



2013

## The Struggle toward Equality in Higher Education: The Impact of the Morrill Acts on Race Relations in Virginia, 1872-1958

Nicholas Betts  
*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

© The Author

---

Downloaded from

<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/3052>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).

© Nicholas A. Betts 2013

---

All Rights Reserved

The Struggle toward Equality in Higher Education:  
The Impact of the Morrill Acts on Race Relations in Virginia, 1872-1958

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Master of Arts at Virginia Commonwealth University

By

Nicholas A. Betts

Bachelor of Arts, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2011

Director: Dr. John T. Kneebone

Department Chair and Associate Professor,

Virginia Commonwealth University Department of History

Virginia Commonwealth University

Richmond, Virginia

April, 2013

## Acknowledgements

First I would like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. John T. Kneebone for his help and encouragement throughout the process. I would also like to give a special thank you to Dr. Brian Daugherty and Dr. Katherine D. Walker for their insightful comments, which helped me to improve my Thesis. I would like to thank all of the excellent professors, whom I have not yet mentioned, that have helped me to improve my writing skills while I was enrolled in the Master of Arts program for History at Virginia Commonwealth University, including: Dr. Sarah Meacham, Dr. George Munro, Dr. Ted Tunnell, Dr. Andrew Crislip, and Dr. Timothy Thurber. I would also like to thank Dr. Sarah Meacham and Dr. John Powers for all they taught me about teaching a college course, during the time I worked for each of them as a graduate teaching assistant. I would like to thank Dr. Bernard Moitt for mentoring me from the time I was an undergraduate here at Virginia Commonwealth University. I would like to give a special thank you to my father and mother Wayne and Amy Betts, my brother Nate Betts, my sister Chloe Betts, my grandparents Bob and Ada Jones, my grandmother Catherine Louise Betts Lopez, and my girlfriend Lindsey Gibson for their love and support. I would also like to give thanks to God.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Chapter 1: Background on the Passage of the Morrill Act and its Effect on Virginia.....	1
Chapter 2: Virginia Tech’s Establishment in Accordance with the 1862 Morrill Act .....	31
Chapter 3: The Establishment and Operation of Virginia State University.....	47
Chapter 4: Education, Agriculture, and Race Relations in Virginia.....	78
Chapter 5: Federal and State Responsibility for the Effects of Segregation in Virginia’s public higher education system.....	92

## Abstract

### THE STRUGGLE TOWARD EQUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THE IMPACT OF THE MORRILL ACTS ON RACE RELATIONS IN VIRGINIA, 1872-1958

By Nicholas A. Betts, Master of Arts

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2013

Director: Dr. John T. Kneebone, Department Chair and Associate Professor,  
Virginia Commonwealth University Department of History

This thesis examines the impact of the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Acts on Virginia's public higher education system. While the Morrill Acts, issued by the federal government, expanded access to higher education for all Americans, they also resulted in the entrenchment of segregation in seventeen different state public higher education systems. The segregated public higher education systems in Virginia and elsewhere led to inequality in the higher education available to African Americans students, compared with the higher education available to white students within these states. This thesis will address the disparity, brought about by unequal funding of institutions based upon race, which Virginia's state government policy exacerbated,

from 1872 to 1953. It will analyze the difference between the funding and program availability at Virginia Tech, designated to educate white students, compared with Virginia State University, which was the public institution designated to educate African American students during this period.





## **Chapter 1**

### **Background on the Passage of the Morrill Act and its Effect on Virginia**

The passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 helped to set the foundations for American educational and economic growth. Despite its success, however, the Morrill Act was inherently flawed, even after the introduction of the 1890 Morrill Act, due to its acceptance and facilitation of racial segregation. The original Morrill Act was passed in 1862 to allow for the establishment of public land-grant colleges and universities. Virginia, however, was absent from the Union and continued to fight with the Confederacy until it collapsed in 1865. Thus, Virginia did not immediately adopt the tenets of the original Morrill Act upon its passage. Virginia returned to the Union in 1870 and officially began compliance with the Morrill Act in 1872, with the opening of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, which would become Virginia Tech. The establishment of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, however, did not afford African Americans any further opportunity to obtain higher education, although it made higher education more accessible to whites. African Americans would receive greater, yet still far from equal, access to higher education after the establishment of the first fully state-funded institution for black Virginians, Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, eleven years later in 1883. Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute went through various names and classifications, some of which were imposed upon it by the state of Virginia, until it eventually was renamed Virginia State University.

Although the first fully state-funded college for African Americans in Virginia was established a decade after Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, Virginia was somewhat unique, and progressive for the late nineteenth century South, in its apportionment of funds from the original 1862 Morrill Act to an institution for the higher education of African Americans. These funds were initially awarded in 1872 to Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. The distribution of the funds from the Morrill Act of 1862 by the Virginia General Assembly, however, showed the inequality of the time period. In *Cradle of America: Four Centuries of Virginia History*, Peter Wallenstein indicated that the distribution of funds was not equal between Hampton, designated for black students, and Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, designated for white students. He maintained that “One-third of the money was allocated to Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. The other two-thirds went to a school in Montgomery County previously known as the Preston and Olin Institute...which now took on a new identity as the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College.”<sup>1</sup> Primary source material, which this thesis will address in its second chapter on the establishment of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, confirms Wallenstein’s assertions about the disparity in the distribution of funds to Hampton in comparison with the funds distributed to Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1872. This distribution of funds was unequal, even in terms of population representation, between African Americans and whites during this period in Virginia. Wallenstein contended that this unequal distribution was initially contested by African Americans in the Virginia General Assembly, but was eventually agreed to. He concluded that “Black legislators, arguing that Virginia’s population was more than 40 percent black, pushed for five-twelfths of the Morrill Act money, but one-third was far more, symbolically and

---

<sup>1</sup>Peter Wallenstein, *Cradle of America: Four Centuries of Virginia History*, (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007), p. 226.

substantively, than none at all.”<sup>2</sup> One of the reasons why the black legislators may have conceded to the unequal distribution of funds was that the Virginia Legislature was acting on a strict deadline to accept the tenets of the 1862 Morrill Act before time ran out. Wallenstein noted that “Congress had extended to ten years the length of time states had for acting under the 1862 Morrill formula, but the ten year limit was fast approaching,”<sup>3</sup> and the agreement splitting these funds unequally was not accepted until 1872. Wallenstein’s assertion that the agreement to an unequal funding distribution for the extension of higher education to African Americans was a rational choice for black legislators, when faced with the possibility of receiving no federal funds, for higher education expansion in Virginia if the deadline was missed, sheds light on why these African American legislators accepted this unfair distribution of funds in 1872.

Although Virginia distributed funds to a higher educational institution for African Americans before there was a federal mandate to do so in 1890, with the distribution of funds to Hampton Institute in 1872, it was not only done to address concerns about improving education of African Americans. Wallenstein posited that “White legislators assumed that black Virginians, if they could benefit from the funds at a black institution, would be easier to exclude from the white one.”<sup>4</sup> Although segregation in public primary and secondary schools officially began in Virginia in 1870, no the precedent for segregation in public higher education was established before the 1872 decision to split Morrill Act funding unequally between separate black and white institutions. Thus, the original Morrill Act was not purely beneficial. The 1862 Morrill Act was beneficial because it extended higher education to more African Americans in the state of Virginia, but by design both Morrill Acts had the negative effect of entrenching segregation in

---

<sup>2</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 227.

<sup>3</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 225.

<sup>4</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 227.

Virginia's public higher education system over the next 80 years. The most detrimental effect of this legislation was the ability of subsequent Virginia legislators, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to continue to distribute federal funds unequally, and also to further erode the course offerings and the institutional control at black state-funded institutions; while Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, designated for white students, gained increased autonomy in institutional control and course offerings. This thesis traces the differing access to higher education, with a focus on agricultural education, for black and white Virginians over the 70-year period between 1883-1953, through the comparison of funding and program availability at Virginia Tech and Virginia State University. It will also explore the effects of the federal government's endorsement, in the 1890 Morrill Act, of states' ability to establish separate universities for black and white students.

Discrimination in agriculture aided by the US federal government was not unique to the establishment of state-funded institutions of higher learning. In *Beyond Forty Acres and a Mule: African American Landowning Families since Reconstruction*, Debra A. Reid pointed out that by 1990 "activism culminated in the first lawsuit on behalf of black farmers against the national government...in 1997, FLAG with the FSC filed a lawsuit that became *Pigford v. Glickman*, the largest class action lawsuit in U.S. history, citing racial discrimination as the class grievance."<sup>5</sup> The original *Pigford* lawsuit by black farmers resulted in a financial settlement, approved on April 14, 1999, by Judge Paul L. Friedman of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia after hearing the case of *Pigford vs. Glickman*, as compensation for discrimination by the U.S. Department of Agriculture against black farmers. Although this decision was undoubtedly a

---

<sup>5</sup> Debra A. Reid, "Introduction" in *Beyond Forty Acres and a Mule: African American Landowning Families since Reconstruction*, edited by Debra A. Reid and Evan P. Bennett, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012) p. 2.

victory for all those who faced racial discrimination, only sixty-nine percent of eligible applicants filed for compensation by the established deadline. Those who filed late did have access, as a collective group, to \$100 million which was appropriated by “a provision in the 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246).”<sup>6</sup> The large number of lawsuits filed late caused a second class action lawsuit, often referred to as Pigford II, which eventually resulted in a settlement after the appropriation of an additional \$1.15 billion in funding through the passage of the “Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (H.R.4783)” by Congress and approved by the President on December 8, 2010.<sup>7</sup> The original Pigford ruling involved racial discrimination between 1983 and 1997; however, the problem began much earlier than that. Black farmers were at an educational disadvantage in agriculture, as well as in other fields, solidified by the passage of the Morrill Act 1890, which allowed for the creation of separate unequally funded, institutions of higher learning for African Americans.

The Morrill Act of 1890 specifically gave the option of establishing segregated state-funded colleges if a state chose not to integrate its existing institutions. Although black state-funded institutions often performed admirably with the resources they were given, they were undoubtedly placed at a disadvantage, due to unequal funding and constant attacks on their institutional programming. Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, which would eventually become Virginia State University in 1979, under pressure from the state changed its name and mission for the first time on March 29, 1902, to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, and was also forced by the state to abandon its collegiate course work on May 14, 1902. Thus, Virginia

---

<sup>6</sup> Tadlock Cowan and Jody Feder, Congressional Research Service. “The *Pigford* Cases: USDA Settlement of Discrimination Suits by Black Farmers,” Accessed May 23, 2012.  
<http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RS20430.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Tadlock Cowan and Jody Feder, Congressional Research Service, The *Pigford* Cases

eroded higher education opportunities for African Americans with at least the defacto support of the federal government, which had opened the door to this injustice by allowing separate institutions to be created in accordance with the 1890 Morrill Act. The Supreme Court case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, six years later, in 1896 would further entrench segregation by officially making “separate but equal” institutions legal until the middle of the twentieth century.

In accordance with federal regulations the state of Virginia maintained separate state-funded institutions, based on race, in order to continue to receive federal funds. Although Hampton Institute was the first black institution in Virginia to be given funds by the government, it was a pre-existing private institution. The first fully state-funded institution created for black students, after the implementation of the original Morrill Act in Virginia, was Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. Although Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute became the first fully state-funded 4-year institution for black students in the country, it received nowhere near the funding Virginia Tech received.

In *A History of Western Education*, Harry G. Good and James D. Teller indicated that twenty-one state universities were founded prior to the start of the Civil War.<sup>8</sup> They argued, however, that “the early institutions were hardly of college grade, were not secular, and were not given regular support by the parent states.”<sup>9</sup> The two exceptions highlighted by Good and Teller, which they described as “leaders in developing university standards of scholarship and teaching,”<sup>10</sup> were the University of Virginia and the University of Michigan. There was a distinct difference between these earlier state institutions and those which developed after the Morrill

---

<sup>8</sup> Harry G. Good and James D. Teller, *A History of Western Education*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960), page 474.

<sup>9</sup> Good and Teller, *A History of Western Education*, p. 474.

<sup>10</sup> Good and Teller, *A History of Western Education*, p. 474.

Act was passed. Good and Teller indicated that “the older colleges and state universities prepared students for the older professions; the land-grant colleges prepared them for scientific agriculture, engineering, homemaking, and the growing industry and commerce of the country.”<sup>11</sup> There was a paradigm shift in higher education with the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, which illustrated an expansion of higher education programming and accessibility, expanding college education into areas it had not previously focused on and to individuals who would not have had the ability to attend college before the expansion of state universities brought about by federal legislation.

In *The Freedom of Thought Struggle in the Old South*, Clement Eaton maintained that the South, prior to the Civil War and the passage of the Morrill Act, focused on the development of higher education in order to educate its leaders. Eaton posited that the development of higher education in the pre-Civil War South was elitist, largely ignoring the vast majority of citizens. He noted that the development of higher education was “In bright contrast to the apathy of the Old South toward the educating of the masses.”<sup>12</sup> Eaton indicated, however that southern states developed state universities first. He argued that new universities were founded and older universities expanded prior to the Civil War. Eaton reported that “According to the census of 1860, Virginia had twenty-three colleges with an enrollment of 2,824 students, Georgia, thirty-two colleges with 3,302 students, while New York had only seventeen colleges with an enrollment of 2,970 students, and Massachusetts eight institutions of higher learning with 1733 students.”<sup>13</sup> In addition Eaton noted that Virginia spent fifty thousand dollars more a year on

---

<sup>11</sup> Good and Teller, *A History of Western Education*, p. 475.

<sup>12</sup> Clement Eaton, *The Freedom of Thought Struggle in the Old South* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964), page 216.

<sup>13</sup> Eaton, *The Freedom of Thought*, page 216.

higher education than Massachusetts, “indicating that she realized the need of trained leaders.”<sup>14</sup> The figures highlighted by Eaton in relation to the distribution of higher education in the United States prior to the Civil War indicate two very important notions. First, the South was comparable and possibly even ahead of the North in the development of higher education prior to the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862. Second, throughout the entire United States higher education was largely inaccessible to the wider population prior to the passage of the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Acts. Good and Teller posited that the Morrill Act “has been a powerful democratizing force that has been felt throughout the American system.”<sup>15</sup> Although this statement is correct, it is important to note that the democratization which the Morrill Act brought has happened slowly since its inception, with its full extension to African Americans happening only fairly recently after the desegregation of higher education.

The original 1862 Morrill Act was first brought to the House Floor of the 35<sup>th</sup> U.S. Congress in 1857 by Justin Morrill, a Whig Congressman from Vermont. In “Major Issues in the Congressional Debate of the Morrill Act of 1862,” John H. Florer recounted the legislative struggle, prior to the Morrill Act being signed into law by President Lincoln in 1862. Florer indicated that legislation first put forward in 1857 by Morrill “proposed a total grant of 6,060,000 acres of federal land worth an estimated \$7,575,000 and appropriated to each state according to the size of its congressional delegation. Each was expected to use its portion to establish at least one college where major, but not exclusive, attention would be devoted to ‘agriculture and the mechanic arts.’”<sup>16</sup> States which did not have enough federal land to sell

---

<sup>14</sup> Eaton, *The Freedom of Thought*, page 216.

<sup>15</sup> Good and Teller, *A History of Western Education*, p. 475.

<sup>16</sup> John H. Florer, “Major Issues in the Congressional Debate of the Morrill Act of 1862,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (4), (1968): p. 459.



within their own borders would be given “land script,” which signified possession by that state of land they could sell to acquire the necessary funds to establish a state college, although this land was actually located within the borders of another state. The land script was supposed to be issued by the United States Secretary of the Interior, according to Morrill’s legislation.<sup>17</sup>

Morrill’s legislation faced problems from its inception, due to the divided Congress of the late 1850s. After the legislation was forwarded to the less than favorable Committee on Public Lands, “The Committee reported the proposal back on April 15, 1858, with a recommendation that it should not be passed.”<sup>18</sup> Despite this decision, the Morrill bill was able to pass through the House of Representatives narrowly, with 105 congressmen voting for the legislation and 100 opposing the legislation, and it passed through the Senate with even fewer votes to spare, with 25 Senators voting for the legislation and 22 Senators voting against it.<sup>19</sup> Although the bill narrowly passed through Congress it was not approved by President Buchanan. Buchanan’s veto stopped Morrill’s legislation from becoming law because with the 35<sup>th</sup> Congress so divided it was impossible to overturn Buchanan’s decision with the two-thirds of congressional support needed to invalidate a presidential veto impossible to obtain.<sup>20</sup>

Since the Morrill Act was largely opposed by Southern and Western states, Morrill reintroduced the bill in 1861, during the Civil War, after the southern states had seceded from the Union. Only Congressmen from the West remained as an obstacle to passing the Morrill Act, after the South had seceded. The legislation was again sent to the Committee on Public Lands and it was referred back to the floor with a recommendation against its passage for the second

---

<sup>17</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 459.

<sup>18</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 460.

<sup>19</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 460.

<sup>20</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 460.

time, but this time the vote was not close in either House of Congress; the House of Representatives voted 90-25 to pass the Morrill Act, while the Senate voted 32-7 in favor of the legislation.<sup>21</sup> This time the bill was signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln in 1862. The theory and the idealism engrained in the original 1862 Morrill Act are unquestionably positive. The Morrill Act sought to increase educational opportunity for American citizens and to increase the economic and military prowess of the United States in the process, although the implementation of the 1862 Morrill Act would prove to be problematic and exclusionary.

During the Congressional debates on the merit of the Morrill Act in the House of Representatives, Morrill tried to appeal to the “national pride” of his fellow legislators. Florer maintained that “Morrill went to some lengths to compare mid-nineteenth-century America with her European competitors and concluded that we could not long afford to be second best in agriculture, education and industrial development.”<sup>22</sup> Morrill believed it was especially critical for the United States to develop better farming techniques to maximize its agricultural production. Florer pointed out that Morrill argued “Day by day the soil was being depleted by farmers who continued to use unenlightened methods of production. Three-fourths of our land, he insisted, was ‘more or less’ subject to a process of exhaustion. The annual income of the soil of not less than one hundred million acres was falling at an estimated annual rate of ten cents an acre. A loss, he calculated, at \$166,666,666 a year, ‘a sum greater than all our national and state taxation.’”<sup>23</sup> Florer posited that soil exhaustion was a recognized problem among many farmers

---

<sup>21</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 460-461.

<sup>22</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 463.

<sup>23</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 467.

and that Morrill sought to develop an education system with institutions that helped farmers to maximize their yields with the most current technologic advancements.<sup>24</sup>

Florer also addressed the debate surrounding the Morrill Act which took place in the Senate. He highlighted Senator James Harlan as a champion of the legislation. In the debate Harlan stressed the importance of providing educational opportunity to the American population. Florer indicated that the Republican from Iowa “argued that farmers and mechanics were part of a ‘mass’ that suffered from an inferior social position and were unjustly dependent upon the power of those classes above them. Education was needed to help lift such men out of this situation.”<sup>25</sup> Harlan also recognized that large groups of people were consciously being denied the ability to obtain education. Florer noted that “Harlan lamented the fact that there were those who would like to keep the ‘laboring men’ of the country in a state of ignorance—uneducated and dependent so ‘that their toil and sweat may be used to advance the interests and promote the happiness of those more highly educated and refined.’”<sup>26</sup> Harlan’s analysis of the sociopolitical atmosphere of late-nineteenth century America seems fairly accurate. Although the passage of the 1862 Morrill Act would increase access to higher education for many American citizens, the paradigm shift was incomplete because there were still those who fought against the equal expansion of educational opportunity for African Americans, for the same reasons they had fought to impede the expansion of education to less affluent whites. No accommodations were made specifically to provide African Americans with the opportunity to receive state-funded higher education in the 1862 Morrill Act and as a result some southern states chose to exclude

---

<sup>24</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 467.

