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ABSTRACT

Contained in this thesis is an annotated edition of the correspondence between the African-American leaders W.E.B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington. Du Bois and Washington would go on to become rivals, their philosophies of education and racial uplift diverging from one another. Du Bois favored vocal protest and higher education, while Washington preferred a gradual approach of vocational education and economic advancement. However, this correspondence sees them attempting, albeit unsuccessfully, to work together. Covering the decade between 1894 and 1904, the letters touch on a variety of political, social, and educational topics at a crucial time for race relations in America. The differences between the two men that would lead to their split – age, regional origin, education, philosophy – are seen in the correspondence, but so too is a spirit of cooperation. These themes are explored in an introductory essay, while other more specific contextual details are provided in the footnotes accompanying the letters. The many individuals mentioned by Du Bois and Washington are annotated, allowing the reader a fuller understanding of the social world of black activism at the turn of the twentieth century. Narrative material is provided to help bridge the gap between letters, and a timeline detailing the relationship between the two men is also included. While some of these letters have been published before, their presentation as part of an annotated correspondence allows for a greater understanding of this primary source material.
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At the First Pan-African Conference in July 1900 W.E.B. Du Bois, in his customary grand, prophetic style, declared that “the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line”. Du Bois, who was at that time an up-and-coming 32-year-old professor at Atlanta University, saw correctly the imminent threat of legalized segregation, and the erosion of the hard fought rights that African Americans had gained from the Civil War a generation before. He would go on to live 63 more years, passing away just one year before the first Civil Rights Act was signed into law. Soon after his statement at the conference Du Bois became nationally prominent for his incisive social commentary on race in America. His collection of essays entitled *The Souls of Black Folk*, published in 1903, was a landmark work in the field of African-American literature and scholarship. In this collection Du Bois delved into the history of slavery and Reconstruction, current conditions of African Americans, and the psychic and spiritual uniqueness of being a black person in a country dominated by whites.

While Du Bois viewed the color-line as the overarching issue of his day, he also devoted attention to conflicts within the black community. In the third chapter of *The Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois took aim at the most influential black leader of his day, Booker T. Washington. Washington, of the last generation to be born into slavery, was the head administrator of the Tuskegee Institute, an industrial school located in rural Alabama. Industrial education was the predecessor of modern vocational education, focusing on practical trade skills meant to prepare students for lives as farmers and tradesmen, and it became part of Washington’s formula for improving the lives of the nation’s ten million black citizens. This philosophy was lauded by Americans of all races,
and made Washington into a national celebrity. Washington believed that economic prosperity and optimism, rather than protest and moral outrage, would achieve racial equality. Du Bois thought differently, believing that access to traditional higher education was necessary for the development of an informed and effective protest movement. As the walls of the color-line grew ever higher around them, Du Bois and Washington moved further apart.

But Du Bois and Washington were not always enemies. For the ten years between 1894 and 1904 they exchanged letters on a variety of topics. Their communication began when Du Bois embarked on his search for a teaching position after earning his PhD from Harvard, and it continued until Du Bois felt that further collaboration with Washington would be fruitless. In between they shared ideas, praised each other’s work, and attempted several times to work together. They planned meetings where they discussed the problems of their day and how best to solve them. In the end they failed to find common ground, and the roots of this failure can be seen throughout their correspondence. Yet there existed, at least for a time, a genuine desire for cooperation.

This edition is a collection of the direct correspondence between Washington and Du Bois. The letters are arranged in chronological order with added contextual annotations. As the letters were exchanged over a long period of time, and their contents touch on many different and important topics, these notes are provided to inform the reader of any background information needed to understand what Du Bois and
Washington are discussing. Where there are gaps in time between letters a brief connecting statement is provided to explain any relevant details that happened in the intervening period. In addition to the annotated letters, a timeline and biographical register are provided to give a quick overview of the sequence of events and the important figures surrounding the two men.

Washington and Du Bois were at the same time the two most influential leaders of black America and bitter rivals. They both made valuable contributions to American history and they both deeply affected one another. Neither Du Bois nor Washington can be discussed without discussing the other. Their conflict established dueling paradigms of race leadership and the struggle for racial justice in America. The relationship between Du Bois and Washington, even when it was at its most negative, was the most important in their professional lives. Therefore it is worthwhile to examine how they interacted. Their correspondence is a direct way of doing that.

This purpose can be broken down into two parts: what can be gained by looking specifically at their letters to each other, and what can be gained by combining them into a single correspondence. Focusing on the letters Washington and Du Bois sent to each other, rather than about each other, gives insight not only into their ideas, but also their relationship. It is not just the content of the letters, but the tone of the writing that can give clues to how each writer felt, and, perhaps more importantly, how they wished to be perceived by the other. Additionally, what they do not say to one another can be just as revealing. Combining the letters into one collection allows the reader to see them
collectively instead of piecing them together from archives or previously published collections. With the letters scattered in several collections and amongst other correspondents it can be difficult to see themes and trends that emerge in this one particular correspondence. It becomes easier for the reader to see subtle details that might be lost among the noise of a greater collection.

Collecting the letters together also affords both men an equal representation. One of the difficulties of researching Du Bois and Washington is that the legacies of both men have been influenced by political and historiographical debates that have occurred since their deaths. History is inevitably seen through the lens of the present, but with a topic as fraught as race in America, that lens has a tendency to further alter perceptions. Washington is particularly affected by this perceptual shift. He died a half-century earlier than Du Bois, and was always the more private and enigmatic of the two. In many ways Du Bois, as a preeminent literary and philosophical figure in the African-American community, was able to turn public opinion against his colleague turned rival. Du Bois’s criticisms of Washington are not without merit, but the fact remains that he was able to influence general and scholarly opinion long after Washington was around to defend himself. Du Bois was also able to experience historical changes that Washington could not have imagined. A goal of this collection is to provide to Washington’s words as charitable an audience as is given to Du Bois.

This collection has been gathered from two sources. The first is the W.E.B. Du Bois papers located at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The second is the
Booker T. Washington Papers housed at the Library of Congress. I have relied on digital images of the manuscripts, but where I have been unable to access digital images of the manuscripts I have relied on transcriptions in previously published editions. Both the Du Bois and Washington Papers are large and house thousands of letters to hundreds of correspondents, along with speeches, notes, drafts of articles, and other papers accumulated over their careers. In putting together this correspondence I extracted strictly the letters between Du Bois and Washington. There is a significant amount of other material where Du Bois and Washington talk about each other, which, while potentially relevant, was not included in this project.

Both the Du Bois and Washington Papers have also been published, at least partially, before. A three volume edition of Du Bois’s correspondence, edited by Herbert Aptheker was published between 1973 and 1978 by the University of Massachusetts Press. Aptheker’s edition is a selected correspondence and thus many letters are omitted. The letters are generally introduced by a headnote giving contextual details, with minor details and cross-references provided in footnotes. Washington’s papers are more thoroughly published in a 14 volume edition by the University of Illinois press edited by Louis Harlan. Publication dates range from 1972 to 1989. These volumes feature speeches, newspaper articles, and other miscellaneous writings alongside Washington’s correspondence but letters to and from hundreds of correspondents, including Du Bois, make up the bulk of the collection. Harlan annotates the papers using footnotes, although the amount of annotation is generally small, with most letters having three or fewer notes.
The editions by Aptheker and Harlan, while not without flaw, are impressive works of scholarship and are invaluable resources for readers wanting to delve into the primary sources of Du Bois and Washington. This project is not meant to supplant either edition, nor could it hope to, considering its much smaller scope. Rather, the aim of this project is to focus on one relationship and give it a more detailed examination than is possible or warranted in a larger edition. A lack of detail on specific issues is a price that is paid when preparing larger, more comprehensive editions. Aptheker’s edition of Du Bois’s letters is especially vulnerable because his edition is a selected one. Unlike Washington, who died at 59 from a combination of overwork and stress, Du Bois lived to be 95 years of age, and was a productive writer through his final days. Aptheker’s edition has only three volumes to cover over seven decades of correspondence. The first volume, which contains the entirety of the correspondence with Washington, covers the years between 1877 and 1934 in 500 pages. When one flies through the years at such a speed, it is not surprising that things are missing, or must be sacrificed along the way. One of those things is a full sense of Du Bois’s relationship with Washington.

Reviews noted this weakness in Aptheker’s edition at the time. In the journal *Reviews in American History*, Marion Kilson wrote that “The correspondence of Du Bois and Booker T. Washington illustrates some of the problems associated with the … correspondence”, referring to her concerns regarding the “completeness” of the image of Du Bois Aptheker’s edition was trying to provide. “The picture that emerges of the
correspondence seems partial,” Kilson continued, arguing that more letters from the Du Bois-Washington correspondence should have been included in the edition.¹

Aptheker briefly mentions his selection criteria in the introduction to volume one. Because of size constraints and a desire to focus on the “historical dimensions” of Du Bois, Aptheker “excluded practically all personal correspondence.” Then within these historically relevant letters, he chose “a representative letter” to avoid repetition. This process and Aptheker’s “editorial judgment concerning the relative significance of the letters, were the basic principles of selection.”² These criteria are reasonable, albeit vague. However, Aptheker also hopes his edition will be a “definitive” one. This is a contradiction in that a selected edition, which by nature contains numerous omissions, can hardly be called definitive, however sound the editorial judgment behind the selection process might be.

Aptheker’s selection process also may have been biased, consciously or unconsciously, due to his association with Du Bois, and by his own personal political and intellectual beliefs. Aptheker was a Marxist historian and member of United States Communist Party, and his academic focus was African-American history. In the 1940s Du Bois chose to entrust him with the publication of his papers, which Aptheker completed following Du Bois’s death.³ This personal and professional experience made Aptheker a deserving candidate to become Du Bois’s literary executor, and this shows in

³ Ibid, xxiii-xxiv.
the quality of his work. However, Aptheker’s academic activity and political activism connected him much closer to the Du Bois of the 1940s and 1950s, instead of the Du Bois of the 1890s and 1900s who was corresponding with Booker T. Washington.

As a Marxist historian, Aptheker’s judgment on what was important may be different from that of other historians or the average reader. This is especially true now 40 years after the original publication and 20 years after the end of the Cold War. The harsh American reaction against Communism was at its height in the years Aptheker was working on this edition, and so the political concerns that came along with being an American Marxist during this time were real and on Aptheker’s mind. In his introduction, he alludes to the fact that he was a controversial figure (because of his political beliefs) and that his association may have an effect on how Du Bois’s letters are perceived. This fact helps explain why the latter half of Du Bois’s career – when he was more radical politically – received more attention from the editor than his earlier career. All of this is not meant as a criticism of Aptheker, his politics, or his selection choices. Rather, it is presented to show why there is room for a different editorial presentation of Du Bois’s correspondence, and in particular his correspondence with Booker T. Washington.

Louis Harlan, the editor behind the *Booker T. Washington Papers*, was a less controversial figure than Aptheker. The *Papers* are longer than the Aptheker’s *Correspondence* (fourteen volumes compared to three), and encompass more than just letters. During the last 20 years of his life, Washington travelled extensively on speaking tours and fundraising missions. He was also heavily involved in Republican Party politics.

---

and became a broker of sorts for federal appointments of black bureaucrats. Washington also remained the principal of the ever-expanding Tuskegee Institute. With such a busy life and often being away from his Alabama home meant that Washington was a prolific letter writer. Paging through the volumes of Papers one can see the great variety of people that Washington corresponded with, from powerful white philanthropists, to his many black allies, and even the president of the United States.

