curriculum, which he implemented in 1904, was commonly referred to as the
Hampton Social Studies (HSS) and was more a statement of political and racial
philosophy than classroom curriculum.11

The HSS, which foreshadowed Jones's *Negro Education* report, written a decade
later, assigned black Americans a permanent subservient role in southern society
transitioning from agricultural to industrial. The HSS enforced the love of manual labor,
endurance of oppression, necessity of thrift, and eschewed politics and social equality.
The HSS were craftily embodied in several related courses, including economics,
sociology, civil government, social welfare and race relations, all of which reinforced
gradualism, racial evolution and the superiority of Western Civilization.12

Jones argued that the HSS effectively equipped the black labor class with the
knowledge and practical skills necessary to assume cheerfully their roles and survive in a
racially stratified society. Jones maintained that the subservient classes and races were
not in their present positions because of blind prejudice, oppression, and unjust racism,
but simply because they were at a lower stage of development. He argued that racial
development and evolution required time. He explained that the natural process of
development must be allowed time to take its natural course and evolve from one social
stage to another.13 Jones explained that HSS trained students in the rudiments of
civilization, which he argued, were never acquired under African and Native American's
inferior traditional customs and practices. Jones noted:
Slavery and the tribal form of government gave the Negro and Indian but little opportunity to understand the essentials of a good home, the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, the cost and meaning of education, the place of labor, and the importance of thrift. The origin and development of all institutions—social, economic, and religious—were hidden in the mysteries of superstition. According to Jones, the HSS was not driven by conventional wisdom about education but driven by the needs of the students. They were designed to help the inferior races better understand and cope with their deficiencies. Jones maintained that the different races being in different stages of civilization had different needs. He explained:

Economics shows the importance of material possessions and the power to toil as factors of progress. Civil government emphasizes the importance of intelligence and integrity in the members of a democracy, the toil and suffering through which civil liberty has obtained, and the responsibility resting upon the citizens of a republic. Sociology describes the origin of such human institutions as the home, the school, the church, the government; it states the types of character which strengthens these institutions, and the qualities which these institutions must possess in order to develop the character of its members.

In a series of articles published in the *Southern Workman (SW)*, beginning in 1905, Jones explained the rationale behind each social study. In an article entitled “Civic and Social Welfare,” published in 1906, Jones explained that at Hampton the government course was primarily dedicated to the evolution of government and the close relationship between southern blacks and the Department of Agriculture, not voting and the political process. Jones noted that the majority of blacks were farmers that lived in southern rural areas therefore, it was necessary to understand the activities of the Department of Agriculture, the area of government that most directly influenced their lives.

The HSS reinforced that government, like races, must evolve over time. Civil government students traced the centuries old evolution of government from the matriarchal and patriarchal governmental systems of antiquity to absolute and limited
monarchies to modern democracies. Jones maintained that this process allowed students to relate the slow evolution of governments and societies to the present evolution of races. This afforded the students the opportunity to see that their present condition is not permanent, but only a step in their evolution. Furthermore, the course broadens the students’ understanding of government so that they have a more sympathetic view of the position of those who oppose them, thus, they become more intelligent in their work, more patient under oppression and more hopeful as to the future.\(^{17}\) In time, Jones concluded, prejudice will disappear leaving races like governments to evolve into a true democracy.\(^{18}\)

In a second article published in 1906, “Economics and Material Welfare,” Jones explained economics in the Hampton curriculum. Jones maintained that the HSS encouraged thrift, promoted savings and cooperation, explained the power of labor, and distinguished between consumption and demand. Jones argued that due to blacks lack of knowledge and exposure to basic essentials of civilization, their impulsiveness and thoughtless spending, and their long for simple and pleasant pleasures, a course in economics was necessary. Jones maintained that generally blacks were thoughtless with their spending. He explained that they prefer ham instead of beef, desired fats and sweets instead of the more nutritive foods, and they often purchase fancy and brilliantly colored garments that are too expensive in view of their income instead of the more substantially made clothes. Jones noted that blacks often purchase fruit out of season and other items without regard of time they labored for the money spent. Jones, therefore noted, that discrimination was sometime justified based on the facts.\(^{19}\)
Moreover, the HSS was Jones’s solution to the so-called Negro problem. The controversial courses were designed to promote black subservience, accommodationism, and gradualism, which according to Jones would foster racial cooperation and reconciliation. Jones believed the HSS, would encourage the love of manual labor and thrift, would reinvigorate the southern economy by forging proper relationships between white capitalists and the black labor force. Overall, the inherently oppressive curriculum challenged social equality, shunned racial agitation, and promoted patient endurance of oppression while racial evolutionary process plotted its natural course.

By the time Jones left Hampton Institute in 1909, he had established himself as an expert in the education of racial groups. Shortly thereafter, Jones served two temporary positions with the United States Census Bureau and the Federal Bureau of Education. At the Census Bureau, Jones was hired to supervise the collection of statistics for black Americans for the 1910 census. He was charged with the task of safeguarding against and preventing the undercounting of blacks as previously occurred during the 1890 and 1900 census. In November of 1909, Jones explained to Booker T. Washington that his purpose at the Census Bureau was, “to make the census of the Negro as accurate as possible.” While in Washington, D.C., supervising the collection of data for the 1910 census, Jones taught sociology classes at Howard University. At the conclusion of the census in 1912, Jones accepted a position with the Federal Bureau of Education as a specialist of racial groups. He served as chair of the Committee on Social Studies, which was part of the U.S. Commission for the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Jones went from curriculum development at Hampton Institute and the Bureau of Education to policy making with the Phelps-Stokes Fund (PSF). As an educational
specialist hired by the PSF in 1913, Jones’s reputation and influence was world
renowned. The PSF, the brainchild of Miss Caroline Phelps Stokes, was founded in
1911 as a not-for-profit philanthropic organization. Stokes, upon her death on April 26,
1909, bequeathed $900,000 for the development of a fund devoted primarily to fostering
industrial education in Africa and America. Stokes was born of English and Puritan
ancestry and descended from a long line of generous donors and Christian missionaries.
Her grandfather was president of the New York Colonization Society and he helped
established the Republic of Liberia for recently emancipated slaves. Both of Caroline’s
parents were heavily involved in the abolition of slavery and the Temperance Movement.
Reared in a Christian household, Caroline gave generously to a variety of benevolent,
charitable and racial causes. She purchased a cottage for the New York Orphan Asylum
and for many years was a generous benefactor of Tuskegee Institute and its principal
Booker T. Washington.22

The PSF was established in the age of industrial and corporate philanthropy.
Similar to contemporary foundations such as the General Education Board, Laura
Spelman Rockefeller Memorial and the Julius Rosenwald Fund, the PSF supported black
schools and organizations that were committed to the cause of interracial cooperation.
The PSF was distinguished from other agencies of the era in that its charter interests lied
in the industrial education of Africans, African Americans, Native Americans, and poor
whites. Upon her death in 1909, Stokes will in part designated that:

The interests and the net income of such fund be used . . . for educational
purposes in the education of [N]egroes, both in Africa and the United States,
North American Indians, and the needy and deserving white students, through
industrial schools, the founding of scholarships, and the erection or endowment of
school buildings or chapels.23
In accordance with the directives of the will, the PSF published two pioneering educational studies, *Negro Education* (1917) and *African Education* (1921). Both reports were extensive studies on black schools. The reports addressed the history and management of the schools, the quality of its curriculum and instruction, its religious and social activities, the work of its graduates, and the relationship with its surrounding community. Moreover, the two reports designed a colonial style curriculum for black schools on both sides of the Atlantic to establish a permanent subservient role for a white dominated industrialized society. However, it was *Negro Education* that initially brought Jones international acclaim.