<sup>25</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 468.

<sup>26</sup> Florer, “Major Issues,” 468.

African Americans from the 1862 land-grant institutions and provided no alternative method for African Americans to pursue a state-funded education prior to the passage of the 1890 Morrill Act.

In *An Educational History of the American People*, Adolphe E. Meyer noted that by the 1840s Congress had received numerous petitions to aid in the development of higher education. Meyer posited that “From the forties on, in fact, the men of Congress were besieged with demands to lend a hand in the establishment of colleges to teach agriculture, architecture, and the mechanical arts and similar specialties.”<sup>27</sup> Meyer indicated, however, that there were two notable differences between the Morrill Act which passed in 1862 and its predecessor, which was vetoed under the Buchanan Administration: “the increase of each grant from 20,000 to 30,000 acres and the inclusion of military science and tactics – to contribute in measure to the winning of the Civil War.”<sup>28</sup> Meyer posited that the implementation of the Morrill Act helped to develop the United States into the military and economic powerhouse it became in the twentieth century. He noted that “When, in 1962, the American people took time to memorialize the first centenary of the enactment of Morrill’s law, the scheme of higher learning which it had propagated had become the country’s largest single contributor of its trained and educated manpower.”<sup>29</sup> Although the 1862 Morrill Act was undoubtedly a huge step forward in the expansion of higher education, throughout the United States, the 1890 Morrill Act would bring increased higher educational accessibility while still creating new problems for equal access to collegiate programming and funding.

---

<sup>27</sup> Adolphe E. Meyer, *An Educational History of the American People Second Edition*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), page, 211.

<sup>28</sup> Meyer, *An Educational History*, page, 211.

<sup>29</sup> Meyer, *An Educational History*, page, 212.

*In Education for Work: The Historical Evolution of Vocational and Distributive Education in America*, Arthur F. McClure, James Riley Chrisman, and Perry Mock contend that Morrill “like a number of his contemporaries...was deeply concerned about the future of higher education.”<sup>30</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock noted that those who opposed the bill did so because they found it to be unconstitutional. The majority of states that argued the Morrill Act was unconstitutional were Western or Southern. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock maintained that “the item which appears to have most upset Buchanan and the opposition was the provision which required the money to be used for education.”<sup>31</sup> The opposition contended the Morrill Act was intended to shift control of education away from the states and localities and give increased control to the federal government.<sup>32</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock posited that the provision introduced into the bill in 1861, which required these land-grant universities to include military training, aided in generating wider congressional support. They also indicated that “The Morrill Act as passed gave each state land-script in the amount of thirty thousand acres for each senator and representative it had in Congress.”<sup>33</sup> The revenue generated from the sale of the land had to be used by the state to endow a college for the mechanical arts and agriculture. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock concluded that “The land-grant colleges had the greatest impact and importance in western states – the region that offered the most opposition to the passage of the bill.”<sup>34</sup> The Morrill Act would become so successful that additional funding was appropriated in

---

<sup>30</sup> Arthur F. McClure, James Riley Chrisman, and Perry Mock, *Education for Work: The Historical Evolution of Vocational and Distributive Education in America*, (Cranbury: Associated University Press, Inc., 1985), p. 42.

<sup>31</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 42.

<sup>32</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 42-43.

<sup>33</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 43.

<sup>34</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 43.

the 1890 Morrill Act and the 1907 Nelson Amendment. These additional acts would increase higher educational opportunity throughout America.

Although the 1862 Morrill Act was a positive step toward providing accessible higher education throughout the United States, the original 1862 Act only benefited whites in many states. The racial disparity in the access to higher education was not addressed at the federal level until the 1890 Morrill Act, which increased accessibility to higher education for African-Americans, but also helped to entrench segregation and led to separate but unequally funded institutions of higher learning for black and white Americans. Previously both racism and a desire by many white southern legislators, from the mid to late nineteenth century, to keep African Americans from obtaining the full rights of American citizens for political reasons, resulted in blacks being excluded from the benefits of the original Morrill Act. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock argued that many of the legislators in power during the period did not care about the African Americans who had just been freed from bondage. They concluded that “Most of those in positions of power believed the new freedmen possessed few of the skills necessary for full involvement in American life. Owing to the nature of their previous condition, the vast majority of the former slaves entered freedom unskilled, uneducated, and unprepared.”<sup>35</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock effectively pointed out the inherent racial bias on the part of the lawmakers of the period, but they fail to address the economic and political gains these nineteenth lawmakers sought by attempting to keep the black population disenfranchised; an issue I will discuss in detail later in this text.

The Second Morrill Act of 1890 expanded the mission of the original Morrill Act passed in 1862. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock posited that Morrill recognized the need for more

---

<sup>35</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 26.

federal aid to the land-grant institutions established in 1862, by 1872, ten years after the original bill passed, so he began to work on a bill which would increase funding to these institutions.<sup>36</sup>

The authors concluded that “Finally, in August 1890, [Morrill] was successful and the Second Morrill Act was passed. This act provided that each state which participated under the original act of 1862 would receive a grant of \$15,000, which would increase by \$1,000 per year for ten years. At the end of that period the grant would become an annual grant-in-aid of \$25,000.”<sup>37</sup>

McClure, Chrisman, and Mock also noted a provision of the 1890 Morrill Act which made it “the first federal grant that allowed a federal official to withhold funds if he felt the requirements were not being met.”<sup>38</sup> This provision places the failure to provide equal access to higher education for all citizens, within a state, squarely at the feet of the federal government, which called for the “equitable” distribution of funds in the 1890 Morrill Act. Although the states that misappropriated the funds based on race share the blame, the federal government had the ability to stop the flow of funds into states which were discriminating against black citizens by granting the segregated African American institutions far less funds to develop.

The federal and state governments, however, were not the only proponents of segregated schools. Booker T. Washington, one of the most influential black leaders during the period when segregation became entrenched in America, publicly accepted segregation in his 1895 “Atlanta Compromise” speech. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock posited that “The “Atlanta Compromise,” had a tremendous impact upon race relations and minority vocational education.”<sup>39</sup> Washington also suggested instead that African Americans seek to become more educated and develop skills

---

<sup>36</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 43.

<sup>37</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 43.

<sup>38</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 43-44.

<sup>39</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 27.

which would enhance their ability to find work.<sup>40</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock contended that “One result of Washington’s plan was that some state governments lost some of their reluctance to appropriate money for black educational institutions. Political leaders in the South who actively opposed spending money to educate blacks found that once the threat of social equality between races was removed they could support the establishment and the financial backing of vocational schools for blacks.”<sup>41</sup> Washington’s strategy had some immediate success, but in the long term Washington’s methodology unfortunately helped to solidify segregation, by adding his voice in support of it, as one of the most prominent African American leaders of the period.

In *The History and Growth of Vocational Education in America*, Howard R. D. Gordon indicated the responsibility of the federal government to provide education to its people, based upon the legislative precedent Congress has established over the last 150 years. He posited that “The Constitution of the United States makes no provision for federal support or control of education. However, the federal government has considered vocational education in the national interest to provide federal legislation in support of vocational education. Beginning with the Morrill Act in 1862, which established land-grant colleges aimed at preparing people for the ‘agricultural and mechanical arts.’”<sup>42</sup> Unfortunately, the implementation of education policy was carried out by the federal government in a racially apathetic or even biased manner, favoring one group of American citizens over others, for at least 100 of the 150 years the federal government has involved itself in educational policy. The original Morrill Act of 1862 made no mention of African American admission into state-funded colleges. Thus, African Americans in most

---

<sup>40</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 27.

<sup>41</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 27.

<sup>42</sup> Howard R. D. Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education In America*, (Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon, 1999), p. 67.



segregated states would not be provided with the opportunity to seek affordable state-funded education until the Second Morrill Act of 1890 was passed.

Gordon argued the adoption of the Second Morrill Act in August of 1890 greatly benefited African Americans who sought higher education. This expansion, however, also included inherent problems which facilitated inequality in higher education for decades. Gordon indicated that the provisions of the 1890 Morrill Act required states to establish separate state-funded institutions for black and white students, if their existing land-grant institution was only open to whites. Although this was not a mandate until 1890, Gordon contended that four Southern states had already established state-funded colleges for African American students: Mississippi, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Virginia.<sup>43</sup> The establishment of these institutions, however, did not provide equality. Gordon also concluded that in the North, as well as the South, equal education opportunities were denied to African Americans. He maintained that “Land-grant institutions for Blacks did not develop as rapidly as those for Whites in the 17... states where they were located.”<sup>44</sup> Gordon argued that African Americans often did not receive a fair share of federal funds based on their proportional representation in the population. He posited that “The retardation of these institutions can be greatly attributed to the misappropriation of federal funds entrusted to the states for distribution to these institutions.”<sup>45</sup> Gordon also indicated that “A study by Wilkerson (1939) revealed that blacks constituted from 25 to 27 percent of the population of the southern region in the 1920s and 1930s, but their land-grant colleges received only 3 to 8 percent of all federal funds coming into the region for this type of education.”<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education*, p. 38.

<sup>44</sup> Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education*, p. 40.

<sup>45</sup> Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education*, p. 40.

<sup>46</sup> Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education*, p. 40.

Although the unequal distribution of funds between African American and white institutions was not as egregious in Virginia as in some of the other segregationist states during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as I will explain later in this text, there was an unequal distribution of funds in Virginia indicating the state favored the white state-funded institution when appropriating funding during this period.

In addition to the unequal funding of higher education in segregated states, the lack of funding to primary and secondary education compounded the problems faced by African Americans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Gordon contended that many of the black state-funded colleges were often only able to teach material at the secondary level. He noted, “This was mainly due to inadequate public schools for blacks and the lack of black students prepared to do college work.”<sup>47</sup> Gordon indicated that training in professional engineering, one of the main focus points of the Morrill Act, was largely absent at black state-funded institutions. Gordon also maintained that the majority of the courses taught at black state-funded institutions, before 1930, only focused on manual training or “subcollegiate” trade courses, which were “in occupations that were in harmony with the then prevailing social and economic status of Black men in the South.”<sup>48</sup> Although Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute initially had collegiate programming, it was forced by the 1902 Virginia General Assembly to drop this tenet of its mission, in order for the institution to teach an industrial curriculum. Since the 1890 Morrill Act had now validated Virginia’s segregationist policy, the state had more leverage in maintaining segregated institutions, thus impeding African Americans from seeking to pursue college coursework elsewhere in the state during the early twentieth century. Gordon’s

---

<sup>47</sup> Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education*, p. 40.

<sup>48</sup> Gordon, *The History And Growth of Vocational Education*, p. 40.

work simultaneously demonstrated both the improvement for blacks as educational opportunity increased, as well as the existing disparity between black and white state-funded colleges, which was facilitated by the racially biased state and federal policies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In *American Singularity: The 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the 1862 Homestead and Morrill Acts, and the 1944 G.I. Bill*, Harold M. Hyman maintained that Justin Morrill “became a nonopponent to racial segregation in education.”<sup>49</sup> Morrill as a “nonopponent” to racial segregation aided in the further institutionalization of racial inequality, as Morrill’s undoubtedly huge impact on education was only extended in its fullest capacity to white Americans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Through the segregation of higher learning, black students were impeded from access to the same resources provided to white students, as a result of the 1890 Morrill Act. Despite Morrill’s shortcomings as a champion of racial equality, Hyman pointed out the overall success of the Morrill Act in bettering the standards of education throughout America. He argued that the impact of the Morrill Act even helped to reform education at the secondary level. He noted, “Morrill Act universities, Abraham Flexner perceived in 1910, were also escalating standards of the secondary school and teacher-training systems in their states.”<sup>50</sup> Hyman also contended that research received increased funding in Morrill Act colleges and universities by the start of World War I, leading to increased development in theoretical and applied science.

In *The Emergence of the American University*, Laurence R. Veysey posited that often, despite popular opinion, academic reformers were able to shape the policies of the Morrill Act to

---

<sup>49</sup> Harold M. Hyman, *American Singularity: The 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the 1862 Homestead And Morrill Acts, and the 1944 G.I. Bill*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), p. 48.

<sup>50</sup> Hyman, *American Singularity*, p. 54.

include wide ranging academic curriculums, although the Morrill Act was originally designed to develop agriculture and the mechanical arts at newly constructed public land-grant institutions. Veysey argued, “Only potentially would these colleges be more than pretentious trade schools, but academic reformers with loftier intentions often secured control of them in their infancy and made them entering wedges for their own plans.”<sup>51</sup> Although academic reformers attempted to gain support through various state legislatures, Veysey contended that “Only very gradually and unevenly, and with frequent setbacks, was state support for higher education gained.”<sup>52</sup> He maintained that some of the main opposition to the expansion of new public universities came from religious leaders.

Veysey posited that some religious leaders found these state-run institutions threatening, due to their secular nature and because public land-grant institutions “drained students from local colleges operated by [their] denomination.”<sup>53</sup> Despite this opposition, however, public land-grant universities were able to continue to develop during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Veysey contended that the alumni of public land-grant institutions were able to form a strong minority group in many state legislatures and used their influence to provide appropriations to these universities. Also, he posited that state competition and states’ ability to acquire land through the Morrill Act at no charge aided in the development of public land-grant universities. Despite these factors, Veysey concluded that some state legislators continually sought to impede the progress of public land-grant institutions, due largely to popular sentiment

---

<sup>51</sup> Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 15

<sup>52</sup> Veysey, *The Emergence*, p. 15.

<sup>53</sup> Veysey, *The Emergence*, p. 15.

of constituents who often opposed land-grant institutions on anti-intellectual or anti-secular grounds.

Veysey, however, contended that many figures within these newly established universities felt that it was imperative to teach not only practical skills that could be used to pursue a career path, but also to produce informed and productive citizens. He pointed out the statements of an important advocate for technical training during the nineteenth century, Calvin M. Woodward, of Washington University, who saw the importance of educating students to become successful workers, but also citizens. Veysey indicated that Woodward argued universities should be designed as “‘a place where everything useful in a high and broad sense may be taught.’ He warned that ‘We must not fail to preserve the dignity and the nobility of our educational standards.’ The aim should be ‘the artist rather than the artisan; the engineer, not the craftsman; the freeman, not the slave.’”<sup>54</sup> Virginia made great strides in the decades after the Civil War to offer curriculums for both black and white students at state-funded institutions that covered not only the vocation they may have been there to learn, but also a wide range of academic material which that institution’s administration felt was necessary to produce not just effective workers but leaders. The shift, however, began after the loss of the Readjuster Party in the General Assembly election in 1883, and culminated with the forced change in the curriculum offerings at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute in 1902. While Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was forced in 1902 by the General Assembly to abandon its academic programming, no such demand was made of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, designated for white students during the same period, which retained institutional control over its academic course offerings. The progression made under the Readjuster Party between 1879—

---

<sup>54</sup> Veysey, *The Emergence*, p. 71.

1883 was the most equal expansion, although still imperfect due to segregationist policies, of higher education in Virginia until the late twentieth century.

In *Two Paths to the New South: The Virginia Debt Controversy, 1870-1883*, James Tice Moore maintained that a shifting political climate, beginning in 1870, brought about increased educational opportunity for African-Americans in Virginia. The Readjuster party was a Fusion party, which consisted of a coalition of black Republicans and some white Democrats, brought together by the goal of readjusting the state debt. The state debt had gotten out of control as a result of the policy of the party which had control of the Virginia General Assembly, a political party known as the Funders. According to Moore, the Funders were made up of affluent individuals who had held political power prior to the Confederate defeat in 1865. He posited that Virginia's "ruling oligarchy clung to power. Demonstrating a remarkable tenacity, it survived the trials of war and Reconstruction and gained a new lease on life by smashing the Radical Republicans in 1869."<sup>55</sup> By the mid-1870s, however, the debt had become the key issue in Virginia's political discussions. Moore concluded that no longer united, the elites' "party's leadership split into quarreling factions known as 'Funders' and 'Readjusters.'"<sup>56</sup> He maintained that the Funders tried to account for the extreme amount of debt by cutting the budget for social services. Moore argued that "the fiscal crisis soon infected almost every aspect of governmental affairs. High taxes, school closings, and other hardships brought the issue home to the masses in unmistakable fashion."<sup>57</sup> Thus, Moore posited that the more conservative elites would associate

---

<sup>55</sup> James Tice Moore, *Two Paths to the New South: The Virginia Debt Controversy 1870-1883*, (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974), p. 12.

<sup>56</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 18.

<sup>57</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 20.

themselves with the Funders, as the Readjusters began to appeal to a wider base of individuals afflicted by the mismanagement of Virginia's debt.

One of the byproducts of the debt, according to Moore, was cuts to education in Virginia at all levels. Moore discussed the unfortunate level to which education appropriations decreased, between 1876 and 1878, under the Funders' leadership. He noted that "the state's financial stringency forced a drastic reduction of educational funds. Appropriations dropped from \$443,000 in 1876 to only \$241,000 in 1878. The number of schools and students plummeted. In some counties every school closed its doors, and the government owed the teachers more than \$250,000 in back salaries."<sup>58</sup> Moore recounted that higher education was no different, "weakened by budget cuts and declining enrollments, the state-supported colleges reduced teacher salaries and course offerings."<sup>59</sup> Rather than address the turmoil Virginia's debt was causing, and the effect it was having on the state's population; the Funders' concerned themselves with maintaining control of the state, by trying to find ways to keep less affluent individuals from voting. Moore indicated that "Determined to maintain elitist rule, the Funders worked tirelessly to limit the political power of the lower classes. They restricted the franchise by making the prepayment of the poll tax a requirement for voting, and they took the vote away from those who had been convicted of petit larceny."<sup>60</sup> The Funders also attempted to turn Virginia's white population against the state's black population and against the Readjuster Party. The Funders engaged in numerous fraudulent activities to achieve this end. Moore concluded that Funders "repeatedly raised the specter of 'Negro rule' to frighten the whites into line, and

---

<sup>58</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 22.

<sup>59</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 21.

<sup>60</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 36.

they rigged elections through ballot box frauds and wholesale bribery.”<sup>61</sup> Despite these immoral actions designed to maintain control, the Funders would lose control of the General Assembly for a brief period, from 1879-1883, and they would later lose the Governorship of Virginia from 1882-1886. The Readjusters gained control of the General Assembly in 1879 and passed some of the most progressive reforms in Virginia for the next 40 years.

The Readjusters brought positive change to Virginia by finding a way to mitigate the state debt and simultaneously improve education for all Virginian’s regardless of race. Moore contended that by 1883 the Readjusters’ administration “completely revitalized Virginia’s government.”<sup>62</sup> He noted that the Readjusters “cracked down on defaulting revenue agents, forced the corporations to pay a larger share of the taxes, and slashed the crippling debt burden.”<sup>63</sup> Moore posited that the reforms made by the Readjusters allowed for the influx of “hundreds of thousands of dollars” into the Virginia treasury, which then allowed for the growth of public schools in the state. Despite their common goals, Moore pointed out that the Readjuster coalition was made up of individuals from diverse backgrounds. Their voting bloc was made up partially of white farmers, from throughout the state, and younger individuals from the emerging middle class, such as lawyers, financiers, and businessmen.<sup>64</sup> According to Moore both groups felt hindered by the Funders’ policies and wanted to change the state administration. Also, he noted that “more important numerically than any of these groups, however, was the great mass of Negroes in eastern Virginia. Concentrated in the Southern Piedmont and Tidewater, these

---

<sup>61</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 25.