The sheer scope of the Booker T. Washington Papers makes it a true scholarly achievement. A reader looking to learn more about Booker T. Washington would be advised to read through the collection. Harlan’s annotations are helpful, and not overly abundant. The criticism that was laid against Aptheker’s Correspondence – a lack of material – cannot be applied to Harlan’s Papers. In publishing such a large edition, Harlan has avoided the pitfalls that accompany a selected edition. However, every decision has a trade-off. In such a large collection, piecing together all the letters from one correspondent can be time-consuming. Letters to and from Du Bois can be found in volumes 3 to 8 and each of those volumes is hundreds of pages long. The index is comprehensive so finding the letters is not impossible, but is more difficult than it would have been in a selected volume.

Another downside created by the extensiveness of the Papers is that individual narratives get lost among so much material. The chronological organization meant that if a reply to a letter arrived six months later, it could be 200 pages deeper into the book. George Breathett, a reviewer, noted these issues, arguing that “the value of future
volumes will be enhanced if the authors … group letters to and from given individuals over a time frame”\textsuperscript{5}. Harlan’s annotations referring readers to other letters can help in these cases, but they do not solve every issue. Harlan was attempting to provide readers with as much primary source material as possible, in order to establish a complete picture of Washington and the social world in which he existed. In the series introduction, Harlan explains that he is seeking to “reveal black culture in all its complexity and rich human interest”\textsuperscript{6}. His goal is a large one and so the cohesion of specific narratives is sacrificed in order to achieve this goal.

While editing the \textit{Booker T. Washington Papers}, Harlan wrote a two-volume biography of Washington. Together with the papers, these two volumes provide a detailed and fascinating insight into the life of Booker T. Washington. However, they also lead to another problem with relying on the \textit{Papers} for Washington’s correspondence with Du Bois. The letters are presented with a single editorial viewpoint, and specifically a viewpoint focused on Washington. For the purposes of his edition Harlan was right to present it in this way, and his point of view, while controversial, is not wrong. However, it is not ideal to look at the relationship between Du Bois and Washington from a single point of view.

A problem shared by Aptheker and Harlan’s editions is their age. Both are roughly 40 years old, and have not been updated in any way. The lack of revision is not


surprising as both Harlan and Aptheker have since passed away, and their editions were published by small university presses. The correspondence has not changed, but many new editorial possibilities have become available. One is the general advance in scholarship in the field. Harlan admitted that his notes at times suffer from a lack of information available to him at the time, “a comment on the obscurity of many figures and events of the period”\(^7\). Since then, a great deal of scholarly work has been done, including new biographies and historical studies of Du Bois and Washington, and new historical interpretations have been advanced.

During the Civil Rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, Booker T. Washington came to represent a failed policy of accommodation to white supremacy, while Du Bois came to represent the defiant protest that eventually led to the movement’s success. Washington became known as the Great Accommodator who ignored or minimized racial injustice, instead of standing up to it. It did not help Washington’s legacy that he died long before his rival. Du Bois, as a historian himself, was able to influence the public perception of Washington. In his autobiography written in 1940, Du Bois said about Washington, “He was wary and silent. He never expressed himself frankly or clearly.”\(^8\)

While Harlan emphasizes in his biography that Washington did try to do some good, this interpretation of Washington is generally what he and Aptheker subscribed to.

In *Up from History*, historian Robert J. Norrell sees Washington not as an accommodator, but as a pragmatist trying to survive in a world of Jim Crow and the

\(^7\) Ibid, xxxii.
KKK. He believed Du Bois had personal grievances with Washington that clouded his judgment and led to the rift between the two men. David Levering Lewis, in his biography of Du Bois, argues that personal differences did exist between the two men, but that serious philosophical differences were the main cause of their rift. The purpose of this edition is not to decide which interpretation is correct, but rather to give the reader a more well-rounded view of Du Bois and Washington by considering these newer sources and interpretations.

Technological advances since the 1970s have also changed what is possible when creating an edition. Harlan and Aptheker both included letters from the other’s collection, but the ability to see everything was much more difficult, and it was likely not worth the effort to follow up on a small detail from a letter that was itself only a small part of the greater edition. This is especially true for Du Bois’s papers, because the Aptheker edition was selected and contained only correspondence. Now that the Du Bois Papers have been digitized and placed online, it is much easier to find extraneous materials within that collection that may be contextually relevant. The digitization of other documents from the time period, such as newspapers and magazines, also allows for much easier searching than was previously possible. Entering a name into a search engine brings up contemporary news reports that would have been difficult to find in earlier times even when the researcher knew they existed.

10 Ibid, 279.
An illustration of all these factors is the letter written by Washington to Du Bois on February 3, 1903 regarding a meeting he had with George R. Parkin, the head of the Rhodes Scholarship committee. Washington tells Du Bois that he asked Parkin why black universities were not being considered for the Rhodes Scholarship, and that he impressed upon Parkin that black students deserved a chance to win the prestigious award. This letter is contained in the Du Bois Papers and was not published in either of the previous editions. It is likely that Harlan did not see it, and that Aptheker did not think it was historically important enough to include. In looking for contextual details for this letter, I was able to find a contemporary news report about Parkin’s tour of Southern universities, as well as a letter from Parkin to Du Bois in reply to a similar set of questions Du Bois had sent him after Parkin failed to visit Atlanta University. Having information from these sources allows for a greater understanding of this letter, as one can now know the facts of Parkin’s tour through the South (from the news report) and the extent of Du Bois’s involvement (from his letter to Parkin).

While Aptheker was probably right that this letter did not have enough historical interest to include in his edition, it is not without historical worth. It presents Du Bois and Washington as having had a common purpose, specifically a purpose in support of black universities. Washington was often accused by Du Bois and others of not being supportive of black universities. Having a black student become a Rhodes Scholar was something much more akin to Du Bois’s opinion on education and race leadership than Washington’s. Du Bois, himself a recipient of a scholarship to study abroad, came to believe that change would be brought about by a highly educated group of black elites he
called the “talented tenth”, which was contrasted with Washington’s aim of providing industrial education to as many black people as possible. To see Washington lobbying for a cause in support of Du Bois casts doubt that such clear cut divisions always existed between the two men. Unfortunately, the first black Rhodes Scholar was not chosen until 1907, years after the rift between Du Bois and Washington had become impassable.

The theme of attempted good-faith collaboration that eventually fails to work out is commonplace throughout the letters. Du Bois receives three job offers to work at Tuskegee Institute but for various reasons declines all three. Du Bois gains Washington’s approval for a political appointment, only to be overruled by Washington’s allies. Washington and Du Bois try to work together to mount a legal challenge against railway sleeping car segregation, but were eventually thwarted by the intransigence of the railroad company and a lack of funds.

Their greatest collaboration, which also led to a final falling out, was the New York Conference held in January 1904. The conference was Washington’s idea, and its goal was to bring together all the major black leaders of the day to write and subsequently publish a common statement of purpose. In essence, Washington was attempting to bring his potential enemies into his camp before they were lost completely. By this point Du Bois and Washington were beginning to drift apart, but the presence and endorsement of Du Bois were essential to give the conference legitimacy outside of Washington’s circle of allies. To this end Washington wrote Du Bois on numerous occasions asking for advice, and keeping him informed with regards to planning of the conference. There is a
perceptible level of tension in this set of letters, but eventually the conference was held. At the conference, Washington’s supporters outnumbered Du Bois and his allies, and overruled any objections regarding the statement of purpose, which generally endorsed Washington’s politics. It was shortly after this event that Du Bois lost faith in cooperating with Washington, and the letters between them stopped.

Through the letters one can also see how the power dynamic between the two men changed over the years. This subtle change can be seen by comparing the three job offers received by Du Bois. In the first offer, the younger Du Bois is just starting his academic career and humbly writes to Washington, introducing himself and his qualifications. Washington replies offering a position teaching mathematics but by that time Du Bois had already accepted another offer at Wilberforce University and felt honor bound to abide by his word. The second offer finds Du Bois once again requesting a position at Tuskegee, after finding his time at Wilberforce unsatisfactory. However, he displays more confidence, and ends up taking a position at Atlanta University. The final offer originated from Washington, who wanted to have the now well-respected scholar as part of his institute (or, as Du Bois feared, under his control). Du Bois considers this offer but eventually turns it down.

Despite being ostensibly for the same purpose, these letters are written in different styles. For example, in the first letter an enthusiastic and humble Du Bois begins his letter with “May I ask if you have a vacancy for a teacher?” In the second he is more nonchalant, saying “If you hear of any opening which you think I am fitted to fill, kindly
let me know”. The third letter has Du Bois as recipient of an invitation to come to Tuskegee, and he says only that he would “consider” the offer. This slight change in tone is the kind of thing that can be lost in large editions that feature numerous correspondents and that have these letters scattered across different volumes. However, it has value in that it gives clues to the feelings and motivations of the historical figures beyond the literal content of the text. Knowing that Du Bois rejected three offers to teach at Tuskegee under Washington is only part of the story. Being able to easily compare these letters allows the reader insight into the relationship between Du Bois and Washington, how it evolved, and why they were not able to work together despite their efforts.

The difference in writing style can also be seen throughout the correspondence. Washington had a clear, simple style and he rarely used complex vocabulary or grammatical constructions. He almost always ended his letters with a “Yours Truly”, where Du Bois varied his sign-offs regularly. During their more agreeable moments, Washington is direct in answering Du Bois’ questions and praising his work. When disagreements began to appear Washington did his best to ignore the offense, or minimize it when it cannot be ignored. Washington was a relentless optimist and the only emotion he wrote about is positive. By writing this way Washington had the appearance of being straightforward and forthright, while never truly exposing himself to any potential backlash.

Du Bois by contrast used a denser prose style. He frequently posed rhetorical questions, and then mused on the answers. At times it took him multiple paragraphs to
get to his point. He showed more of his personality than Washington did, including his negative emotions. The reader can often sense frustration from Du Bois, especially when he felt that he was not being listened to. One would never see Washington snap and write something like “I do not think it will be profitable for me to give further advice which will not be followed” as Du Bois did during the planning of the 1904 New York Conference.

The advantage of this edition is that these tonal differences are more readily compared. In the larger editions featuring multiple writers there are so many different styles that it can be hard to compare two correspondents to each other. The reader could get a sense of Washington’s style by reading the *Booker T. Washington Papers*, but comparing it to Du Bois would be difficult because that particular correspondence is scattered throughout several volumes. Also, bringing together the Du Bois and Washington Papers gives a more balanced appraisal of their writing styles, as each of those collections on their own tend to have more received than sent letters.

While there was a stylistic difference between Du Bois and Washington, the topics they were interested in, and subsequently corresponded about, were similar. Both men were deeply concerned with improving the education level for African Americans. Numerous black schools were built in the decades following emancipation, but they did not receive the same amount of funding as their white counterparts and their budgets were routinely cut during economic downturns.\(^{12}\) The legalization of segregation only

made this divide worse. Most black families depended on farming to make a living\textsuperscript{13}, and needed their children for extra labor, which limited the time available for education. For every exception like Du Bois and his doctorate from Harvard, there were hundreds of black students who were barely able to get an elementary education. The fact that Du Bois was only able to get teaching positions at black universities despite being an exceptional student at Harvard reveals the discriminatory climate within American education at the time.