The idea for a comprehensive study of black schools in the South was conceived in the mind of Booker T. Washington decades before *Negro Education* was published. Washington insisted that a critical examination of the roughly 600 southern black schools classed as above the ordinary public schools was needed. He maintained that such a study of industrial, professional, secondary, and post-secondary schools in the South would separate the fraudulent claims of schools doing industrial work from the large majority of legitimate ones. Furthermore, Washington believed that an educational study would establish objective standards to rank efficient black schools for philanthropic agencies to better coordinate and properly dispense funds.  

With the establishment of the PSF Committee on Education in 1910, Washington was able to realize his dream. The PSF Committee on Education consulted Washington, Hollis B. Frissell, Principal of Hampton and other prominent southern educators on the most effective way to administer the funds provided through the will and designated for industrial education. In 1912, Washington and Frissell, proposed among other things to I.
N. Phelps Stokes, Chairman of the PSF Board of Trustees, a plan to study and publish a comprehensive report on the state of black schools in the South. I. N. Phelps Stokes and the Trustees accepted the recommendation of Washington, Frissell, and the Committee on Education, and agreed that an impartial investigation of black schools in the South would prove very helpful in the administration of the Trust. Additionally, a critical examination of black schools would help respond to the numerous and insistent demands for information on the schools and prevent duplication of philanthropic efforts.25

I. N. Phelps Stokes and the Board of Trustees was later charged with the task of selecting a lead researcher to head the survey on black schools in the South. Both Washington and Frissell advised that the researcher be experienced in education, research methods, and the race problem. Washington recommended his friend and colleague at Tuskegee, Robert E. Park, to the Board of Trustees for the job of lead researcher and Frissell likewise, recommended his friend and colleague from Hampton, Thomas Jesse Jones. Washington wrote to Anson Phelps Stokes, “Dr. Park, is in my opinion, by far the best qualified white man in any part of the country to have charge of the work.”

Washington was not pleased with Frissell’s recommendation and noted:

Dr. Jones is a good man and has valuable qualifications for certain kinds of work, especially that of dealing with statistics, but what we need just now is a broader and more comprehensive study than a professional statistician would be likely to give us. Dr. Park, in my opinion, has a wider vision of the whole Southern field than is true of Dr. Jones.26

Despite Booker T. Washington’s request, the Trustees of the PSF employed Hampton’s candidate, Thomas Jesse Jones, in part because his Welsh birth gave him a certain intellectual detachment from the Negro problem.27
The preliminary preparations for the *Negro Education* report began in November 1912; however, the framework for the study was largely provided several years later at a private GEB meeting held in New York City. Three days after Booker T. Washington’s funeral in November 1915, GEB officials called a meeting with select southern educators to gain a consensus and plan the direction for black education in the South. The conference convened at 61 Broadway, in the offices of the Rockefeller Foundation and was attended by thirteen educators and foundation representatives. Four black college presidents, Robert R. Moton of Tuskegee, John Hope of Morehouse, Fayette McKenzie of Fisk University, and Hollis B. Frissell of Hampton were present. Frissell, also a trustee of the GEB, presided over the event. Noted attendees included James Dillard, Abraham Flexner, secretary of the GEB, W. T. B. Williams, black conservative and representative of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the GEB, and Thomas Jesse Jones.\(^2\)

Absent from the conference were representatives from northern missionary agencies such as the American Missionary Association who heretofore had contributed significantly greater amounts of money to black schools than the GEB. Additionally, representatives from the state and federal educational communities were omitted. Abraham Flexner’s theories of progressive education heavily dominated the agenda and the conference. Flexner’s arguments, which ultimately formed the thesis of Jones’s *Negro Education* study, centered around three principles: black public education, institutional consolidation, and the elimination of black private secondary schools.\(^2\)

The principles Flexner advocated for black schools were recently employed in his own study on medical schools published in 1910. Flexner’s study, entitled *Medical
Education and commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation, critically examined every medical school in America and published its finding. Medical Education, which foreshowed Negro Education, "was a dramatic report, with startling anecdotes about the primitive conditions in just about every medical school: minimal entrance requirements, uninterested faculty and inadequate space-dissecting rooms crowded with clucking hens and putrid cadavers, laboratory tables cluttered with dirty test tubes standing in pans and cigar boxes." As a result of Flexner's Medical Education, several medical schools lost founding and were forced to close.

Flexner desired similar results for black schools in the South. He encouraged the consolidation of philanthropic efforts to support certain black schools at the expense of smaller and weaker institutions. By ignoring the so-called inferior black schools, Flexner hoped that the lack of support would force the weaker institutions to close. Flexner explained the process to John Hope:

Dr. Hope, what would be the effect of selecting four or five Negro colleges and building them up, making them good, honest, sincere, effective colleges so far as they went, and letting the others alone, not to suppress them or consolidate them but just to make them sweat, would that tend in the long run to so stigmatize the inferior institutions that they would give up?

Flexner's advocacy for a public school system financed by a consolidated effort of philanthropic foundations, southern public school authorities, and tax money did not garner Hope's support. Hope understood that merging schools for the duplication of efforts and the so-called inefficient college level program would ultimately bring about the death of many black private institutions. Furthermore, Hope believed that the schools Flexner considered merging or from which he planned to withdraw funds for the
duplication of efforts and inefficient college level programs were in Atlanta. Hope also believed that such action would place Morehouse, the school he led in jeopardy.32

Two years later, in 1917, the Jones report was published as *Negro Education: A Study of the Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States.* The highly anticipated two-volume compilation report of over 1,100 pages was the largest study ever conducted on black schools in America. Jones explained:

The primary value of a study of *Negro Education in the United States* lies in the fact that the educational activities described constitute what is probably the most significant effort ever made by a white group powerful in number, wealth, education and experience to develop an educational system for and by a black group differing widely in origin and type and only freed from slavery.33

The report heavily utilized statistics, graphs, and charts to survey and rank the schools according to the standards set forth by the GEB at the 1915 conference. The report called for increased funds for black vocational institutions, less money for black liberal arts colleges, and charged that the curriculum in most black schools in the South were often irrelevant to the educational needs of the people.