<sup>62</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 101.

<sup>63</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 101.

<sup>64</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 48.



rebellious blacks provided an ever-increasing percentage of the Readjuster vote.”<sup>65</sup> Moore concluded that for African Americans, “political power mushroomed during the brief Readjuster hegemony. They constituted almost a third of the electorate, and they held the balance of power in the debt struggle.”<sup>66</sup> Once the state’s debt crisis was solved the Readjusters turned most of their attention toward social issues and rectifying past injustices. The Readjuster coalition’s need for black support allowed African American constituents to secure a state-funded institution of higher learning in Petersburg, which became Virginia State University.

Although the Readjusters were progressive, they were still a product of their time. The Readjusters initially embraced the segregationist status quo of the period, despite their desire for increased equality between whites and African Americans. Moore posited that the Readjuster platform pushed for economic and political equality, but also for social segregation. He indicated the Readjusters believed that “The races would also coexist in harmony, socially segregated but united by the common political rights and economic needs.”<sup>67</sup> The Readjusters were ahead of many contemporaries in recognizing the justice in providing equal educational rights, and by extension equal political and economic rights, to whites and African Americans, but they continued to perpetuate the injustice of mandating social segregation. Moore indicated that the Readjuster platform made “repeated denunciations of racially mixed marriages and schools.”<sup>68</sup> The Readjusters must be looked at as a product of their time period: struggling to make progress, but simultaneously perpetuating the segregationist status quo to remain politically relevant in a political system and time rampant with racism. Without some conformity to the existing political

---

<sup>65</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 47.

<sup>66</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 103.

<sup>67</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 86.

<sup>68</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 104.

ideology of the period it is arguable whether they would have been able to expand educational, political, and economic opportunity for all Virginians. A comparison in the push for advancement at the expense of complete equality can be effectively made between the tactics and ideology of the Readjusters and Booker T. Washington.

The Readjusters should be commended for their advanced understanding of the importance of increasing the investment in the education of all citizens, regardless of race or background. Moore noted that once the Readjusters had overcome the deficits compounded by the Funders in the 1870s, they achieved an economic surplus for the state of \$1.5 million. The surplus, achieved in 1883, was used to improve public schools in hopes of encouraging economic growth.<sup>69</sup> The Readjusters made a comprehensive change, which resulted in progress toward greater equality and economic development, with their investments that increased the availability of public education. According to Moore, “Pouring money into the struggling system, therefore, the insurgents boosted the number of schools, pupils, and teachers by almost 250 percent. Dissatisfied with this rate of progress, the legislature petitioned Washington for federal aid in the struggle with illiteracy.”<sup>70</sup> The Readjusters recognized that to make the necessary changes to the education system it would take federal as well as state intervention. Improving higher education was also a priority for the Readjusters. Moore posited that the Readjusters dramatically increased appropriations to higher education and focused specifically on infrastructure improvements at the state colleges, offering more courses at these institutions, as well as decreasing the cost of tuition.<sup>71</sup> The Readjusters recognized the importance of providing higher education to all of

---

<sup>69</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 88.

<sup>70</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 88.

<sup>71</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 89.

Virginia's citizens and established Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute in 1883, the first fully state-funded institution for the higher education of African Americans in Virginia. The short term success of the Readjusters, however, would be impeded by racism, ultimately leading to the break-up of this coalition. Moore concluded that "A large bloc of Readjusters were ripe for revolt. The white agrarians of the eastern counties seethed with unrest, angered by the movement's drift toward Negro rights and national Republicanism."<sup>72</sup> Once this coalition fell apart, after the election of 1883, the progression toward educational equality would be halted in Virginia for the next 40 years.

In "Agricultural Education in the South: A Comparison of Student Characteristics at Land Grant Institutions," Joseph J. Molnar, John E. Dunkelberger and Dannis A. Salter discussed the difference between "1862 and 1890 Land Grant Schools." Molnar, Dunkelberger, and Salter maintained that the Morrill Act of 1890 was a more comprehensive reform than the first Morrill Act, providing funds for black institutions of higher learning as well as for the purpose of providing additional funding to the white public land-grant colleges. Molnar, Dunkelberger, and Salter noted that the 1890 Morrill Act provided start-up funds for black colleges in seventeen southern and border states, although nine of the schools which received the 1890 Morrill Act funding were pre-existing institutions. The authors concluded that the pre-existing black institutions of higher learning had diverse backgrounds, "although most originated as normal schools, or schools for the education of teachers."<sup>73</sup> Thus, the establishment of Virginia Normal

---

<sup>72</sup> Moore, *Two Paths*, p. 110.

<sup>73</sup> Joseph J. Molnar, John E. Dunkelberger and Dannis A. Salter, "Agricultural Education in the South: A Comparison of Student Characteristics at Land Grant Institutions," *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 50, (1), (1981), p. 30.

and Collegiate Institute, by Virginia, was unusual but not unheard of, as other states established similar institutions for the segregated instruction of black teachers and farmers.

The first chapter of this Thesis is a brief introduction explaining the implementation of the Morrill Acts in the state of Virginia. This chapter provides insight into my reasoning for undertaking the study. The first chapter draws initial comparisons between the implementation of the Morrill Acts at Virginia Tech and Virginia State. This chapter also deals with the historiography of the Morrill Act. Along with sufficient explanation of the initial implementation of the Morrill Act, its subsequent amendments, and what previous historians have said about it, I began the analysis of the specific relevance of the Morrill Act to Virginia.

The second chapter of this Thesis will focus on the implementation of the Morrill Act at Virginia Tech, from the founding of the institution in 1872 until the graduation of the first African American student from Virginia Tech in 1958. I will discuss Virginia Tech's funding and program history, with a focus on agricultural education, in order to provide a comparative analysis of the funds afforded to Virginia State for similar programming. The 1950s present a logical ending point because although the admission of the first black undergraduate students to Virginia Tech did not end the racial disparity between blacks and whites in Virginia's public higher education system, Virginia became the first former Confederate state to admit a black undergraduate student to a public land-grant institution. Thus, Virginia's break with the 80-year segregationist status quo, which denied higher education equality for black students, begins a transition toward greater equality a year before *Brown v. Board of Education*, affording at least one black student the same educational opportunity as white students at Virginia Tech. Irving L. Peddrew III, Virginia Tech's first black student, was admitted as an engineering student because Virginia State had no engineering program. If Peddrew had studied agriculture he would have

been turned away from Virginia Tech and told to study at Virginia State. Thus, the existence of separate agricultural programs at Virginia Tech and Virginia State helped to perpetuate segregation even after Virginia Tech began to admit black students to its engineering program.

The third chapter will focus upon the implementation of the Morrill Act at Virginia State, from 1883-1953. I discussed Virginia State after I discussed Virginia Tech for two specific reasons. First Virginia State was established ten years after Virginia Tech, thus discussing them in chronological order makes sense. Also, discussing Virginia State's funding and program history after discussing the funding and program history of Virginia Tech will allow for a clearer analysis of the funding and program disparity within the history of two state institutions. I will also address Virginia State's forced shift in 1902 from a curriculum which encompassed collegiate programming toward a curriculum which emphasized industrial education. To draw a direct contrast with the amount of funding awarded to Virginia Tech, I will analyze the funding awarded to Virginia State for the development of agricultural education.

The fourth chapter of this thesis will address education, agriculture, and race relations in Virginia. I will discuss historical statistics which indicate the decline of African American farmers throughout the United States and in the state of Virginia during the early part of the twentieth century. I will analyze the reasons why this trend occurred and I will explain how the decline of African American farmers is relevant to the *Pigford* cases and education policy in the United States, as well as in Virginia.

The fifth and final chapter will sum up the findings of the study. I will analyze both the increase of higher education opportunity along with the evident disparity in educational access for African American and white scholars during the history of public higher education, which resulted due to the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 and its subsequent Amendments in 1890

and 1907. The *Pigford* cases allowed for class action lawsuits to be brought against the government for the purpose of rectifying past racial injustice. Although it will never be possible to completely rectify past inequality and injustice, affording Historically Black Colleges more in annual appropriations would help to further close the educational gap exacerbated by federal and state sponsored segregation policies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Virginia Tech's Establishment in Accordance with the 1862 Morrill Act**

The Virginia General Assembly did not designate land script to be sold for the establishment of a state-funded land-grant college until 1872. This ten-year gap between the passage of the Morrill Act and the establishment of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was due, at least partially, to Virginia's absence from the Union during the Civil War. The *1872 Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College: Its History and Organization* described the process by which Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College received its initial funding, "The Congressional Land Script was disposed of by Act of General Assembly, approved March 19<sup>th</sup>, 1872, one-third thereof being bestowed on Hampton Normal and Agricultural school, and two-thirds set apart for the establishment of a separate institution, to be called the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College."<sup>74</sup> The presence of African Americans in the Virginia General Assembly, who were acting in their constituent's interest during this period, led to a split in the funding; although based upon the state's African American population representation, it was skewed in favor of the institution designated for white students. This General Assembly decision is relevant as both a landmark expansion of higher education in Virginia as well as an inherently flawed appropriation, indicative of the period, which entrenched segregation within

---

<sup>74</sup> Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, Committee on Organization, *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, its history and organization*, (L210. B2 1871/1872 Appendix ?) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (Richmond, VA 1872), p. 1

Virginia's state-funded higher education system from the start and funded this education disproportionately in favor of white students.

The location chosen for the establishment of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was Blacksburg, in Montgomery County, Virginia. Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College acquired "real estate belonging to [the] Preston and Olin Institute [which was to] be transferred without cost to the Visitors of the new college."<sup>75</sup> In addition Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College asked for an additional \$20,000 from Montgomery County, where it was located.<sup>76</sup> This new institution established a nine-member Board of Visitors, "to be appointed by the Governor, the president of the Virginia Agricultural Society, and the members of the Board of Education."<sup>77</sup> Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College's first Board of Visitors, including Messrs D.C. Dejarnette, John Goode, Jr.; J.R. Anderson; W.T. Sutherlin, Robert Beverly, Joseph Cloyd, W.A. Stuart, J. T. Cowman, and Harvey Black, held their first meeting in Richmond, on March 25, 1872.<sup>78</sup> The first meeting was held over the course of two days and positions of Secretary and Rector were filled by W.H. Ruffner and Harvey Black respectively. The following committees were also selected:

"A committee composed of Messrs, Ruffner, Anderson and Sutherlin, was appointed to propose a plan of organization and instruction for the new college, to the next meeting of the Board.

Messrs, Black, Cowman and Cloyd were appointed a committee to see whether a suitable farm for the use of the college could be purchased, and on what terms, and report at the next meeting."<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 1.

<sup>76</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 1.

<sup>77</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 1.

<sup>78</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 1.

<sup>79</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 1.



The Board of Visitors reconvened on July 18, 1872, for a period of three days, with all nine members in attendance along with Governor Gilbert Walker, the Superintendent of Public Instruction W.H. Ruffner, Attorney General J.C. Taylor, and Lewis E. Harvie, the President of the Virginia Agricultural Society. At this meeting a representative of the Board of Supervisors for Montgomery County, Mr. A. Phlegar from Christiansburg, informed the meeting attendees “that the county had complied with the conditions required by Act of Assembly approved March 19, 1872, entitled an Act to authorize subscriptions in aid of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical Collegiate Blacksburg, ‘By voting the requisite \$20,000 by a large majority.’”<sup>80</sup> The local \$20,000 allotment was to be dispersed over the course of eight years. The state of Virginia also benefited from the sale of the land scrip it was awarded by the federal government, in accordance with the 1862 Morrill Act. In the *1872 Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College: Its History and Organization* records, it is noted that “Governor Walker, as President of the Board of Education, made a statement concerning the sale of land scrip, and the investment of the proceeds thereof the price obtained being ninety-five cents per acre, the largest price obtained by any State.”<sup>81</sup> Thus, the founding of Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, and by extension the expansion of higher education in Virginia, demonstrated the success that could be obtained when educational improvement was a cooperative endeavor at the national, state, and local level.

Agriculture was an important component at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College from the time when the college was established. The Board of Visitors resolved to purchase 250 acres as well as the mansion and farm buildings on the land, from Col. Robert T.

---

<sup>80</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 2.

<sup>81</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 2.

Preston on October 1, 1872. Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College paid \$85 an acre for this land,<sup>82</sup> or \$21,250 in total. It is indicated that the Board of Visitors “resolved to apply one-tenth of the proceeds of the land script to the purchase of this farm.”<sup>83</sup> This means that Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College must have received approximately \$200,000 in land script from the federal government, as a result of the 1862 Morrill Act.

In October 1872 Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College opened its doors for the first time. The primary fields of instruction for this first year included chemistry, natural philosophy, mathematics, modern languages, technical mechanics, agriculture, and military tactics, somewhat of a broad spectrum considering that only three faculty members would teach these seven subjects. Each professor would earn at least \$1500, and possibly, up to an additional \$500 from tuition fees.<sup>84</sup> Tuition was very reasonable, however, as “the charges to each student not exempt by law were fixed at thirty dollars for tuition, and ten dollars for college fees.”<sup>85</sup> Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College also gave free tuition, or scholarships, to as many students as there were seats in the Virginia House of Delegates, as required by the legislation. This number may have been set in order to ensure that Virginia would have a substantial group of educated individuals, possibly outside of the traditionally elite families, as they required financial assistance, who could help to lead the state in the future. It also benefited the State Delegates, as each secured a scholarship for the constituents in the district they represented.

The course offerings and programs expanded quickly at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College. In 1875 the institution sent out an announcement, most likely to prospective

---

<sup>82</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 3.

<sup>83</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 3.

<sup>84</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 3-4.

<sup>85</sup> *Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical, Committee on Organization, its history and organization*, p. 4.

students, outlining the course offerings. In a postcard from the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College President at the time, C.L.C. Minor, the course offerings were as follows:

“The course of instruction [at Tech] is arranged to meet the wants of Farmers and Mechanics. Besides Mathematics, French or German, (Latin if desired), Psychology, Ethics and Political Economy, Natural History, Natural Philosophy and Chemistry, the course includes instruction in practical Agriculture and Mechanics on the Farm and in the Shop, in Tactics, Drawing, Telegraphy, Printing and Photography.”<sup>86</sup>

The postcard also indicated that “One hundred and thirty-two State Students are receiving free of charge for tuition and College fees, and can get board at \$10 or live in the messes at \$6 a month.”<sup>87</sup> There was also an option to work off some of the expenses that students incurred at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College during this period, if they chose to work in shops and/or on the farm at the College. The free tuition, however, was designated based upon a set number of spots for each county, although flexibility was reserved for unfilled spots.<sup>88</sup>

Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College’s agricultural program is as old as the institution. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University’s website maintains that “Half of the [institution’s] first graduating class received certificates as associates in agriculture in the summer of 1875. In addition to those six graduates, three others received certificates in agriculture and mechanics.”<sup>89</sup> An important expansion of the agricultural program at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College came with the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station, established in 1886.<sup>90</sup> The Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station was established just prior to

---

<sup>86</sup> United States Postal Card sent from President C.L.C Minor to F. B. Hunt of Washington County, VA., 1875, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA.

<sup>87</sup> Postal Card sent from President C.L.C Minor, 1875.

<sup>88</sup> Postal Card sent from President C.L.C Minor, 1875.

<sup>89</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, *College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, About the College, History*, Accessed on April 4, 2013 <http://www.cals.vt.edu/about/history/>

the passage of the 1887 Hatch Act by the federal government, expecting it to pass. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock indicated that prior to the passage of the Hatch Act, individuals as well as groups lobbied for the establishment of experiment stations, in the 1870s and early 1880s, and for the federal government to support this endeavor.<sup>91</sup> They noted that “A bill was drafted in 1882 that called for the establishment of experimental stations connected to the land-grant colleges but controlled by the Department of Agriculture. State government, education groups, and land-grant colleges opposed the bill because none of them would have control of the stations. Finally, a new bill that met with the approval of those concerned was passed by Congress in 1887.”<sup>92</sup> Although there was argument over how to manage the experiment stations, the need for them was apparent throughout the 1880s; Virginia passed legislation establishing experiment stations at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College as soon as they expected the Hatch Act to pass, illustrating that the state of Virginia recognized the importance of experiment stations by the mid-1880s.

Once it was passed by the federal government in 1887, the Hatch Act appropriated additional funds to public land-grant institutions for the development of experiment stations. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock posited that “The experiment stations created by the Hatch Act were instrumental features in the revolution that came to American agriculture. Through the research conducted by these stations, the quantity and quality of agricultural production improved greatly.”<sup>93</sup> They pointed out that “The Hatch Act provided an annual grant of \$15,000

---

<sup>90</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute Tech, *College of Agriculture, History*, <http://www.cals.vt.edu/about/history/>

<sup>91</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 46.

<sup>92</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 46.

<sup>93</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 46.

to each state to fund agricultural experimental stations that were to be directed by the land-grant colleges.”<sup>94</sup> Although the funding was originally supposed to come from the sale of public land, mirroring the method used to generate funds for land-grant institutions which originated in the 1862 Morrill Act, McClure, Chrisman, and Mock concluded that “the origin of the funding was soon changed and attached directly to the Agriculture Department’s appropriations.”<sup>95</sup> The 1887 Hatch Act was specifically designed to be used for agricultural research purposes, with funding for experiments in crop production, breeding livestock, developing new crops, countering plant and animal diseases, and for other necessary agricultural research. The Department of Agriculture had some authority to withhold funds if the requirements of the Hatch Act were not being properly met. Also, experiment stations had to report annually to the governor of their state or territory, as part of the requirements of the Hatch Act.<sup>96</sup> The state of Virginia made important strides in furthering agricultural development with the acceptance and implementation of the Hatch Act at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, even before the Act officially passed through Congress.

Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, as Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College would come to be known by 1896, had student enrollment increase noticeably around the turn of the twentieth century. *The Present Condition and Outlook at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute: And the Necessity for the Appropriations Asked for Buildings and Equipment and for an Increase of Annuity for 1902-1903*, made the claim that it had “probably the largest annual increase [of new students] recorded [to that point]

---

<sup>94</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 46.

<sup>95</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 46.

<sup>96</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 46.

in the history of any Southern college,”<sup>97</sup> that academic year. The total enrollment at Virginia Polytechnic Institute “more than doubled” in only five years, from 303 total students in the 1898-1899 academic year, to 627 total students in the 1902-1903 academic year.<sup>98</sup> The 1903 report indicated that the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was reorganized, “from the foundation up,” during the summer of 1891. The changes were made for the following reasons:

“the field of technical instruction was practically unoccupied. It was also realized that the intent of the United States acts of endowment [the Morrill Acts], and of the State act of acceptance, demanded this kind of work of the school, and that it was, besides, a line more and more called for by the scientific and industrial activity of our day.”<sup>99</sup>

The 1903 Report claimed that for the above reasons, Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College would become “strictly a school of technology.” As a result the administration at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College felt it was necessary to borrow \$200,000 from the state for new buildings and equipment. The 1903 Report, however, noted that “Authority was only obtained to borrow \$100,000, but even this inadequate provision has carried the attendance up to 627 in less than five years.”<sup>100</sup> The money borrowed was used to improve various science departments, including; “General Chemistry, Agriculture and Analytic Chemistry, Mineralogy and Geology, Physics and Biology,”<sup>101</sup> as well as new dormitory rooms to accommodate the new students. Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College was also awarded an additional \$20,000

---

<sup>97</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute: And the Necessity for the Appropriations Asked for Buildings and Equipment and for an Increase of Annuity for 1902-1903*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (n. p. 1903?), p.1.

