

Hampton, Fisk, and Atlanta: The Foundations, the American Library Association, and Library Education for Blacks, 1925-1941

By: Robert Sidney Martin and Orvin Lee Shiflett

Martin, Robert Sidney, and [Orvin Lee Shiflett](#). "Hampton, Fisk, and Atlanta: The Foundations, the American Library Association, and Library Education for Blacks, 1925-1941." with Robert Sydney Martin. *Libraries and Culture* 31 (Spring 1996) : 299-325.

Made available courtesy of University of Texas Press: <http://www.utexas.edu/utpress/journals/jlc.html>

*****Note: Figures may be missing from this format of the document**

Abstract:

Training Black librarians to work in the segregated South was a major concern of the American Library Association (ALA), of the philanthropic foundations involved in library development in the South, and of southern librarians in the 1920s and 1930s. The choice of the Hampton Institute and, later, Atlanta University as designated centers for training Black librarians was a controversial one. The issues of appropriate institutional affiliations for the effort, of funding, and even of the need for such a facility were hotly debated. This paper investigates the issues surrounding the establishment of a formal school for Black librarians and the circumstances that eventually placed the school at Atlanta University.

Article:

Introduction

Beginning in the 1920s, the development of professional education for librarianship in the United States was fostered by an active partnership between the ALA and philanthropic foundations, especially the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the General Education Board (GEB). In 1925, these parties, together with the Julius Rosenwald Fund, began a crusade to establish a library education program for African Americans in the South. The idea may well have originated at the initiative of Frederick Keppel, the president of the Carnegie Corporation, but it was taken up with gusto by the leadership of the ALA, which in 1925, with Carnegie money, commissioned Louis Round Wilson to undertake a survey of institutions that might provide an appropriate home for such a school. On Wilson's recommendation, Carnegie provided a grant to the Hampton Institute in Virginia for the establishment of a program. This decision was hotly debated throughout the decade by individuals vitally interested in southern librarianship. Eventually, the Hampton school closed and a new school for Black librarians was established at Atlanta University.

The saga of the establishment and subsequent abandonment of the Hampton Institute library school is one that has mystified a number of library historians. James V. Carmichael, Jr. in his masterful work on Tommie Dora Barker, labeled the closing of Hampton in 1939 "inexplicable."¹ Edward G. Holley, in his review of library education in the South, admitted that he "imperfectly understood" the phenomenon and closed his discussion of the subject with the observation that "the question needs further investigation."² This paper is an attempt to pursue that investigation and to explain the inexplicable.

Hampton Established

Providing adequate library services to Blacks in the South was an issue that perplexed many leaders in library development during the early decades of this century. In 1920, three-quarters of all Black Americans lived in the segregated South, where they constituted about one-third of the total population. Few southern towns and cities had anything approaching adequate library service for any of their citizens, and of those few, only fourteen public libraries in the South maintained separate branches for the Black community. In the segregated South, this, of course, meant that other cities had few or no provisions for library service to Black citizens.³ A 1926 survey documented that almost ninety percent of the Black population of the South was without public

library service of any kind.⁴ Because of the structure of segregated society, one of the most crucial elements in providing library services to Blacks was providing an adequate number of trained Black librarians.

The philanthropic foundations having an interest in library development were concerned about the situation. The GEB, created in 1902 by John D. Rockefeller, Sr. to support education in the South with particular emphasis on educational opportunities for Blacks, shared this interest. Its officials had been aware for some time that elementary and secondary education of Blacks in the South was futile if they had no access to libraries and books after leaving school. The field investigators of the GEB noted in their report for the spring of 1925 that Black school children and teachers in the South did not read and had no books, and there were no good libraries in the schools and colleges where the teachers were trained. GEB field agents recommended the establishment of a library school for African Americans in order to improve these conditions. Though some officers of the GEB favored funding scholarships to northern library schools for promising Black students, and though the GEB did, in fact, fund such scholarships, officers of the Carnegie Corporation concurred with the GEB field agents and looked toward establishing a separate library school in the South for Blacks.⁵

Of more immediate import, however, Frederick Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation wrote Carl Milam, executive director of the ALA, twice in February 1925, urging that the Board of Education for Librarianship (BEL) consider the possibility of establishing a school for training Black librarians. In response to this request, the BEL addressed the issue at a meeting on 12 March 1925. The members of the board had given the matter no thought prior to that time and were reluctant to express an opinion, but they assured Keppel that they were "much interested in the subject" and were convinced that such a facility should be established "at some southern school for negroes," provided that the library facilities of the school itself were adequate. In reporting the sentiments of the BEL to Keppel, Milam asserted that there was an informal consensus "that a school for equipping colored people for library work would probably best be established at Tuskegee," the Alabama institution founded by Booker T. Washington. This consensus was based on the reputation Tuskegee had established for training Blacks for work in the South with its peculiar conditions and institutions.⁶ Sarah C. N. Bogle, Milam's assistant at the ALA, concurred a few days later when she sent Milam some information about Tuskegee and argued, "There is no question whatsoever in my mind but that such a school must be in the South and not in connection with the library school for white people." Further, she expressed a firm opinion that such a school had to be established at a Black university rather than a public library, such as the one at Louisville, Kentucky, as had been suggested.⁷ The Louisville Free Public Library probably was the most progressive of the southern public libraries, maintaining two branches for the use of Black patrons and even providing some formal training for Black library workers since 1905 under the direction of Thomas Blue. The library director, George Settle, had approached the ALA about the possibility of establishing some sort of official role in the training of Black library workers.⁸

Because the proposed school involved both African Americans and southern education, Milam and others consulted with officials of the Rosenwald Foundation and the GEB, the two philanthropic institutions most directly concerned with these matters in March 1925. All were agreed from the outset that such a school was desirable, that it should be established in the South, and that it should be at an institution that was exclusively for the education of Blacks. Wickliffe Rose, President of the GEB, suggested that, in addition to Tuskegee, the Hampton Institute be considered as a potential host for the school.

Rose argued that it would be better to have the school at a southern public library. But if an academic institution was demanded, he thought Hampton would be a better place for it than Tuskegee because of Hampton's higher academic reputation. As a result of this meeting, Milam suggested that the BEL could send a librarian from the South to visit both the Hampton and Tuskegee campuses at ALA expense to report on the advantages of establishing a library training program at each. Milam suggested Louis Round Wilson, librarian of the University of North Carolina, as the most appropriate person to undertake the investigation.⁹ Bogle wrote to the chair of the BEL, Adam Strohm of the Detroit Public Library, recommending this course of action and noting that "Mr. Louis Wilson seems a very proper person" to make the proposed survey. The board members were duly polled, and they resolved to ask Wilson to undertake the project.¹⁰ The matter became urgent when Milam

was invited to attend a 1 May meeting of the principal organizations interested in African American education in the South, including the Rosenwald, Slater, and Jeannes Funds, and the GEB.¹¹ On 7 April 1925, Milam wired Wilson, commissioning him to do the survey. He noted that it was imperative to have the report by 1 May, if possible, and he cautioned Wilson to "avoid publicity."¹² These brief instructions were followed by detailed letters from both Bogle and Milam. Bogle noted that the possibility of the establishment of a library school for southern Blacks had come up some time ago, but that matters began to move very suddenly, and it now appeared that provision for it might be made very soon. She furnished him with a copy of the tentative standards for library schools then being prepared by the BEL, as well as some of the forms it used when visiting schools.