During the three-year period of research, Jones and his research team inspected more than 747 African-American schools in the South and concluded that only two institutions, Howard University and Fisk, were capable of offering college-level work. Hence, Jones recommended that the remaining colleges convert to secondary, elementary, or normal schools.34

*Negro Education* was highly praised among circles of philanthropists and southern moderates alike. Anson Phelps Stokes found that the study had been prepared without prejudice and with full appreciation of Negroes themselves. Abraham Flexner praised the study as, “the most important contribution to the general subject of education
in this country." Robert Moton raved that *Negro Education* was, "most illuminating and in a real sense constructive." Talcott Williams of Columbia University wrote, "for years to come," the study would be, "the datum line from which men reckon the rise of the Negro."35

Several southern newspapers celebrated the publication of the report. The *Fisk University News* printed in part:

> Four distinct groups must read or consult the report or indict themselves for criminal negligence and indifference—i.e., (1) All Negroes; (2) all the white South; (3) all philanthropists who are supporting Negro Schools or all boards and agencies acting for these donors; (4) all denominational bodies which are conducting colored schools.36

Furthermore, the *Fisk University News* went on to suggest, "No Negro, whether he approves of the suggestions or not, has any right to claim interest in his race until he has informed himself of this suggestion looking toward more concrete courses of study."

Consequently, Columbia University awarded Thomas Jesse Jones the Grant Squires Prize for original investigations of a sociological character for *Negro Education*.37

Despite the praise *Negro Education* received, several critics found the report to be very problematic. Critics charged that the report questioned the legitimacy of nearly all black institutions of higher learning in the South. W.E.B Du Bois, one of the earliest outspoken opponents of *Negro Education*, sounded the alarm against the report in a review for the *Crisis* in 1918. Du Bois saw the sabotaging of the strongest institutions as the underlying purpose of *Negro Education*.38 He wrote,

> The ordinary reader unacquainted with the tremendous ramifications of the Negro problem will hail this report with unstinted praise. Thinking Negroes and other persons who know the problem of educating the American Negro will regard the Jones report, despite its many praiseworthy features, as a dangerous and in many respects unfortunate publication.39
Du Bois lambasted the report for de-emphasizing higher education and placing a greater priority on industrial education and agricultural training. Du Bois charged that Jones, by placing a heaving emphasis on manual and vocational training in black schools, mounted a concerted campaign to dismantle liberal arts instruction. Additionally, Du Bois found inconsistencies with Jones’s insistence on a cooperative relationship between the black private schools, southern education boards, and philanthropic foundations. Du Bois chided that in fostering the relationship, the report fell short of making a real attempt to secure the proper and just lines along which the united effort should work and it failed to spell out the lines along which blacks would be represented by voice or vote. Du Bois concluded that in calling for a recast of the black educational program, the study fails to leave the door of opportunity open for the development of a thoroughly trained class of leaders.40

The foundation’s top executives outwardly gave little attention to the criticisms of Du Bois who was by most accounts considered marginal and a dangerous left wing radical. His perceived radicalism was so widespread that in 1912, presidential candidate Theodore Roosevelt, cautioned Joel Spingarn, one of several founders and organizers of the NAACP, to be careful of Du Bois, who was in Roosevelt’s opinion, “a dangerous person.” Du Bois, however, was the most qualified to review the Negro Education study. He championed the cause of liberal arts education that rivaled the Hampton-Tuskegee philosophy espoused by Booker T. Washington and published his own monographs on black education entitled The Negro Common School (1900) and The College Bred Negro (1910). Du Bois’s two reports were the first and, until the Jones report, the most comprehensive on the subject.41
Outside the critical voice of W. E. B. Du Bois, few blacks, particularly those receiving philanthropic support, dared to utter a negative remark against Jones and the goals of the *Negro Education* study. During the critical three-year period of school inspections and data preparation, Jones wielded enormous power and influence over the fate of hundreds of black schools in the South. Without the voices of an objective committee, the destiny of these institutions fell in the hands of one clearly subjective investigator.

The slightest indifference toward the study could result in the loss of philanthropic support. College presidents and institution representatives understood and realized the long-term importance of a favorable comment in print. Six months before the publication of *Negro Education*, John Hope, then President of Morehouse College, wrote to Jones:

> You may be interested to know that the following announcement was made at our commencement exercises on Wednesday of this week: 'The College has put at the disposal of seven college men in the agricultural class, a horse, a wagon, plow, garden tools, hand-spray and insecticide, garden seeds and the plants to be used in aiding the people of the community with their gardens.'

The publication of *Negro Education* catapulted Jones to national prominence and unanimously anointed him a Negro education expert. As a result, Jones was appointed Educational Director of the PSF, a position he held until 1946. In this capacity, he conducted studies and administered funding that greatly influenced the direction of black schools and black education. Jones's authority over the awarding of philanthropic funds allowed him significant influence over the direction and fate of black institutions and organizations seeking philanthropic support.
Around the time *Negro Education* was published, Carter G. Woodson was reorganizing the Executive Council of the ASNLH in order to make it interracial and more palatable to philanthropic foundation officials. Woodson’s appointment of Jones to the Executive Council in 1917 demonstrated his commitment to interracial cooperation. Additionally, Woodson published a favorable review of Jones’s *Negro Education* in the *Journal of Negro History*. The review, written by Jones’s friend and colleague Monroe Work, was not unlike the praise of southern moderates who recognized the report as an invaluable and authoritative statement of fact finding.45

Jones’s 1917 appointment to the Executive Council came during the ASNLH’s first biennial meeting convened in the nation’s capital. Woodson invited northern philanthropists, southern moderates, and black conservatives interested in interracial cooperation and the race problem to share in the occasion. Most prominent among the invited guests affiliated with philanthropy were Julius Rosenwald of the Rosenwald Fund, George Foster Peabody of the GEB, J.G. Phelps Stokes of the PSF, James H. Dillard of the Slater Fund, and Thomas Jesse Jones. The black participants were well known fundraisers and ideologically conservatively inclined. The most notable of the black invited guest were Jesse Moorland, executive secretary of the YMCA Colored department, and Monroe Work of Tuskegee.46

The convention proceeded with a succession of speakers including Moorland, Woodson, Work, Peabody, Rosenwald, Dillard, and Jones. Each address lauded the work of Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH and supported the scientific study of black history and the race problem. In addition to the work, the mission of the ASNLH, which in part included, “the promotion of harmony between the races,” inspired the participants. As a
result, northern philanthropists and foundation officials such as George Foster Peabody, J.G. Phelps Stokes, and Julius Rosenwald took out membership in the association and agreed to serve on the Executive Council. In the eyes of the white philanthropic community, this distinguished group of appointees “conferred upon the ASNLH an aura of respectability and thus legitimacy while their personal and business connections immeasurably enhanced fundraising potential.”

Woodson’s appointment of James Hardy Dillard and Robert E. Park in 1917 signaled a shift in the ideological direction of the ASNLH. James Hardy Dillard, an enlightened southern statesman, was admired and respected by both white moderates and black conservatives. The former Tulane professor was a tactful gradualist and champion of interracial cooperation. Dillard served as director of both the Anna T. Jeanes and the John F. Slater Funds, two philanthropic agencies that supported black education in the South. Dillard delivered an insightful address to the convention that stressed the importance of studying Africa. Dillard’s influence within the network of philanthropy was attractive to Woodson. In addition to directing two foundations, Dillard also served on the boards of Hampton and Tuskegee, was a trustee of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, the General Education Board, and the CIC.