Du Bois and Washington frequently wrote to each other on the subject, and even praised each other’s work. Du Bois suggested different courses he might teach for Tuskegee and they discussed a potential research collaboration examining the rural counties of the Black Belt. Washington praised an article written by Du Bois on the funding disparity between black and white schools in the South, going as far to say that the article could not “but help our cause greatly in the long run”. Whether this praise came out of politeness, a desire to appear diplomatic, or genuine respect is a matter of interpretation, but the fact that it appears often in their correspondence worth considering for historians.

The two also worked together to mount legal challenges against Jim Crow laws in the South. Du Bois was drawn to this cause after being forced to move to a segregated sleeping car on an overnight rail journey. He was so incensed that he wrote to Washington asking his advice on what to do. Washington had experience with legal challenges against segregation, although his involvement was usually kept secret for fear

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, x.
of white backlash against him and Tuskegee.\textsuperscript{14} The extent of his secret funding of legal battles was not completely known until the publication of the \textit{Booker T. Washington Papers} and it is likely that Du Bois was unaware of the majority of Washington’s efforts, although they did discuss their own law suit against the railway, as well as some of the few cases that were resolved successfully. The two often wrote to each other about the progress of the case and different ideas they had on how to advance it. The success of Washington’s legal challenges was mixed, and the lawsuit with Du Bois did not succeed. However, this line of correspondence tends to undercut Du Bois and others’ assertion that Washington accepted the implementation of segregation without resistance. It is clear he knew at least something of Washington’s actions.

The increasing legal codification of Jim Crow segregation laws and the chronic neglect of the black school system were some of the toughest challenges faced by African Americans at that time, and it was telling that Washington and Du Bois chose to work together on these causes. Even more impressive was that the ever secretive Washington opened up, at least partially, to Du Bois regarding something they both cared about. Despite their best intentions Du Bois and Washington could not overcome their differences and make their collaborations successful. The roots of many of these differences can be seen in the letters. The most persistent difference between them mirrored one of the great divides of the country itself, that between North and South. Washington was born on a plantation in Virginia and spent the greater part of his adult life in rural Alabama. In his work as a school administrator he interacted with average

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid}, 245-249.
African Americans from the cotton fields of the Black Belt. Harlan characterized Washington as “indelibly a southerner”, and as a man who was more at home in the fields of the South than the great urban centers of the North.¹⁵

Du Bois grew up in the western Massachusetts town of Great Barrington. The town had a small but thriving black community that went back to the ante-bellum period. Great Barrington was relatively tolerant and integrated, at least compared to the South.¹⁶ While he gained experience living in the South during his undergraduate studies at Nashville’s Fisk University, he was always more at home in the big Northern cities than the rural South as typified by Washington’s Tuskegee. His graduate studies in Berlin and Boston only solidified this feeling. In his April 10, 1900 letter turning down Washington’s offer to move to Tuskegee, Du Bois explained “the only opening that would attract me now would be one that brought me nearer the centres of culture & learning”.

Washington felt that only someone from the South was able to effectively lead African Americans, because only someone from the South could understand the life of the average black person. Around the turn of the century the majority of African Americans had not moved far from the former slave plantations of the South. The typical black person in 1900 was a sharecropper living on land rented from a white landlord. Their world was far from the “centres of culture & learning” that Du Bois preferred. In his letter of November 8, 1903 planning the New York Conference with Du Bois,

---
¹⁵ *Ibid*, 202  
Washington outlined his thinking on the matter, arguing that “We should bear in mind that the bulk of our people are in the South and that the problems that relating to their future very largely surround the Southern colored people...and we should not have to depend too much on mere theory and untried schemes of Northern colored people”. While this letter was not meant as a direct attack at Du Bois, it was aimed at people with similar backgrounds and sensibilities.

Another point of difference between the two men was the type of education that they valued. Washington preached the value of industrial education, while Du Bois believed in the power of a traditional university education and rigorous scholarship. They both cared about improving the education of African Americans and tried to work together, but the letters show that they saw their positions not as variations on the same theme, but as competing ideologies. These ideologies were not mutually exclusive and could potentially work together but they were not the same. When questioning whether he should come to Tuskegee in 1900, Du Bois pondered whether he would “be regarded by the public as a sort of superfluous addition not quite in consonance with the fundamental Tuskegee idea?” Du Bois went on to say that he wanted to try and bring about more cooperation between Tuskegee and Atlanta University, but that he felt that what he was doing as professor at a major university was different from what Washington was doing at Tuskegee.

Washington did not talk much about his exact educational philosophy in his correspondence with Du Bois, but there were subtle indications of his beliefs spread
throughout. In the letter of November 8, 1903, the reference to the “mere theory and untried schemes” indicates what he thought of the ideas espoused by the Northern college-educated black elite. He disliked academic thought that was abstract and not directly useful. Washington was not against scholarship, but he wanted research and data that backed up his ideas, whether to prove the reality of racial injustice, or to provide positive signs that his strategy of racial uplift was working.

There are examples of this mindset in the letters. In his offer to bring Du Bois to Tuskegee he provided a detailed research plan that would provide tangible sociological data. Similarly he wrote to Du Bois on July 15, 1902 praising an article Du Bois had written that systematically catalogued the underfunding of black schools. Washington lauded Du Bois for his hard work and that “Constantly putting such facts before the public cannot but help our cause greatly in the long run”. He valued the research because it produced facts that might change the perception of the greater public, not because he felt scholars were important leaders in themselves. Du Bois was himself a practical man, but was fond of abstractions and pondering philosophical questions, although he got little chance to show this side of himself to the always business-like Washington.

There are several threads of historical narrative that weave their way through the letters, but taken as a whole the reader finds two men with a strong belief in racial justice, a genuine desire to work together, but also an inability to overcome the personal and professional differences that would eventually lead to their bitter rivalry. It is unfortunate that Du Bois and Washington are primarily known as rivals, because, as the letters show,
they had periods of cooperation and cordial, if not warm, correspondence. Du Bois himself is partially to blame for this misperception, because his published writing took a harsher stance on Washington than he presented in his private letters. Part of this can be explained by a desire to be diplomatic on the part of Du Bois, but if he truly disagreed with Washington as much as he later claimed to, it is unlikely he would be writing at all.

That is, of course, what ended up happening. From 1905 to 1915, when Washington passed away, Du Bois and Washington did not write to each other. Du Bois went on to become an activist in his own right, and eventually founded the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Washington continued to manage the Tuskegee Institute, and preached his philosophy of racial uplift. It was during this time that their rivalry reached its greatest intensity. The rift between them cast a pall on their earlier, friendlier relationship that historians are still struggling to deal with. In his head note to Du Bois’s September 24, 1895 letter to Washington congratulating him on his speech at the Atlanta Cotton Exposition - the speech that outlined the “accommodationist” message that Du Bois would later oppose - Aptheker wrote that “great historical interest”17 was attached to the letter, because it represents an opinion that Du Bois would later repudiate. As this letter and the other letters in the correspondence show, the relationship between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois cannot be simplified into one of pure conflict. The truth, as always, is more complex.

As this project is an edition of historical documents, its goal is not to argue for a particular interpretation of the correspondence. The themes described are to give readers

an indication of what they will find when reading through the letters. Secondary sources have been consulted in order to give further background information, but in the end it is up to the readers to draw their own conclusions about the letters. When researching and writing on a historical conflict such as this one, it can be difficult not to take sides, or at least sympathize with one person. However, in outlining these themes I have strived to be as neutral as possible within the framework of the facts, and I have tried to indicate where there is disagreement between historians. It has generally been the case that Washington takes the brunt of historical criticism. While it is not all undeserved, I have taken extra care that his words and ideas get a charitable and equitable hearing. That way the reader can interpret him based on facts rather than an inherited disdain.

I have used a similar approach when annotating the text of the letters. The primary purpose of the notes is to provide the reader with contextual details that will allow for a better understanding of the letters. Names, places, events, articles, court cases, etc. are given notes explaining what they are and what relevance they have. Specifically I have tried to relate what is being annotated to both Du Bois and Washington wherever possible. This practice has the advantage of giving insight into both sides of the correspondence.

For example, take the letter sent by Washington to Du Bois on March 11, 1900. Here Washington is informing Du Bois that he has endorsed him for the position of Superintendent of Negro Schools in the District of Columbia. The story becomes complicated when shortly after this letter Washington is told by some of his allies in DC
that they had a preferred candidate. This placed Washington in the awkward position of having to withdraw his support of Du Bois. In the end Du Bois did not get the position, and blamed Washington for it. This is a representative example in that it is a somewhat difficult situation to understand without the assistance of contextual notes, and it appears in both the Harlan and Aptheker editions. Harlan has only one note, which refers the reader to another letter earlier in the edition. Nothing else about the situation is explained in the notes. In fairness to Harlan, if readers look through all the surrounding letters, they can piece together the narrative, at least on Washington’s side of things. Having relevant letters from third parties close at hand is an advantage of an edition as comprehensive as Harlan’s. However, if a reader was using the index to look specifically at letters to and from Du Bois, a reasonable strategy given the size of the edition, there is no indication which other letters should be read.

The Aptheker edition is also not as clear as it could be. The letter is preceded by a headnote introducing the situation. A footnote directs the reader to a different book written by Aptheker, and relates a conversation held in 1949 between him and Du Bois in which Du Bois recalled not seeking and not getting the appointment. The reader is left questioning why he did not get the appointment, especially after apparently being endorsed by Washington. Then there is the unacknowledged fact that Du Bois did indeed seek the appointment, despite his assertion 49 years later. It is also uncomfortable as a reader to be told to read a different book if one wishes to understand the book one is currently reading.
In my annotation of this letter, I have attempted to summarize the relevant details found in the other letters of the *Booker T. Washington Papers* as well as Du Bois’s response to the episode. The reader now does not need to look at two (or three) sources to get both sides of the story. The necessary trade off in structuring the notes this way is that they tend to be longer and more numerous. Considering however that the edition is shorter and more focused, I believe that devoting more space to notes is a reasonable concession. Also, as seen from this example, spare annotation may cause the reader to have to search elsewhere without a guide, thereby undermining any time or space saving advantage gained from using fewer notes.

Structurally, the notes appear at the end of each letter, have been set off by a horizontal rule, and are in a smaller font. This has been done to try to eliminate any confusion between what has been written by the correspondents, and what is editorial. Within the notes I have elected to abbreviate Du Bois as DB and Washington as BTW. I chose to do this mainly to save space, with the secondary benefit of removing any confusion between Booker T. Washington and Washington D.C., which comes up several times in the correspondence. It is common practice in many editions of letters to abbreviate the most commonly used names, and Harlan used the abbreviation BTW in his edition.

The annotations of the letters are almost entirely contextual in nature. Compared to some other editions of letters, there are relatively few textual cruces that might warrant additional explanation. None of the letters feature significant revisions by the author, and
the majority of them are in typescript form, making comprehension an easy task. The letters that are handwritten are not particularly difficult to read, and tend to be shorter, reducing the possibility of textual difficulties. Those that do exist in the letters are of the minor variety, such as single words being struck through and replaced, typographic errors, and individual characters transposed. To deal with these issues I have opted to transcribe them approximately in the text. The problems are so minimal that fixing them and marking the fixes with a note would be more intrusive and less immediately clear. Silently fixing the errors was a reasonable alternative (and is what Aptheker and Harlan choose to do), but again considering the minor nature of the errors, I believe the gains of preserving the text as close to what was written as possible are greater than the losses of readability incurred by retaining the errors. One minor exception to this rule is the expansion of the informal ampersand to a full one. I have also chosen not to modernize the spellings used in the letters, as the differences are minor, and do not pose a challenge to comprehension.