She suggested that Wilson look carefully at a number of factors. Among these were the attitude of the administration toward the library school, the library facilities, the status of the librarian among the faculty members, the organization and income of the institution, the strength of the normal course for teachers, and the number of professional and vocational courses offered. She asked Wilson also to express his opinion of Howard University as a possible site. Milam wrote separately to assure Wilson that the ALA wanted to consider the question of library training for Blacks from the southern point of view. "We are not at the moment interested in the education of colored librarians for work in New York City or Chicago, but for librarians who will work in the South," Milam wrote.¹³

Wilson immediately rejected Howard University as a possible site for the school, because it was far from the center of the South and was too expensive for the type of student the ALA wanted to attract, even though he admitted that it offered a higher educational standard than either Tuskegee or Hampton. He suggested instead that Fisk University in Nashville be considered, as it offered work of a college and professional grade and served an area of the South in which some of the larger cities were to be found. Wilson also expressed his concern on one critical point: Hampton employed White teachers, whereas at Tuskegee the instructors were all Black. Hampton would therefore be in a better position to start right away by securing qualified instructors from the best library schools of the country, while Tuskegee would have difficulty securing qualified teachers. Wilson asked Bogle to tell him if there were a sufficient number of qualified Black instructors available to take up the teaching posts at Tuskegee.¹⁴ Bogle responded that Wilson should skip Howard and that he should use his own judgment about going to Fisk. The question of Black instructors, though, was one which deserved further consideration.¹⁵

In late April Wilson visited the three institutions for one day each, gathered other information from published catalogs and reports, and submitted his report on 23 April. Of the three schools visited by Wilson, Fisk seemed almost perfect to him. The library was large and adequate. The facilities of the surrounding community offered strong support for a library school, and, Wilson observed, "although the Fisk income is only about \$160,000, it handles its student-body of 500 in an effectively educational way." He recommended, however, that Fisk not be considered because "the student body has been in a state of mutiny and the president's resignation has just been announced."

The situation Wilson referred to was indeed disturbing. Fayette Avery McKenzie, who had been president of Fisk University since 1915, had high aspirations for the institution, but his methods were criticized by many Black intellectuals, who accused him of pandering to the White community of Nashville. More importantly, his methods were condemned by Fisk students and some faculty members, who felt them repressive and demeaning to a group of young people who were increasingly ambitious to establish their own dignity as human beings. In June 1924, Fisk alumnus W. E. B. Du Bois joined the attack by calling for a boycott of Fisk before the New York Fisk Club. McKenzie's reaction was toward greater repression and suppression of criticism on the campus. On 4 February 1925, the students rioted after McKenzie proclaimed in chapel that there would be no change in his policies. McKenzie called in the Nashville police and had seven students arrested as ring leaders in the disturbance. At their trial, it came out that McKenzie had no evidence that the seven were involved, and two of them had not even been on campus during the fray. All were convicted. The verdict sparked a general student strike, and McKenzie offered his resignation in the face of the deteriorating situation.¹⁶

Wilson's information about the situation at Fisk seems to have come entirely from an interview with McKenzie shortly after his resignation and was undoubtedly a biased picture of the situation. This perspective led Wilson to conclude that the upheaval at Fisk rendered it unsuitable as a site for the program the ALA was considering, at least for the present. Wilson wrote,

Until the present warfare is over between DuBois, negro editor of the Crisis, for a negro institution manned by negroes, and the friends of Fisk who desire the direction of the University to be in the hands of the whites, nothing, it would seem to me, can be done.

In his opinion, the "fundamental question" for the BEL to answer before making a recommendation to the Carnegie Corporation was "shall you place your school in an institution which is apt to follow the lead of DuBois, or one in which the closest sort of cooperation with the white people will be maintained by the negroes?"

Wilson then turned his attention to Hampton and Tuskegee, each of which had advantages and disadvantages. Hampton was superior to Tuskegee in at least one respect: "as the principal and heads of the various schools are white, it has had at all times the advantage of white managerial intelligence." Nevertheless, Wilson admitted that Tuskegee was "a tremendous institution. . . . Its personnel is colored, but it is running smoothly." Wilson concluded his comparison of the two institutions by noting that "Hampton is the better financed, better directed, more attractive, and, from the point of view of ability to fit courses into a splendidly organized curriculum, has a fairly decided advantage over Tuskegee." He recommended that Hampton was to be preferred over Tuskegee if for no other reason than "the setting up of library instruction might be gotten underway more quickly" at the Virginia institution.¹⁷

Wilson's report was received and read with great interest by Milam and the members of the BEL. Milam was inclined toward Tuskegee "partly because of its geographic location, but more especially because of its spirit and philosophy." In particular, Tuskegee was run "by and for the negro race." Milam thought that this approach would be more successful in the long run "than the policy of accepting white leadership (and domination) as at Hampton and Fisk."¹⁸ In general, Milam's sentiments were echoed by the members of the BEL. Harrison Craver, director of the Engineering Societies Library in New York City, thought Wilson's report "very good," and inclined toward Tuskegee because of its location and the fact that it had a Black administration, which he thought to be "quite an advantage." Like Milam, he perceived the troubles at Fisk to be symptomatic of problems likely to occur elsewhere. Elizabeth Smith, director of the Albany (New York) Public Library, agreed, but was troubled about the unavailability of Black teachers. She wondered if the administration of Tuskegee would agree to a White head of the school, at least during the organizational phase.¹⁹

Milam reported these conclusions and recommendations at the 1 May New York meeting and was surprised to learn that they were not shared by the philanthropic organizations. The officials of the GEB, who were most experienced with the educational conditions of the South, strongly favored Hampton because of the number of Black high school graduates in the Hampton area, the fact that it already offered relatively advanced college work, and Tuskegee's reputation as a second-class technical school. A subsequent conference with Keppel quickly convinced Milam, who requested the BEL to approve Hampton as the site for the Negro Library Training School, which it promptly did.²⁰

With a Carnegie grant,²¹ the Hampton Institute Library School was duly established under the direction of Florence Rising Curtis, who had been the first secretary of the Association of American Library Schools (1915-1921) and assistant director of the Drexel Institute library school (1922-1925) prior to taking the Hampton position. Curtis was well known and respected in the library education community and was a close friend and professional associate of Bogle.²²

Wilson's Hampton survey had been extremely important, not only in deciding the location of the first Black library education program in the South, but also in bringing Wilson to the attention of officials of the Carnegie

Corporation, the GEB, and the BEL. As a result of his thorough work on the survey, Wilson was appointed to fill the vacancy created on the BEL when Andrew Keogh resigned in May 1925.²³ He was thus a member of the board when controversy over the Hampton school erupted later in the summer, when the selection of Hampton for the school became generally known.

The BEL's interest in establishing a library school for Blacks was reported in the July 1925, issue of Library Journal, and the Carnegie Corporation grant to the Hampton Institute was announced a short time later. These events elicited an immediate reaction on the part of those who were fighting racial segregation in all its forms. Ernestine Rose was the head of the 135th Street (Harlem) Branch of the New York Public Library. She was incensed that the proposal could come to fruition without the library community's knowledge and, especially, without the participation of those most affected by it. She wrote Charles F. Belden, the new president of the ALA and director of the Boston Public Library, when she read of the school's establishment in Library Journal:

Now I learn what makes me suspect that a library school for a segregated group has practically been established under the sponsoring agency of the ALA, without open discussion or inquiry among many of those most deeply interested. I refer to librarians like myself who are laboring to make libraries an agency for a free and equal citizenship and to influential and progressive Negroes, the very people it is proposed to serve. I should wish to voice my strong and most indignant protest and to state my reasons for this attitude frankly and openly.²⁴

She concluded by asserting that if a library school had been established at Hampton under the auspices of the ALA.