Woodson’s appointment of Robert E. Park, the prominent sociologist at the University of Chicago, illustrated Woodson’s conscious leanings toward conservatism and interracial cooperation. Park, the former Chief Public Relations Officer at Tuskegee Institute under the late Booker T. Washington, was not a new contributor to the ASNLH, for he donated a total of seventy-five dollars to the Journal of Negro History during its first two years. However, Park’s selection as president of ASNLH deserves
consideration. Park replaced the retiring George C. Hall, a prominent African-American surgeon, signaling a shift in the direction of the association. Whereas Park was a northerner regionally, his ideology was in line with southern moderates and black conservatives. Park was devoted to racial accommodation, formal segregation and the white domination of black industrial education. He advocated racial justice but not equality and presided over the Executive Council for four years.52

In addition to Dillard and Park, several other moderate educators and foundation officials were appointed to the Executive Council. The majority of whites appointed to council served only as ceremonial figureheads. Woodson preferred whites, like Robert E. Park and Julius Rosenwald, whose presence on the council enhanced financial and scholastic credibility. However, these persons had little to do with the day to day operations of the organization. These socially prominent scholars and philanthropists agreed to have their names attached to the letterhead and contribute money, but they were not genuinely interested in the daily operations of the organization. In Park’s four years as president of the ASNLH, he, “never attended any of the meetings of the executive council and conducted all association business through correspondence.”53 Rosenwald, in fact, wrote, “I am entirely willing to have my name included with such a committee provided that it is understood that I am not obligated to take part in the organization.”54

Thomas Jesse Jones and Albert Bushnell Hart, however, refused to serve as rubber stamps for Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH. They questioned Woodson’s decisions and challenged his authority concerning the affairs of the ASNLH. The bickering between Woodson and these two active council members developed into a public controversy in 1921. When Woodson and ASNLH was awarded $50,000 from the
Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, dissention arose over how best to utilize the funds and resulted in a disgruntled Hart’s resignation. Jones used Hart’s resignation as fuel for his own public showdown with Woodson. By 1921, Woodson had grown very critical of Jones whose controversial *Negro Education* report made him anathema to virtually all sections of black political opinion during the early 1920s. Moreover, Jones’s controversial dealings in South Africa led to Woodson’s abrupt removal of Jones from the Executive Council. The culmination of these events made the Woodson and Jones controversy of 1921 inevitable.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE CARTER G. WOODSON AND THOMAS JESSE JONES

CONTROVERSY, 1921-1925

The early 1920s controversy between Carter G. Woodson and Thomas Jesse Jones accentuated the adverse racial philosophies and ideologies of both men. Woodson and Jones met in the 1910s during Woodson’s tireless campaign to secure funding for the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) and his scholarly publication, the *Journal of Negro History (JNH)*. Woodson served as founder and director of both enterprises while Jones held significant influence with the philanthropic community as an official of the Phelps-Stokes Fund (PSF). Despite Jones’s racially controversial reports *Negro Education: A Study of the Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States and Education in Africa: A Study of West, South, and Equatorial Africa by the African Education Commission, under the Auspices of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Foreign Mission Societies of North America and Europe* published in 1917 and 1921 respectively, Jones was appointed to the Executive Council of the ASNLH. The similar publications, designed to influence black education in both America and Africa, promoted low order vocational training and the devaluation of higher education for black Americans and natives of British colonial Africa.¹

After serving only four years on the Executive Council, Jones was dismissed in 1921. Jones dismissal came as a result of a swell of controversial allegations by black
leaders who accused Jones of distrusting black leadership and selfishly seeking to influence many aspects of black advancement efforts during the 1910s and 1920s. Jones sought to influence the selection of African-Americans leaders. He often categorized black leaders and the degree of their usefulness to one of two prevalent schools of thought based on their racial and philosophical ideologies. He designated the more conservative minded black leaders as “Washingtonian” and the less conservative as “Duboisian.” Jones believed that those most closely associated with the latter philosophy were much too radical to be race leaders.²

Jones most controversial categorization of black leaders came during his stay in South Africa in 1921 while serving as chairman of the Phelps-Stokes African Commission and researching *Education in Africa*. Jones categorized Max Yergan, a prominent black American missionary and YMCA official, as a proponent of the radical Duboisian school of thought. Jones’ categorization ultimately prevented Yergan from serving missionary causes in South Africa. The Max Yergan controversy permanently damaged Jones relationship with the black community and left Jones at odds with Carter G. Woodson and the black intelligentsia.

Jones’ two controversial studies, coupled with Jones’s distrust of black leadership, evoked an international storm of criticism and made Jones somewhat of an anathema to nearly all sections of the black intellectual community. The controversy surrounding Jones and his unpopular views led to his abrupt dismissal from Woodson’s Executive Council in 1921. Additionally, Woodson inserted a critical passage about Jones in his 1921 publication *History of the Negro Church* that accused Jones of personally handpicking blacks to serve abroad during World War I and influencing the colonial
administration to refuse Yergan permission to serve in South Africa. Jones and many in the philanthropic community were angered by Woodson's decision to insert the passage. Jones retaliated against Woodson by using his influence to turn Woodson's benefactors against him and to prevent additional foundation support to the ASNLH. This Woodson and Jones controversy continued for a decade until all philanthropic foundations discontinued their support for Woodson and the ASNLH.

Prior to Jones' comments about Max Yergan, Jones was in South Africa serving as chairman of the first of two PSF interracial African Commissions in 1921. The interracial make-up of the commission caused grave concerns among foundation officials. James Aggrey, a native of the West African Gold Coast and loyal disciple of Thomas Jesse Jones, was the only black person appointed to the commission. Aggrey's appointment came over the objection of several white Commission members who feared that Aggrey's presence would cause embarrassment for the commission with regard to travel and hotel accommodations and during negotiation meetings with governments. Nevertheless, the commission employed Aggrey as a liaison between the natives of Africa and the white governments. Aggrey defined his task as, "to get into the soul of the Natives and help the governments to evolve great things for our people."4

The first Phelps-Stokes African Commission was created in 1920 to study various colonial educational systems in Africa. The goals of the Commission were as follows:

1. To inquire as to the educational work being done at present in each of the areas to be studied.
2. To investigate the educational needs of the people in the light of the religious, social hygienic, and economic conditions.
3. To ascertain to what extent these needs are being met.
4. To assist in the formulation of plans designed to meet the educational needs of the Native races, making adequate use of Native resources and providing for the present and prospective demands of the country itself.
5. To make available the full results of the study.  

To carry out these goals, Jones assembled a committee and surveyed the existing educational systems throughout British colonial Africa. The committee then recommended to the British government an educational policy that would allegedly prevent interracial friction and serve what the commission considered to be the actual needs of the natives. The study was followed by recommendations to the British colonial offices and was published in a two-volume report entitled *Education in Africa* in 1921.