For the heading, greeting and closing of the letter however I have decided to follow common practice and standardize. The main reason for this decision is readability. Standardization allows the reader to orient themselves around the different parts of the letter and more quickly understand what they are looking at. For example, if one wanted to follow the path of Du Bois over the course of his academic career through the correspondence, one could look at the address on his letters and see Great Barrington, then Wilberforce, and then Atlanta, all in the same place on the page. The only exception to this standardization is for the letters that were marked by the author (usually
Washington) as “Confidential” or “Private” in the header. In these cases I left the marker as close to where it was in the letter as possible. I believe that the historical interest that may attach itself to such authorial designations was worth preserving even at the cost of readability or neatness.

I have justified the heading to the right margin and included the date on the top line, and then the location details on a second line. The greeting has been placed on one line justified left, and followed by a colon. The colon, chosen because it mirrors Harlan’s choice (although he did not devote a separate line to the greeting) and is one of the more common ways the manuscripts are punctuated. Along with the colon, Washington and Du Bois also often used variations of a colon followed by a dash (e.g. “:-”) after their greeting. Considering this fact, the colon is a reasonable medium between exact accuracy and useful brevity. The closing I have given its own line and justified it to the right. Any editorial insertions in these sections (e.g. a missing date, location or signature) are enclosed by square brackets.

When there is a need to explain more general historical events between letters I have included a brief summary in italics, separated from the text of the letters by horizontal rules. These additions are not meant to give a full and detailed historical account, for there are other sources that serve such a purpose. Instead, they are meant to bridge the space between the letters. In this way they are similar to the headnotes employed by Aptheker. As that edition was a selection of historically representative letters, Aptheker had to cover narrative gaps that the less representative letters might have
filled in a more comprehensive edition, much in the same way this edition has to explain
gaps that letters from other correspondents may have filled. One issue with Aptheker’s
presentation is that the headnotes are in the same font as the letters and not clearly set off
by any punctuation, making it difficult at times to see what was editorial and what
authorial. By putting the headnotes in italics and setting them off with horizontal rules,
this distinction is made clear.

In designing the style and format of this edition, I have drawn from three main
sources of inspiration. The first two are the Harlan and Aptheker editions. As the only
previously published editions of the Du Bois and Washington’s correspondence, they
were a natural starting place. In reviewing them closely, I looked for what worked best in
those editions, and what I felt could be improved upon. I also considered what editorial
decisions might work better for a smaller more focused edition that might not work in the
larger editions.

I also looked at editions that were not about Washington or Du Bois, but had
similar themes or structures as the edition I was planning. The most helpful of these
editions was *William and Henry James: Selected Letters* edited by Ignas K. Skrupskelis
and Elizabeth M. Berkeley, published by the University of Virginia Press in 1997.
*William and Henry James: Selected Letters* shares many similarities with my edition,
although it is much larger in size. It is a correspondence between two people, both of
whom are well-known in their own right, that has been taken from a larger collection (in
this case the first three volumes of *The Correspondence of William James*). It also covers
a similar period of history, roughly the latter half of the 19th century into the early 20th. (There is even mention of an instance when William James shared the stage with Washington at a Civil War memorial dedication in Boston.) Selected Letters is readable and informative and helps the reader more closely examine a relationship between two figures. From this edition I have adapted the idea of placing connecting editorial material in italics separated by horizontal rule. I have also taken inspiration from this volume in making the biographical register that follows the letters.

The biographical register for this edition consists of the name, dates, and a brief description for individuals that are mentioned frequently throughout the correspondence. Its purpose is to consolidate biographical information into one place, and thereby avoid the need to have repetitive footnotes throughout the letters. For the individuals included in the biographical register I have footnoted their first appearance with a direction to the biographical register. All other instances are left unannotated. This practice runs the risk of confusing readers who consult a letter within the body of the edition (a common occurrence with editions of letters) and miss the earlier instance of the subject’s name where they would be directed to the biographical register. However, the intrusion caused by the alternative options of either repeating the information every time the name appears, or continually directing the reader to the biographical register is more severe than the momentary confusion of an unannotated name. In general, if a name does not have a note in these letters, it can be assumed that the information can be found in the biographical register.
In addition to the biographical register I have included a timeline of events in the lives of Washington and Du Bois. This timeline is not meant to be exhaustive or especially detailed. Rather, it is intended to give the reader a sense of the chronology at a glance. In doing so the reader can get a better sense of what was happening in the lives of Washington and Du Bois while they were writing to one another. The timeline includes events that may not have been discussed in the correspondence. One example is the 1901 entry of Du Bois’s critical review of Washington’s autobiography *Up From Slavery*. The two men never acknowledged in their letters that Du Bois criticized Washington in the press, but it is an important fact to know as one reads the letters after 1901, because it was the first public disagreement between the two. A similar timeline was included in the Oxford University Press series of Du Bois’s published writings.

The hope of all of these editorial additions is that the relationship between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois contained in their correspondence can be fully understood and appreciated. Many of these letters have been published before, but they have never been put together in a focused presentation. I believe that by looking at their relationship as a whole, rather than from the vantage point of Du Bois or Washington, a more balanced view is created. In the notes and other editorial additions I have strived to maintain this balance. Both Du Bois and Washington were influential activists, thinkers, and writers, and both fought for a better, more just America in the way they thought best. They may not always have been right, but their intentions were good. Their rivalry may have become bitter, but it was not constant, nor was it necessarily inevitable. In these letters one can find genuine cooperation and admiration, alongside a growing rift that
would split black America into two factions. Neither man’s story is complete without the other. It is hoped that this edition can help tell that shared story.
President Washington, Sir:

May I ask if you have a vacancy for a teacher in your institution next year? I am a Fisk and Harvard man (A.B. & A.M) & have just returned from two years abroad as scholar of the John F. Slater trustees. My specialty is history and social science but I can teach German, philosophy, natural science classics &c. Your wife knows of me, and I refer by permission to

President Gilman, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore
Secretary Harvard Univ.,
5 University Hall, Cambridge
President Fisk Univ. Nashville
Rev. C.C. Painter of Indian Rights Association
President Calloway of Alcorn

I can procure letters from any and all of these.

Respectfully yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

1 Referring to DB’s time studying social science at the University of Berlin from 1892 to 1894. The Slater fund was a scholarship program that funded black education.
2 Margaret James Murray (1865-1925), Washington’s third wife, was a student at Fisk University during DB’s time there.
3 Daniel C. Gilman (1831-1908), the first president of Johns Hopkins University.
4 Charles C. Painter (1833-1895), abolitionist, Indian rights activist, and Fisk University faculty member.
5 Thomas J. Calloway (1866-1930), president of Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College.

---

To W.E.B. Du Bois:

Great Barrington Mass

Can give mathematics here if terms suit. Will you accept Wire answer.

Booker T. Washington

---

1 While most of the correspondence was sent via regular mail, and BTW and DB did use telegrams when a faster response was needed. Clipped phrasing and a lack of punctuation are indicative of the medium.
During the time between inquiring about a position at Tuskegee and receiving a positive response, Du Bois received and accepted an offer to teach classics at Wilberforce University in Ohio. Not wanting to go back on his word, Du Bois went to Wilberforce, where he taught for two years.

September 24, 1895
Wilberforce, OH

My Dear Mr. Washington:

Let me heartily congratulate you upon your phenomenal success at Atlanta\(^1\) – it was a word fitly spoken\(^2\).

Sincerely

Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

\(^1\) Referring to BTW’s speech given at the Atlanta Cotton States and International Exposition in which he outlined what came to be known as the Atlanta Compromise. Delivered to an audience of wealthy white planters, the speech urged black people to improve themselves economically before demanding social equality, and argued that white people would benefit from the prosperity of their black neighbors. This message proved to be popular and helped launch BTW as the leader of blacks in America. While DB would later come to oppose the values of the Atlanta Compromise, at the time he was at least outwardly supportive.

\(^2\) Proverbs 25:11 “A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.”

January 3, 1896
Wilberforce University, OH

My Dear Mr. Washington:

Professor Hart\(^1\) of Harvard in writing me recently asked me to communicate with you – I do not know that he had anything definite in mind, but I nevertheless follow his suggestion. This is my second year at Wilberforce, and although the field here is a good
one, yet I am not wholly satisfied and am continually on the lookout for another position. There is a little too much church politics\(^2\) in the management and too little real interest and devotion to the work of real education. Then again I have no chance to teach my specialty of History and Sociology at all. I have had the good fortune to have a monograph of mine accepted at Harvard and it will be published on the spring as the first of a series of historical studies. It is on the suppression of the slave trade\(^3\).

I am thinking somewhat of trying to organize a summer School of Sociology here next summer – it is a delightful and cheap place to spend the summer and I might be able to do some good.\(^4\)

If you hear of any opening which you think I am fitted to fill, kindly let me know. I trust your work is prospering as it deserves to. My best regards to yourself and Mrs. Washington

Sincerely Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

\(^1\) Albert Bushnell Hart, see Biographical Register.
\(^2\) Wilberforce is affiliated with the African Episcopal Methodist Church. DB was an interested and knowledgeable observer of the black church, but, like BTW, was not a religious man himself.
\(^3\) DB’s doctorate was entitled *The suppression of the African slave trade to the United States of America, 1638-1870* and was published in 1896.
\(^4\) DB had prior experience with summer teaching. During his time at Fisk he taught summer school in Tennessee, his first exposure to the life of rural African Americans in the South.

---

Wednesday, 1 April 1896

Wilberforce, OH

Dear Mr Washington:

I have been for some time seeking a leisure hour in which to answer you kind letter of the 17\(^{th}\) January – but leisure hours are scarce here. I feel that I should like the work at Tuskegee if I could be of service to you. My idea has been that there might gradually be developed there a school of Negro History and social investigation which might serve to help place, more and more, the Negro problem on a basis of sober fact.\(^1\) I think that in time various northern colleges like Harvard, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and the U. of Penn. would join in supporting such a movement. What do you think of it?\(^2\)
At present I do not know just how I could be of service. I can teach most primary and secondary branches – preferring of course, History, Economics, Social Problems, &c. It seems to me that some elementary courses in these lines would be needed at Tuskegee. I have had an indication that I may possibly expect an offer from the Univ. of Pennsylvania to conduct an investigation as to condition of the Colored people of Philadelphia, for a year. This, it might be, would a good introductory year’s work after which if needed I could come to Tuskegee and perhaps have the active aid of a great college like the Univ. of Penn. In any case I am willing and eager to entertain any proposition for giving my services to your school. As to salary I know the embarrassment of all southern schools: at the same time I shall, in the future, have to care for two i.e. I expect to marry this spring.

Hoping to hear from you at your convenience, I remain

Sincerely Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

1 At this point in his career DB believed that illuminating the conditions of African Americans through scientific investigation was the best way he could help the cause of racial equality. The brutal lynching of Sam Hose, a black farmer from Georgia, shocked DB and changed his view. He recalled in his autobiography “one could not be a calm, cool, and detached scientists while Negroes were lynched, murdered and starved.”

2 While not entirely opposed to higher education, BTW was generally skeptical of the utility of exclusive Northern universities in improving the life of the average black person.

3 At this time, “colored” and “negro” were standard terms used to describe African Americans.

4 DB received and accepted this offer, and published The Philadelphia Negro, a sociological survey of the Philadelphia’s black population commissioned by the University of Pennsylvania, in 1897.