A number of other people expressed their concern about various aspects of the proposed school, but the opposition of Ernestine Rose was an important obstacle. She clipped out the Library Journal notice and sent it on to either W. E. B. Du Bois or Walter White, assistant secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). White responded by expressing to Charles Belden the concern of the NAACP that "this proposed school will not only not be approved by thinking colored people, it will be vigorously opposed and resented."

White's letter blasted the idea of a library school at Hampton, asserting that Black students were already accepted at many schools in the North, that segregating them from the White population "places upon them the stigma of being either unable to compete with white students or else not fit for association with white librarians," and that establishing a Black school was a step in the direction of total segregation. White expressed fear "that when a segregated institution of this sort is established, in the course of time all colored persons desiring library training would be forced to attend the segregated school at Hampton."

Hampton itself was a point of contention. White pointed out that the already established library schools were at reputable institutions, either major public libraries or universities, while Hampton, though "doing a very splendid and a much needed piece of work," was "an industrial High School" with no academic standing. Further, the argument for locating a school in the South, because that is where the Black population that would benefit from it lives was fallacious. He contended,

Since students who might come from the south would have to travel as far as Hampton, Va., anyhow to attend the new school, we feel that they might better travel a bit further to one of the library schools located in a section of the country where white and colored students have attended classes together without friction or disturbance.

We are respectfully requesting that you whose reputation on such matters has always been of the highest will not only use your influence as President of the American Library Association towards the withdrawal of whatever approval has been given to this segregated institution, but that through you the American Library Association may go on record as being opposed to the establishment of this segregated school.

On 2 September, White had a long meeting with Bogle and Keppel in which he expressed his concern that the Hampton program would damage efforts to integrate higher education. "He was irate when he came in," Bogle

reported to her associate, Harriet Howe, "but I think he saw the light." Bogle and Keppel were ultimately able to calm White, but he still was not converted to support the school.²⁵

Meanwhile Belden, who had been caught completely by surprise by the protests, inquired of Milam what it was all about. Milam responded by giving the history of the situation, assuring him that, although the protests should be taken seriously, there was no reason to reconsider the BEL's actions. Adam Strohm also defended the board's actions and suggested that Wilson address the issue, pointing out that the BEL and the Carnegie Corporation had been "very largely guided by his findings."²⁶ Wilson was happy to give his point of view. He acknowledged that he

belonged to that group which believes that the interests of the colored folk will be taken care of better at Hampton through segregation than through the other regular library schools. I think that a course gauged to meet the needs of the average colored library can be worked out more effectively there than in connection with the library schools, and I believe that association with the teachers of the colored race who are being prepared at Hampton will necessarily benefit those studying library methods.

He went on to point out that the opposition to Hampton was but one facet of the NAACP's campaign to end all racial discrimination, but that in the South such discrimination was a way of life. As for segregation in education, Wilson held that "in my opinion, certainly for the present, the prevailing policy is the wise one." Milam responded with his thanks for Wilson's candor, noting that his letter "confirms very forcibly the opinions held by others competent to give advice."²⁷ When the BEL met later that month Wilson expounded at length on library education in the South, and the members of the BEL accepted his views, voting a resolution affirming that Hampton was the appropriate place to establish a library school for African Americans and expressing its will to cooperate fully with the authorities at Hampton.²⁸

The Fisk Challenge

Even though the Hampton Institute received ALA approval and the Carnegie grant, the controversy was far from over. Of all the higher educational institutions serving the Black population of the South, Fisk University was probably the strongest in its academic standards and reputability. The resignation of the controversial President McKenzie and his replacement with Thomas Elsa Jones in 1925 began the process of rebuilding the Fisk community. Part of this rebuilding process included attention to the library and the hiring of the first professionally trained librarian.

In the fall of 1928, Louis Shores became librarian of Fisk University. When Shores went to Fisk, an evident qualification he had for the job was a master's degree in education from City College of New York. Jones, ambitious for Fisk and for the progress of Black education in the South, must have had in mind the potential for professional library training at Fisk when he hired Shores. Jones had instituted moves in this direction from at least February 1927, when he had a member of the faculty library committee contact the BEL for information about requirements for library schools and about Carnegie grants for supporting library education programs.²⁹

During the summer of 1928, Shores wrote Sarah C. N. Bogle on several occasions with requests for information and assistance in planning for a new library building at Fisk. By the fall of 1928, he was prepared to offer his first course in "library instruction" and wrote Bogle asking her opinion of his plan. The course was to be opened only to advanced students and was designed as an introduction to the profession of librarianship. It was entirely separate from the general introduction to library use he was offering to entering freshman students.³⁰

In early 1929, Jones and Shores decided that it was time for Fisk to attempt seriously to obtain the Black library school. At the end of January, Shores approached the BEL for suggestions as to what would be necessary for Fisk to establish an ALA accredited program to train school librarians. When Shores wrote Margaret Herdman with his request, he sent her information about the steps he had already taken, including a listing from the Fisk college catalog describing the courses he was offering. One of these was a three-hour course, "Reference and Bibliography for the School Library," which was described as "intended to meet the requirements of the Board of Education for Librarianship of the ALA for training teacher librarians in elementary and secondary schools."

Margaret Belle Martin, general assistant to the BEL, answered Shores. She cautioned Shores about the potential conflict with his plans and the work of the Hampton Institute and warned against offering a series of short courses that could devalue the necessary work being offered by Florence Rising Curtis, but she ended on a positive note encouraging Shores by telling him that she was prepared to offer all the help she could.³¹

Perhaps she encouraged Shores too much. In October 1929, Jones made the journey to Chicago to confer with Carl Milam about the proposed school and left him with a copy of Shores's annual report on the Fisk library. Milam, reading through it, discovered Shores's claim that the proposed school "had already received the endorsement of the American Library Association." After Milam inquired of the BEL staff about what authority Shores had to make such a statement and was shown the correspondence between the BEL and Shores, he wrote Jones that it would be more accurate to say, "The project has received the encouragement of a representative of the American Library Association." Jones passed Milam's letter on to Shores who wrote Milam an apology for the misunderstanding, telling him that his intent had been merely to show that the ALA had offered encouragement to the effort. Shores ended his response to Milam with the assurance that he was having Jones change the wording and expressed regret for the "oversight" for which he humbly assumed full responsibility.³²

Shores took this exchange as general approval for his plans for Fisk. The first overture to the foundations for money was made when Shores was sent to the May 1929 ALA Conference in Washington, D.C., and talked to Robert Lester of the Carnegie Corporation about the possibility of moving the school and its foundation support from Hampton to Fisk. Whatever answer Shores received must have given him sufficient encouragement in the endeavor. When he was in New York in the summer of 1929, he pressed the issue, writing to Jones that he had obtained a projected budget, at least some idea of what the school would cost, and that he was planning to approach the Rosenwald Fund about financing the Fisk school.³³