<sup>98</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p.1

<sup>99</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p. 3.

<sup>100</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p. 7.

<sup>101</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p. 7.

to build and equip an Agricultural Hall. In total, for the aforementioned purposes among others, the 1903 Report indicated that “in the shape of direct, special appropriations, the State has given us \$53,750, and it has allowed us to borrow for specified purposes \$115,000.”<sup>102</sup> These figures are most likely additional funds awarded to Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, not including those received in the initial endowment of the University. The annual grant for 1902 alone was \$25,000.<sup>103</sup> To validate its expenditures, the 1903 Report pointed out that “the graduates of the school are now eagerly sought for by leading railways and manufacturing and industrial plants. Any graduate recommended by the college finds immediate employment-- indeed, there are now more applicants on file for our graduates than we have graduates to fill them.”<sup>104</sup> Thus, the Board of Visitors Report from 1903 makes the case that although continuing to ask for additional funds, the school educated students in skills directly transferable to the work world. Their appeal for additional funds in 1903 was successful, as the 1906 Report points out that; “In direct special appropriations since 1891, the State has given us \$217,750, and it has allowed us to borrow \$115,000, the State paying the interest.”<sup>105</sup> This means that over the course of a three-year period, Virginia Polytechnic Institute must have been awarded over \$150,000 in direct special appropriations, a significant increase.

Despite Virginia Tech’s successes in the early twentieth century President Paul P. Barringer, who was active in the deliberations for Virginia’s 1902 state constitution, was brought before the Welfare Committee of the Alumni Association and the Board of Visitors, as president

---

<sup>102</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p. 15.

<sup>103</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p. 15.

<sup>104</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook, 1902-1903*, p. 20.

<sup>105</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute: And the Necessity for the Appropriations Asked for Buildings and Equipment and for an Increase of Annuity for 1906*, (LD5655. A4 1906) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (n. p. 1906?) p. 9.

of the institution, to answer the charges of mismanaging Virginia Polytechnic Institute, on January 13, 1910. Although there was a broad array of charges leveled against Dr. Barringer, I will focus upon changes to the program offerings and designs for the purpose of this study. One of the changes made by Dr. Barringer was “the abolition of history as a required study in regular courses offered.”<sup>106</sup> The commentary on this change, by the Welfare Committee, was that Dr. Barringer “departs not only from a very essential educational need, but also from the educational evolution as it is being worked out in other institutions.”<sup>107</sup> Barringer was limiting Virginia Polytechnic Institute’s academic curriculum to focus on programs directly related to the acquisition of vocations, which did not please the institution’s alumni or its Welfare Committee. It is important to note that the same institutional control, over program and curriculum offerings, was not afforded to the administration and alumni at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute; which had its entire collegiate program abolished, including historical study, only eight years prior.

Another complaint leveled against Dr. Barringer, in regards to course offering changes, was the abolition of Latin. The Welfare Committee Report indicates that “Latin is no longer taught in the college...a fair working knowledge of Latin is absolutely essential in every course of medicine, we cannot see wherein its elimination is consistently desirable so long as the preparatory courses of medicine are offered.”<sup>108</sup> In addition to the changes made in the Humanities, the Report also complained of the “Abolition of Courses of General Science.” The

---

<sup>106</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Alumni Association, *Charges Preferred Against Paul P. Barringer, President Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia By The Welfare Committee Of The Alumni Association, Before the Board of Visitors At A Special Meeting Held At Richmond, January 13, 1910*, (LD5655. A4 1910) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (Richmond, VA 1910?) p. 62.

<sup>107</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Alumni Association, *Charges Preferred Against Paul P. Barringer*, p. 62.

<sup>108</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Alumni Association, *Charges Preferred Against Paul P. Barringer*, p. 63.



Report argued that this was one of the most egregious curriculum mistakes under Dr. Barringer's Administration, and it ended a course of study which the Welfare Committee believed was popular among students in Virginia. The Welfare Committee maintained that this "will weaken [scientific courses] because of the fact that many men who started their course in general science in the second and third year turned to one of the engineering schools,"<sup>109</sup> and vice-versa. The Committee also complained about the consolidation of the Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Science Chairs being consolidated into one position; viewing this change as a detriment to the Agricultural Department. The charges against Dr. Barringer, however, were not confirmed by a majority of the Board of Visitors.<sup>110</sup> He resigned in July 1912, a short time after the hearing, as his "administration continued to be racked by political controversy."<sup>111</sup> Dr. Barringer's presidency would officially end one year later, due to a request from the Board of Visitors to postpone his resignation, in July of 1913.<sup>112</sup>

By 1918 the annual state appropriation to Virginia Polytechnic Institute had increased to \$71,000. This appropriation amount was more than double the amount afforded to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute the same year. In *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, however, the report made the point that Virginia Polytechnic Institute was receiving less in annual state appropriations than its southern counterparts. This report claimed "The annuity from the State to Virginia Polytechnic Institute is now \$71,000—the lowest of any land-grant college

---

<sup>109</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Alumni Association, *Charges Preferred Against Paul P. Barringer*, p. 64.

<sup>110</sup> John T. Kneebone, J. Jefferson Looney, Brent Tarter, and Sandra Gioia Treadway, *Dictionary of Virginia Biography: Volume 1*, (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 1998) p. 365.

<sup>111</sup> Kneebone, Looney, Tarter, Treadway, *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, p. 365.

<sup>112</sup> Kneebone, Looney, Tarter, Treadway, *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, p. 365.

in the South.”<sup>113</sup> After noting that only the small state of Rhode Island was appropriated “as little” as Virginia, the *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, indicated the funds received annually by comparable southern states. The Report concluded that “In Alabama the land grant college receives in annuity from the State \$115,000.00; North Carolina, \$122,500.00; Georgia, \$222,000.00; South Carolina \$230,000.00, etc.”<sup>114</sup> To further dispute the institution’s level of state funding during this period, the report claimed that even if Virginia Polytechnic Institute was given the total sum of more than \$400,000, which it was requested in its 1918 Report; it would not out pace other state institutions. The *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, maintained that “Quite a number in the North and West have almost as large an annual income in their agricultural departments alone, while others have even more.”<sup>115</sup> One of the solutions proposed to raise the necessary amount of funds required for the further development of Virginia Polytechnic Institute was the sale of bonds. On page five of *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, report, entitled *The Solution*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute discussed its plans for the sale of bonds, pending the approval of the General Assembly. The report noted that “A bill has been introduced in each body to allow the Virginia Polytechnic Institute to issue bonds to the amount of \$100,000.00, the State to guarantee the interest and sinking fund. The appropriation required is \$25,000.00 to \$30,000.00.”<sup>116</sup> The report then pointed out that “This bill has been reported favorably to the House by its committee on appropriations by unanimous vote.”<sup>117</sup> This decision

---

<sup>113</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, (LD5655 A4 1918) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, p. 1.

<sup>114</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, p. 1.

<sup>115</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, p. 3.

<sup>116</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, p. 5.

<sup>117</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, p. 5.

to appeal to the Virginia General Assembly for the ability to sell bonds had precedence in both state and institution history. The *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, report contended that “The Virginia Polytechnic Institute was allowed to issue bonds in 1896 to furnish a water supply.”<sup>118</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute was able to make a compelling argument in 1918 for an increase in institutional funding and provided a method to acquire a portion of those funds by suggesting the sale of bonds for the improvement of an institution. Virginia Polytechnic Institute would continue to grow as its annual appropriations increased. Although the funding it was receiving in 1918 was not as substantial as some of the other state-funded institutions in the South, Virginia Tech was receiving far more in annual appropriations than Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, the segregated state-funded institution for African Americans, during this period. Virginia Tech had more programs available to its students, when compared to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, due to its higher funding levels and institutional control over its curriculum. The period of segregation in state-funded higher education, from the late nineteenth to the middle of the twentieth century, will be discussed in greater detail in my third chapter.

The early 1950s brought change to race-relations and higher education in Virginia. In “Not Fast, But First: The Desegregation of Virginia Tech,” Peter Wallenstein indicated that “in the aftermath of U.S. Supreme Court decisions handed down in 1950, Virginia authorities recognized that black Virginians, if academically qualified, must be admitted if they applied to programs of study not available at Virginia State College, the state’s black land-grant school in Petersburg. That meant that black applicants for graduate and professional study could not be rejected on racial grounds.”<sup>119</sup> These Supreme Court decisions led directly to the admission of

---

<sup>118</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, p. 5.

<sup>119</sup> Peter Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First: The Desegregation of Virginia Tech,” *Virginia Tech Magazine*, Vol. 20, (1), (1997)

Gregory Swanson, an African American law student, to the University of Virginia “under court order in 1950.” The admission of African American undergraduate students to segregated institutions designated for white students, was also applicable when no comparable program existed at the institution designated for African Americans, based on the Supreme Court’s decisions. As a result the first African Americans admitted to Virginia Tech all studied engineering and were admitted because engineering was not taught at Virginia State.<sup>120</sup>

Virginia Polytechnic Institute became unique among public land-grant colleges in the formerly Confederate South when it admitted its first black undergraduate student in 1953. Irving L. Peddrew III was admitted to Virginia Tech in 1953, making him Virginia Tech’s first black student and making “Virginia Tech the first historically white, four year, public university in the former Confederacy to admit a black undergraduate.”<sup>121</sup> This was a historic moment because for the first time a black student in Virginia had access to the same funding, facilities, and to programs such as engineering which had historically only been available to white students. Although Historically Black Colleges, such as Virginia State, had done an excellent job with the resources they had, educating numerous African American students, Virginia denied segregated black institutions the same funding and sometimes the same programs that were available to their counterparts designated for white students. Peddrew, however, would not graduate from Virginia Tech. In “Not Fast, But First: The Desegregation of Virginia Tech,” Peter Wallenstein maintained that “During his first year, Peddrew was the only African American among 3,322 students. He felt wretchedly isolated and left after his third year.”<sup>122</sup> The pressure Peddrew must

---

<sup>120</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

<sup>121</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

<sup>122</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

have felt and the hardship he must have endured are unimaginable and although he left, he had opened the door for the admission of other black students not only to institutions which had been previously segregated in the Virginia, but also in other states which had previously denied African Americans admission to institutions based upon their race. It was, however, up to another trailblazer to finish what Piddrew had started and become the first African American undergraduate to graduate from a four year institution, earn a bachelor's degree, and become the first African American in a former Confederate state to do so.

Charlie L. Yates became a trailblazer in 1958 as the first black student to graduate from Virginia Tech with a bachelor's degree. Wallenstein pointed out that Yates was "one of six honors graduates in mechanical engineering at Virginia Tech that year. The only African American in his class of 911 undergraduates, he was the first of his race to graduate from Virginia Tech. In fact, nowhere in the former Confederacy did a black undergraduate spend four years at a historically white institution and earn a bachelor's degree before Yates did."<sup>123</sup> By graduating with honors from Virginia Tech and becoming the first African American in the formerly Confederate South to graduate from a formerly segregated four-year institution with a bachelor's degree, Yates won a huge victory in the struggle for educational equality and was a key figure in the desegregation of higher education.

The state of the Virginia was not necessarily progressive when it came to the integration of its public universities, but it was compliant. Wallenstein maintained that the transition away from segregation in Virginia's public higher education system "was far smoother and more peaceful than the desegregation of Deep South colleges and universities. In Virginia, no state governor stood in the schoolhouse door to prevent integration of a public university, and no

---

<sup>123</sup> Wallenstein, "Not Fast, But First."

federal troops had to accompany the enrollment of black students.”<sup>124</sup> He also gives a degree of credit to Virginia Tech for facilitating the process of integration because “unlike many schools, it did not wait until a federal court ordered forced admission.”<sup>125</sup> It is, however, noteworthy that Virginia Tech followed the letter of the law and had rejected an African American applicant in 1951, Everett Pierce Raney, who wished to study business administration because Virginia State had a business administration bachelor’s degree program. Thus, Virginia Tech had the legal authority to reject Raney because a comparable program existed at the State’s segregated institution designated for African Americans.<sup>126</sup> Two years later, in 1953, when Piddrew applied to Virginia Tech’s engineering program he had to be admitted for the University and the state to comply with the law. Wallenstein concluded that “The attorney general [of Virginia, James Lindsay Almond] had made it clear to [Virginia Tech’s President] Newman that Tech had no legal leg to stand on if it wanted to reject Piddrew. The school could opt to reject Piddrew and see if he filed suit—a suit he would surely win.”<sup>127</sup> Virginia Tech admitted Piddrew in order to comply with the law and they should be recognized for their compliance which brought historic change to the state of Virginia and to the formerly Confederate South. It would, however, be a misnomer to think that Virginia Tech admitted Piddrew solely for progressive purposes.

---

<sup>124</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

<sup>125</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

<sup>126</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

<sup>127</sup> Wallenstein, “Not Fast, But First.”

### **Chapter 3**

## **The Establishment and Operation of Virginia State University**

Although Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College extended higher education opportunity to an increased number of white Virginians in 1872, black students would not benefit from a fully state-funded institution of higher education in Virginia for another 11 years, until the establishment of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was established in 1883 as the first fully state-funded college for African Americans in Virginia and in the United States. When Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute opened it offered a wide range of curriculum options for students who came in with various levels of academic experience. The funds from the Morrill Acts, however, still went to Hampton, a private institution, until 1920 when the funding was transferred to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. This name change was forced upon Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, along with an industrial curriculum in place of its collegiate curriculum, by the 1902 Virginia General Assembly, which will be address in greater detail later in this chapter. Although a regression in higher educational opportunity for African Americans in Virginia was apparent after 1902, this regression arguably had its roots in the 1880s, when a white-supremacist campaign ousted the Readjuster Party in Virginia. Under the Readjuster administration, higher education access for African Americans reached a peak not reached again until the middle of the twentieth century.

The opening of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute in 1883 was the culmination of almost two decades of expansion of educational opportunity for black Virginians. Prior to the end of the Civil War it was hard for African Americans to obtain education of any kind. Peter Wallenstein indicated in *Cradle of America* that “Into the 1860s, a state law had made it a crime to hold a school that black Virginians—free or slave-attended.”<sup>128</sup> Wallenstein indicated that some of the first schools were set up by the Freedman’s Bureau or northern missionary societies,<sup>129</sup> after the Civil War. In *Education for Work* Arthur F. McClure, James Riley Chrisman, and Perry Mock noted the contributions of General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a Freedman’s Bureau administrator, who helped develop education for African Americans prior to either federal or state efforts. McClure, Chrisman, and Mock indicated that in 1868 Armstrong opened a boarding school in Hampton, Virginia, for African Americans.<sup>130</sup> They posited that “Armstrong envisioned an institution that would provide a practical education, a blend of the general and the vocational. It was his desire that those trained at Hampton Institute would go back to their homes and train their fellow blacks.”<sup>131</sup> This is an important notion; Armstrong recognized the importance of training African Americans not only as workers, but also as citizens and community leaders, which the state and federal government struggled to do comprehensively for portions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

It was a paradigm shift, caused by Black political participation, when the Virginia General Assembly chose in 1872 to allocate federal funds for the higher education of African

---

<sup>128</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 216.

<sup>129</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 216.

<sup>130</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 26.

<sup>131</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 26.



Americans, designating one-third of the state's funds to Hampton Institute. Although some legislators may have voted to do this to entrench segregation, the shift from laws against the education of African Americans at any level, less than ten years earlier, to the distribution of funds designated for the higher education of Africans marked a step forward in equality for Virginians. This designation of 1862 Morrill Act funds also marked Virginia as more progressive than some of its regional counterparts during the mid-nineteenth century. Of the seventeen states that would eventually establish segregated institutions, Virginia was one of only four states to award funds from the 1862 Morrill Act to a black institution of higher learning.

The presence of African Americans within the Virginia General Assembly undoubtedly aided in the representation of the interests of black constituents in Virginia. The result was the dramatic increase in higher education accessibility for African Americans, which culminated between 1872 and 1883. Wallenstein maintained that this paradigm shift began with the end of slavery and the rise of black legislative representatives in the Virginia General Assembly. He posited that when slavery ended and the ban against schools for African Americans was lifted in Virginia, it allowed for both the education and political participation of the African American population, who sent African American legislators to the General Assembly to give black Virginians a voice.<sup>132</sup> African Americans were also aided by their involvement in the Readjuster Party, which was a biracial coalition formed as result of the inept policies of the previous administration in Virginia, the Funders, which had caused economic hardship for a large cross-section of Virginians. Once the Readjusters dealt with the Virginia debt crisis of the 1870s, however, they turned their attention to progressive reforms, many of which were centered around educational expansion and reform. One of the major Readjuster reforms which affected African

---

<sup>132</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 227.

Americans in Virginia was the establishment of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute.

Wallenstein indicated that Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was “The nation’s first fully state-supported school for the higher education of African Americans, [and] it was also the Old Dominion’s first institution designed specifically to train teachers.”<sup>133</sup> The establishment of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute not only helped expand access to higher education for African Americans, with the training of African American teachers; by extension Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institution expanded accessibility to all levels of education for African Americans by increasing the number of individuals able to teach African American students.

The first President of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, John Mercer Langston, was an African American leader who assumed the office in 1885. After his time as President of the institution, Langston ran for a seat in the United States House of Representatives as a Republican in 1888. Langston was eventually declared the winner of the election after he contested the original election results, which had given the victory to his opponent due to election fraud by the opposition. Once the results of the election were reversed Langston served the last six months of his term as the first black Congressman from Virginia. Langston, however, would lose his reelection campaign, as African Americans continued to lose political power at the end of the nineteenth century. Although three African American congressmen, Henry P. Cheatham, Thomas E. Miller, and John M. Langston held office in the 51<sup>st</sup> Congress (1889-1891), only one African American would hold a seat in any congress, for the next decade, until 1901. After 1901 there were no African American congressmen for a period of 28 years until

---

<sup>133</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 235.

1929.<sup>134</sup> The loss of African American representatives at both the state and federal levels ushered in a period where African Americans lost numerous political rights.

An important component of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute's formation, as originally constructed by the Readjuster controlled General Assembly in 1883, was the make-up of the Board of Visitors and faculty at this Institution. Wallenstein noted that the General Assembly originally decided that the faculty at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, as well as six of the seven of the board of visitor members, would be African American.<sup>135</sup> The inclusion of African American faculty at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute ensured jobs for educated African Americans; while the make-up of the Board of Visitors, in 1883, ensured that African Americans in Virginia would have control over the state-sponsored institution for higher learning where their youth would be educated. The makeup of the institutions Board of Visitors would be the target of the opposition, who sought to limit the educational opportunity and political rights of African Americans.

Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was officially founded on March 6, 1882, by an Act of Virginia's General Assembly. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1885-1886 through 1899-1900 noted that "The Act of Incorporation [of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute] appropriated \$100,000 of the proceeds of the sale of the Atlantic, Mississippi, and Ohio Railroads for the erection of suitable buildings, and \$20,000 annually for its support. In 1887 the annuity was reduced to \$15,000."<sup>136</sup> Additional appropriations, however,

---

<sup>134</sup> Jennifer E. Manning and Colleen J. Shogan, "African American Members of the United States Congress: 1870-2012," Congressional Research Service, Accessed May 9, 2013, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30378.pdf>

<sup>135</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 236.

were made to Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute by the summer of 1888, totaling \$57,700, to complete the school's main building. The Act of Incorporation for Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was important for a variety of reasons. Primarily it proved to be important to provide higher education to young African Americans, with the added focus of training teachers. The way in which Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was first appropriated funding also proved to be important. The appropriation of funds through the sale of state property mirrors the Morrill Act of 1862. The construction of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute through this process, however, was more progressive than the original Morrill Act of 1862 because it provided access to a fully state-funded institution where African Americans could receive higher education. There was no mandate within the federal code that an institution of higher learning for African Americans be provided within every state with segregated higher education institutions until the passage of the 1890 Morrill Act, seven years after Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute first opened its doors. The construction of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute thus simultaneously demonstrated both the progressive nature of Virginia, during this period, as well as the Readjuster's reluctance to challenge the segregationist status quo, keeping blacks and whites from attending the same institutions of higher learning. The Morrill Act of 1890, although providing extra funding for pre-existing African American colleges, helped to reaffirm segregation in states that had already organized segregated higher education institutions for African Americans, including in the state of Virginia.

Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute opened with excellent attendance in October of 1883. Wallenstein indicated that Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute initially opened with 62 students, but the number of students at the institution rapidly increased to 131 by the end of

---

<sup>136</sup> Virginia State College for Negroes Catalogue, 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p. 38.

that year.<sup>137</sup> He posited that these were “numbers that resembled those at Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College when it opened in 1872.”<sup>138</sup> From when Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute opened its doors in 1883 until 1902 it offered the option of a collegiate curriculum to prepared students, as well as the option to undertake a “Normal Course” of study. Three departments were organized, the Academic, Normal, and Preparatory, within the institution’s first year. Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute offered preparation for the Normal Course of Study, for students requiring further academic development prior to their entrance, through a Preparatory Course of study, encompassing a three year period. The Preparatory Course of study included arithmetic, decimal fractions and percentages, English grammar and composition, geography, Virginia history, United States history through the Washington Administration, penmanship, and drawing.<sup>139</sup> Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute also had the option of a Collegiate Preparatory Course for more advanced students, who planned to pursue collegiate study. The skills accumulated in the Collegiate Preparatory Course included: Arithmetic, Latin, Physics, Chemistry, Algebra, the Inductive Method, and General History. Students had to demonstrate proficiency in a vast array of skills to move to the next level of study. The existence of different placement options for entering students undoubtedly increased accessibility to higher education in the African American community, which previously had not only been denied higher education but sometimes any education at all. Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute’s diverse curriculums allowed individuals who lacked academic proficiency in certain subject matter to increase their knowledge, in order to continue to advance in their studies.

---

<sup>137</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 236.

<sup>138</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 236.

<sup>139</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, p. 15.

Students who demonstrated the necessary skills, however, would be allowed to undertake the Normal Course of study from the onset of their experience at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. Over a three-year period these students would become proficient in Arithmetic, Physiology, advanced English Grammar, United States history, Voice culture and Elocution, Spelling, Drawing, Penmanship, Music, Physical Geography, Civil Government, Algebra, Book Keeping, Botany, Chemistry, Rhetoric, Psychology and Moral Philosophy, Latin, School laws of Virginia, School management, Economics, and the history of Education.<sup>140</sup> The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, which is a compiled version of primary source material including the individual catalogues from those years at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, indicated that most of the students that came to Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute in these inaugural years studied in the Normal Department. The Normal Department within Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was organized to prepare its students to become well equipped teachers. Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute's mission was "to give all that is essential to fit our graduates to teach [in] any of the public schools of Virginia."<sup>141</sup> Thus, Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute put its pupils in the Normal Course of study through rigorous study in diverse subject matter and followed this study with effective on-the-job training, where the student would teach "little children" under the supervision of "the model school teacher."

The College Course of Study for Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute encompassed an even more rigorous curriculum, one that would prove rigorous by the standards of any time period. The subject matter studied included Algebra, Latin, Greek, Geometry, the History of

---

<sup>140</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, p. 15-16.

<sup>141</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, p. 19.

Rome, French, Trigonometry, and German, English literature, Psychology, Moral Philosophy, Political Economy, Geology, History of Civilization, Christianity and Science, International Law, and Astronomy.<sup>142</sup> Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute sought to help students in the college course of study prepare themselves for the “professions.” Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute produced its first graduate from the College Department in 1889. The College Department, as it originally existed, produced forty-nine graduates, forty-eight men and one woman, from 1889 to 1902.<sup>143</sup>

The students who completed the college course of study would have undoubtedly have been prepared to engage in a variety of academic fields, due to the rigor of Language Studies, Science, Literature, and History, among others areas. The level of student preparation at the collegiate level was consistent with the “design” of the college course of study at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, as outlined in the Catalogue Virginia State College for Negroes 1885-1886 through 1899-1900. This Catalogue recounted that “the School is young and quality, not quantity or number being our standard of success, we have thus far labored to prepare thoroughly those who have taken the college studies before admitting them to this department. Our curriculum will compare favorably with the best. The advantages here offered for obtaining a college education at small cost are unparalleled.”<sup>144</sup> Unfortunately, neither the quality education Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute afforded to its college students, nor the program’s competitive nature, helped to keep this program at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. Despite the rigorous and competitive nature of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute

---

<sup>142</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, p. 17-18

<sup>143</sup> Virginia State College for Negroes Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p.19 ?

<sup>144</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 19.

collegiate course of study, Virginia State was forced by the Virginia General Assembly to drop its college program in 1902, due to racial discrimination.

The change to the structure of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute happened gradually, throughout the 1880s and 1890s. The first problems arose after the loss of Readjuster power in the Virginia General Assembly after 1883. The opposition used racism to win control of the General Assembly, with their dubious efforts culminating in their skewed depiction of the Danville Riot. Wallenstein recounted that “On Saturday November 3, 1883, when a minor altercation took place involving a black man and a white man on a down-town street, it quickly grew into something far less routine, as whites formed a mob and fired weapons into a crowd of blacks, ending with five men dead, one white, four black.”<sup>145</sup> Wallenstein then maintained that the opponents of the Readjuster Coalition, the Democrats also known at the time as Funders, constructed their own depiction of what took place in the Danville Riot. Wallenstein noted that despite evidence to the contrary, African Americans were depicted by the Funders as “the aggressors.” He cited that “According to a report from one western county, Funders—not only demagogic but simply mendacious—‘made passionate appeals to the white people to rescue their brothers of the east from the terrible consequences of negro rule, mixed marriages, and mixed schools.’”<sup>146</sup> Unfortunately, these unscrupulous appeals by the Funders to the racism prevalent during the period affected the outcome of the 1883 General Assembly election and the course of Virginia history. Wallenstein pointed out that the Readjusters earned 13,000 more votes than in the previous election, 2 years prior; but the Democrats gained 44,000 more votes, largely from less affluent white males from the west, a result of the Readjusters successful elimination of the

---

<sup>145</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 238.

<sup>146</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 238.



poll tax requirement for voting.<sup>147</sup> Although it happened gradually, the change to the make-up of the Virginia General Assembly would dramatically impact the structure of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. The regression that occurred, as African Americans lost rights and freedoms they had gained over the previous decades, including the access to a state-funded collegiate education, was not unique to the Virginia.

The late nineteenth century was a period of disenfranchisement for African Americans throughout the South. In *Defining Moments: African American Commemoration & Political Culture in the South, 1863-1913*, Kathleen Ann Clark argued that violence was used as a means to strip African Americans of rights they had gained during Reconstruction and in its immediate aftermath. She maintained that “finally, escalating white-on-black violence and the steady elimination of black rights that defined the era struck a terrible blow against even the most optimistic and determined black southerners; in one state after another, confident assertions of black progress gave way to responses ranging from searching self-doubt to bitter anger in the late 1890s and early 1900s.”<sup>148</sup> Clark also concluded that “Lynchings climbed to an all-time high in the early 1890s and wholesale massacres occurred in cities like Wilmington, North Carolina, and Atlanta, Georgia.”<sup>149</sup> Although it happened a decade earlier, Clark concurs that the shift away from political equality in Virginia came after the violence that ensued during the Danville Riot. She pointed out that “the turning point in the fall [1883] elections came when Democrats murdered four black Readjusters in Danville.”<sup>150</sup> She argued, citing the work of historian

---

<sup>147</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p 238.

<sup>148</sup> Kathleen Ann Clark, *Defining Moments: African American Commemoration & Political Culture in the South, 1863-1913*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), p. 12.

<sup>149</sup> Clark, *Defining Moments*, p. 190.

<sup>150</sup> Clark, *Defining Moments*, p. 138.

Stephan Hahn, that fear tactics were used after this incident to stop black Readjusters from voting; actions which ultimately lead to the Democrats winning control of the Virginia General Assembly.<sup>151</sup> As a result black Virginians saw a steady decrease in African American representation within the General Assembly and this ultimately limited African Americans political power within the state. As the Democrats took control they would gradually limit the rights African Americans had fought hard to gain, including their option to receive an affordable state-funded college education.

In Virginia the Democrats would continue to fund Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute but they began to make changes. Wallenstein indicated that soon after the Readjusters lost power the General Assembly “changed the composition of the school’s board of visitors to majority white and Democratic.”<sup>152</sup> This change was an obvious power play by the Democrat controlled General Assembly that would allow them to make changes in the future to Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute with less possibility for resistance from the Institution’s top administrative officials. Another change made shortly after the shift from the Readjuster controlled General Assembly to the Democrat controlled General Assembly was a reduction in funding to the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. The Democrats decreased the school’s annual appropriation to \$15,000 in 1888,<sup>153</sup> a reduction from the \$20,000 Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute had originally been appropriated. Despite these setbacks, Wallenstein posited that Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute “survived through the 1890s before getting its wings severely clipped.”<sup>154</sup> The beginning of the twentieth century brought with it unprecedented

---

<sup>151</sup> Clark, *Defining Moments*, p. 138.

<sup>152</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 238.

<sup>153</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 240.

<sup>154</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 263.

changes to the structure of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, as well as to the access of an affordable state-funded college education for African Americans in Virginia. Since the segregation implemented in Virginia, and reaffirmed by the federal 1890 Morrill Act, established segregated institutions, it was possible to develop these institutions with different missions and to construct these missions based upon the unfair racial ideology of the time period. Both the federal and state laws allowing for segregation were again reaffirmed in 1896 with the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision. Clark posited that “Black opposition to the rising tide of discrimination was dealt a terrible blow in 1896, when the Supreme Court gave official sanctions to segregation laws in the famous ruling of *Plessy v. Ferguson*.”<sup>155</sup> This decision, which allowed for separate but “equal” institutions based upon race, would open the door for further inequality, as demonstrated when the Virginia General Assembly sought to change the mission of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute.

In 1902 Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was forced to replace its college program with industrial education by the Virginia General Assembly. Wallenstein argued that “The constitutional convention that met in 1901 strived to put a permanent end to significant black political power.”<sup>156</sup> He concluded that this was done by limiting African Americans’ ability to vote, as well as through efforts by the General Assembly to limit African Americans access to a college education. On March 29, 1902, the school had its original Act of Incorporation amended by the Virginia General Assembly. The General Assembly Amendment resulted in the following:

First, that the name of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute be changed to the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute; and that the number of members constituting the Board of Visitors be reduced from seven to four.

---

<sup>155</sup> Clark, *Defining Moments*, p. 191.

<sup>156</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 246.

Second, that the courses of study shall embrace a normal and industrial department, and such other departments as deemed proper and fitting to the Board of Visitors.

Third, that the legislation shall appropriate annually such funds as may seem advisable to carry on the work.<sup>157</sup>

This Amendment to the structure of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was an attack on African American's ability to access college education in Virginia. Although both the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Acts afforded colleges funds for instruction in Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts, nowhere did they specify that academic programs could not be funded as well. Also, despite being Virginia's only fully state-funded institution for African Americans, Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was denied land-grant status until 1920.

There were, however, individuals at Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute who fought against the loss of the institution's collegiate curriculum. One such individual was John M. Gandy, who served as Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute's Executive Committee Chairman, prior to his service as the institution's President. Gandy questioned the General Assembly's decision immediately; rather than accept this decision Gandy outlined the direction he believed Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute should take in a message transmitted by Governor Montague to the General Assembly. In this transmission Gandy questioned "But if we are to have the industrial feature why curtail or do away with the advanced literary and classical work of the school?"<sup>158</sup> This is a valid question, since no such demand was made by the Virginia General Assembly of Virginia Polytechnic Institute when it expanded its agricultural and mechanical training mission in the 1890's, even though Virginia Polytechnic Institute was seeking additional appropriations from the state for this purpose. In the message transmitted by

---

<sup>157</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 19.

<sup>158</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "The Meeting of the Alumni Association," The Governors Message transmitted by Governor Montague to the General Assembly, Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:67, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p.2.

Governor Montague, Gandy also questioned “Does not the demands of the times and the very best interest of the state suggest that her black children should be given an opportunity to secure a higher education and to fit themselves for literary and professional work if it best suits them?”<sup>159</sup> Unfortunately, the Virginia General Assemblies of the first two decades of the twentieth century ignored Gandy’s appeal to restore some degree of equality in higher education accessibility to African Americans in Virginia.

After the college curriculum was gone, however, the General Assembly shortly returned to the original appropriation amount afforded to Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute in 1882, under the Readjusters. Wallenstein indicated that “In 1908, however, the legislature restored the full \$20,000 annuity. Thus the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute regained the level of state financial support it had enjoyed as the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute for a time in the 1880s, though the white schools were by that time receiving far greater funding than two decades earlier.”<sup>160</sup> Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute began to develop its Agriculture program, prior to receiving land-grant status, as the state began providing extra funds for this purpose starting in 1907. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1920-1921 through 1924-1925 pointed out that four more appropriation increases were made within the next ten years; when the appropriated amount to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was raised again in 1912 to \$21,500 and “in 1914 to \$22,500 with a special appropriation of \$10,000 for a boy’s dormitory and \$1,000 for farm improvement.”<sup>161</sup> Appropriations were raised to \$25,000 in 1916 and again to \$30,000 by 1918, also additional appropriations for improving Virginia

---

<sup>159</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “The Meeting of the Alumni Association,” Governors Message, p. 2.

<sup>160</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 263.

<sup>161</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 20.

Normal and Industrial Institute were made by the state, totaling approximately \$56,000, during that two year period.<sup>162</sup> Although on the surface this may look like a good-faith effort by the General Assembly and private philanthropy to improve Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, I question the timing of the decision to do so. Prior to 1908, the General Assembly had not increased this institution's funding for a period of over twenty years and Democrats only restored the original funding after the mission of the institution was changed to industrial education. Yet after Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was forced to change its mission, it saw five increases in appropriations within a ten year span. This would seem to indicate that the Virginia General Assembly, of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, limited the availability of collegiate opportunity for African Americans while directing Virginia's black population into vocational, rather than leadership or academic, roles.

Clark indicated that this type of shift was common throughout the South during this period. She argued that "southern white officials took steps to limit the educational opportunities of African Americans—and took particular aim at the gains made by middle-class blacks—by endorsing industrial education, which emphasized the training of students for agricultural and domestic work, while refusing to support programs designed to prepare African Americans for a broader range of pursuits including the professions of law, medicine, and higher education."<sup>163</sup> These actions draw attention to the inequality in the expansion of higher education in Virginia as well, illustrating the malicious nature of the cuts to the funding Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute by the Democratic Party, which failed to restore the original funding, or to increase funding levels, until after the purpose of the institution changed to industrial education.

---

<sup>162</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 20-21.

<sup>163</sup> Clark, *Defining Moments*, p. 192.

The mission of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was much different from what it had been as Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute only a short time before. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, recounted the institution's forced shift in focus. The Catalogue indicated that "The Act of Incorporation did away with [the] Academic and College department and placed the emphasis on the normal and industrial features."<sup>164</sup> The shift to an industrial education, while simultaneously dismantling the collegiate program, reflected an inherent racial bias on the part of the 1902 Virginia General Assembly. Rather than expanding the educational choice to include industrial education, among the existing educational opportunities, the General Assembly chose to make the decision for African Americans entering Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute by eliminating the College program. African Americans in Virginia no longer had the same opportunity to receive the excellent and affordable collegiate training which was available at Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute from its inception until 1902.

In 1907 agricultural programming was added to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute's Normal Course of study, 35 years after Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College gained its agricultural program. This increase in funding for Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute coincided with the passage of the 1907 Nelson Amendment, which gave increased funding to states for their land-grant institutions. Although Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute did not yet have land-grant status, the increase of federal funds for higher education to the state of Virginia may have helped free up state funds to expand the programming at Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, focusing it on an area deemed important by both Morrill Acts and the 1907 Nelson Amendment. Agricultural expansion again took place at Virginia Normal

---

<sup>164</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 19.

and Industrial Institute in 1916, as a result of a combined effort by the state and the Alumni of the institution. The General Assembly appropriated a special Act on March 23, 1916, for the appropriation of \$6,000 to act as a portion of the payment on twenty-eight and one-half acres of land deemed necessary for agricultural purposes. The total cost of the land was \$9,262.50, thus it was up to the institution's Alumni Association to raise the remaining \$3,262.50. The National Alumni Association of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute led by their President Bailey, a graduate of Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute from the 1890s, was able to raise the necessary funds to purchase the land after the school appealed to the Alumni Association for help. The contribution of the Alumni was recognized when the tract was named. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1920-1921 through 1924-1925 maintained that "because of this generous attitude on the part of the graduates of the school, the tract of land is called the 'Alumni Field'...The purpose of it met a very pressing need for agricultural extension in connection with the school."<sup>165</sup> In 1918 Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute became the designated institution for the training of African American teachers who specialized in vocational education in the Virginia public schools.

Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute also saw a large increase in 1918. In addition to having its annuity raised to \$30,000 in 1918, "\$30,000 additional was given for very needy repairs around the Institute. During this year a nucleus of \$10,000 for a Training School Building was secured by meeting a conditional gift of \$5,000 from the General Education Board."<sup>166</sup> The State Board for Vocational Education was responsible for choosing Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute to train African Americans to teach vocational education. Additional

---

<sup>165</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 20.