5 DB married his first wife Nina Gomer, a former student at Wilberforce, on May 12, 1896.

---

April 6, 1896

Wilberforce, OH

Dear Mr. Washington:

I have been wanting to have you as my guest when you visit the University in June but living in the building as I do I had no place. My friend however, Lieutenant Young of the US Army, and mother, cordially unite in inviting you thro’ me to be their and my guest at their residence. Answer at your convenience and let us know when you arrive that we may meet you.

Sincerely,
Despite requesting and receiving an invitation to teach at Tuskegee, Du Bois instead chose to take a position at Atlanta University after completing a sociological survey in Philadelphia and a brief respite in Massachusetts.

[c. 1897]

Great Barrington, MA

Dear Sir:

Can you send me a list of your instructors & their colleges, by return mail? I wish to use it at the coming meeting of the American Missionary Assoc.¹

Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

¹ Christian abolitionist group that founded Atlanta University after the Civil War.

September 16, [1898]

Dear Mr. Washington,

I shall not be in Atlanta until Oct 3. On Sept 20th – 22nd I shall be in Boston (C/. C.G Morgan¹ 39 Court St) from 23rd –25th I shall be in New Bedford, (C/. Mrs. Alex Du Bois² Col. Arnold & Ash Sts.); from 26th – 28th I shall be at Kelly Miller’s³, Howard U.⁴, Washington, D.C.
My Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 18th has just reached me. I think it very probable that I can be in Boston early in December on the occasion you suggest. The final decision must of course come from the authorities at Atlanta¹ but I’ve little doubt of their willingness to grant me leave of absence for the time. Awaiting further details, I remain

Very Sincerely Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

¹ Atlanta University.
whether on any particular subject &c. &c. Kindly write me at your convenience. Please too return Dr Bumstead’s letter.

Very sincerely

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

1 Horace Bumstead, see Biographical Register.
2 DB and BTW shared the stage at a speaking event at the Hollis Street Theatre, Boston in March, 1899. They were both in the North to raise money for their institutions, so BTW urged Bumstead to combine their appearances.

---

In early 1899, Washington once again invited Du Bois to come teach at Tuskegee the following year, this time as an independent researcher. Soon afterward the position of Superintendent of the Washington D.C. colored schools became available, and Du Bois asked Washington for his endorsement. In the end neither opportunity came to fruition, once again keeping the two men from a closer collaboration.

---

July 12, 1899

Atlanta, GA

My Dear Sir:

I have taken time to think over carefully your kind offer of May 12th. I assure you I appreciate the honor. For the coming year I shall as you suggest feel under obligations to remain at Atlanta University. I shall however consider your offer for the year 1900-1901 and shall decide during the winter as to whether I think a change best for all interests. Meantime I should like to hear from you more definitely as to the work you expect & the salary. You have as you know my best sympathy for the Tuskegee work and whether or not I see my way clear to join you in it my interest will be the same & I shall be ready to help by word or deed.

I shall try during the summer & fall to think out a plan of work that I might accomplish at Tuskegee & when I have I shall submit it to you. I trust you will write me freely & frankly as to any plans you may have, that we may understand each other thoroughly.

I hope you & Mrs. W. are enjoying your outing as I know you must be. My regards to you both.
Dear Sir:

I have delayed writing you a little longer than I intended to do, but this has been an exceedingly busy fall with me.

I write to renew the proposition that you connect yourself permanently with this institution. What I wish you to do is make your home here and to conduct sociological studies that will prove helpful to our people, especially in the gulf states\(^1\), including both the country districts, smaller towns and cities. I am especially anxious that some systematic and painstaking work be done with the country districts in the Black Belt.\(^2\) Our printing office will be wholly at your service and you could use it in a way that would scatter your writings all through the country.

I should like, if possible, for you to teach at least one class in our institution, this would result in keeping the students in close touch with the line of work which you would be pursuing.

All the work of course would be done in your own name and over your own signature. I should like, of course, for the name of the institution to be in some way attached to whatever publications you should make. I repeat that it would be the policy of the school to leave you free to use your time as you decide would be most desirable.

I would have made you this offer several years ago but I did not feel it would be doing you justice to ask you to come here and tie your hands with routine work. For this work we can pay you a salary of fourteen hundred dollars ($1400.) per year\(^3\) and furnish you a comfortable and convenient house. If any portion of this proposition is not satisfactory to you I shall be glad to make any reasonable changes in it.

I had a letter a few days ago from Prof. Hart\(^4\) asking whether or not we had come to a definite decision.

Yours Truly,
February 17, 1900

Atlanta, GA

Confidential

My Dear Mr. Washington:

I have taken a rather unreasonable amount of time to consider your kind offer to come to Tuskegee, and I have not yet fully decided. I want however to lay some considerations before you & then when I come to the Conference as I now think I shall, we can talk further. Since your offer was made I have had two other chances – tho’ not formal offers: one to stand for a professorship in Howard University and the other to enter the race for the position of Superintendent of the Washington colored schools. Then of course there are the claims of the work here.

Now the question that really puzzles me in these cases is the one as to where I would really be most useful. Howard I cut from the list without hesitation – I’m sure I shouldn’t get on well there for it’s a poorly conducted establishment. On the other hand I really question as to how much I am really needed at Tuskegee. I think to be sure I could be of use there but after all would it not be a rather ornamental use than a fundamental necessity? Would not my department be regarded by the public as a sort of superfluous addition not quite in consonance with the fundamental Tuskeege idea? On the other hand there is no doubt that I am needed at Atlanta and that in the future a much closer cooperation between Tuskegee Atlanta & Hampton is possible in the future than in the past. Well this is the line along which I had been thinking some months, when there came letters urging me to seek the position of superintendent of the Washington D.C. schools. It seems that Mr. Cook who has held the position over 20 years has some thoughts of resigning. Now the question comes Is not this the most useful place of the three & could I not serve both your cause & the general cause of the Negro at the National capital better than elsewhere? I wish you’d think this matter over seriously & give me your best advice.
Boiled down the questions are: 1\(^{st}\) Am I really needed at Tuskegee. 2\(^{nd}\) Considering the assured success of the Tuskegee institute are there not weaker places where pioneer work is necessary. 3\(^{rd}\) Is not the Washington position – provided always I could get it – such a place?

Of course if I should apply for the W. place your indorsement would go further probably than anyone’s else. Could you conscientiously give it?

I write you thus frankly & hope you will consider the matter from my point of view & give me the results of your wisdom.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

1 Possibly the Pan-African Conference in London in July 1900, in which DB would express his famous sentiment about the problem of the twentieth century being the problem of the color line. BTW did help plan the Conference.
2 Washington D.C.’s school system had a single white superintendent, who then employed one white and one black assistant superintendent to oversee the racially separated school systems.
3 In other words, industrial education.
4 Historically black university in Hampton, Virginia. BTW’s alma mater. Much of the inspiration for BTW’s educational philosophy came from his time at Hampton.
5 George Frederick Thompson Cook (1835-1912), longtime school superintendent in Washington and one of the city’s few black officeholders.

February 17, 1900

Atlanta, GA

Dear Mr. Washington,

The 1899 Conference report\(^1\) just came from the binder today & I mail it forthwith. I want if possible to be at your conference, but I am not sure whether I can come or not. With best wishes

Yours.

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

\(^1\) The annual Atlanta University conference, a gathering of black social scientists, which DB had been running since 1898. The conference published its findings in a yearly report.
My Dear Mr. Washington:

On reaching here yesterday I found several urgent letters asking me to apply for the Washington position before it is too late. I thought therefore that application would do no harm even if on later personal investigation I found the place not to my liking. Therefore I wired you asking you for your endorsement. I do not of course want you to do anything which would compromise you or make you appear “in politics”¹ but if without prejudice to your position & the school’s you could endorse me I shall appreciate it. I repeat that I have not definitely decided to accept the Washington place nor am I certain of not coming to Tuskegee. My present leaning however is toward Washington for I seem to see there a chance for a great work. However I shall go there next month & investigate². I want to thank you again for your hospitality during my very pleasant stay at Tuskegee.

Yours &c.

W.E.B. Du Bois

¹ BTW put great effort into appearing apolitical, but was deeply involved in Republican party politics, and had a great deal of influence in the Roosevelt administration. BTW hid his political dealings for many reasons, including preserving the reputation of Tuskegee (as DB suggests here), and protecting himself and his Republican allies from unwanted scrutiny.

² Possibly referring to the American Negro Academy (ANA) meeting on March 5 in Washington DC. The ANA was an organization that supported black scholarship. DB would later go on to head the organization.

March 11, 1900

Grand Union Hotel, New York, NY

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Please consider the contents of this letter strictly private. If you have not done so, I think it not best for you to use the letter of recommendation which I have sent you. I have just received a letter¹ direct from one of the Commissioners in the District asking me to recommend some one for the vacancy there and I have recommended you as strongly as I could. Under the circumstances it would make your case stronger for you not to present the letter which I have given you for the reason that it would tend to put you in the position of seeking the position. It is pretty well settled, judging by the Commissioner’s letter that some one outside of the District is going to be appointed.²
This will be my address for the next week.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 The letter dated March 6, 1900 from John Wesley Ross, explains that someone from outside DC would be chosen because the internal candidates were too divided and many had relatives teaching in the school system. Ross asks for BTW’s opinion on whom to choose and mentions that DB is being considered.

2 The day after this letter was sent, BTW received a letter from T. Thomas Fortune asking him to rescind the endorsement of DB in favor of a more preferred local candidate. BTW conceded that he should have checked with Fortune before granting the endorsement. DB was not chosen, and blamed BTW for blocking his appointment. While this is true, it is clear from BTW’s correspondence with Fortune and others that BTW was trying to placate some of his allies, and that his original endorsement was genuine. He was also still hoping that DB would come to Tuskegee.

March 16, 1900

Atlanta, GA

My Dear Mr. Washington:

I called on Mr. Hardwick\(^1\) yesterday. He was pleasant but cautious. He admitted that conductors of the S.R. had been given orders as to sleeping cars, but said this did not apply to inter-state travel. He thought a journey from here to Washington would be considered inter-state & that sleepers could be taken. He asked me to state my case in writing & he would lay it before the legal department of the R.R. & give me an early reply. I sent the enclosed letter to him today.

Yours &c.

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

\(^1\)S.H. Hardwick, agent of Southern Railway (S.R.). On February 19, 1900 Du Bois was denied a sleeping car berth on a train from Atlanta to Savannah due to his race.

April 10, 1900

Atlanta, GA

My Dear Mr. Washington:
I am sorry to say that I have been unable to lay my hands upon the data mentioned and consequently could not forward it. I am sorry.

I think I ought not keep you any longer in uncertainty as to my coming to Tuskegee. I have given the matter long and earnest thought and have finally decided not to accept your very generous offer. I see many opportunities for usefulness and work at Tuskegee, but I have been unable to persuade myself that the opportunities there are enough larger than those here at Atlanta University to justify my changing at present. The only opening that would attract me now would be one that brought me nearer the centres of culture & learning and thus gave me larger literary activity. I thank you very much for the offer and for the other kindnesses and I need not assure that you will always have in your work my sympathy and cooperation.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

1 BTW probably requested some of DB’s research data on black owned businesses in Atlanta. Based on these data DB presented at the 1899 Atlanta University conference an idea for organization of black business owners, but the eventual organization, the National Negro Business League would be created in 1900 and was controlled by BTW.