Shores and Jones meanwhile had gathered some important support for their efforts. Mary Utopia Rothrock, then emerging as a major voice in southern librarianship, was as strong a supporter of Fisk's claim to be the preeminent institution for Black education as she was of any program benefiting her native Tennessee. Though the location of the school at Hampton was accomplished, she continued to lobby for its removal to Fisk because of her own firm belief that "a Fisk student would be much more acceptable to educated Negroes everywhere than one from Hampton, and at the same time, no less acceptable to whites, so long as they have confidence in the administration of the University." Rothrock's feeling was echoed by Edwin Embree of the Rosenwald Fund, who also felt that Hampton's mission as a vocational school made it far inferior as a base for library education than the academically reputable Fisk and that the school must eventually be moved to Fisk.³⁴

Shores's plan for library education at Fisk had enough support that Florence Rising Curtis felt compelled to answer this challenge to Hampton's hegemony. In discussions with Anita Hostetter and Margaret Belle Martin, general assistant to the BEL who was to become the assistant director of the Hampton Library School later in the year, Curtis addressed the proposal of Jones and Shores to train Black librarians at Fisk. Her primary objection was that Shores and Jones "seem [ed] to be moving somewhat too rapidly." In answer to the objection that Hampton was not situated in the center of the South and was isolated from the population it served, she replied, "distance means little to the negro since he now travels in his own car and enjoys going to institutions in other parts of the country than his own." Besides, she continued, there was no real need for the program Shores and Jones intended for Fisk since there were few libraries in public schools serving Blacks and, consequently, no need for school librarians. In addition, "another library school might hamper the work done at Hampton which is now meeting the demand."³⁵

Though reason was on their side, and the commitment of the foundations and the ALA to the Hampton Institute was weak at best, Shores and Jones still failed to gain official sanction for their plan. To a great extent, the basis for this lack of sanction lay in the commitment of Louis Round Wilson to the idea of the Hampton Institute as the appropriate place for the education of Black librarians and to his almost complete control of library policy in

the South. It was Wilson who had the final approval of all strategic planning and who was invariably consulted first by both the ALA and the foundations.³⁶

Even though they were faced with strong opposition, Shores and Jones persisted. They realized that in addition to ALA approval of the project, they needed the financial support from the foundations to make it a reality, but neither Shores nor Jones was aware of how closely the ALA worked with the foundations in an attempt to direct their efforts. In June 1929, Shores met with Sarah C. N. Bogle to discuss the Fisk project. He informed her that Fisk's president, Jones, had been told by the Rosenwald Fund to provide classrooms in the new library building then being planned for Fisk. Shores had a meeting planned with W. B. Harrell of the Rosenwald Fund to discuss support for a Fisk library school and promised Bogle that he would report back to her on the results of that meeting. Shores appears not to have kept his promise to Bogle. At the end of July, she telephoned Harrell herself and found that the Rosenwald Fund had made no commitment to Fisk for funding a librarian training program. Further, Harrell asked her to report to him on the situation at Fisk when she went to Nashville on a trip she had already planned for early August. Bogle lost no time in apprising Louis Round Wilson of the true status of the understanding between Fisk and the foundations.³⁷

Shortly after her return from Nashville, Bogle met with Clark Foreman of the Rosenwald Fund. Foreman assured her again that his foundation had made no commitment to Fisk. Rather, Foreman expressed an interest in a plan by which the Rosenwald Fund, the Carnegie Corporation, and the GEB would cooperate in an effort to establish a school at Emory University in Atlanta. Once the school at Emory was established, it would be followed by a school for Black librarians at Atlanta University. Bogle apparently pressed the issue of Fisk, and Foreman conceded that, though he preferred Atlanta University, he might recommend a grant to Fisk for the advanced training of school librarians, but the issue of funding Fisk as the primary site for training Black librarians was not to be given serious consideration by the Rosenwald Fund.³⁸ Indeed, the foundations, the ALA, and the leadership of southern librarianship were beginning to reassess the entire problem in a way that would effectively force Fisk University out of the picture.

The picture was clarified even further in the fall of 1929. The dedication of the library building in Chapel Hill in October provided an occasion that marked the beginning of a new phase in library development in the South. As Sarah Bogle wrote to Keppel in the aftermath of the occasion, "much came our way regarding every phase of library development in the South." To Bogle, the most important event during the three days of celebrations and conferences was the luncheon conference that she had with Jackson Davis and Leo M. Favrot of the GEB and with Clark Foreman and Jackson Towne of the Rosenwald Fund. "Everyone agreed," she wrote, "that the time had come to define more or less clearly the work of the several foundations in library development in the Southeast." She passed on to Keppel their request that he convene a meeting early in January to discuss this issue.³⁹

When the three foundations met on 3 January 1930, the Southeastern Library Association (SELA) Policy Committee made a presentation outlining an agenda it proposed for addressing the library needs of the South which included, among a long list of desiderata for southern library development, a survey of the library training facilities of the region to be conducted by the Board of Education for Librarianship.⁴⁰ Among themselves, the foundations agreed to fund all of the items on the agenda.⁴¹ The BEL followed the policy committee's recommendation that Sarah Bogle be placed in charge of the survey, and she embarked on the project with funding from the Carnegie Corporation.⁴²

The report of Bogle's survey was discussed at length at the 15 November 1930, BEL meeting. Bogle strongly emphasized the need to come to terms with library service to Blacks in the region and the concomitant need to provide adequately for the education of Black librarians. She noted that at Hampton Institute, "emphasis has been placed on training for service in college libraries." One of her recommendations, therefore, was that an additional library school for Blacks was needed in the South to train librarians for public and school library service and that it should probably be located at Atlanta University, "an institution well-adapted to its satisfactory conduct."⁴³

Clark Foreman of the Rosenwald Fund was extremely interested in pursuing such a development even to the point of moving the Hampton Institute program to Atlanta, which he thought better located and more suitable. BEL Member Harrison Craver suggested that Bogle's recommendation be more strongly stated to directly advocate such a move. Wilson, who had been elected to chair the BEL, knew how controversial this matter might become. He and Bogle objected to the advocacy of a specific institution and, instead, prepared a footnote to the recommendation suggesting that a conference of interested individuals and institutions be convened to study the matter.⁴² Wilson noted confidentially that "Foreman is young, his opinion of Hampton should be questioned."⁴⁵

Meanwhile, Louis Shores had been attempting to enhance Fisk's prospects for the school by other means and in the process created a controversy that effectively removed Fisk from consideration. In planning the November 1930 dedication of a new library building on the Fisk campus, Shores issued a call for a Negro Librarians Conference as a part of the dedication. In so doing he managed inadvertently to become the center of a major crisis in southern librarianship. Fisk's obtaining a grant to build a new library was obviously a matter solely for Fisk. Shores's call for a southern conference of Black librarians in association with the dedication of such a building, though, was a matter with serious regional and national implications. Shores seized the opportunity of the library dedication to promote Black librarianship, giving the event regional and even national significance in the realm of library development. Further, Shores had managed to acquire a grant of five hundred dollars from the Carnegie Corporation for the event without the knowledge of Milam or Bogle.⁴⁶

Shores sent a copy of the call for the conference, as a matter of form, to Carl Milam who sent it on to Tommie Dora Barker. Milam's concern was that Shores's planning for the Negro Librarians Conference ignored the southern White leadership and added a random element to the carefully planned development of southern libraries. The problem was further exacerbated by the form of Shores's call itself. He intimated in the announcement that the ALA had done little to aid Black citizens in developing library service. It was a statement that could not have been better calculated to inflame the sensibilities of Milam, who had spent a term of duty in the South at the public library in Birmingham, Alabama, and of Tommie Dora Barker, who was still trying to nurse the Hampton school along.⁴⁷ The fact that Shores was well known to them through his persistent attempts to gain the school for Fisk could only have deepened their concern.