<sup>166</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 20-21.



vocational courses were added at Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute in 1918, in agriculture, auto-mechanics, and electricity, as a result of the Smith-Hughes Act.<sup>167</sup> The Smith-Hughes Act provided appropriations for “vocational agriculture according to the proportion of the national total of rural population it had within its borders. Allocations for industrial, and trade subjects, and home economics would be made according to each state’s proportion of the total national urban population.”<sup>168</sup> There was also a clause in the legislation which afforded states a “guaranteed minimum” of funds if they participated, but had a small urban or rural population. Participating states and localities had the initial burden of funding the programs outlined in the Smith-Hughes Act, but they could seek to be reimbursed by the federal government for up to half of their related expenses. The states were expected “on a dollar-for-dollar basis” to match the federal funding that they were awarded. There was, however, no mandate that states had to comply with the Smith-Hughes Act, although states that choose to comply had to meet all the requirements of the legislation or the federal government reserved the right to withhold funds.<sup>169</sup>

Numerous upgrades were made at Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute in 1919 to improve the institution’s infrastructure. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1920-1921 through 1924-1925 noted that “At a special session of the Legislation that met October 10, 1919, \$25,000 [was] appropriated to the Institute to be distributed as follows: \$16,000 to build sanitary baths in the girls dormitory, \$5,100 to meet balance of expenses incurred in reconstruction of the northern wing of the Main Building and \$4,250 to pay balance of the cost of the water tank.”<sup>170</sup> The eleven years from 1908 to 1919 were important in the

---

<sup>167</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 20.

<sup>168</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 64.

<sup>169</sup> McClure, Chrisman, and Mock, *Education for Work*, p. 64-65.

<sup>170</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 21.

development of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. Although the type of education was limited, Virginia did begin to fund education for African Americans better than in the previous decade. The next decade would be an important move back toward equality, but the funding given to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute during the 1910s helped grow both the infrastructure and programming at the institution, which was important in its later move to acquire land-grant status.

In 1920 real changes came to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute and with them a small shift toward increased higher educational equality for African Americans in Virginia. Despite being the first fully state-funded college for African Americans in Virginia and the nation, Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute did not receive federal funds from either the 1862 or 1890 Morrill Acts, until 1920. Wallenstein noted that in Governor Westmoreland Davis' 1920 budgetary address, he argued that Virginia had designated the privately operated Hampton Institute to receive the land-grant funds for Virginia's black population in 1872, when no public institution for black students existed in Virginia. The opening of publically funded and operated Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute, however, allowed logically, based upon the requirements of the Morrill Act, for a reassignment of funds from Hampton to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. So, Governor Davis suggested that the General Assembly make this change.<sup>171</sup> The legislature consented to this proposal and in 1920 Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was given land-grant status. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1920-1921 through 1924-1925 indicated that "This law brings to the Institute annually additional funds for the instruction in Agriculture and Mechanical Arts."<sup>172</sup> The Virginia State Catalogue also

---

<sup>171</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 264.

<sup>172</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 20.

noted the funding increases that Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was afforded in its first two years with land-grant status: “in 1920 the Legislature appropriated \$74,835 to the Institute for the first year and \$45,700 for the second year.”<sup>173</sup> Another important factor in the allocation of this land-grant funding was the degree of institutional control that Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute had in deciding where a portion of the funding would be used. The Catalogue for Virginia State College for Negroes 1920-1921 through 1924-1925 pointed out that “of the \$74,835 thirty-seven thousand nine hundred fifteen dollars and of the \$45,700, ten thousand eight hundred thirty-five dollars were designed for definite purposes.”<sup>174</sup> This left the amount of \$71,785, over the course of two years, to be used for purposes not predetermined by the state legislature, thus affording Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute an increased degree of institutional control. Although the shifting of federal funds from Hampton to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute may seem to be a formality, rather than a shift toward equality in higher education, it was not. Land-grant status gave increased funding to the only fully state-funded institution for the higher education of African Americans in Virginia, and with this status came increased power and institutional control for Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute.

The assumption of land-grant status by Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute allowed for an attempt by the institution’s President to regain its collegiate curriculum, which had been lost for a period now of about 20 years. The President of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute John Gandy was able to convince the General Assembly to restore the college curriculum to the institution. Wallenstein concluded that “President John M. Gandy saw an opportunity that stemmed from the school’s new land-grant status. In 1922, two decades after it had its collegiate

---

<sup>173</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 21.

<sup>174</sup> Virginia State College Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, p. 21.

wings clipped in 1902, he urged what he called ‘the pressing necessity of reinstating College work at the Institute.’”<sup>175</sup> According to Wallenstein, Gandy’s reasoning rested on two points: that Morrill Act funds were supposed to be afforded to colleges and that teachers with bachelor’s degrees were needed with the increase of black high schools in Virginia.<sup>176</sup> Gandy’s argument was successful and the 1923-1924 academic year brought a curriculum change to the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, which regained its college programming that year. There were also expansions made to the agriculture program at Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, under President Gandy’s administration. J.L. Lockett, the institution’s Director of the Agricultural School between 1926 and 1930, submitted to Gandy an extensive inventory of livestock and materials required for the further development of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute’s agriculture program on April 25, 1929. Lockett stated in his letter to Gandy that “We are submitting the plan recommended for the development of the agricultural school with the information you requested as near as we could get it.”<sup>177</sup> This letter denoted both the inventory the school requested. Some of the proposed additions which required materials were a poultry plant, a hog house, a vegetable garden, an orchard, a potato house, an isolation ward for sick animals, a granary, a green house, an implement shed, a horse barn, and an agricultural building. In addition there he requested five breeds of poultry, four breeds of hogs, six cows, one pair of mules, one pair of mares, six bee hives, and two breeds of sheep. Lockett also requested funds to hire faculty for the agriculture program including: a horticulturalist, a farm shop instructor, a

---

<sup>175</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 264.

<sup>176</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 264.

<sup>177</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Letter to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute’s President John M. Gandy from the Director of the Agricultural School J. L. Lockett, April 25, 1929, Accession # 1967-2, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

poultry husbandry man, a dairy husbandry man, an animal husbandry man, an itinerant teacher, a landscape architect, an agriculture economist, an entomologist, a veterinarian, and an agronomist.<sup>178</sup> Lockett concluded that “We recommend that 3000 [an alteration within the document from the originally printed \$10,000] be appropriated annually for up keep of the agriculture school. This amount be budgeted to different departments, travel for faculty, laboratories, class room and office equipment.”<sup>179</sup> Lockett outlined an ambitious expansion for Virginia Normal and Industrial Institutes agricultural program in April of 1929, although he was not able to gain all of the appropriations he requested.

On July 11, 1929, a committee meeting was held in Richmond, Virginia to revise the initial appropriation submitted by J.L. Lockett, who recorded the events of the meeting and the adjusted appropriation requests, which were a result of the meeting. The committee included a delegation from Virginia State, including Gandy and Lockett, who met with Mr. W.S. Newman at his office.<sup>180</sup> Lockett maintained that “The organization of Agriculture faculty and the plan recommended for the development of the Agricultural School were presented to Mr. Newman for suggestions.”<sup>181</sup> The major exclusions and revisions, likely submitted by Newman, included: reducing the green house from the requested \$4,000 to \$1,000, reducing the orchard and nursery appropriations requested from \$1,000 to \$500, and reducing farm implement requests from

---

<sup>178</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Letter to Gandy from Lockett, April 25, 1929.

<sup>179</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Letter to Gandy from Lockett, April 25, 1929.

<sup>180</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Account of July 11, 1929 Meeting by Director of the Agricultural School J. L. Lockett with suggested revisions by W.S. Newman, Accession # 1967-2, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

<sup>181</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Account of July 11, 1929 Meeting by J. L. Lockett with suggested revisions by W.S. Newman.

\$5,000 to \$1,500.<sup>182</sup> Another suggested reduction occurred in the agricultural faculty members, reducing them from the originally requested 11 to 8. Lockett indicated that Newman “stated that the Agricultural faculty should not contain more than eight full time members until the student enrollment is more than sixty.”<sup>183</sup> The positions which were excluded after this meeting included the Dairy husbandry man, Landscape architect, entomologist, and agricultural economist, while the position of Resident Teacher Trainer was added.<sup>184</sup> The loss of the proposed agricultural economist is crucial, as African American students would have lost the ability to learn about agriculture markets and while they were taught to grow produce they were not taught how to market the produce to garner the best prices for their products.

The agriculture program saw further expansion under President Gandy with the addition of Experiment Stations in September of 1936. Although the state of Virginia recognized the importance of Experiment Stations by 1886, with the establishment of an Experiment Station at Virginia Tech, the state did not provide its state-funded institution for African Americans with an Experiment Station for 50 years, until 1936. There were two conferences which led to the establishment of the Experiment Stations at Virginia State. The first of these conferences was held in Blacksburg, Virginia, due to a request by the President of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Julian Ashby Burruss.<sup>185</sup> Burruss was heavily involved in Virginia’s agricultural development. He served from 1928 to 1930 “on a state commission that studied the condition of Virginia’s

---

<sup>182</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Letter to Gandy from Lockett, April 25, 1929.

<sup>183</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Account of July 11, 1929 Meeting by J. L. Lockett with suggested revisions by W.S. Newman.

<sup>184</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Account of July 11, 1929 Meeting by J. L. Lockett with suggested revisions by W.S. Newman.

<sup>185</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:48, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p. 1.

farmers. Burruss also sat on state commissions studying crop pests, geology...[and] in 1937 *Progressive Farmer* magazine named him the man of the year in Virginia agriculture.”<sup>186</sup> Thus, it made sense that Burruss would see the need to establish experiment stations at Virginia State.

The attendants of the first conference included President Burruss, President Gandy, and Dr. T.B. Hutcherson, an agronomist who oversaw country stations. These men “set the overall policy for the establishment of a sub-station here at Virginia State College.”<sup>187</sup> The second of the two conferences held to establish Experiment Stations at Virginia State was held at the institution. The attendants of this conference included “Mr. L.H. Foster, Treasurer-Business Manager, Mr. C.J. Wartmen, Farm Manager, and Mr. M.T. Carter, then acting Director of the Division of Agriculture [who all] met with Dr. T.B. Hutcherson and worked out details”<sup>188</sup> necessary for the establishment of Experiment Stations at Virginia State. The group of men at the second conference came up with the following outline, which designated responsibilities for the management of the Experiment Stations. The designated responsibilities were as follows: “1. To begin with Virginia State College would furnish land, labor, equipment, and supervision; the Virginia Polytechnic Institute would furnish seed, fertilizer, and hired labor. 2. The Experiment Station officials would include in their budget for the next biennium the work at Virginia State College. 3. All experiments and experimental procedures should meet the approval of the Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station. 4. M.T. Carter would conduct the experiments.”<sup>189</sup> In September of 1936 six experiments began at Virginia State, including: “1. A cover crop

---

<sup>186</sup> Sara B. Bearss, John T. Kneebone, J. Jefferson Looney, Brent Tarter, and Sandra Gioia Treadway, *Dictionary of Virginia Biography: Volume 2*, (Richmond: Library of Virginia, 2001) p. 427.

<sup>187</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 1.

<sup>188</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 1.

<sup>189</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 1.

comparison experiment, 2. A small grain variety test, 3. A lespedeza fertilizer test, 4. A soy bean and cow pea variety test, 5. A fertilizer experiment with corn and wheat, [and] 6. A corn variety test.”<sup>190</sup> The document “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” pointed out that “A wealth of knowledge relative to time, money and facilities necessary to carry on experiments was accumulated.”<sup>191</sup> This group of experiments continued for two years, under the agreement outlined at the conferences.

By 1938 the experiments were deemed successful and an expansion of supervision for the Experiment Station was required. The document “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” indicated that “It was clearly revealed that to carry on the work efficiently the supervision by Virginia State College would increase...and beginning July 1938 Mr. Carter was put on  $\frac{1}{4}$  time with the experiment station and  $\frac{3}{4}$  with the college.”<sup>192</sup> The funds for the Experiment Stations increased in 1938, to pay Carter and to acquire more equipment. The experiments were also expanded with “the addition of three new experiments. This made a total of nine experiments involving at least one-half acre each. The total plots numbered more than 300.”<sup>193</sup> Another expansion took place in 1940 and Carter had his responsibilities split equally in half, between the Experiment Station and the college. With four additional experiments added, a total of 13 experiments existed at Virginia State’s Experiment Station by 1940. Although World War II slowed further expansion, the document “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” highlighted that “It is the hope that within the next two years there will be a project so large that it will require the full time of one superintendent. Thus establishing at the college a full sub-

---

<sup>190</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 1.

<sup>191</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 1-2.

<sup>192</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 2.

<sup>193</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 2.



station program.”<sup>194</sup> Virginia State’s agriculture program expanded quickly from its inception in 1907 to the addition of cooperative Experiment Stations by the middle of the twentieth century, with a large portion of that expansion occurring during Gandy’s presidency.

Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute made its third name change in 1930, at President Gandy’s request, according to Wallenstein. The institution’s name was changed to Virginia State College for Negroes by the Virginia General Assembly. Edgar Toppin does an excellent job in describing how the mission change led to the name change at Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. Toppin indicated that President Gandy made his initial request for the restoration of the institution’s college programing on August 14, 1922, during his annual Board of Visitors Report. Toppin noted that Gandy’s argument centered on the fact that “All the other Negro Land Grant Colleges of the South have sensed the situation and have organized and are now executing college courses.”<sup>195</sup> Toppin also pointed out Gandy’s argument that African Americans from Virginia were leaving the state, after they were denied an opportunity to pursue a college degree, to receive a college education elsewhere.<sup>196</sup> Gandy promised that if the college curriculum were restored “that the agricultural and mechanical aspects would not be neglected.”<sup>197</sup> After Gandy’s appeal the Board of Visitors voted unanimously for the return of college programs to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute on November 10, 1922.<sup>198</sup> With the curriculum change a name change made sense, but the name change Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute got was not the name change wanted. The change to Virginia State College for Negroes in 1930 was an

---

<sup>194</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Agriculture Experimental Work at the College,” p. 2.

<sup>195</sup> Edgar Toppin, *Loyal Sons and Daughters*, (Norfolk: Pictorial Heritage Publishing Company 1992), p. 77.

<sup>196</sup> Toppin, *Loyal Sons and Daughters*, p. 77.

<sup>197</sup> Toppin, *Loyal Sons and Daughters*, p. 77.

<sup>198</sup> Toppin, *Loyal Sons and Daughters*, p. 77-79.

incomplete shift, as the Institution's students had the ability to pursue and be recognized for their collegiate study, but they were still designated by race rather than merit. Wallenstein contended that the people at Virginia State rejected adding "for Negroes" to the title of the college, but their appeals were disregarded as the state board forced the designation on the institution in 1931.<sup>199</sup> The designation was a clear message of inequality; rather than designate the school as solely an institution of higher education, both the General Assembly and state board of education continued to try to make distinctions between Virginia State College for Negroes and the other state institutions on the basis of race. The shift was also incomplete because although the type of education at Virginia State was no longer restricted, the higher education institutions in Virginia were still segregated, making Virginia State the only public institution African Americans in Virginia could attend.

There were also improvements and program expansions made at Virginia State in the late 1930s, although the reasoning behind them may not have been intended fully for the benefit of African Americans in Virginia, at least as conceived by the state's administration. Virginia State's campus expanded in 1937 with the construction of various new buildings, including: an administration building, a science building, a library, and a men's residence hall finished by 1940.<sup>200</sup> Although these additions improved educational equality for black Virginians, they were intended as a means to forestall the integration of Virginia institutions of higher learning. This improvement of Virginia State coincided with the *Gaines v. Missouri* case being heard in the Supreme Court. In 1938 the Supreme Court decided that African Americans had to be admitted to a segregated states' white institution, for higher education, if that states' institution for African

---

<sup>199</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 265.

<sup>200</sup> Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, p. 308.

Americans lacked the desired graduate or professional program to which the individual sought admission. Virginia, as a segregationist state, had to either improve upon the program availability, and as a result the infrastructure at Virginia State, or admit black students to its white institutions, which Virginia was still unwilling to do in the 1930s. In “Establishing Graduate work at the College,” John Gandy indicated the affect the pending *Gaines* decision had on Virginia State’s efforts to acquire a graduate program. Gandy’s recollection is a bit off here, as the *Gaines* decision was not handed down until 1938, he was likely thinking of the Alice Jackson’s application to the University of Virginia. Jackson applied to the University of Virginia’s graduate program to study French, because a similar program did not exist at a segregated institution for African Americans in Virginia, but she was denied because of her race. The threat of future legal action, however, resulted in the establishment of the graduate school at Virginia State.<sup>201</sup> Although Gandy’s recollection was off, his insight into the establishment of graduate work at Virginia State is still extremely valuable. He indicated:

About 1933 the *Gaines* case was announced by the Supreme Court. This Case struck terror in the hearts of the public school authorities in the South. At this time I recommended to the State Board of Education that we began graduate work at the college. It was not difficult to get the Board to agree to do this because of the *Gaines* case decision. The Board agreed that we should offer graduate work beginning in the summer of 1937.<sup>202</sup>

The decision brought an increased element of equality to African Americans in Virginia, allowing black students to pursue graduate study at an accessible state-funded institution. There was an element of the faculty, however, that felt they were not prepared to make this expansion in 1937. Despite some opposition President Gandy insisted on the time frame for the expansion

---

<sup>201</sup> Priya N. Parker, “Storming the Gates of Knowledge: A Documentary History of Desegregation and Coeducation in Jefferson’s Academical Village,” *Exhibit: Alice Jackson, First African American to Apply to U.VA. (1935)*, Accessed on April 11, 2013  
<http://www.virginia.edu/woodson/projects/kenan/jackson/jackson.html>

<sup>202</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Establishing Graduate Work at the College,” Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:58, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p. 236.

of graduate work at Virginia State. After the expansion into graduate studies took place, Gandy posited “the reports however have indicated that the graduate work has gone very well.”<sup>203</sup>

Gandy was able to help facilitate positive change during his time as President of Virginia State. He regained Virginia State’s college curriculum, gained land-grant status for the institution, established Experiment Stations to help improve Virginia State’s agricultural program, and he worked to establish a graduate studies program.

The achievements of President Gandy were recognized as significant and celebrated by a wide variety of people even during his active tenure at the institution. The account “Impressive Ceremonies mark Harmon Awards to Distinguished Virginia Educator,” recounted a ceremony which took place to honor Gandy in 1929. It pointed out:

On Tuesday evening, February 12, 1929, one of the most impressive and inspiring programs within the memory of Virginia State College was given at this institution in honor of President John M. Gandy in recognition of his constructive accomplishments in education. The occasion was the Presentation Ceremony of the Harmon Award in Education. The spacious Audience Hall was packed to its capacity with friends and visitors of both races from different sections of the country.<sup>204</sup>

Although Gandy wrote much of the history which highlights his accomplishments, it is undeniable that equality in higher education for African Americans in Virginia improved drastically while he presided over Virginia State. From 1920 with the recognition of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute as a land-grant institution to 1937 with the establishment of Graduate Studies at Virginia State, the struggle toward equality in higher education moved in a positive direction for black Virginians. This change, however, was incomplete. Segregation continued to exist and African Americans did not have access to the same facilities, funds, or programs that white students had access to at any level of education. Another important change

---

<sup>203</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “Establishing Graduate Work at the College,” p. 236.