2 Tuskegee is located in rural eastern Alabama, roughly 40 miles from the state capital Montgomery and 120 miles from Atlanta, and did not have the cultural institutions that DB had come to enjoy.

---

Despite the failure of the school superintendency appointment and Du Bois’s third refusal to work at Tuskegee, Du Bois and Washington were still committed to working together. They urged one another to attend conferences at their respective universities and they shared ideas.

May 16, 1900

Atlanta, GA

My Dear Mr. Washington:
I shall try & get the list of business men\textsuperscript{1} to you in a week or two. I have been very busy.

Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} Probably the “data” mentioned in the previous letter.}

November 6, 1900

Atlanta, GA

Dear Sir:

Your note of the 23 of June enclosing $2 for copies of reports came after I left here & I have just found it. Copies of 2 3 & 4 are sent herewith. Copies of 5 will follow.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

Feb. 11, 1901

Atlanta, GA

Dear Mr. Washington:

I shall probably attend the Tuskegee conference this year again\textsuperscript{1}. I have been thinking that perhaps I could do a service there in taking a personal census of all the visitors, especially the farmers &c. – number, property owned, age, history, crops, improvements, &c., &c. If you could furnish me 3 or 4 or 5 reliable clerks I could probably do the work & present results to the final meeting. This plan occurred to me, and I mention it to you.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois
Dear Mr. Washington:

Mr. Mosely\(^1\) of the Inter-State Commission has advised me to retain Mr. W.C. Martin\(^2\), a colored lawyer of 503\(\frac{1}{3}\) D St. N.W., Washington, for my interstate commerce case & to bring it thus to a regular trial with sworn witness &c. What do you think of this?\(^3\) Do you know Martin? I shall write for his charges – I do not want to get too deeply involved financially.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

\(^1\) Edward A. Moseley (1846-1911), secretary of Interstate Commerce Commission, which regulated railways that passed through multiple states.

\(^2\) William C. Martin see Biographical Register.

\(^3\) DB wanted to legally challenge segregated sleeping cars aboard inter-state train journeys following his own experience of Feb. 19, 1900 (see March 16, 1900 letter). BTW was supportive, but the legal challenge did not succeed.
July 3, 1901
Atlanta, GA

Dear Mr. Washington:

I shall be delighted to accept your kind invitation of the 26th ult. to camp in West Va.¹ My summer address is Sea Isle City, N.J. I enclose the letter from Martin.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

¹ BTW invited many of the leading black leaders of the day to a camping trip in West Virginia. According to a September 14, 1901 article in the Colored American, the group fished and had the use of a private rail car.

September 1, 1901
Sea Lake City, NJ

Dear Mr. Washington,

Your change of date rather upset my plans so that I’m afraid I cannot get to West Va. to accept your very kind invitation. I have a series of articles for the NY Times¹ which it will take this week to finish. That will leave too little time before the breaking up of your camp for me to come. I’m very sorry as I counted on the good time. I thank you just the same for the invitation & wish you & the guests a pleasant time.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

¹ DB’s article “The Black North: A Social Study” ran on November 17, 1901 and examined the history and current concerns of black people living in the North.
My Dear Mr. Washington:

I am sorry that I was detained so long in the North with lectures that it was impossible for me to attend your conference, much as I would have liked to.

I write now to invite and urge you to attend our conference May 27, Tuesday. Our subject for this Seventh Conference is *The Negro Artisan*, we are collecting data on the history of trades among Negroes, the number & distribution of artisans in the United States; the increase & decrease in various communities, the influence of trade schools, the influence of colleges. We expect Hampton, Fisk & other schools to be represented & are particularly anxious to have you.\(^1\)

I think you will grant that I have sought in every way to minimize the breach between colleges & industrial schools & have in all possible ways tried to cooperate with Tuskegee in its work. I have not been so successful in getting you to cooperate with ours\(^2\), altho’ this is off of course largely due to the fact that you are a busy man. This time, however, I hope you can serve us & will accept this invitation to speak to us on that occasion.\(^3\)

Very Sincerely Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

---

\(^1\) The black merchant class was a concern that DB and BTW shared. DB was interested as a social scientist while BTW was always looking for evidence of progress, especially economic, among African Americans.

\(^2\) May refer to Atlanta University, or the small group of black intellectuals opposed to BTW.

\(^3\) BTW did attend, and spoke for about 15 minutes.

March 16, 1902

Atlanta, GA

Dear Sir:

I see that you often have calls for guides to literature on the Negro problems.\(^1\) I therefore take the liberty of sending you my bibliography which may come handy for distribution.

Very Sincerely,

W.E.B. Du Bois
The Negro problem or problems was a blanket term for the fraught state of race relations in America. DB wrote an article in 1898 for the *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* titled “The Study of the Negro Problems”.

March 28, 1902
Atlanta, GA

My Dear Mr. Washington:

I should like to put you down on our program for an informal talk of about twenty (20) minutes (or longer if you choose) on either one of the two following subjects: “The Graduates of Industrial Schools as Artisans” or “The Proper Relation of Colleges and Industrial Schools”.

Kindly let me know which subject suites you best, or if you would prefer still a different subject and also if I may put you on the program as suggested.

Very Sincerely Yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

P.S. The date, you remember, is Tuesday, May 28 at eight oclock in the evening.

W.E.B.D.

March 31, 1902

Dear Sir:

The date of the Atlanta Conference is Tuesday, May 27. I fear I gave you the wrong date in my previous communications.

W.E.B. Du Bois

May 19, 1902
Atlanta, GA

Dear Mr. Washington:
I send enclose the preliminary program of the Conference which is subject to such correction or suggestions as you may have.

Will you please send me by return mail or as soon as practicable on the other side of this sheet a short synopsis of your proposed paper: we wish to use it for the associated press.

Very respectfully yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

May 26, 1902

Mr. W.E.B. Du Bois:

Mr. Scott¹ and I plan to reach Atlanta tomorrow morning at 11:40 o’clock

Booker T. Washington

¹ Emmet J. Scott (1873-1957), BTW’s secretary.

July 15, 1902

South Weymouth, MA

My dear Dr. Du Bois:

I have just read the editorial in the last number of the The Outlook¹ based upon your investigation of the condition of the public schools in the South², and I want to thank you most heartily and earnestly for the investigation of the subject referred to and also for the work which you are doing, through your conference³ and through your writings. This editorial shows the value of such investigation. I know it is hard work and you may feel often that you are not very much encouraged in your efforts, but such an editorial ought to prove of great comfort to you. Constantly putting such facts before the public cannot but help our cause greatly in the long run.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

¹ The Outlook
² The condition of the public schools in the South
³ The conference
A weekly magazine published in New York, which also serialized *Up From Slavery.*

2 “The Negro Common Schools” published Jul 12, 1902. The article presents DB’s findings of disproportionate public funding levels between black and white schools in the South as well as some historical background on the creation of the black school system during Reconstruction. DB would go on to use the information he gathered here in *The Souls of Black Folk,* especially chapters 2 and 6.

3 The Atlanta University Conference, see note 1 in the previous letter.

---

[c. November 1902]

Dear Mr. Washington:

We have last got a permanent committee formed here & our first work is to push the sleeping car matter before the inter-state commission. I think we’d better get Smith\(^1\) of N.Y. to take it up. We are going to raise money here & are going to do 3 things:

1. Present personally a signed petition to Lincoln\(^2\) of the Pullman Co.
2. Push case before the Inter-State Commission.
3. Go to courts.

Are you still disposed to stand part of the expense and if so what parts? What is Smith’s address?

---

\(^1\) Wilford H. Smith, see Biographical Register.
\(^2\) Robert Todd Lincoln, see Biographical Register.

November 28, 1902

Crawford House, Boston, MA.

*Personal and Confidential*

My dear Dr. Du Bois:

I have your letter of recent date, and if you will let me know what the total expense will be I shall be willing to bear a portion of it provided I can hand it to you personally and not have any connection with your committee. I do not want my name to go before the committee in any shape or to be used publicly in connection with this matter.\(^1\) I am very glad indeed to hear that you are moving in such a sensible way. Smith is a fine and able man.

---

\(^1\) I am very glad indeed to hear that you are moving in such a sensible way. Smith is a fine and able man.
1 BTW secretly funded several legal challenges to discriminatory laws. BTW desired secrecy because his privileged position among influential white leaders would be jeopardized if his activism became public. His dealings with Smith were sensitive enough that he used codenames when writing to him.

[c. Dec 1902]

Dear Mr. Washington:

Mr. W.H. Smith wrote to me Dec 1, in part as follows:¹

I am replying asking what he thinks of a preliminary case simply before the Inter State Commerce Commission.

I presume he is right in preparing for the courts from the very first². What do you think of the fee charged? It’s very high & I’m not sure how much we can raise³.

[W.E.B. Du Bois]

¹ This letter is in draft form. Presumably DB included a passage from Smith’s letter in the copy sent to Washington.
² Smith agreed with DB that sleeping car segregation laws were void when applied to inter-state travelers. Moreover, he believed that the law was generally invalid, and desired to make a case before the United States Circuit Court.
³ The fees quoted by Smith were $2,500 without expenses or $2000 plus expenses.

In 1903 Washington began organizing a conference of black leaders to discuss the social problems confronting African Americans, as well as to ease growing tensions. Washington was eager to get Du Bois’s cooperation as without him, the conference would have no legitimacy. They also continued to collaborate on a legal challenge against segregated sleeping cars.

January 2, 1903
Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois:

Have wired Dr. Grimke if he could not be present to ask his brother\(^1\) to take his place check your traveling expenses sent to-day

Booker T. Washington

---

\(^1\) Francis and Archibald Grimké, see Biographical Register.

February 3, 1903

Confidential

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Enclosed I send you the exact wording of the plan agreed upon by the people in Atlanta yesterday. I have only had a few minutes conversation with Dr. Parkin\(^1\) and am planning to have another conference with him before he leaves. The male college graduates in our faculty are to meet him this evening at dinner.

I asked the Doctor the direct question as to why Atlanta University was not invited to attend the conference and he said that the Southern man with whom he left the matter of sending out invitations found a technical objection and that was that in mathematics he did not consider Atlanta University doing the kind of work that would entitle it to attendance. I then asked him about Fisk University and he had no explanation to make. I tried in every way to impress upon Dr. Parkin the importance of not depending on promises or mere talk but to see that in some practical, tangible way our people are given a chance and he assures me that through the plan which has been adopted it will be impossible for the colored people to be shut out completely. He says that among other requirements, an institution must have 100 students in the department of liberal arts. I think this is a matter we must keep working at in order not be left out.

Yours Truly,

Booker T. Washington
February 12, 1903

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

I am sorry that a tremendous pressure of work has delayed my sending out the letters sooner, but I am sending to you copy of such letters as I have sent out\(^1\). I shall keep you informed as to the answers. I find that I did not mention to you when you were here the name of Mr. Fortune\(^2\) as he is out of the country, but I find that it is probable he will return within a few weeks, and in that case, I should feel that it is proper to invite him to be present at this time. I understand that you and he do not agree on many matters. I have known Mr. Fortune for a number of years and while he has his weak points he also has his strong ones, and I think his counsel in such a meeting would be of great value.\(^3\) I am very anxious that the meeting be not confined to those who may agree with my own views regarding education and the position which the race shall assume in public affairs, but that it shall in every way represent all the interests of the race.\(^4\)

Very truly yours,

Booker T. Washington

P.S. I rather think it would be better for you to write Mr. Morgan yourself. I do not know him very well and then besides I rather have the idea that he has some feeling against me and would not perhaps under the circumstances be inclined to consider favorably anything that I might say.\(^5\) Please let me know if you will write him.