Jones' *Education in Africa* relegated Africans to a permanently inferior status. Much like *Negro Education*, the *Education in Africa* report offered little more than an extension of the Hampton-Tuskegee vocational training module to Africa. Many blacks, both Africans and African Americans, feared this module would ultimately prove detrimental to the natives for decades to come. Jones maintained that in most of colonial Africa, the educational systems were not meeting the actual needs of the community. He argued that Africans were taught English, arithmetic, and writing to the exclusion of agriculture, which were the skills that Africans needed most. The vocational program that Jones proposed for colonial Africa was twofold. First, it created a black labor force for white exploiters of black labor and secondly, it countered Du Bois's pan-Africanism and Garveyism, two philosophies with growing support among Africans throughout colonial Africa.

*Education in Africa* delayed the implementation of higher educational opportunities for Africans until they could be what Jones considered civilized. Jones argued that higher education for uncivilized groups bred racial agitation. To illustrate his
point, Jones explained that in India where higher education was stressed to the exclusion of vocational training, economic and social development resulted in societal unrest.9

Many within the black intellectual community were outraged by the publication. Du Bois, one of the earliest to challenge the findings of the study, published a critical review of Education in Africa in the Crisis in 1926. Du Bois found that the major themes of the study suggested that Africans should be trained to be submissive, peaceful, industrious, and content with their present condition and work in ways that their labor will be most profitable for the countries that were exploiting Africa.10

Jones’s lack of support for higher education, however, garnered Du Bois’s harshest criticisms. Du Bois denounced Jones’s claim that higher education bred racial agitation and asserted that higher education was the foundation for black progress and racial uplift. Du Bois criticized Jones’s campaign against higher education generally and in institutions such as Fisk and Atlanta University specifically. Du Bois maintained that if it were not for schools like Fisk and Atlanta University that trained young teachers and staff there could not have been common and normal schools such Tuskegee, which Jones overwhelmingly supported.11

Du Bois maintained that Jones focused on the failures of colonial schools to the obvious neglect of the very successful institutions that had trained African professionals such as lawyers, doctors, merchants, and teachers. Du Bois also pointed out that Jones failed to find a single school in Africa that neither he approved nor did Jones recommend any new courses of study that remotely could be considered higher training.12

Furthermore, Du Bois observed that in parts of colonial Africa, such as Kenya, where
racism was most prevalent were the same areas where the conclusions of *Education in Africa* were widely accepted. Du Bois noted that in Kenya, where natives were stripped of their land and most systematically and economically reduced to a class that resembled slavery, Jones was among the most popular and celebrated guest.\(^{13}\)

Overall, *Education in Africa* challenged the traditional practice that universal educational objectives acceptable to whites could be successful if applied to the natives in Africa. Anson Phelps Stokes articulated this theme when writing the introduction to *Education in Africa*. Stokes universally condemned a standard curriculum applied to all races and people who he deemed to be on different levels of civilization. He claimed that the North's gravest mistake after emancipation, as it relates to black education, was to attempt to train the Freedmen with the same curriculum used to train whites. However, he praised General Armstrong and his work at Hampton for adapting education directly to the needs of the Freedmen. Hampton, he claimed, had applied real education.\(^{14}\)

While Jones was conducting research on the colonial educational system of Cape Town in 1920, Max Yergan, a young YMCA secretary, was appointed to fill the vacant position of traveling secretary of the Native branch of the Student Christian Association in South Africa under the auspices of British missionary organizations. The position of traveling secretary included the responsibility of serving and supervising South African youth. However, up until 1920, whites exclusively held that position.\(^{15}\) Yergan's appointment to serve in South Africa was particularly significant because South-African officials were suspicious of black Americans and closely scrutinized them for ties to Garveyism, the Pan-African movement, or any other radical influences. As a result,
colonial officials desired to exclude black Americans from missionary work in South Africa.  

In spite of the skepticism mounting over Yergan’s appointment, his Christian spirit and missionary experience made him an obvious candidate. Yergan was born in North Carolina and educated at Shaw University where he devoted his life to service and Christian study. In 1914, while a student at Shaw University, Yergan began working with the YMCA’s Colored Department. Two years later at the age of twenty-five, Yergan’s YMCA work took him to Bangalore, India, where he served the missionary needs of the Indian troops during World War I. After several months of service in India, Yergan then went to Dar-Es-Salaam in British East Africa to work with the British and South African troops stationed there until the armistice of 1918.

Yergan’s appointment of traveling secretary of the Student Christian Association of South Africa was delayed when British officials sought Jones’s approval of Max Yergan. Jones advised that the British proceed with caution. Jones explained that the Colored YMCA in America was composed of both Pan-African sympathizers with a violent antipathy toward racial cooperation as well as more cooperative blacks. Since Jones was not personally familiar with Yergan or his racial philosophies, he was unable to properly categorize Yergan. Jones needed time to consult with Robert Moton of Tuskegee and other reliable contacts in America about Yergan’s racial philosophy. Once Jones discovered Yergan’s close relationship with Jesse Moorland, Executive Secretary of the YMCA Colored department in America, Jones withheld any favorable remarks, which ultimately resulted in the rescinding of Yergan’s appointment.
Woodson was aware of Jones's meddling. He maintained that Jones constantly harassed Moorland ever since, he recalled, “they all but came to blows in an altercation resulting from Jones meddling with the work of the YMCA and YWCA.” Jones considered Moorland a radical and denounced his close association with Du Bois. Prior to the Yergan appointment, Jones unsuccessfully tried to discredit and have Moorland removed from his YMCA post. Jones had criticized Moorland’s YMCA programs and was angered that Moorland’s workers were filing protests against the flagrant mistreatment of black troops abroad, actions Jones considered radical.

John Mott, general secretary of the International Committee of the YMCA, attributed his reluctance to support Yergan to his conversations with Jones. Mott maintained that Jones was apprehensive about the radical attitude of Jesse Moorland and classed Yergan with him. As a result, the British Administration rescinded Yergan’s appointment and refused him entry into South Africa.

Yergan was angered by what he considered meddling on the part of Jones. He was compelled to explain the circumstance of his denial to the members of the African-American community who had held fund-raisers and solicited donations to assist financially with his trip. Yergan submitted a letter to the black press exposing Jones’s unfair reservations and doubts about black leadership in South Africa. Yergan accused Jones of attempting to do in Africa what he had attempted in America, that is to prevent blacks philosophically linked to Du Bois from obtaining responsible positions of leadership. Furthermore, he observed, Jones desired to exclude all African Americans from serving as missionaries to Africa. Writing in the Crisis, Yergan noted:

In conference with high Government officials (you understand that these are all Europeans) the letter informs us that Dr. Jones expressed himself as doubtful
about colored American Association leadership. In view of the fact that there is already a strong prejudice in South Africa against the coming in of colored people from America, and because of their state of mind over newspaper reports on Marcus Garvey, it is easy to see how the added opposition of Thomas Jesse Jones caused the government to take the position it did.  