In preparing for the conference, Shores wrote to Adam Strohm, now president of the ALA, inviting him to represent the ALA. The invitation to Strohm stressed the national importance of the event to library service to the southern Black population and implied that the ALA had largely ignored the problem even though it had expressed a commitment to universal library service.⁴⁸

Strohm copied Shores's letter and sent it on to Carl Milam. Milam, in turn, forwarded it to Tommie Dora Barker with the terse comment, "This looks like a stick of dynamite to me." But, since the foundations were involved, Shores's conference presented a delicate situation for the ALA, and Milam asked Barker for her reaction. Barker's response was that she found Shores's letter to Strohm "disturbing." She wrote Milam that "this is just the kind of thing best calculated to embarrass the Regional Field Agent [herself] at the time of initiation of regional work."

She felt that Shores had, by attempting to sponsor the conference, failed to recognize that the development of library services for Blacks had to be a subsidiary consideration to the general development of library services for the majority White population. And she expressed the fear that Shores, by pushing so far in the planning of the conference by himself, had effectively precluded any hope that the library leadership in the South could be effectively brought into the plans for the conference. She concluded that if the foundations had not been involved, the best course of action would have been to ignore Shores's conference, but since they were, that course of inaction was impossible.⁴⁹

In late September, Shores met with Tommie Dora Barker in an attempt to mend the rift. The meeting was successful, and Shores wrote back to Milam about his "very pleasant conference with Miss Barker in Atlanta." In a six-hour meeting, Shores and Barker had drafted a tentative schedule for the program and a letter to be sent out as an invitation to the conference. Milam, after talking to Barker about her meeting with Shores, gave his approval to the plans and wrote Adam Strohm to urge him to accept Shores's invitation, telling him that "all the suggestions which we made to Mr. Shores for bringing in the Southern white librarians have been accepted" and that Barker had given her final approval to the plans.⁵⁰

The conference itself represented something of an anti-climax. Shores was amenable to all of Barker's suggestions for the program, and the papers presented represent the sort of pageant of which the conservative library leaders would approve.⁵¹ The Negro Librarians Conference was successful as a generic dedication exercise, though it had no lasting impact on library development in the South. The proceedings were distributed in mimeographed form, and the event was quietly forgotten.

Immediately following the Fisk conference, the issue of the Black library school came up for discussion during the meeting of the SELA in Tampa at the end of November 1930. Louis Shores and Clark Foreman both held forth on the topic, touting the virtues of Fisk and Atlanta respectively. The wisdom of not advocating a specific institution too forcefully in the Bogle report seemed confirmed.⁵² It was apparent that Shores was interested in going ahead to expand the courses he was offering at Fisk University into a full-fledged library school.⁵³

Wilson was fully entangled in the matter. Not only was he the consultant who had originally sold Hampton to the BEL, but he was now chairing that body, which was charged with reviewing and recommending to the foundations possible changes in the establishment; and he had also been retained as a consultant by Atlanta University to advise on the construction of its new library building. When he visited the campus there at the end of December 1930, he learned that Atlanta University was definitely planning to start a library school. Wilson accordingly recommended a different layout and design for the library building, incorporating numerous changes, and he arranged financing through the Rosenwald Fund for a larger piece of property to accommodate the enlarged facility.⁵⁴

Thus Wilson was thoroughly familiar with conditions at all three of the Southern institutions providing, or planning to provide, library training for Blacks. He remained convinced that his original 1925 recommendation in favor of Hampton were sound and "that inasmuch as Hampton is underway any new planning should be carried out with what has been done at Hampton steadily in mind."⁵⁵

Meanwhile, Frederick Keppel convened a meeting of representatives of the ALA, the Carnegie Corporation, the GEB, and the Rosenwald Fund to review the status of southern library development and the progress that had been made since the meeting in January the year before. The Conference on Library Development in the Southeast convened in New York on 20 February 1931. Wilson had submitted to Milam a list of fourteen points that he felt should receive consideration at this meeting. Most of these points were items already on the library development agenda. Wilson added in a manuscript notation, however, seemingly as an afterthought, that a "Negro library school for public librarians may be needed."⁵⁶

After Keppel had summarized recent events Milam took the floor and advanced the agenda that Wilson had provided him. He pointed out that a new library school for Blacks would probably be needed, but that any decision on that matter should await the outcome of a conference at Chapel Hill that Wilson had called for 5 March 1931. Keppel ended the discussion by recalling a remark made by President Chase of the University of North Carolina (which was planted with Chase by Wilson) that the South had not been in a position to profit by the Carnegie largess in constructing library buildings a generation earlier. He thought the time had now come for the corporation to provide more assistance in library development in the region, but he was uncertain what form that assistance should take. "The officers of the Corporation were looking at the situation with an open mind," Keppel concluded.⁵⁷

With this as a backdrop Wilson convened the Conference on Training of Negro Librarians in Chapel Hill on 5 March 1931. Present were representatives of the Carnegie Corporation, the GEB, the Rosenwald Fund, Hampton Institute, Fisk University, and Atlanta University. Charlotte Templeton represented SELA, and Sarah Bogle attended for the ALA.

Wilson called the meeting to order, stating that its purpose was "the promotion of library service to negroes." The group proceeded to address the questions of the need for Black librarians, the agencies providing training, the types of training required, and the cost of training programs. The participants described the plans of the institutions represented. Hampton wanted gradually to elevate its program to the graduate level. The hesitancy of some students to attend Hampton because of its vocational character or its emphasis on college librarianship were frankly discussed. Louis Shores and Thomas Jones of Fisk announced their plan to enroll twenty-five students in the school at Fisk to prepare them to become "teacher-librarians for schools with an enrollment of under 500." Atlanta University was also planning a building, as Wilson well knew, that would house a library school. The Atlanta University representatives underscored its advantageous location and close relationship with the school at Emory as its strengths.

After these recitals, there was a full discussion of the question of whether a school in addition to Hampton was needed. It was suggested that, rather than starting a new school, aid should be given to Hampton to augment its programs. "The removal of the Hampton library school to a more advantageous location was mentioned as a possible future development," and the meeting adjourned without reaching any conclusion.⁵⁸

The matter remained controversial. Charlotte Templeton was forceful in arguing that another school was not the solution and that a better one in a better location could supply all the librarians needed. She therefore advocated moving the Hampton School to Atlanta.⁵⁹ Wilson remained adamant that Hampton would serve well and should be maintained, at least until the libraries at Fisk and Atlanta, both with new buildings, were "stabilized." Clark Foreman was uncertain what Wilson meant by this. "If you mean financial stabilization," Foreman later wrote to Wilson, "it seems to me that it would be just as easy for the foundations to support the school at Atlanta or Fisk as at Hampton." He pointed out that the Carnegie Corporation contributed \$12,500 and the Rosenwald Fund \$5,500 annually to the operation of the Hampton school, while the Institute itself provided only \$2,450 from the its total \$20,450 budget. He had no doubt that either Fisk or Atlanta would provide better support. He urged Wilson, as chair of the BEL, to come to a decision to transfer the school immediately.⁶⁰

The BEL took up the question again when it met on 7 April 1931, and yet again on 24 June 1931. These discussions ranged over every aspect of the issue. Wilson remained a staunch advocate of supporting and augmenting the Hampton program and, as the Southern representative on the BEL and its chairman, he was deferred to by the other members of the board, none of whom held strong contrary opinions. The matter was left unresolved.⁶¹