B.T.W.

---

\(^1\) Invitations to the proposed conference in New York.

\(^2\) Timothy Thomas Fortune, see Biographical Register.

\(^3\) Fortune struggled with alcoholism and money troubles, but was generally supportive of BTW until after 1905.

\(^4\) BTW often used “the race” to mean African Americans as a whole.

\(^5\) Morgan was an outspoken opponent of BTW, but was friendly with DB since their time together at Harvard.
Dear Mr. Washington:

Will you presently send me a list of those invited to the proposed conference?

Very sincerely,

WEB Du Bois

[c. 1903]¹

¹ This letter is undated but, given BTW’s response, it seems likely that this one immediately preceded his letter of March 4, 1900.

March 4, 1903

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

I send you herewith list of persons who have been invited to the proposed conference. All of them have been written to with the exception of Mr. Clement G. Morgan.

Very truly yours,

Booker T. Washington

March 27, 1903

Fifth Ave. Bank, New York City, NY

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

I am in receipt of your letter of March 20. The definite date for the meeting has not been fixed. It is a very difficult matter to set a date where so large a number of busy people are concerned that will bring together the majority of the people we want, for that reason the matter has dragged. All the people invited, however, are willing to attend. I have been working at the matter ever since we had our meeting at Tuskegee. I am very
much afraid however, that it will be impossible to have the meeting in any month except April unless we defer it until June.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

May 9, 1903

Chicago, IL

My dear Dr. Du Bois:

When you are in New York again I hope you will make it a point to meet Hon. John E. Milholland\textsuperscript{1}, 52 Broadway. Mr. Milholland is a loyal friend of the race. He is inclined to take radical views but withal is a very find able man, and he is very anxious to get into personal touch with you. I think you will like him.\textsuperscript{2}

I am still at work on the matter of the New York meeting and it now looks as if sometime in June might be the season that would be most convenient to most of the people.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

\textsuperscript{1} John E. Milholland (1860-1925), white activist for racial equality.
\textsuperscript{2} BTW was right. Milholland help found the NAACP with DB.

July 6, 1903

Tuskegee, AL

To WEB Du Bois:

Mr. Booker T. Washington will be pleased to have you take dinner with him at his home “The Oaks,” at 6:30 o’clock this evening.\textsuperscript{1}
October 28, 1903

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

The enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have sent out to all parties mentioned in our previous conference, and I hope very much it will have your approval. If for any reason you think any change should be made in the personnel of those invited, I wish very much that you would say so.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 This probably refers to DB’s visit to Tuskegee in July (see previous letter).

November 5, 1903.

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Replying in part to yours of November 3d, I want to get your opinion on the question as to whether or not either Bishop Turner or Bishop Holsey should not properly be included in our New York conference. Both of these men represent in a way the John Temple Graves idea and that is an element which I wonder if it is safe for us to ignore if we wish to have all sides of the question fairly and honestly considered.

I will write you later about the other suggestions raised in your letter.

In looking over the list I find that we have no representative from the state of Texas. Texas is so large within itself that I have been wondering if that section of the
country should not be represented, in that case have you any one to suggest? I think you know R.L. Smith⁴, a graduate from Atlanta University, and a man who has done excellent work in many directions in Texas. In case you decide to have someone from that state I can think of no one who is more representative in his character. Perhaps you know some other person.

I have been telegraphing trying to make arrangements for our reception in Chicago⁵ ever since I reached home, but up to the present time nothing is very satisfactory. Mr. Lincoln is evidently waiting for some developments in the South or trying to hedge. The last telegram wanted to know the names of the committee and parts of the country that they represented and the object to be covered by the conference. This information I telegraphed day before yesterday, but still no answer.

Yours truly,

[Booker T. Washington]

It may be, however, that the company is holding out in our favor and is trying to avoid seeing committees in order to not attract attention and thus now stir up the South to any great extent.

---

¹ Henry McNeal Turner, see Biographical Register.
² Lucius Henry Holsey, see Biographical Register.
³ John Temple Graves (1856-1925) Atlanta based newspaper journalist and orator who defended lynching and inflamed racial tensions. The “idea” mentioned is likely the concept of racial separatism.
⁴ Robert Lloyd Smith (1861-1942), a black ally of BTW based in Texas. BTW had secured him a position as deputy U.S. Marshall.
⁵ A meeting with the Pullman Company, which was headquartered near Chicago.

Nov. 8, 1903.

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Please be kind enough to let me have your opinion of the following matters just as early as possible as the matter is pressing: Of course the main object of our New York conference is to try to agree upon certain principles and to see in what way we understand or misunderstand each other and correct mistakes as far as possible. I agree with your suggestion that in Chicago, for example, we ought to have as far as possible, all shades of opinion represented. I have no objection to inviting either Dr. Bently¹ or Mr.
Morris\textsuperscript{2}. Which one do you prefer? Of course we could not invite them both. In this same connection I think that we ought to have W. H. Lewis\textsuperscript{3} from Boston as we could only get at both sides of New England by having him or some such man, as well as Mr. Morgan. The more I think of it, the more I feel convinced that Dr. J. W. E. Bowen\textsuperscript{4} ought to be present. He represents a very large constituency and I have found him on all questions a pretty sane man. I have already written you as to your opinion about either Bishop Turner or Bishop Holsey. Of course we must avoid having the conference too large and too expensive. Do you really think that Dr. Grimke\textsuperscript{5} would represent some idea or element that would not be represented by somebody else already invited? Please think of this and write me. As to Fortune; we may or may not agree with a great many tings that he does, but I think that there is no question but that he influences public opinion in a very large degree. We must make an especial effort to drop out of consideration all personal feeling, otherwise the conference will be a failure from the beginning.

So far in making up the conference, I fear it has one especially weak point which should be strengthened if possible. We should bear in mind that the bulk of our people are in the South and that the problems that relate to their future very largely surround the Southern colored people, and we should be very sure that there is a large element in this conference who actually know Southern conditions by experience and who can speak with authority, and we should not have to depend too much on mere theory and untried schemes of Northern colored people\textsuperscript{6}.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

\textsuperscript{1} Dr. C.E. Bentley (1859-1929), Chicago based dentist. Bentley would go on to join the Niagara Movement with DB.

\textsuperscript{2} Edward Morris (1860-?), Chicago based lawyer and politician who opposed BTW.

\textsuperscript{3} William Henry Lewis (1868-1949), black lawyer and politician. The first black man to become assistant attorney-general. He had originally been an opponent of BTW, but had become a loyal supporter at this point.

\textsuperscript{4} John Wesley Edward Bowen (1855-1923), theological scholar, earned PhD from Boston University in 1887.

\textsuperscript{5} Francis Grimke.

\textsuperscript{6} At this time, over 80\% of African-Americans lived in the South. BTW believed that Southerners (such as himself) understood best the problems faced by the typical black person.

November 14, 1903
New York, NY

Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois:

Most important receive answer to my last letter at once. If not sent Tuskegee. Please send me here hotel manhattan.

Booker T. Washington

November 15, 1903

Dear Mr. Washington:

I do not think it will be profitable for me to give further advice which will not be followed. The conference is yours and you will naturally constitute it as you choose. I must of course reserve the right to see the final list of those invited and to decide then whether my own presence is worth while.¹

W.E.B. Du Bois

¹ Fearing that DB might withdraw from the conference following this letter, BTW redoubled his efforts to invite Clement G. Morgan, DB’s closest ally among those invited to the conference.

November 26, 1903

Crawford House, Boston, MA

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

I enclose a list of the names of the men who have been invited to attend the January Conference in New York. I may add that with a few exceptions, I have heard from these people, and they have already accepted. I expect to hear from all of them within the next few days. My address will be Tuskegee from this on.

Very truly yours,

Booker T. Washington
December 4, 1903

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Enclosed I send you a copy of a letter received from Dr. Grimke, together with my reply.¹ All of the men indicated by him are strong forces and I wish we could invite them, but I hesitate because of the fear of making the conference too large.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

¹ Francis Grimké suggested a series of names including his brother Archibald. BTW objected to Archibald on the grounds that he was a Democrat and lived in Boston, for these groups were already represented. In his December 5, 1903 letter to Francis BTW also indicated that he did not want to make the conference too large so that it remained a “confidential, serious, heart to heart talk.”

December 5, 1903

My dear sir:

In case you do not care to secure boarding accommodations for yourself in New York while attending the conference, if you will address a letter to Mr. Charles W. Anderson¹, Fifth Avenue Hotel, New York City, he will be very glad to secure you a comfortable boarding place.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

¹ Charles W. Anderson (1866-1938), Republican political activist in New York City. Was a close ally of BTW and became part of the Republican political patronage network during Roosevelt administration.

December 13, 1903.

Hotel Manhattan, New York City, NY

PERSONAL.

Dear Dr. Du Bois:
Apropos of our private previous correspondence regarding the conference in New York during the 6th, 7th, and 8th of January, I write to say that the meetings will be held in the parlors of Carnegie Hall, 154 West 57th Street. The first session will be open at 10:30 A.M. January 6th. A midday luncheon will be served each day in the Hall.

Very truly yours,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919), steel magnate and philanthropist. One of BTW’s strongest white allies. BTW’s ties to wealthy white philanthropists were criticized by those in DB’s camp, as they felt BTW was beholden to white interests, rather than what was best for African Americans.

December 14, 1903

Hotel Manhattan, New York City, NY

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Enclosed I am sending you a copy of the opinion of Mr. Cravath1 upon the Pullman Car question2. Another step in this direction will soon be taken. I wish that you would be kind enough to let all the Atlanta members of the committee see the opinion. I have sent a copy direct to Rev. Proctor3.

Very truly yours,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 Paul Cravath (1861-1940), lawyer based in New York. Son of the co-founder of Fisk University
2 This letter, dated December 9, 1903 was originally sent by Cravath to William H. Baldwin. In Cravath’s opinion the Pullman Company could legally bar black passengers from certain cars, as long as they provided “substantially equal” accommodations for them. In essence it was the doctrine of separate but equal.
3 Henry Hugh Proctor (1868-1933), black church leader in Atlanta who was assisting BTW on this case.

December 29, 1903

Tuskegee, AL

Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois:
Necessary all business arrangements connection Newyork conference be closed, be kind enough to telegraph today my expense whether you plan to be present.

Booker T. Washington.

Jan. 1, 1904.

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

I send you herewith post office money order covering expenses of travel to New York. This is the amount mentioned in Dr. Adams’ telegram advising me that you intend being present at the conference.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

_Du Bois did attend the conference, but was disappointed by the results. Washington’s platform was generally affirmed, and the opposition led by Du Bois had little input. After the conference the trio of Washington, Du Bois, and Hugh M. Browne gathered to plan the formation of the Committee of Twelve for the Advancement of the Negro Race, an organization meant to continue the work of the conference. Browne was a loyal Washington supporter, and Du Bois, realizing that he would be outvoted, quit later that year._

---

January 234¹, 1904

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

You will remember that I announced on the floor of our conference on the last evening that some one had given out information to the newspapers. I am glad to state that I found afterward that the report was an imagined one, and did not come from the inside. The editor to whom it was submitted refused to print it.