<sup>204</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “The Meeting of the Alumni Association,” Impressive Ceremonies mark Harmon Awards to Distinguished Virginia Educator, Appendix Chapter VII, Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:67, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p. 355.

took place shortly after Gandy's Presidency, which ended in 1943. In 1946 Virginia State College for Negroes was able to drop the end of its name, to simply become Virginia State College. This name change was significant as officials and students from the institution had fought to remove the "for Negroes" at the end of the designation for 16 years. Although he was no longer the acting President of Virginia State, John Gandy lived long enough to see this important change. John Gandy passed away only a year after Virginia State's fourth name change in 1947. The state of Virginia made a degree of progress by the middle of the twentieth century by expanding equality in higher education.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Education, Agriculture, and Race Relations in Virginia**

Education in agriculture was one of the main focuses of the Morrill Acts. There, however, was a disparity in the availability of agricultural education based upon race in Virginia. This disparity arose as a result of the difference in program funding and availability at Virginia's segregated state-funded institutions. One of the large disparities was the number of students that could be educated at these segregated state institutions. With limited state funding, Virginia State was unable to educate the same number of students as Virginia Tech during the period the schools were both in existence. Although Virginia State came into existence only 11 years after the establishment of Virginia Tech, it did not establish an agricultural program until 1907, thirty-five years after Virginia State was founded. Agricultural programming, however, must have been important to the alumni of Virginia State, at the time known as Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, since these alumni provided funding to purchase a tract of land in 1916. Although the state of Virginia did provide \$6,000 of the amount necessary to purchase the 28 ½ acres, the alumni of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute had to raise the other \$3,262.50 to purchase the land. In comparison Virginia Tech, originally Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, provided agricultural education to its students from its inception, and this institution was endowed with the necessary funding from its founding to accomplish this goal. This funding disparity in agricultural education negatively affected the economic development of African American farmers in Virginia.

Although the full ownership of farms decreased regardless of race, between 1900 and 1954, non-whites lost full ownership of their farms at a significantly higher rate than white farmers during this period. In 1910 there were 3,159,560 white farm operators who were full owners in the United States, but this number dropped to 2,604,730 by 1954. By comparison non-white farm operators owned 196,171 farms in 1910, a number which dropped to 139,978 by 1954.<sup>205</sup> The percentage of white farmers who no longer qualified as full farm owners at the end of this period, however, was significantly lower at an 17.6 percent decrease, compared to a 28.7 percent decline for fully non-white owned farms from 1900-1954. The situation was even more problematic for non-white farmers in the South when compared to that of their white counterparts. According to another study there was actually an increase of farms that were fully owned by whites in the South, between 1900 and 1954, from 1,078,635 to 1,145,372. The situation was, however, comparatively bleak for non-white full farm owners in the South, who declined from 158,479 to 129,854 between 1900 and 1954.<sup>206</sup> The loss of farms disproportionately affected African American farmers. There was also a significant decrease of the non-white population's involvement in agriculture altogether; from 1910 to 1960 non-white males' participation in agriculture dropped from 1,555,185 individuals in 1910 to 499,481 individuals by 1960.<sup>207</sup> The trend was similar for non-white females in agriculture, since a

---

<sup>205</sup> Alan L. Olmstead and Paul W. Rhode, "Farms, by race and tenure of operator: 1880-1997," Table Da530-545, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition On Line*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 4-71.

<sup>206</sup> Alan L. Olmstead and Paul W. Rhode, "Farms in the South by race and tenure of operator: 1880-1975," Table Da546-565, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition On Line*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 4-72 – 4-73.

<sup>207</sup> Matthew Sobek, "Major industrial groups of labor force participants-nonwhite males: 1910-1990," Table Ba724-741, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition On Line*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 2-105.

significant drop can be seen in their employment within this industry, as numbers dropped from 849,634 non-white women employed in agriculture in 1910 to 94,533 non-white women employed in agriculture by 1960.<sup>208</sup> These figures show a clear move away from agriculture by a large portion of the African American population, during the period known as the Great Migration. The lack of agricultural opportunity for many African Americans in the South may have contributed to their decision to leave the region.

Unfortunately, despite efforts to improve agricultural training for African Americans in Virginia, there was a decline of black farmers from 1910-1935, which mirrored the national and regional trends. A study conducted in the early twentieth century entitled “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline,” with information released by Virginia Polytechnic Institute, outlines both the statistical decline of African American farmers and property owned by African American farmers in Virginia, as well as speculates on the reasoning behind this decline from 1910-1935. The study claimed that “There were in 1910 in Virginia 32,228 Negro farm owners. By 1935 this number had dropped to 27,662 farm owners. During the twenty-five year period the actual number of Negro farm owners decreased by 4,566. During the same period, the number of acres of land owned by Negroes had decreased 252,042 acres or 18.2 percent.”<sup>209</sup> This decline was spread throughout Virginia; according to the study, 67 of 74 counties that had “considerable” African American populations saw their numbers of black farmers decline, with

---

<sup>208</sup> Matthew Sobek, “Major industrial groups of labor force participants-nonwhite females: 1910-1990,” Table Ba760-777, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition On Line*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 2-107.

<sup>209</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline,” Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:82, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p. 1.



an average loss of 55 acres for each black farmer.<sup>210</sup> The study then turned its attention to accounting for where these African American farmers went and addressing possible reasons why they may have left their farms. The study contended that some of these black farmers had their land absorbed by other farms, causing the former owners to become tenants or sharecroppers, while other African Americans moved to cities after they sold or lost their land. To effectively depict why many African Americans may have left their farms in Virginia, “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline” indicated that “The total numbers of acres lost by Negroes equaled to almost one half of the total acreage of the state of Rhode Island, one twelfth of the total acreage of Connecticut, and one twenty-third of the total acreage of Vermont.”<sup>211</sup> There was, however, more than one reason why African American farmers lost their land and sometimes their autonomy.

The study “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline,” outlined three different reasons for the declining ownership of farm land by African American farmers from 1910-1935. The first reason involved the personal choice of the children of deceased black farm holders. The study noted that many of the children of independent African farmers moved to the North and after their parents’ deaths returned to sell the land for monetary gain. The study argued that most of the time it was whites within the communities of that period that had the necessary liquid assets to purchase this land from the children of the African American farmers, often at less than fair market value.<sup>212</sup> The second reason that “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline” indicated African American farm owners lost their land from 1910-1935 was the

---

<sup>210</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline,” p. 1.

<sup>211</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline,” p. 2.

<sup>212</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, “The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline,” p. 2.

influence of the Great Depression. The study pointed out that many black farmers, as well as white farmers, bought their land using a mortgage and after the Stock Market Crash many of these individuals could not get their mortgages renewed, were foreclosed on, and had their farms taken by creditors.<sup>213</sup>

The third reason why black farmers lost their land may have influenced both African American's decision to move to the North as well as the banker's decisions to foreclose on their mortgages, and this was racial prejudice. The report specified:

Further, the Negro being a member of a minority group becomes a prey to all those who wish to impose upon him. His belongings are often violently and stealthily taken away from him. In some places in America, Negroes who are prosperous have either been killed or run out of the state by those who wish to come into the possession of their property. Very little of this occurs in so violent form in Virginia, but less violent forms of it can be found even in this Commonwealth.<sup>214</sup>

This study conducted by Virginia Polytechnic Institute not only recognized the decline of black farmers in Virginia but identified racial discrimination as one of the three leading factors in forcing African Americans off of their land. I would argue, however, that the first two factors outlined in "The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline," were often a result of the third factor. The limited opportunity and the constant discrimination by bankers and others undoubtedly contributed to the decisions of some African Americans to move North in hope of better opportunity. The children of African American farmers who moved North may have chosen to stay there because of the discrimination which was present in early twentieth century Virginia. Also, in an atmosphere where discrimination was present it is more likely that black farmers would have had their mortgages foreclosed on after the slightest misstep. Although racial

---

<sup>213</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline," p. 3.

<sup>214</sup> The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline," p. 3.

discrimination was not the only factor which caused the decline of African American farmers in Virginia, from 1910-1935, it was the primary factor.

In the section of *African American Life In The Rural South, 1900-1950*, edited by R. Douglas Hurt, entitled “Benign Public Policies, Malignant Consequences, and the Demise of African American Agriculture,” William P. Browne argued there were consequences of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal policy that negatively affected black farmers. Browne contended that “In another irony, it was the radically unique and so often idealized agriculture policies of the Great Depression’s New Deal that finally destroyed African American agriculture.”<sup>215</sup> He posited that elements of the federal government’s agriculture policy actively caused discrimination against African American farmers, while benefiting white farmers. Browne argued that for most African American farmers “doing business in a racially stressed South, agricultural institutions were not organized to reach out effectively. Browne argued that smaller farmers, including African Americans, were hurt by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. Browne noted that “The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 was one distinct effort, and it did so best for the largest and most locally influential land holders who produced most of the crops. The AAA awarded domestic production allotments for previously farmed acres and provided cash payments to farmers who voluntarily cut acreage production at designated levels.”<sup>216</sup> Thus, he posited that “The largest landholding growers won, since the AAA was about boosting prices and so necessarily focused on these producers. Smaller growers lost, especially tenants, which meant almost all African Americans. These yeomen simply produced too little to be targets for

---

<sup>215</sup> William P. Browne, “Benign Public Policies, Malignant Consequences, and the Demise of African American Agriculture,” in *African American Life In The Rural South, 1900-1950*, edited by R. Douglas Hurt, (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2003,) p. 129.

<sup>216</sup> Browne, “Benign Public Policies,” p. 138.

farm modernization and development.”<sup>217</sup> Browne also cited the inequality of agricultural programming at 1890 land-grant institutions as part of the problem.<sup>218</sup>

Browne, however, posited that the issue of inequality of resources for farm institutions was only part of the problem. He argued that African American farmers did not embrace the modernization of farming techniques at the turn of the century. As a result Browne maintained that “So even though agricultural institutions seldom served black southern farmers, no one really cared about the neglect—not even those same southern African Americans.”<sup>219</sup> I think Browne has over generalized this claim, especially when Virginia is examined. The alumni of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute cared enough about helping improve agricultural development for black farmers that they collectively donated \$3,262.50 to help purchase 28 plus acres of land, for this purpose, in 1907.

The impediments placed before black farmers by the state and federal governments are important since black farmers made up a substantial portion of the black population in Virginia during the years of segregation. Charlene Gilbert and Quinn Eli maintain in *Homecoming: The Story of African-American Farmers* that after the 1896 Supreme Court decision *Plessy v. Ferguson*, black farmers were specifically hit hard by the segregation restrictions which were implemented throughout the South in the decision’s aftermath. One reason black farmers were disproportionately affected was that they did not have access to the same agricultural education, as whites, due to segregation. Gilbert and Eli argued that black farmers began to lose farms they already held and new black farmers were unable to replace them as independent farmers. Gilbert

---

<sup>217</sup> Browne, “Benign Public Policies,” p. 138.

<sup>218</sup> Browne, “Benign Public Policies,” p. 134.

<sup>219</sup> Browne, “Benign Public Policies,” p. 135.

and Eli contend that “Even though African-Americans operated about 937,000 farms in the South by 1913, a decline in number of new farms was becoming increasingly steep. Many of the old farms were being abandoned—sold off quickly to pay debts or absorbed by white farmers who started a campaign to ‘reclaim’ the land.”<sup>220</sup> The authors argued that this lack of opportunity caused many African Americans to leave the South and reestablish themselves in the North. It is important to note, however, that some other factors may have also contributed to African American farmers leaving the South, such as crops being eaten by boll weevils or drought affecting the crops, which affected some farmer’s yields.

Gilbert and Eli posited that conditions for African Americans in the South who did not own land were bad for “unskilled” laborers in agriculture because after the passage of Jim Crow laws, “it became increasingly easy for an employer to insist that even his hardest working black employees were not pulling their weight, thereby justifying a reduction in their wages.”<sup>221</sup> The problems for African American farmers in the Jim Crow era had two major components, both of which could have been curbed by the further extension of agricultural education to African Americans. The first component was that black farmers were being driven from their own land as a result of debt. Increased education for black farmers dealing with how to increase crop yields, as well as how to market and sell these crops could have saved some of these black farmers from compiling debt and losing their land. The second component, black farmers who did not own land were paid low wages as “unskilled” labor could have been addressed had these farmers been given the ability to acquire the necessary agricultural skills which would have equipped them to demand higher wages or the ability to use their skills to find other employment with better

---

<sup>220</sup> Charlene Gilbert and Quinn Eli, *Homecoming: The Story Of African-American Farmers*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000), p. 68.

<sup>221</sup> Gilbert and Eli, *Homecoming*, p. 68.

compensation. The lack of federal and state funding to aid in the development of higher education in agriculture for African Americans proved detrimental to the economic development of black farmers.

Another failure on the part of the federal government was oversight of the Farmer's Home Administration. The Farmers Home Administration was designed to help farmers obtain "equal access to resources that could help them grow and cultivate their property."<sup>222</sup> This program was instated as a result of the New Deal's Resettlement Program, in order to help farmers obtain loans when no other options were viable, but racism at the local level acted as an impediment to black farmers obtaining these loans even after World War II.<sup>223</sup> In the opening of chapter 8 of *Homecoming*, entitled "The Price of Progress: World War II and the Call for Southern Change," Gilbert recounted a story from her family history which speaks to the problems black farmers had obtaining higher education in the South as a result of racial prejudice. Gilbert maintained that "My grandfather went to the bank to plead for a loan to send her to college. He offered his land to back the loan...but even that was not enough. The local banker couldn't stand the thought of black children going to college; he did everything he could to keep black families from sending their children to school."<sup>224</sup> Although Gilbert pointed out that her grandparents were able to overcome the odds and send their children to college "off one by one," this discrimination at the local level caused many African American students not only to be denied the same higher education opportunities as white students, but at times caused black students to be denied the opportunity to obtain higher education at all. Black farmers were caught

---

<sup>222</sup> Gilbert and Eli, *Homecoming*, p. 135.

<sup>223</sup> Gilbert and Eli, *Homecoming*, p. 135.

<sup>224</sup> Gilbert and Eli, *Homecoming*, p. 106.

in a problematic situation, as they had their traditional way of life in agricultural production attacked and were simultaneously denied, in many cases, the ability to obtain higher education as a result of racial discrimination, especially at the local level. Gilbert and Eli contended that “In the end, more often than not, that which was cultivated and grown was taken away, stolen by developers and legislators whom, it appears, argued to keep rural blacks from pursuing an education because a degree might make them less easy to exploit.”<sup>225</sup> This two-front assault on the rights of black citizens, inhibiting their right to hold property as well as their right to receive equal access to higher education, led to both political and economic disenfranchisement for many African American farmers in the South.

Jay R. Mandle argued in *Not Slave, Not Free: The African American Economic Experience since the Civil War*, that economic development and innovation was hindered as a result of poor education in the South. In addition Mandle pointed out that the Deep South, which he labeled the “plantation states,” including Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, had significantly higher illiteracy rates than the “nonplantation states” in the South which included Florida, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. He indicated that illiteracy rates were a combined 20 percent in “plantation states,” while the remaining southern states had a combined illiteracy rate of 11.7 percent.<sup>226</sup> Mandle maintained that this resulted in the stifling of economic modernization, within the “plantation South.” He contended that “Their relatively low levels of education meant that they were much less likely than people elsewhere in the United States to be the source of technological

---

<sup>225</sup> Gilbert and Eli, *Homecoming*, p. 158.

<sup>226</sup> Jay R. Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free: The African American Economic Experience since the Civil War*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1992), p. 55.

innovation.”<sup>227</sup> Mandle concluded that the Southern agricultural economic system was largely the cause of this, as profits could be made without the need for workers with high levels of educational training.<sup>228</sup> The problem, however, is that African Americans began to lose their land in the early twentieth century, as described by Gilbert and Eli in *Homecoming*, and without the ability to obtain the necessary land or education, due to discriminatory lending practices and financially limited segregated public school systems. Many African Americans in the South were thus forced into lower wage agricultural labor jobs with little opportunity for economic advancement from the late-nineteenth century into the mid-twentieth century.

African Americans in the South often went without much education during the early twentieth century, partly as a result of discriminatory government spending. In 1940 around 5 percent of African Americans in the South were high school graduates and only 1 percent of the black southern population had college degrees.<sup>229</sup> The level of funding given to educate black students in the segregated South played a role in these disparaging statistics. Mandle indicated, “Thus during the 1930-40 academic year, expenditures per black pupil in the South came to \$18.82, almost exactly one-third the level spent on that region’s white students, which itself was the lowest recorded in the country.”<sup>230</sup> This lack of educational opportunity caused a disparity to develop by impeding African Americans from obtaining lucrative employment. Mandle contended that only 2 percent of African Americans in the South worked as professionals, although he posited this figure may even be high, possibly inflated by inclusion of teachers who

---

<sup>227</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 55-56.

<sup>228</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 56.

<sup>229</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 100.

<sup>230</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 100.



lacked full credentials.<sup>231</sup> Unfortunately even African Americans who moved out of the South and into the North were unable immediately to advance their economic status, due to lack of educational opportunity and training. Mandle indicated that “Of African American men who were working in 1950, almost one half were employed in the low-income occupations of service, laborers and private household work. By contrast only 13.6 percent of nonfarm white laborers were employed in such low-income jobs. A similar pattern was true for women.”<sup>232</sup> Although educational opportunity for African Americans was limited in the years of federal and state sponsored segregation, the situation would improve as integrated school systems provided increased equality, by providing greater accessibility to higher education for African Americans.

After integration, the African American population became substantially more educated. By 1970 10.3 percent of African Americans had some experience with higher education, and that figure grew to 26.3 percent of the African American population by 1988.<sup>233</sup> The shift to full equality, however, was still incomplete. Mandle cited statistics from the 1990 United States Census, which indicated that by 1988, although the opportunity for the African American population to obtain higher education increased substantially, an educational disparity between the black and white populations still remained. The substantial increase in the level of education received by African Americans, with 11.3 percent of African Americans attending four years of college by 1988 compared to only 4.4 percent of the African American population in 1970, did not allow for the gap in higher education to be significantly narrowed, since America’s white population still held a substantial statistical advantage in 1988, with 20.9 percent of the white

---

<sup>231</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 100.

<sup>232</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 101.

<sup>233</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 107.

population attending 4 years of college.<sup>234</sup> Although improvement has been made since the late 1980s, the damaging effects of decades of educational inequality are still felt by the African American population and as a result, Mandle argued, by the entire United States.

Mandle argued that the economic oppression of African Americans, through the denial of equal access to educational opportunity, not only effected the United States' black population, but the country as a whole. Mandle posited that:

“The slowing of growth in the 1970s, however, reduced the pace at which African Americans continued to progress, all the more so because a lag in the education of blacks compared to whites put the former at a disadvantage in the labor market. That very educational deprivation in turn seems to have been an important element in accounting for the reduced rate of economic growth in the United States generally.”<sup>235</sup>

Mandle contended that an increase in educational, and by extension economic, opportunity for African Americans could benefit the entire United States by increasing this country's rate of economic growth.<sup>236</sup> In the age of technology and globalism, which we currently live in, it is logical to believe that a country which educates a higher proportion of its population would have more potential to achieve sustained economic growth. The solution, therefore, may be to rectify the injustices of the recent past, where educational equality was denied based upon race in the United States. Mandle argued eloquently that “What would be good for the African American population is also what the nation needs. If the condition which must be satisfied for the elimination of disproportionate black poverty is that it be unambiguously in the interests of both blacks and whites, it seems likely that moment has arrived.”<sup>237</sup> A model for handling the needed legislation could be derived from the *Pigford* cases. The leadership of the United States should

---

<sup>234</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 108.

<sup>235</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 3.

<sup>236</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 3.