Atlanta Emerges

Through the 1931-1932 academic year, Shores and Jones continued to petition the BEL for approval of a library education program at Fisk. Shores had been writing Bogle about offering graduate courses in library science at Fisk,⁶² but it was a topic that Bogle sought to avoid after the Negro Librarians Conference in Nashville. In early August Anita Hostetter sent a memo to Bogle telling her that Shores was pressing for an answer to a letter he had sent in April. Bogle's response was to the point. She scribbled on the memo that she did not want "to reopen this case." For his part, Jones also pushed for activity by the BEL. In October, he visited ALA headquarters to talk to Milam and Bogle and found neither in their offices. He did talk to Emily Miller who reported to them that Jones had given a glowing report on the prospects at Fisk for the library school. He particularly sought to reassure the ALA about Shores who he said was "doing excellent work and has not again been guilty of the tactlessness which may have left question in your minds about him."⁶³

On 11 March 1932, Keppel again convened the representatives of the foundations and the ALA for what was now an annual "Inter-Foundadon Meeting" on library matters in the South. During the meeting Edwin Embree,

president of the Rosenwald Fund, raised the issue of support for library education for Blacks in the South. He pointed out that the great enthusiasm for such a school had died down in the face of the Depression and that now there seemed to be a choice only between Hampton and Atlanta. Keppel noted that when the Carnegie Corporation first provided support to establish the school at Hampton, it was with a clear understanding that Hampton was not ideal for such a school, but at the time it was the only acceptable alternative. He added that, with the development of Atlanta University, it might be advisable to move the school to Atlanta, where it would be more centrally located, and where it could benefit from cooperation with the school at Emory.⁶⁴ Frank discussions about closing the Hampton school and moving it to Atlanta were thus already underway in the spring of 1932.

As the decade of the 1930s progressed and the effects of the Depression worsened, especially for educational institutions in the South, the Carnegie Corporation began to weary in its grant support of the library school at Hampton. The Carnegie grant was almost the only income for the school and constituted virtually its entire budget. The apparent increasing inability of Hampton Institute to contribute anything in support of the school seems to have frustrated Carnegie officials. The amount of the Carnegie grant was reduced to \$7,500 for the 1937-1938 and 1938-1939 academic years, and Hampton was advised that there would be no more funds forthcoming. Anita Hostetter, writing confidentially to a representative of the United States Office of Education, summarized her understanding of the situation: "Frankly, the foundations, particularly the Carnegie Corporation of New York, apparently believe that Hampton Institute has not contributed as much as it might to maintain the Library School and that it should now assume more responsibility for continuing it." She also pointed out that the impending retirement of Florence Rising Curtis, the director of the school, was almost certainly a factor as well.⁶⁵ With that kind of information as common knowledge, it came as no surprise when, in the spring of 1939, Hampton Institute announced that it was closing the library school due to lack of funds.

No sooner had the announcement of the closing of Hampton been made in January 1939, than the officials at Atlanta University began investigating the possibility of establishing a school to succeed it. Atlanta University had been interested in establishing such a school for a number of years, but had deferred to Hampton so long as the school's program there was viable. Atlanta had clearly had the possibility of such a school in mind as early as 1930, when planning for its new library building was underway. It was now ready to step forward and stake a claim. The other institution with similar hopes was, of course, Fisk University.

For a time, Fisk had dropped out of the picture. In January 1933 Shores announced that he had abandoned his plan for a full library school at Fisk in favor of offering a few courses for teachers to prepare them to work part time in their school libraries. He later announced that he planned to offer no library science courses at Fisk during the summer of 1933.⁶⁶ He had become director of the library school at George Peabody College for Teachers.

But, Shores did not neglect his desire for a school to train Black librarians at Fisk and continued to work with Thomas Jones on the possibility. In March 1939, with closure of the Hampton school now a certainty, Jones wrote to Franklin Fergusson Hopper, director of the New York Public Library, about a plan for Fisk and Peabody to cooperate in a program to train Black librarians for school and college work. Hopper, apparently unaware of the previous attempts of Jones and Shores, was enthusiastic when he wrote to Margaret Mann at the BEL about it. The proposal took Mann by surprise. She wrote Anita Hostetter, the new head of the BEL, asking if she had heard anything about this new offensive, expressing the opinion that Jones should have gone to the ALA about it.⁶⁷

Jones had already announced his plans to Milam even as Mann was writing, and he had gone further. In mid-March he sent a representative to Hampton to present the proposal. The school would be operated on the Fisk campus as an adjunct to the Peabody library school with the director acting as an assistant to Shores. The instructors would be shared by both institutions, but there would, of course, be no joint classes. When Margaret Mann reported on this meeting to Anita Hostetter, Mann admitted that the plan, theoretically, was excellent. But she felt there were serious problems at the practical level. Any attempt to use the same faculty members to

instruct both Black and White students would inevitably lead to comparisons that would certainly be detrimental to the Black students at Fisk. She wrote that because "Negroes tend to be timid and somewhat shy in their relations with white instructors," the Fisk students could not be expected to be as academically successful as White students. Instructors could overcome this in a situation such as that at Hampton, where they only taught Black students, but in a situation such as the one proposed, where the instructors would be teaching students of both races, it would be impossible for the teachers to overcome the natural reticence of Black students. Mann felt that, though the idea had merit, the problems of having the two schools engage in a cooperative venture would prove an impossibility, and she urged a separate facility for training Black librarians.⁶⁸

Meanwhile the issue of the Black library school had become a major focus of attention for the BEL. At the 1939 meeting of the BEL at the ALA midwinter conference, it was voted that it would be wise to investigate the southern situation, but nothing was done until April, when Hostetter began to look for someone to undertake the investigation. On 1 June 1939, Hostetter wrote Tommie Dora Barker, then dean of the library school at Emory, on behalf of the BEL asking her to conduct the survey.⁶⁹ She delivered a report in October 1939 that addressed the projected need for Black librarians and surveyed the employment and education of Black librarians in the South. The fear that she might not be objective was unfounded, and her final report merely recommended the establishment of a professional school for Black librarians in the South.⁷⁰

Even before Barker's report was released, Robert Lester of the Carnegie Corporation favored Atlanta over Fisk as the logical place for a Black library school, and support by the foundations was crucial to the success of the effort. Barker refrained from any specific recommendation in her report but, when she was asked by Hostetter, she admitted that she unofficially favored Atlanta because it offered "promise of being more of a center than Nashville." The Atlanta University Library School opened in September 1941 with funding from the Carnegie Corporation and the GEB.⁷¹ The school's founding director was Eliza Atkins Gleason, the first Black Ph.D. recipient from the University of Chicago Graduate Library School (GLS), whose dissertation on "The Southern Negro and the Public Library" was published with a foreword by GLS dean Wilson.

Conclusion

Training Black librarians for service in the South was a major concern for both the leaders of the library profession and the leaders of the philanthropic foundations during the 1920s and 1930s. This issue took such prominence in the plans of both groups of leaders, because the strict segregation of the races in the South meant that if Black citizens were to receive library services of any kind, they would have to be provided in segregated facilities managed by Black librarians. A major thrust of the enlarged library program of both the foundations and the librarians was to extend library services throughout the South. Since such a large portion of the population of the region was Black, the program was doomed to fail unless an adequate supply of trained Black librarians could be assured.