I have thought it wise to send the above statement to each of the members of the conference.
Very truly,

Booker T. Washington

January 27, 1904

Tuskegee, AL

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

1 BTW and DB met in New York on March 21st, 1904 to discuss their continuing legal challenge of sleeping car segregation.
Even before our committee is formed, I think there are one or two matters that we might attend to effectively. First. I presume you have seen something of the recent decision handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court bearing upon the question of colored men serving upon juries. So far as I can get hold of the facts, this is a clear, clean cut decision in our favor, and I think it will be a good idea for you, Mr. Brown and myself to arrange to have Mr. Wilford H. Smith, the lawyer who had charge of the case, make up a letter of instruction that might serve as a guide to colored people throughout the South and have this circular printed as far as possible. If the facts and proper instruction as to methods of procedure are put before the colored people and they do not secure representation upon juries they will have no one to blame but themselves. Please let me have your idea as soon as possible upon the advisability of taking this course.

Second. Either before or soon after the committee of twelve has been formed, I think it well to get Mr. Smith, or some competent authority, to make a digest of the various requirements for voting in the various Southern States and put it in pamphlet form for large circulation among the colored people throughout the South. I find that in many cases the people do not vote simply because they are careless or ignorant of the law. For example, as the law now stands in Alabama, a very large number of colored people could vote if they were aware of the fact that they must pay their poll tax between now and February 1. Unless some individual however, takes it upon himself to keep the poll tax matter constantly before them between now and February, comparatively few of them will pay this tax. It seems to me that our committee might have for one of its objects the keeping of such matters constantly before the people.

I do not mind saying for your private information that I think I could get Mr. Smith to compile the circular bearing on the jury system without charge since I employed him to take the case through the Supreme Court.

Yours very truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 Referring the Committee of Twelve for the Advancement of the Negro Race. It was supposed to be the organization that continued the work of the New York Conference. DB withdrew his membership after realizing it would be controlled by BTW, and the Committee never actually met.

2 In *Rogers v. Alabama*, decided January 18, 1904, the US Supreme Court overruled the Alabama Supreme Court and held that black men could not be excluded from a jury. Alabama had been barring black jury members based on their inability to vote, which was in turn caused by onerous voting requirements (see note 4).

3 Hugh M. Browne (1851-1923), a BTW ally and fellow member of the Committee of Twelve.
Many Southern states had adopted additional voting requirements such as poll taxes, literacy tests, and grandfather clauses, in order to prevent black people from voting without technically breaking the voting rules established by the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

January 30, 1904
Atlanta, GA

Dear Mr. Washington:

I think both the matters you suggest are important and should be attended to immediately.

It is rather necessary that I should know soon the date of our committee meeting. Have you considered the matter? How would February 29 or March 1 do?

Sincerely yours,

W.E.B. Du Bois

February 10, 1904
Atlanta, GA

Booker T. Washington:

Compelled to settle conference date will march twenty first do wire.

W.E.B Du Bois

February 11, 1904
Lynchburg, VA

Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois:

Haven’t list engagement with me think March twenty first will suit me

B.T.W.

February 13, 1904
Dear Dr. Du Bois:

You will be interested in the enclosed copy of a telegram received from Prof. Willcox. I have telegraphed him urging that he immediately make a statement of his position in Leslie’s Weekly.

I presume you have seen Gov. Vardaman’s article in the last issue of Leslie’s.

Very truly yours,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 Walter Willcox (1861-1964), white social scientist at Cornell who researched black crime, and argued that unemployment among black men led to increased criminality. Willcox refused to come to a conclusion on whether this was due to racial inferiority or racial prejudice and oppression. DB thought Willcox’s findings were racially biased, while BTW was initially supportive until began using Willcox’ research to justify their claims.

2 Illustrated newspaper published 1852-1922.

3 James K. Vardaman (1861-1930), Governor of Mississippi 1904-1908. A white supremacist who advocated lynching and opposed any form of race mixing. In the article “A Governor Bitterly Opposes Negro Education” published February 4, 1904, he denies racial equality and ties education with a rise in crime and cites Willcox as a source.

February 19, 1904

Dear Dr. Du Bois,

I write to say that March 21st seems an acceptable time for the meeting in New York. If this is satisfactory to you I shall enter it. Please confirm it.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

February 20, 1904

Dear Mr. Washington

I shall attend the meeting of the committee in Monday, March 21 at such an hour and place as you propose.
Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Enclosed I send you the manuscript for a circular on the question of the Negro and the Jury. This was compiled by Lawyer Wilford H. Smith, the gentleman who secured the favorable decision from the Supreme Court, and he says that it answers all purposes. I would suggest that some explanatory acts be added.

What do you think of the wisdom of having this put in pamphlet form and getting the colored newspapers to republish it and get it before the masses of colored people in every possible way? This might be done at once.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

February 25, 1904.

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

I have not answered your letter in which you enclose suggestions as to “The Committee of Safety”\(^1\), for the reason that I want to have some days in which to think the matter over.

The more I think of it, the more I am inclined to believe that while the plan outlined by you in many respects would prove helpful and wise, I am inclined to the feeling rather strongly that for a year at least, the Committee would better consist of twelve only\(^2\). If we can make that a success, it may prove the basis for a larger and more thorough organization.

Very truly yours,
February 27, 1904

Dear Dr Du Bois:

I presume you have seen the last decision of the Supreme Court on the Giles case. This seems to settle the matter, at least for a while, and I think it well to ask Mr. Smith or some competent lawyer to prepare a circular covering the matter to the colored people in Alabama, and then follow this up with a separate circular covering such states as Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, etc. One difficulty is to get colored people to take advantage of such privileges as they have under present laws; we can only get them to do this by constant punching.

I am having the jury circular printed and it will be ready for distribution soon.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 Giles v. Teasley, decided February 23, 1904, in which Giles, a black man from Alabama, sued for the right to be registered to vote after being denied under recently passed restrictions. The Supreme Court refused his request arguing that they did not have the proper jurisdiction. BTW secretly funded the case through his lawyer Wilford H. Smith.
conference with Robert T. Lincoln himself, but as this conference was delayed I wrote urging Mr. Napier\(^2\) to start the suit in accordance with our agreement at New York, but there is a failure to act so far. I rather think that this delay or failure comes about by reason of the fact that our people in Nashville find themselves not so much inconvenienced by the recent action of the State Railroad Commission as they thought they were going to be, still the fact is that no action has been taken.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

---

1 William H. Baldwin (1863-1905), white philanthropist and ally of BTW. He made his fortune in the railroad business.

2 James Carroll Napier, see Biographical Register.

March 5, 1904

The enclosed circular has been prepared by Mr. Wilford H. Smith of New York, and refers, as you will note, to the qualifications for voting in Alabama. After you have looked it over I should like to have it returned with any comments you would suggest.

Yours truly,

Booker T. Washington

March 15, 1904.

Tuskegee, AL

Dear Dr. Du Bois:

Our meeting will be held at the Stevens House, 26 Broadway, March 21\(^\text{st}\), at eleven o’clock

yours very truly,

Booker T. Washington
Dear Dr. Du Bois:

After much digging and patient waiting, enclosed I send you the only information I have been able to get concerning the Bostic case that we decided to push during our New York meeting. In a letter from Mr. Napier just received, he says the following:

“I guess you have wondered why I have not recently said something to you about the Bostic case. He was quite eager at first to have the suit brought, but after thinking the matter over and conferring with some of his friends he concluded that he would not do so. I think that he feared that it would prove an unpopular movement for a man of his surroundings. And now that he has been assured that he can purchase sleeping car accommodations for another trip which he is about to make he is positive in his refusal to have the suit brought. So, I suppose, this ends the matter. Still I think the agitation has done some good.”

I have written Prof. Kelly Miller to have present at St. Louis the full minutes of our proceedings in New York.

Yours very truly,

Booker T. Washington
Biographical Register

Bumstead, Horace (1841-1919) Educator and president of Atlanta University during DB’s tenure.

Fortune, Timothy Thomas (1856-1928) Editor of the New York Age, and black civil rights activist. Frequent collaborator with BTW until a falling out late in BTW’s life.


Grimké, Francis (1852-1937) African-American Presbyterian minister. Active in the Niagara Movement and helped found the NAACP.

Hart, Albert Bushnell (1854-1943) American Historian and DB’s doctoral supervisor. Urged DB to work with BTW.

Holsey, Lucius Henry (1842-1940), African-American minister who promoted the idea of a separate state created by the federal government for black people.

Lincoln, Robert Todd (1842-1926), son of Abraham Lincoln and president of the Pullman Sleeping Car Company during the time DB and BTW were attempting to litigate against segregated sleeping cars.


Miller, Kelly (1863-1939), black sociologist, mathematician and professor at Howard University. He would go on to help DB found the NAACP.


Napier, James Carroll (1845-1940), African-American lawyer, Republican party supporter, and associate of BTW who assisted him with the lawsuit against the Pullman Car Co.

Smith, Wilford H. (1863-1926) BTW’s personal lawyer based in New York. The first black man to win a Supreme Court case and author of several books on race and the American legal system.
Turner, Henry McNeal (1834-1915), African-American minister who advocated black nationalism and emigration to Africa.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Booker T. Washington</th>
<th>W.E.B. Du Bois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTW born as a slave in Hale’s Ford, VA</strong></td>
<td>April 5, 1856</td>
<td>February 23, 1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuskegee Institute founded as Tuskegee Normal School for Colored Teachers. BTW hired as president</strong></td>
<td>July 4, 1881</td>
<td><strong>DB born in Great Barrington, MA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885 – 1888</td>
<td>DB earns Bachelor’s degree from Fisk University in Nashville</td>
<td><strong>DB earns Bachelor’s degree from Harvard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888 – 1890</td>
<td>DB earns Bachelor’s degree from Harvard</td>
<td><strong>DB earns MA in History from Harvard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td><strong>DB is offered a position at Tuskegee by BTW. Accepts offer of Wilberforce instead</strong></td>
<td><strong>DB earns PhD from Harvard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 1894</td>
<td><strong>DB asks for position at Tuskegee</strong></td>
<td><strong>DB works on a sociological research project for Penn leading to publication of <em>The Philadelphia Negro</em></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td><strong>DB takes position at Atlanta University</strong></td>
<td><strong>July, 1897</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atlanta Exposition Speech where BTW outlines Atlanta Compromise</strong></td>
<td><strong>September 18, 1895</strong></td>
<td><strong>October 26,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Tuskegee founds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>BTW founds National Negro Business League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10,</td>
<td>DB rejects offer to work at Tuskegee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Summer 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>DB is not chosen for Superintendent of Washington DC schools. Suspects interference from Tuskegee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>DB critically reviews <em>Up From Slavery</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6-8,</td>
<td>DB publishes <em>The Souls of Black Folk</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Summer 1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>DB founds Niagara Movement, a group of mostly Northern black intellectuals who opposed BTW’s ideology and methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13,</td>
<td>The Brownsville Affair. President Roosevelt dismisses an entire regiment of black soldiers without a trial after a shooting incident near their base.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22-24, 1906</td>
<td>Atlanta Race Riot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Last meeting of the Niagara Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 1909</td>
<td>DB forms NAACP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Niagara movement officially    disbands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BTW publishes <em>My Larger Education</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson is elected president, effectively ending BTW’s influence over federal appointments for black officials. Wilson replaces most black political appointees with whites. DB endorsed Wilson as a protest against the Republican actions in Brownsville Affair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 1915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BTW dies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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