When word of Jones's manipulative tactics and blatant discriminatory actions spread throughout the black community, the wide black spectrum of political opinion, even though often opposed to each other on others matters, began to demonstrate solidarity in their outrage and universal condemnation of Jones. The representatives of the Tuskegee YMCA, most of whom had strong interests in missionary work, logged their protest of Jones's actions. Their letter stated as follows:

The delay of Mr. Max Yergan’s sail for service as missionary secretary among our brothers in Africa, is causing great concern among the NINE HUNDRED young men who constitute the student membership of the Tuskegee Association. . . . Most especially do we covet our ‘birthright of privilege’ to make our distinct contribution toward the salvation of Africa; and we want to be acquainted with the barriers which are delaying your plans for the African work.  

John W. Davis, YMCA secretary and later president of West Virginia State College remarked, “the immediate program of the Young Men’s Christian Association as well as every thinking Negro is to dethrone Thomas Jesse Jones from his hold on so-called leadership.” Du Bois used the controversy to demonstrate how this was the culmination of years of activity by Jones, during which Negro college presidents, YMCA, YWCA and other welfare workers had been selected and rejected on the advice of one white man. In a letter to Anson Phelps-Stokes, Du Bois wrote, “if you expect to work with black people and cooperate with them the cooperation is going to be real. They are going to have the power to say what they think whether you like it or not and they will not submit to the dictation of men like Thomas Jesse Jones.”
Like Du Bois, Woodson recognized that the Yergan controversy was simply an extension of the monopoly Jones had held over YMCA appointments after World War I. Woodson was outraged that Jones had declared himself dictator over black affairs in America and abroad. As a result of the black backlash against Jones, Woodson abruptly dismissed Jones from the Executive Council in 1921. Woodson considered Jones's manipulative tactics a manifestation of the spirit of Beelzebub and remarked that Jones dared even to damn the natives in Africa. Woodson found it disheartening that a man inspired to give service to his people in South Africa was being rejected on the advice of one subjective person. Woodson even went a step further in his criticisms of Jones. He inserted a critical passage about Jones in his 1921 monograph *History of the Negro Church*. In the book, Woodson criticized what he considered to be Jones's evil spirited and manipulative efforts to personally select conservative or Washingtonian blacks to serve in Africa. Woodson noted:

After having nobly served in Africa and India, Max Yergan, an international Young Men's Christian Association Secretary, appointed to serve permanently in Africa recently toured the United States for a mission fund which the Negroes freely contributed that through him some portion of Africa may be redeemed. This man in Africa [Jones] having ingratiated himself according to Yergan's statement, influenced the administration to refuse him the permit to work among his own people. The same meddler, according to complaints made by the colored branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, all but made himself the dictator of the appointments of that department and other Negro welfare agencies sent abroad during the World War. His business now seems to be that of furnishing the world with 'hand-picked' negro [sic] leaders to damn even the Natives in Africa.

As Jones's unpopularity mounted in the black community, he denied the claims that he delayed Yergan's appointment. In the end, Jones went through considerable trouble to have the decision reversed. After nearly nine months of protest by blacks, the decision that barred Max Yergan from South Africa was overturned and Yergan sailed
for Cape Town, South Africa, in November of 1921. However, the Woodson-Jones controversy remained an issue of hot debate. Regrettably, for Woodson, the controversy would be costly. Woodson’s decision to dismiss Jones from the Executive Council and to insert the critical passage about Jones in his book sparked an upheaval within the Council. Several of Woodson’s white benefactors, including Moorfield Storey, resigned citing what they considered the mistreatment of Jones. George Foster Peabody especially objected to Woodson’s criticism of Jones and demanded that his name be removed from the Association’s letter-head.\(^3\)

Woodson’s problems with his Executive Council continued. Following the Peabody resignation, Woodson’s financial situation grew more uncertain with the resignation of the renowned Harvard historian, Albert B. Hart, who was appointed to the council in 1920. In addition to mounting criticisms concerning the mistreatment of Jones, Hart criticized Woodson for his autocratic leadership style and what he considered the misuse of the $50,000 awarded by the Carnegie Corporation and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM).

The financial support from the Carnegie Corporation and LSRM in 1921 increased the ASNLH’s endowment to $20,000 annually and provided Woodson the funds necessary to retire from his post at West Virginia Collegiate Institute.\(^3\) Woodson obtained these grants largely through his connection with John Franklin Jameson, editor of the *American Historical Review (AHR)* and director of the Department of Historical Research at the Carnegie Institution in Washington D.C. With Jameson’s assistance Woodson secured funding from the Carnegie Corporation, which on several previous occasions had denied him financial support. Jameson, who was directing a black history
research project under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution, discouraged Woodson from immediately applying to the Carnegie Corporation, the sister agency of the Carnegie Institution. Jameson explained that as a matter of policy, the Corporation did not subsidize outside research related to projects already undertaken by its own departments. To avoid rejection, Jameson suggested that Woodson focus his research on transcribing manuscripts and documents of private individuals, black and white. Furthermore, Jameson urged Woodson to seek papers relating to slavery and blacks in county court houses and other local archives.33

Jameson spoke highly of Woodson and the potential of the ASNLH to his good friend and colleague James R. Angell, president of Carnegie Corporation. Additionally, Jameson informed Angell in advance of Woodson’s application and expressed confidence in Woodson’s scientific ability. In his recommendation to the Carnegie Board of Trustees, Jameson praised Woodson’s publications for their scientific research approach and objectivity. Jameson saw a unique opportunity for the Carnegie Corporation and argued that it should seize the opportunity and support such an endeavor since there was little chance of Woodson receiving funds from federal, state or private sources.34

In time, however, Hart criticized Woodson. Hart and several members of the Executive Council were angered that Woodson submitted an application to the Carnegie Foundation for funds without the consent or formal approval from the Executive Council. Hart publicly challenged what he termed the secrecy in which Woodson handled the foundation applications. In a letter to Moorland, Woodson explained the primary reason why he kept the application process secret. He noted, “I did not want my nominal
members of the Executive Council, who have done nothing to promote the cause, to step in at this hour and impede progress.”

In a lengthy resignation letter, Hart declared, “I beg hereby to lodge my protest against management which enables one man, however able, trained and capable, to lay out a plan greatly to his personal advantage.” Hart maintained that Woodson’s plans were relegated to research topics of interest only to the director. Hart disapproved of Woodson’s hiring two investigators at generous salaries and scoffed at the $3,000 budgeted to pay Woodson’s annual salary, since Hart protested, West Virginia Collegiate Institute already employed him. Hart suggested that the funds would be better spent by sending five to ten colored students to various universities to receive intensive instruction in research and then engage them in the work of the ASNLH. Hart’s view was held by many white moderates of the period that suggested Woodson de-emphasize documentary history in favor of training black scholars in history and anthropology, and literary figures and musicians so they might take up the study of their own people on a broader scale.

In an effort to address Hart’s frustrations and to anticipate any actions by his benefactors, Woodson quickly responded to Hart in a conciliatory manner. He justified his $3,000 annual salary on the basis of his education and research experience. Woodson further volunteered to take the case of his salary to the foundation boards and allow them to decide if $3,000 was too much. Woodson assured Hart of his intentions to resign from West Virginia. He also explained that he would not receive payment from the LSRM grant until he began full time work for the ASNLH.