With this background, it is no wonder that such individuals as Frederick Keppel and Carl Milam, and the institutions they represented, focused on the provision of a library education program for southern Blacks. Once Keppel suggested in 1925 the establishment of a Black library school, the ALA and its principal agency for library education, the BEL, directed their energies to achieving that goal. At the recommendation of Louis Round Wilson, the Hampton Institute was selected for the establishment of the program in 1925, primarily because at Hampton the work could be initiated immediately and Black librarians could be available for service less than a year from the establishment.

Hampton remained controversial, however, due to its association with vocational rather than liberal higher education and because of its location at the northern extreme of the region. It was also unpopular with some African Americans because the administration and the staff of the school were all White. To those who initiated the program, however—the Carnegie Corporation, the Rosenwald Fund, and the ALA—such concerns were not significant simply because placing a library school at the Hampton Institute was never regarded as any more

than a temporary expedient. It would be succeeded by a more permanent solution as soon as one became available.

One of the most likely prospects to usurp Hampton's place was Fisk University. Fisk had many supporters due to its central location in Nashville and its strong reputation as an institution of higher learning. But Fisk suffered from one fatal flaw: its principal spokesman in library affairs, Louis Shores, had an uncanny knack for offending the leaders of the library profession and for causing friction between and among the foundations. Shores repeatedly shot himself in the foot by stridently pushing Fisk's suitability as a site and by attempting to ignore the wishes and prerogatives of the library leaders. Even after moving from Fisk to Peabody, Shores maintained an interest in the issue and remained a factor to be considered.

The other likely site to replace Hampton was Atlanta University. As early as August 1929, scarcely three years after the initiation of instruction at Hampton, Clark Foreman of the Rosenwald Fund was already discussing with Sarah Bogle the prospect of moving the program from Hampton Institute to Atlanta University as soon as the latter institution had completed the new library facility it was then planning. Repeatedly, over the next few years, Foreman touted the assets of the Atlanta site, chiefly its central location in the South and its interest in establishing solid graduate professional programs, not only for librarianship, but for law, business, and other professions as well. When the Atlanta Public Library program was transferred to Emory University in 1930, the prospect of collaborative efforts between two Atlanta institutions, one White and one Black, also seemed very persuasive. Foreman found many adherents to support Atlanta's case, not least among them Charlotte Templeton and Tommie Dora Barker.

Meanwhile, Louis Round Wilson, the man most responsible for selecting Hampton in the first place, remained adamant that the choice was a good one and that Hampton was succeeding in its mission. Because of his stature in the region and because he soon occupied a central position as chairman of the BEL, Wilson's views held sway. But even Wilson eventually modified his views. His service as a consultant for Atlanta University's library construction program convinced him of the quality of the institution and its suitability for a library education program, and his defense of Hampton grew less adamant over the years. Wilson's influence in southern library affairs began to wane after he moved to the University of Chicago in 1932. As the decade of the 1930s wore on, Tommie Dora Barker's influence began to grow. The Hampton Institute's support of the program, never strong, waned in the face of mounting deficits during the Depression years. The Carnegie Corporation, which had taken over funding of the program from the Rosenwald Fund in 1932, grew impatient with Hampton's inability to support the program. The corporation's officers also were concerned about the future of the program after the impending retirement of its forceful director, Florence Rising Curtis. Other concerns were the continued association of Hampton with vocational education during a period of growing professionalization and its relentless focus on training librarians for college work, leaving the public and school libraries without trained librarians. With no one, not even Wilson, any longer willing strongly to defend Hampton's continued existence, the Carnegie Corporation finally withdrew its support. Without Carnegie dollars, Hampton collapsed. With Hampton out of the way, Atlanta University, which had had an interest in library education for a decade but had deferred to Hampton's senior claim, pressed its case and easily convinced a receptive Carnegie Corporation to provide an endowment adequate to initiate the school.

The respective roles of the ALA and foundations in the pursuit of a Black library school were complex. The idea seems to have originated with Keppel and was fostered from the beginning by strong interest from the Carnegie Corporation and the Rosenwald Fund. The ALA took to the idea with gusto, readily seeing its place in the Expanded Program and the southern strategy of the ALA in the 1920s. Milam clearly hoped to control the development of the program, but the foundations refused to cooperate with his grand design and insisted on having substantial control over how and where the money was to be spent. Milam was sometimes perturbed to find individual librarians like Louis Shores successfully applying directly to the foundations to support efforts related to training Black librarians. Further examination of this phenomenon, along the lines of Wayne A. Wiegand's *Politics of an Emerging Profession*, seems to be in order.

The Hampton Institute was chosen on the strong recommendation of Louis Round Wilson, but the recommendation was accepted simply on the basis of expediency. Fisk had been rejected because of student unrest and questions about the stability of its administration. It continued to be unacceptable because Louis Shores alienated the ALA leadership and many other southern librarians throughout the 1920s and 1930s.

Hampton foundered in part because the parent institution was unable to support the school without continued infusion of support from the foundations, who soon grew tired of that role. Hampton never enjoyed widespread support from the Black community, which felt that it perpetuated segregation, nor from the White southern leadership, which felt that it was academically inferior to several other alternative institutions. Hampton was only a stop-gap solution to a continuing problem. The fact that almost all Hampton graduates found employment in academic institutions, and that few went into either school or public libraries, contributed to its estrangement from the majority of the library community.

The questions posed by Edward Holley and James Carmichael, cited at the beginning of this paper, and the call for further investigation appear to have been resolved. It is time to close the book on the mystery of Hampton and move on to other intriguing questions in the development of libraries and librarianship.

Notes

1. James V. Carmichael, Jr., "Tommie Dora Barker and Southern Librarianship," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1987), 392.
2. Edward G. Holley, "The Development of Library Education in the South," in John Mark Tucker and Edwin Gleaves, *Reference Service and Library Education* (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1983), 171.
3. "Memorandum in Re: Library Work with Negroes," [ca. April 1925], 28/ 50/5 Box 13, American Library Association Archives, University of Illinois Archives, University of Illinois Library, Champaign-Urbana.
4. Tommie Dora Barker, *Libraries of the South* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1936), 50.
5. Harriet Howe, "Two Decades in Education for Librarianship," *Library Quarterly* 12 (July 1942): 561.
6. Minutes of the Board of Education for Librarianship, 12 March 1925, 28/ 50/1, Box 1: Carl Milam to M. A. Cartwright, 12 March 1925, ALA 28/50/5, Box 13.
7. Milam to Morse A. Cartwright, 12 March 1925; "Memorandum of Conference with Dr. Wickliffe Rose and Mr. Whitney H. Shepardson—March 20, 1925"; Bogle to Milam, 16 March 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
8. ALA. BEL, "Memorandum in Re: Library Work with Negroes"; George Settle to Carl Milam, 19 May 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13 ALA Archives: Settle may actually have been the person who planted the idea of establishing a library school for African Americans first in Keppel's mind by directly approaching the Carnegie Corporation about funding the program operated by Blue.
9. Bogle to Milam, 16 March 1925; "Memorandum of Conference with Dr. Wickliffe Rose and Mr. Whitney H. Shepardson—March 20, 1925"; Milam to Frederick P. Keppel, 27 March 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
10. Bogle to Strohm, 1 April 1925; Wilson to Bogle, 2 April 1925; Bogle to BEL Members, 1 April 1925, with replies, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
11. Bachman to Milam, 2 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
12. Bogle to Wilson, 3 April 1925; Wilson to Bogle, 6 April 1925; Milam to Wilson, 7 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
13. Bogle to Wilson, 8 April 1925; Milam to Wilson, 9 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
14. Wilson to Bogle, 11 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
15. Bogle to Wilson, 13 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
16. Joe M. Richardson, *A History of Fisk University, 1865-1946* (University, Ala.: The University of Alabama Press, 1980), 84-100.
17. Wilson to Bogle, 23 April 1925, Series V, Folder 217, Louis Round Wilson Papers, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
18. Milam to Howe, 28 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
19. Craver to Howe, 30 April 1925; Craver to Milam, 30 April 1925; Smith to Milam, 30 April 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.