<sup>237</sup> Mandle, *Not Slave, Not Free*, p. 114.

consider addressing discrimination fostered by its past education legislation, as it effectively addressed the discrimination against black farmers by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the *Pigford* lawsuits. The major difference, however, should be that the compensation be afforded to Historically Black Colleges, rather than to individuals within the African American population, as the long term effects of furthering educational equality, and as a result economic equality, would be more substantial.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Federal and State Responsibility for the Effects of Segregation in Virginia's public higher education system**

The Morrill Acts did substantially increased educational opportunity in the United States, although they did not ensure that educational opportunity was expanded equally among all United States citizens. The Morrill Acts helped African Americans, but not without a cost. After the Morrill Acts were passed more African American students than ever before had the ability to pursue higher education at an affordable state-funded institution. In *The Negro College Graduate*, Charles S. Johnson pointed out that in 1826 John Russwurm became the first African American to graduate from college in America. Johnson noted that “For twenty years after this there were only seven more Negro graduates of recognized colleges, and in 1860, at the outbreak of the Civil War, there had been but twenty-eight.”<sup>238</sup> Johnson concluded, however, that “Based upon the available records of annual graduates from 1826 to 1936, there has been a total of 43,821 Negro graduates of colleges and professional schools. Of this number 6,424, or 14.7 per cent, have been graduated from northern colleges and 37, 397, or 85.3 per cent, have been graduated from Negro colleges.”<sup>239</sup> Thus, with approximately 43,000 more African American graduates about sixty years after the first Morrill Act passed, it is clear that African Americans did

---

<sup>238</sup> Charles S. Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate*, (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), p. 7.

<sup>239</sup> Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate*, p. 10.

immediately benefit from the Morrill Acts, even in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but these Acts also placed limitations on educational advancement for African Americans in the South.

The 1862 Morrill Act largely ignored African Americans and the 1890 Morrill Act validated state-sponsored segregation at the federal level. The federal government did nothing to make sure the states receiving federal funds, through the Morrill Acts, appropriated these funds equally among their population regardless of race. Segregation and inequality in higher education was not only the fault of the states where this existed, the federal government shares the blame for not properly overseeing the funds appropriated and for compliance in segregation, which harmed the African American community. Although the *Pigford* case awarded compensation for federal discrimination against black farmers, it only did so for a short period of time compared to the long length of discrimination that African American farmers faced. African American farmers in Virginia were denied access to experiment stations for fifty years, from 1886-1936, and they were denied access to fully state-funded agricultural education from 1872-1907, although Hampton (a private institution for African Americans) was receiving some Morrill Act funds for agricultural programming from the state, when an agriculture program existed at Virginia Tech but not at Virginia State. African American scholars were denied the ability to pursue a bachelor's degree in Virginia's public higher education system from 1902-1923, and until 1953 no African American undergraduate in Virginia had access to the same programs, educational funding, or facilities that white students had access to in Virginia because of inept political policies.

Progress in the struggle for equality in higher education was never fluid; at times progress was stalled and other times it was reversed. African Americans gained access to state-funded

higher education from 1883-1902, but they lost this right for a period of over twenty years when the Virginia General Assembly mandated that Virginia State abandon its college program. There was steady progress in the struggle for equality in higher education in Virginia after 1923, although it happened incrementally and through the dedication and hard work of the African American community and the work of individuals who believed in the importance of pushing for increased opportunity for African Americans to obtain higher education.

John M. Gandy, the president of Virginia State from 1914-1943, was an instrumental figure in the fight for equality in Virginia's public higher education system. Under Gandy's leadership Virginia State University gained land-grant status, regained its college programming, established experiment stations, and established a graduate program. The struggle for equality in higher education in Virginia was not all from "the top down;" African American students such as Irving L. Peddrew III and Charlie L. Yates were two of the first African Americans to attend Virginia Tech, and their attendance at the institution in the 1950s broke barriers. Peddrew became the first black undergraduate student to attend a formerly all-white public higher education institution in a former Confederate state, and Yates became the first black undergraduate student to graduate from a formerly all-white public higher education institution in a former Confederate state. Although Peddrew and Yates faced struggles, such as isolation from their fellow students, their bravery opened the doors for African Americans in Virginia and in other Southern States where African Americans were excluded from public institutions of higher learning based on their race. The individuals who rejected the status quo of inequality in higher education and fought to open doors for African American students should be remembered for their fortitude. The struggle for equality in higher education was not easily won in Virginia, or anywhere else, where segregation had taken hold.

In *The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery: A Historical Justification for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*, John E. Fleming posited that African American prosperity was impeded from 1890 to 1915. He argued that “the years between 1890 and 1915 were crucial to black people: it was the period when white southerners, with northern acquiescence, relegated blacks to the lowest level in a caste system.”<sup>240</sup> In *Higher Education And The Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black Southerners, and College Campuses*, Peter Wallenstein indicated that:

Every one of the seventeen states [where segregation came into existence] soon had a ‘college of 1890,’ though well into the twentieth century such schools offered a radically narrower curriculum than did their 1862 counterparts [designated for white students.] By the 1920s, the ‘colleges of 1890’ were increasingly offering baccalaureate degrees; beginning generally in the late 1930s, master’s degrees became available, too, particularly in education. Yet the curricular offerings at black schools remained very restricted, even for undergraduates and especially at the graduate level. Into the 1930s, nowhere in the seventeen states was there a law school, for example, at any of the ‘colleges of 1890.’”<sup>241</sup>

Fleming’s and Wallenstein’s assessments apply to Virginia, during the period they specified, since the 1902 Virginia General Assembly stripped Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute of its college program and replaced it with industrial education, and did not restore the college curriculum until 1923, while Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute still had institutional control over its course offerings and was allowed by the state to keep its academic curriculum. The only explanation for the 1902 Virginia General Assembly choosing to deny African Americans the opportunity to pursue an academic course of study, while affording that opportunity to white students, is racism. The discrimination African Americans faced in higher education and the workforce, as a result of state policy, took a toll in

---

<sup>240</sup> John E. Fleming, *The Lengthening Shadow of Slavery: A Historical Justification for Affirmative Action for Blacks in Higher Education*, (Washington D. C.: Howard University Press, 1976), p.84.

<sup>241</sup> Peter Wallenstein, *Higher Education And The Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black Southerners, and College Campuses*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008) p. 5.

the first half of the twentieth century. Johnson concluded that “From the consistency of the choices of both high school students and college graduates, it is evident that they have been greatly influenced by the small number of occupations believed to be open to Negroes. The factor of racial prejudice and the limitations imposed seems to be an important factor in the vocational choices of the Negro students.”<sup>242</sup> Some of these limitations included program availability at the segregated institutions designated for African Americans. Since African American students could not attend Virginia Tech until 1953, and since no engineering program had existed at Virginia State, African Americans who sought affordable state-funded higher education in Virginia were kept out of a potentially lucrative career in engineering, prior to the 1950s.

The state of Virginia and Virginia Tech were compliant with the legal paradigm shift in higher education policy, without being repeatedly ordered by the court system to desegregate higher education, while other states and state-institutions fought bitterly against equality and the end of segregation in public higher education. Wallenstein maintained that some universities in Southern states admitted African American students on a case by case basis only after they were repeatedly ordered to by the courts. He noted that “Bending but not breaking, they might—as the University of Mississippi did—accept a black student, but only under court order, and then accept another solitary black student, again only under court order.”<sup>243</sup> Although the state of Virginia became a leader in following federal desegregation policy, the effects of segregation are still visible in the state. Wallenstein pointed out that “At the end of the twentieth century... Compared with the Virginia population as a whole, which was 20 percent black,

---

<sup>242</sup> Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate*, p. 193.

<sup>243</sup> Wallenstein, *Higher Education And The Civil Rights Movement*, p. 4.



Virginia Tech's undergraduate enrollment was only 4 percent African American, while Virginia State University's was 94 percent."<sup>244</sup> These statistics illustrate an important point; although segregation formally ended half a century ago, the effects are still present today.

The 1890 Morrill Act entrenched segregation in higher education throughout the United States, especially in states such as Virginia where segregation in higher education already existed, as it unfortunately validated what these states were doing at the expense of the African American population. Historically Black Public Colleges were denied the same funding and the ability to develop many of the same programs that public institutions designated for white student had. Many of these institutions have never recovered from the unequal funding they received during the period of state-sponsored segregation. Even Historically Black Colleges doing well today were put at a disadvantage by segregation, since the institutions that were once designated for white students were given much larger annual appropriations during the period of segregation, which they used to expand their universities. An example of this is apparent when the annual funding for Virginia State is compared with the annual funding of Virginia Tech during the 1918 fiscal year. Virginia Tech, which was the public higher education institution designated for white students, received an appropriation of \$71,000 for 1918, whereas Virginia State, which was the public higher education institution designated for black students received only an annuity of \$30,000 for that same year.

The problem of unequal funding, during the period of segregation, has compounded itself over the years, aiding the growth of one institution, while the other institution was unable to expand its facilities or programs as quickly. This is not the fault of either institution; rather the fault should be placed on the federal and state governments for sponsoring segregation. It is up to

---

<sup>244</sup> Wallenstein, *Higher Education And The Civil Rights Movement*, p. 230.

the state of Virginia and the federal government of the United States of America to rectify the past inequality they inflicted upon their citizens. It is impossible to make up fully for the past inequality in the policies of both the state and federal governments, but this inequality should be taken into account when appropriating funds for Historically Black Colleges in the future.

Although it is currently a time of economic uncertainty, the federal and state governments should consider awarding compensation to publicly funded Historically Black Colleges when it is more feasible to do so. Increasing funding to Historically Black Colleges would not only help these institutions grow, rectifying some of the past inequality which resulted from inefficient federal and state policy, but it would also be an investment in the African American community and in America. Also, universities that promote diversity should always be generously funded, by the state and federal government, for expanding educational opportunity and cultural awareness, which brings our society closer together.

**Bibliography**  
**Primary Sources**

US Congress. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,

“Colleges For The Benefit Of Agriculture And The Mechanical Arts,”

January 7, 1907, 59<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Senate, Document No.189.

Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College, Committee on Organization, *Virginia*

*Agricultural and Mechanical College, its history and organization, (L210. B2 1871/1872*

*Appendix ?)* Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections,

Blacksburg, VA, (Richmond, VA 1872).

United States Postal Card sent from President C.L.C Minor to F. B. Hunt of Washington

County, VA., 1875, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special

Collections, Blacksburg, VA.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook at the*

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute: And the Necessity for the Appropriations Asked for*

*Buildings and Equipment and for an Increase of Annuity for 1902-1903*, Virginia

Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (n. p.

1903?).

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Board of Visitors, *The Present Condition and Outlook at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute: And the Necessity for the Appropriations Asked for Buildings and Equipment and for an Increase of Annuity for 1906*, (LD5655. A4 1906) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (n. p. 1906?).

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Alumni Association, *Charges Preferred Against Paul P. Barringer, President Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia By The Welfare Committee Of The Alumni Association, Before the Board of Visitors At A Special Meeting Held At Richmond, January 13, 1910*, (LD5655. A4 1910) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA, (Richmond, VA 1910?).

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Needs, 1918*, (LD5655 A4 1918) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Special Collections, Blacksburg, VA.

Virginia State College for Negroes Catalogue, 1885-1886 through 1899-1900, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

Virginia State College for Negroes Catalogue, 1920-1921 through 1924-1925, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "The Meeting of the Alumni Association," The Governors Message transmitted by Governor Montague to the General Assembly, Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:67, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Letter to Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute's President John M. Gandy from the Director of the Agricultural School J. L. Lockett, April 25, 1929, Accession # 1967-2, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, Account of July 11, 1929 Meeting by Director of the Agricultural School J. L. Lockett with suggested revisions by W.S. Newman, Accession # 1967-2, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "Agriculture Experimental Work at the College," Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:48, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "Establishing Graduate Work at the College," Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:58, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "The Meeting of the Alumni Association," Impressive Ceremonies mark Harmon Awards to Distinguished Virginia Educator, Appendix Chapter VII, Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:67, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University, p. 355.

The John Manuel Gandy Papers, "The Tendency of Negro Land Ownership to Decline," Accession # 1967-2, box-folder 2:82, Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State University.

### **Secondary Sources**

Bayly, C.A., *The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.

Bearss, Sara B., John T. Kneebone, J. Jefferson Looney, Brent Tarter, and Sandra Gioia Treadway, *Dictionary of Virginia Biography: Volume 2*, Richmond: Library of Virginia, 2001.

- Browne, William P., "Benign Public Policies, Malignant Consequences, and the Demise of African American Agriculture," in *African American Life In The Rural South, 1900-1950*, edited by R. Douglas Hurt, Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2003.
- Clark, Kathleen Ann, *Defining Moments: African American Commemoration & Political Culture in the South, 1863-1913*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Craig, Lee A., "Constrained Resource Allocation and the Investment in the Education of Black Americans: The 1890 Land-Grant Colleges," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 65 (2), (1991), p. 73-84.
- Duemer, Lee S., "The Agriculture Education Origins of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862," *American Educational History Journal*, Vol. 34 (1), (2007): p.135-146.
- Eaton, Clement, *The Freedom of Thought Struggle in the Old South*, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964.
- Florer, John H., "Major Issues in the Congressional Debate of the Morrill Act of 1862," *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (4), (1968): p. 459-478.
- Gilbert, Charlene and Quinn Eli, *Homecoming: The Story Of African-American Farmers*, Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- Good, Harry G. and Teller, James D., *A History of Western Education*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969.
- Gordon, Howard R. D., *The History And Growth of Vocational Education In America*, Needham Heights: Allyn& Bacon, 1999.

- Grant, P. M., T. G. Field, R. D. Green, B. E. Rollin, "The Importance of Comprehensive Agricultural Education in Land-Grant Institutions: A Historical Perspective," *Journal of Animal Science*, Vol. 78 (6), (2000): p. 1684-9
- Humphries, Frederick S., "1890 Land-Grant Institutions: Their Struggle for Survival and Equality," *Agricultural History*, Vol.65 (2), (1991), p. 3-11
- Hyman, Harold M., *American Singularity: The 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the 1862 Homestead And Morrill Acts, and the 1944 G.I. Bill*, Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Jeffreys, Richard Langston, "A History of Virginia State College for Negroes." Thesis, University of Michigan, 1937.
- Kneebone, John T., J. Jefferson Looney, Brent Tarter, and Sandra Gioia Treadway, *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Richmond: Library of Virginia, 1998.
- Knight, Edgar W., *Education in the United States*, New York: Greenwood Press, 1951.
- Mandle, Jay R., *Not Slave, Not Free: The African American Economic Experience since the Civil War*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1992.
- McClure, Arthur F., James Riley Chrisman, and Perry Mock, *Education for Work: The Historical Evolution and Distributive Education in America*, Cranbury: Associated University Press, Inc., 1985.
- Meyer, Adolphe E., *An Educational History of the American People*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1967.

Molnar, Joseph J., John E. Dunkelberger and Dannis A. Salter,

“Agricultural Education in the South: A Comparison of Student Characteristics at Land Grant Institutions,” *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 50. (1), (1981), p. 26-40.

Moore, James Tice, *Two Paths to the New South: The Virginia Debt Controversy 1870-1883*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974.

Noble, Stuart G., *A History of American Education*, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1954.

Olmstead, Alan L., and Paul W. Rhode, “Farms, by race and tenure of operator: 1880-1997,” Table Da530-545, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition On Line*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 4-71.

Olmstead, Alan L., and Paul W. Rhode, “Farms in the South by race and tenure of operator: 1880-1975,” Table Da546-565, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition On Line*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 4-72 – 4-73.

Reid, Debra A., “Introduction” in *Beyond Forty Acres and a Mule: African American Landowning Families since Reconstruction*, edited by Debra A. Reid and Evan P. Bennett, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012.

Reynolds, Terry S., “The Education of Engineers in America before the Morrill Act of 1862,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 32 (4), (1992): p. 459-482.



Roberts, Roy W., *Vocational And Practical Arts Education*, New York:

Harper & Row publishers, 1957.

Salmon, Emily J. and Edward D.C. Campbell, Jr., *The Hornbook of Virginia History:*

*A Ready-Reference Guide to the Old Dominion's People, Places, and Past*,

Richmond: Library of Virginia, 1994.

Shannon, Samuel H., "Land-Grant College Legislation and Black Tennesseans:

A Case Study in the Politics of Education," *History of Education Quarterly*,

Vol. 22 (2), (1982), p. 139-157.

Simon, John Y., "The Politics of the Morrill Act," *Agricultural History*, Vol. 37 (2), (1963):

p. 103-111.

Sobek, Matthew, "Major industrial groups of labor force participants-nonwhite males: 1910-

1990," Table Ba724-741, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition*

On Line, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L.

Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 2-

105.

Sobek, Matthew, "Major industrial groups of labor force participants-nonwhite females: 1910-

1990," Table Ba760-777, in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Millennial Edition*

On Line, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L.

Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 2-

107.

Toppin, Edgar, *Loyal Sons and Daughters: Virginia State University 1882-1992*,

Norfolk: Pictorial Heritage Publishing Company, 1992.

Veysey, Laurence R., *The Emergence of the American University*, Chicago:

University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Wallenstein, Peter, "Not Fast, But First: The Desegregation of Virginia Tech,"

*Virginia Tech Magazine*, Vol. 20, (1), (1997)

Wallenstein, Peter, *Cradle of America: Four Centuries of Virginia History*, Lawrence:

University Press of Kansas, 2007.

Wallenstein, Peter, *Higher Education And The Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black*

*Southerners, and College Campuses*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008.

#### **Web Sources:**

Cowan, Tadlock and Feder, Jody, "The *Pigford* Cases: USDA Settlement of Discrimination

Suits by Black Farmers," Congressional Research Service, Accessed May 9, 2013,

<http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RS20430.pdf>

Priya N. Parker, "Storming the Gates of Knowledge: A Documentary History of Desegregation

and Coeducation in Jefferson's Academical Village," *Exhibit: Alice Jackson, First*

*African American to Apply to U.VA. (1935)*, Accessed on April 11, 2013

<http://www.virginia.edu/woodson/projects/kenan/jackson/jackson.html>

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, *College of Agriculture and Life Sciences*,

*About the College, History*, Accessed on April 4, 2013

<http://www.cals.vt.edu/about/history/>

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, *Virginia Agriculture Experiment Station*,

*About (VAES)*, Accessed on April 4, 2013

<http://www.vaes.vt.edu/about/index.html>

Manning, Jennifer E. and Shogan Colleen J., “African American Members of the United States Congress: 1870-2012,” Congressional Research Service, Accessed May 9, 2013,  
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30378.pdf>

## Vita

Nicholas Betts was born on January 29, 1990 in Montgomery County, Maryland, and is an American citizen. He graduated from Damascus High School, Montgomery County, Maryland, in 2008. In 2010 he received the W.E.B. DuBois Award for excellence in History. He received his Bachelor of Arts Degree magna cum laude in History with a minor in Political Science after three years of study at Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia in 2011. He served as President of the Theta Delta Chi Rho Triton Alumni Association for a one year term until October 2011. As a graduate student at Virginia Commonwealth University, Nicholas served as President of the Alexandrian Society from fall 2012 to spring 2013 and also helped to establish the History Graduate Student Organization at Virginia Commonwealth University, which he became the first President of in the fall of 2012, serving until spring 2013. He worked as a graduate teaching assistant for the Virginia Commonwealth Department of History from the fall of 2011 until the spring of 2013. Nicholas received his Master of Arts in History from Virginia Commonwealth University in the spring of 2013.