Woodson further explained to Hart that the stipulations of the Rockefeller grant restricted its use for the purpose of paying the ASNLH’s accumulated debts, operating
expenses, and the salaries of researchers in African-American history. Woodson asked that Hart submit names of qualified black graduate students whom he could hire as research assistants. Hart, unsatisfied with Woodson’s responses, told Woodson that the ASNLH was no longer a personal enterprise. Hart explained, “now that you have $10,000 a year from two foundations, now that you brought together an executive committee and it brings you before the public, the conditions are different.”

Two black Executive Council members and Hart’s former students, Alexander L. Jackson and Clement C. Richardson, pleaded for Hart to reconsider his decision to resign. They both feared that Hart’s resignation would damage the reputation of the ASNLH with white philanthropists. Richardson noted that, “it is the easiest thing in the world to blast the life and service of any colored man by whisperings and misgivings about money matters.” Richardson maintained that when word of Hart’s resignation was reported, public opinion would conclude that Dr. Woodson, or any colored man similarly situated, had been making away with funds. Hart assured Richardson that he did not believe Woodson was guilty of any wrong doing, however, he did object to Woodson’s use of the funds for research assistants and thought that Woodson’s salary was too high. Hart forwarded a copy of the resignation letter to each member of the Executive Council, J. Franklin Jameson, and to the officials of the Carnegie Corporation and the LSRM. In late April 1922, after several futile attempts to persuade the professor to reconsider, Woodson finally accepted Hart’s resignation.

Hart’s departure in 1921 coincided with the departure of other prominent Executive Council members including Jesse Moorland and Robert Park. Woodson and Moorland’s damaged relationship resulted from the controversy surrounding Woodson’s
application to the Carnegie Corporation. In the fall of 1920, when Woodson applied to
the Carnegie Corporation for a grant, he was unaware of the applications submitted by
Tuskegee Institute and the National Urban League. Woodson was angered when he was
made aware of the competing applications and claimed that not until the details of his
negotiations with the Carnegie Corporation became known did Robert Moton of
Tuskegee and Eugene K. Jones of the National Urban League apply to the Carnegie
Corporation for funds. Woodson declared that only after realizing that his grant was all
but assured did Moton and Monroe Work use their influence to swing the funds to
Tuskegee and to prevent him from obtaining the appropriations.42

To Woodson's displeasure, Moorland attempted to broker a compromise that
entailed a collaborative effort between the ASNLH, the Urban League and Tuskegee.
Woodson was angered by the thought of an agreement between the three organizations
and he blasted Moorland for what he considered meddling in the affairs of the ASNLH.
Woodson maintained that only the director could speak for the organization. Woodson
especially distrusted Moorland and challenged his authority as a race leader. Woodson
charged that Moorland refused to separate himself from whites such as the despotic
Stanley Durkee and Howard University administration that continued to exploit the black
race. Furthermore, Woodson attested that he could never agree to compromise with such
unprincipled men as Moton and Monroe Work.43

James Angell, who in 1920 became president of the Carnegie Corporation of New
York, confessed to being a little disturbed by Woodson's attitude. Angell supported
Moorland's compromise. Angell understood that Woodson desired to differentiate his
work from the sociological studies that typically characterized Tuskegee and the Urban
League, however, he explained that it was not the practice of the Corporation to fund three very similar projects. In a letter to Jameson, Angell expressed that Woodson left an unpleasant impression on him. He explained, “I am not in the least sympathetic to Dr. Woodson’s indisposition to cooperate with that department of the Tuskegee School which deals with the collection of current information about the [N]egro. I do not at all appreciate the temper in which apparently he [Woodson] has dealt with perfectly proper overtures on this matter.” Despite the controversy, Angell convinced the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Corporation to fund all three groups.

In October 1921, Moorland moved from Washington D.C. to New York, at which time Woodson replaced him as secretary-treasurer of the ASNLH. However, Moorland was not the only executive council member that would depart following the controversy surrounding the Carnegie Corporation grant. Robert E. Park, who was more closely associated with Tuskegee and the Urban League than to the ASNLH, resigned as president of the ASNLH in May of 1921. Additionally, Emmett J. Scott of Howard University, appointed to the Executive Council in 1919, was dismissed when he spoke out against Moorland’s removal. According to Scott, Moorland had worked so unselfishly on behalf of Woodson and the ASNLH. Despite the events surrounding their removals and permanently damaged relationships, Dr. Park, Moorland and Scott continued to contribute and support the mission and work of Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH.

The series of resignations only fueled the Woodson and Jones dispute. Jones used the changes on the Executive Council to illustrate Woodson’s radical presence of mind and contempt for racial cooperation. Jones pointed to the departure of moderates like
Robert E. Park, Jesse Moorland, Emmett J. Scott and his own dismissal to show Woodson’s shift toward radicalism and racial agitation. In Jones’s assessment radical black officials displaced moderate officers committed to interracial cooperation. Jones pointed out that the Reverend John R. Hawkins of the African Methodist Episcopal Church; a man noted as an orator and for his rather emotional statements on race questions replaced Robert E. Park, a white moderate and objective scholar, as president of the ASNLH. Moorland, Jones expressed, was replaced as secretary-treasurer by S. W. Rutherford, the head of a black insurance company in Washington. Furthermore, Jones reported to ASNLH benefactors that Dr. Woodson was found, “speaking quite vehemently against Dr. Moton,” which further demonstrated, according to Jones, evidence of “an unfortunate attitude of mind.” Jones wrote to Moorland in 1922 inquiring about the recent changes on the Executive Council:

I note by the letter-head of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History that a number of important changes have been made in the Executive Council. As you know, the appropriation of the Phelps-Stokes Fund was made largely because of the interest which you and Dr. Robert E. Park had in the Association. We felt that Dr. Woodson, with your backing, would carry on research according to scientific principles. In view of the radical changes which have been made in the personnel and your own resignation from the position of Secretary-Treasurer, we are eager to ascertain your estimate of the future work of the Association.