20. Milam to Howe, 3 May 1925; Milam to the Board of Education for Librarianship, 5 May 1925; Howe to Board of Education for Librarianship, 7 May 1925; Milam to Keppel, 18 May 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
21. Louis Round Wilson, "Memoirs," 158 Box II, Folder 1, Wilson Papers, Edward G. Holley, "The Development of Library Education in the South," 170.
22. Nancy Becker Johnson, "Sarah C. N. Bogle: Librarian at Large" (PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1991), 306.
23. Wilson, "Memoirs," 158, 183.
24. Louis Shores, *Quiet World: A Librarian's Crusade for Destiny: The Professional Autobiography of Louis Shores* (Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books, 1975), 25; Rose to Belden, 31 August 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
25. Walter White to C. F. D. Belden, 29 August 1925; Harry E. Davis to Belden, 31 August 1925; Ernestine Rose to Belden, 31 August 1925; Bogle to Howe, 2 September 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
26. Belden to Milam, 4 September 1925; Milam to Belden, 9 September 1925; Strohm to Belden, 8, 10 September 1925, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
27. Wilson to Milam, 1 October 1925; Milam to Wilson, 6 October 1925, 28/ 50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
28. Minutes of the Board of Education for Librarianship, October 22-23, 1925, 28-29, 28/50/1 Box 1 ALA Archives.
29. Harriet R. Gordon to Lucille Fargo, 1 February 1927, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
30. Shores to Bogle, 7 September 1928, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
31. Shores to Herdman, 23 January 1929; Martin to Shores, 30 January 1929, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
32. Vinton to Bogle and Hostetter, 19 October 1929; Shores to Milam, 22 October 1929, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
33. Jones to Shores, 4 May 1929; Shores to Jones, 21 May 1929, Box 40, Folder 2, Jones Papers; Shores to Jones, 20 July 1929, Box 40, Folder 1, Thomas Elsa Jones Papers, Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.
34. Rothrock to Milam, 9 April 1929; Carl Milam, "Conference with Mr. Embree and Mr. Harrell, [and Carl Milam] 28 March 1929," 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
35. Hostetter and Martin to Bogle, 3 January 1929, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
36. Robert Sidney Martin, "Louis Round Wilson at the University of North Carolina, 1901-1932" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1988), 672; Carmichael, "Tommie Dora Barker and Southern Librarianship," 215-216.
37. "Memorandum of a Conference with Mr. Louis Shores June 17, 1929"; "Memorandum from Miss Bogle Re: Telephone Conversation with Mr. W. B. Harrell of Rosenwald Fund, July 29, 1929"; Bogle to Wilson, 30 July 1929, 28/ 50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
38. "Memorandum; August 12, 1929; Conference with Mr. Foreman August 7, and 10, 1929," 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
39. Bogle to Keppel, 30 October 1929, 2/4/6 Box 24, ALA Archives.
40. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Policy Committee of the Southeastern Library Association, Atlanta, Georgia, December 21, 1929," Appendix I in: American Library Association, *A Study of the Library School Situation in the Southern States* (Chicago: The Association, 1931), 45-49; Mary Edna Anders, "The Development of Public Library Service in the Southeastern States, 1895-1950" (DLS dissertation, Columbia University, 1958), 89-90.
41. Anders, "Development of Public Library Service," 90.
42. Holley, "Development of Library Education in the South," 169.
43. American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship, *Study of the Library School Situation in Southern States* (Chicago: ALA, 1931), 16-18, 43.
44. BEL Minutes, 11 November 1930, 24-31, 28/50/1 Box 2, ALA Archives; *Study of the Library School Situation in Southern States*, 43.
45. Julia Wright Merrill to Wilson, 4 April 1929; Wilson to Merrill, 8 April 1929, 28/50/5 Box 2, ALA Archives.
46. Shores to Jones, 25 June 1930; Shores to Jones, 19 June 1930, Box 40, Folder 3, Jones Papers.
47. Carmichael, "Tommie Dora Barker," 267-271.

48. Shores to Strohm, 3 June 1930, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
49. Milam to Barker, 14 July 1930; Barker to Milam, 15 July 1930, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
50. Milam to Strohm, 3 October 1939, 28/50/5 Box 3, ALA Archives.
51. Negro Library Conference. Fisk University. Nashville, Tennessee, *Papers Presented* ([Nashville, Tenn.: Fisk University, 1931]) (mimeographed copy in School of Library and Information Science Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).
52. Wilson to Lester, 3 February 1931, 2/4/6 Box 24, ALA Archives.
53. Wilson to Robert M. Lester, 2, 3 February 1931, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
54. Wilson Papers V:197-199 contain the extensive records of this consultancy. See also Wilson to Lester, 3 February 1931, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
55. Wilson to Lester, 3 February 1931, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
56. Wilson to Milam, 16 February 1931, 2/4/6 Box 24, ALA Archives.
57. "Conference on Library Development in the Southeast . . . February 20, 1931," 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
58. "Conference on Training for Librarianship for Negroes" 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
59. Templeton to Bogle, 21 March 1931, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
60. Foreman to Wilson, 26 March 1931, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
61. Board of Education for Librarianship Minutes, 7 April 1931, 44-45, 24 June 1931, 2-4., 28/50/1 Box 2, ALA Archives.
62. Shores to Bogle, 1 April 1931, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
63. Hostetter to Bogle, 4 August 1931; Miller to Milam and Bogle, 5 October 1931, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
64. "Inter-Foundation Meeting, March 11. 1932, Summary of Discussion," "Carnegie Corporation-Southern Library Development, 1929-30," ALA Archives. (Copy of file supplied to authors by James V. Carmichael).
65. Hostetter to Ralph M. Dunbar, 29 November 1938, 28/50/5 Box 13, ALA Archives.
66. Shores to Hostetter, 25 January 1933; Shores to Vinton, 21 March 1933, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
67. Edward Neely Cullum, "George Peabody College for Teachers" (Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963), 356-357: Jones to Shores, 27 September 1937, Box 40, Folder 7, Jones Papers; Hopper to Mann, 8 March 1939; Mann to Hostetter, 10 March 1939, 28/50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
68. Jones to Milam, 13 March 1939; Mann to Hostetter, 30 March 1939, 28/ 50/5 Box 11, ALA Archives.
69. Compton to Hostetter, 25 April 1939; Hostetter to Barker, 1 June 1939, 28/50/6 Box 3, ALA Archives.
70. Hostetter to Compton, 24 April 1939; Hostetter to Barker, 17 October 1939, 28/50/5 Box 3, ALA Archives; Tommie Dora Barker, *Memorandum of the Need in the South for a Library School for Negroes* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1939).
71. Barker to Hostetter, 1 November 1939; Barker to Hostetter, 19 October 1939, 28/50/5 Box 3, ALA Archives; Arthur Clinton Gunn, "Early Training for Black Librarians in the U. S. : A History of the Hampton Institute Library School and the Atlanta University School of Library Service" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1986), 96-97.