The recent departures of Jones, Moorland, Scott and Park gravely concerned the benefactors of the ASNLH. Several benefactors began to raise serious questions about Woodson’s commitment to racial cooperation. Several philanthropists, including Julius Rosenwald launched independent investigations to reassess Woodson and the programs of the ASNLH. In a letter addressed to Rosenwald, Woodson responded to the harsh
attacks by Jones and dismissed the allegations as a result of Jones’s anger from having been removed from the Executive Council.\(^{50}\)

Woodson justified Jones’s dismissal as an act of political expedience. He explained, “an investigation would show that Jones was detested by ninety-five percent of all Negroes, who were seriously concerned with the uplift of their race.”\(^{51}\) In Woodson’s opinion, Jones believed himself to be a self-made dictator of black people, exercising exclusive privilege. Furthermore, Woodson believed that Jones took matters upon himself to classify for white philanthropists and foundation officials the attributes of black individuals and organizations as being good or bad. Jones decided whether or not black individuals and organizations were worthy of foundation assistance. As a result of Jones’s view, Woodson insisted that it had become unpopular to retain Jones on the Executive Council.\(^{52}\)

In response to Jones’s many accusations of radicalism, Woodson vehemently defended and reassured his benefactors of his conservative views. Woodson condemned radicalism and explained that many reviewers of his work refer to him as a conservative historian. He directed Rosenwald to a passage in the *History of the Negro Church*, which read, “The watchword of the Negro church has been patience while waiting on the Lord. The Negro has learned not to avenge his own wrongs, believing that God will adjust matters in the end.” Elsewhere, Woodson adds, “the Negro is conservatively Christian and looks forward to the favorable turn in the affairs of man when the wrongs of the oppressed shall be righted without the shedding of blood.”\(^{53}\)

It was the reassurance of James E. Moorland and Emmett J. Scott, however, that salvaged the relationship between Woodson and Rosenwald.\(^{54}\) Scott, in particular,
assured Rosenwald that the charges of radicalism against Woodson were unwarranted. Scott explained, “if a colored man protests against injustices in the matter of his fundamental rights, he is immediately criticized as being a radical.” Scott continued, “many persons condemn a man for protesting against injustice which white men would not stand for one fraction of a moment. I have seen nothing that Dr. Woodson has written that would lead me to think he is radical in the communistic or anarchistic sense.” “He is radical,” Scott continued, “in his strong condemnation on several occasions recently of the injustices which the Colored people of this country are at this time the chief victims.”

Scott’s reassurance to Rosenwald could not prevent the systematic effort launched by Jones designed to wreck the financial base of the ASNLH. Jones accused Woodson of abandoning objective and scientific study that characterized his earlier works for radicalism, propaganda and racial agitation. Jones informed top foundation officials of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie Corporation and individual contributors of Hart’s complaints of Woodson’s mismanagement of funds and despotic and autocratic behavior.

These ongoing recriminations would eventually wreck havoc on Woodson’s financial efforts. In 1921, the Phelps-Stokes Fund discontinued all financial contributions to Woodson and the ASNLH. Jones’s vowed that the Phelps-Stokes Fund would not make additional contributions to Woodson as long as radicals were in control of the Association. Woodson remarked, “for five years, beginning in 1916, the Phelps-Stokes Fund gave our work annually $200, the usual amount they gave agencies, not adequate to provide substantial aid, but sufficient to justify meddling.” In 1923,
Woodson’s application for a $3,000 grant from the General Education Board, the sister organization to the LSRM, was denied, as was all subsequent appeals to that organization. Additionally, the Julius Rosenwald Fund grew suspicious of Woodson’s administration, despite the presence of Julius Rosenwald on the Executive Council.\textsuperscript{59}

In 1925, following the expiration of the Carnegie grant, Woodson’s request for a renewal was denied, despite the appeals of several noted scholars, including Jameson, who closely supervised the first Carnegie Corporation grant. Dr. Waldo G. Leland, Executive Secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies, wrote to Dr. Woodson on April 14, 1925. The letter explained that an Executive Committee had been appointed consisting of Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, Dr. Thomas W. Page of the Institute of Economics and himself to report on the support and activities of your organization.\textsuperscript{60} Both Dr. Leland and Jameson lobbied the Carnegie Corporation on behalf of Woodson’s request for a renewal of the grant. Their futile efforts could not persuade President Frederick P. Keppel, Angell’s successor, or the trustees of the corporation to reverse its decision and support the ASNLH. However, the LSRM agreed to renew its grant to the ASNLH at a significantly smaller amount. Then in 1929, when the Rockefeller Foundation absorbed the LSRM, the financial assistance to Woodson and the ASNLH were discontinued.

Woodson, in 1924, had an opportunity to give his side of the dispute with Jones and his loss of needed revenues. Woodson was invited to submit a letter for publication to the Indianapolis \textit{Freeman} explaining his views on the public controversy with Jones. Woodson explained that he suffered financially because he criticized Jones and his
Woodson noted:

[Jones] wages war upon all Negro agencies not acceptable to him, or those which may have his point of view, but are managed by person’s whom he dislikes. He has proscribed all Negroes who criticize his policy, and he conducts a general campaign among philanthropists to prevent them from giving to those institutions which he cannot influence or control . . . He proceeds always by indirection, writing letters or misrepresentation, and holding conferences by which he influences philanthropists against those whom he would destroy.61

Woodson maintained that his criticisms of Jones inserted in the *History of the Negro Church* subsequently led to Jones’s systematic campaign designed to destroy the financial base of the ASNLH. Woodson explained that the Associated Publishers, an entirely separate entity from the ASNLH, published the *History of the Negro Church*, which criticized Jones. Therefore, Woodson noted, “prudence should have constrained him [Jones], and restricted his efforts merely to my removal, because the Association is not one man’s affair.”62 Nevertheless, in an attempt to retaliate and professionally destroy Woodson, Jones tried to financially destroy the ASNLH. Woodson blamed Jones for the financial woes of the ASNLH, including the loss of at least $2,000 in 1924.63

Black scholars and educators came to Woodson’s defense. American Negro Academy members Arthur A. Schomburg and John W. Cromwell sympathized with Woodson, agreeing that his courage in speaking out against Jones had cost the ASNLH white financial support.64 Marcus Garvey sympathizers and *Negro World* contributors, who initially were skeptical about Woodson’s accepting funds from white capitalists, rushed to his aid. *Negro World* columnist S. A. Haynes urged his readers to financially support the ASNLH.65
Foundation officials denied that Jones influenced their decision to discontinue funding Carter G. Woodson and the ASNLH. The Officials of the Phelps-Stokes Fund maintained that they discontinued their support of the Association in order to free up funds for the two African Commissions in 1921 and 1924, respectively. Officials of the Carnegie Corporation indicated that their initial grant was intended to be a one-time offer. The LSRM continued its support of the ASNLH until the Rockefeller Memorial absorbed it in 1929. Moreover, by 1929, the ASNLH’s foundation support had dried up. In spite of the controversy, Woodson retained the respect and support of other agencies and individual donors. Over time he also managed to mend damaged relationships with contributors such as Moorfield Storey. Storey agreed to contribute $50 annually similarly Rosenwald and Phelps-Stokes Fund vice-president, James Hardy Dillard, continued to donate funds and serve on the Executive Council until their deaths in the mid 1930s.66

Thus, in the final outcome of the bitter Woodson and Jones controversy of the early 1920s, Woodson and the ASNLH suffered financially during the 1930s. Jones’s manipulative and controlling posture managed to cost Woodson several thousand dollars of philanthropic aid. Woodson, with his independent and uncompromising spirit, harshly criticized and publicly challenged Jones and the philanthropic stronghold over the direction of black scholarship and thinking. As a result, Woodson found himself at odds with Jones and outside the long-range plans of many philanthropic foundations. Nevertheless, Woodson stood up to Jones and the philanthropic community and refused to be coerced or intimidated, and consistently remained true to his scholarly objectives.
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