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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose

The idea of a free public school system manned by teachers specially trained for their tasks is ingrained in the mind of the average Virginian today to the extent that it is hard for him to realize that there was ever a time when such a system was not a natural part of everyday life in Virginia. And yet, the concept of education based upon the dual premises of equal educational opportunity for all and State support and control of education is actually a post Civil War development. It is a matter of record that, during the ante-bellum period, a majority of Virginians believed that education was an individual responsibility—a function of the home, and not of the State. It is also a matter of record that, during both the ante- and post-bellum period, most Virginians sincerely felt that no special training was necessary to qualify as a teacher.

It is not surprising, then, that the Commonwealth lagged behind many of the other states in the Union in establishing a free public school system and in providing specialized teacher-training institutions to prepare and supply competent teachers for the public school system. Although Butts and Cremin, in discussing the development of the American public school system, stated that "the years between 1779
and 1865 mark the era when the great school systems of contemporary
America took form," such was not the case in Virginia. \(^1\) In fact, it
was not until the controversial Underwood Constitution was adopted in
1869 that an unequivocal mandate was issued by Virginians to their
governing officials, not only for the establishment of "a uniform sys-
tem of public free schools," but also for the creation of normal schools
"as soon as practicable" in order to train teachers for the public
schools so established. \(^2\) Although the General Assembly passed "An ACT
to Establish and Maintain a Uniform System of Free Public Schools" just
slightly more than a year after the ratification of this Constitution,
it took much longer for a system of public normal schools to materialize. \(^3\)

Despite concerted efforts on the part of dedicated educators and
sympathetic legislators, all previous laws enacted to establish a satis-
factory system of public schools in Virginia had failed. Of particular
note in this respect are the laws of 1796, 1818, 1829, and 1846. Under
the law enacted in 1796, each child in Virginia was assured of at least
three years of primary schooling, with the opportunity for some to
obtain higher schooling, at State expense. In 1818 a law was passed
that provided for the use of monies from the Literary Fund to educate
poor children at the State's expense. Under this law the courts were
required to appoint school commissioners who decided how many "poor"

\(^1\) R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education

\(^2\) Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1869-70), "Constitution of
Virginia," Article VIII, Sec. 3, and Sec. 5, p. 625.

\(^3\) Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1869-70), pp. 402-17.
children were to be educated from a sum of $45,000 which was set aside from the Literary Fund for that purpose. Secondary education, as before, was left entirely to the discretion and initiative of the local community. The District Free School Law of 1829 was an attempt to convert the primary schools of the State into a voluntary common school system, remove the compulsory feature, and at the same time avoid the stigma of poverty. The law empowered school commissioners to establish district free schools, with the local community paying three-fifths of the expense of the school plant, at least one-half of the salary expenses, and the Literary Fund accountable for the balance. The law of 1846 was compatible with the national education movement and required county courts to establish free school systems in those counties where a majority of the citizens wanted them. The provision for poor children was retained with improved machinery for superintendence, but if a county or corporation chose to, it could set up free schools and levy a tax for their support. However, if any county or corporation did not wish to levy a tax, it could draw upon the Literary Funds and educate as far as its quota of monies from the Literary Fund would permit.

While each of these laws represented an attempt to establish a uniform public free school system in Virginia, each fell short of that goal for the very same reasons: the provisions were not mandatory and adequate funds were not forthcoming from the State for the necessary support of the system so established. Hence, opposition to the idea of free public schooling for all Virginians continued to manifest itself in "the tendency to maintain distinctions in the education of the rich and
the poor, the fear that change in education would involve danger in civil government, and the dread of tax.\textsuperscript{4}

Free public education, when it came to Virginia, began, as it had elsewhere throughout the United States, with the elementary schools. Public high schools did not flourish in Virginia until the decision had been reached that taxes could legally be collected for their support. Although prominent educators had long advocated the creation of normal schools to train teachers for Virginia's public schools, their proposals gained very little favor among Virginians. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, many Virginians were of the opinion that no specialized training was necessary to become a teacher, and thus saw no need for specialized teacher-training institutions. However, as a State system of public schools began to grow, the need for properly trained teachers became increasingly acute, and Virginians began reluctantly to accept the idea of public schools to train teachers. Such schools, when established, developed along the national pattern for specialized teacher-training institutions. They began as public normal schools that were created by legislative acts and placed under the supervision and direction of individual boards. Subsequent legislation converted these normal schools into teachers colleges and centralized them under the direct supervision and control of the State Board of Education.

Credit for the establishment of a viable system of public schools is given to Virginia's educators who accomplished this monumental task by: (1) combining their efforts with such interest groups as the Virginia Educational Association and the Cooperative Education Association; (2) exerting their personal influence upon key officials throughout the State governmental structure; and, (3) articulating their thoughts to the public through the Educational Journal and the press. Once the success of the public school system was assured, these same educators began to concentrate their efforts on the establishment of teacher-training institutions.

As a result of these efforts, five public normal schools were founded. Established by legislative acts were the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute for Colored People at Petersburg in 1882; the State Normal School for white women at Farmville in 1884; the State Normal and Industrial School for white women at Harrisonburg in 1908; the State Normal and Industrial School for white women at Fredericksburg in 1908; and, the State Normal and Industrial School for white women at Radford in 1910.\(^5\)

Centralization of the activities of these institutions began with an act approved by the General Assembly on 27 March 1914.\(^6\) Affirmation of their status as professional teacher-training institutions occurred on 13 February 1924 when the Virginia General Assembly

\(^{5}\)Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1881-82), chap. 266, pp. 283-87; ibid., (1883-84), chap. 311, pp. 417-18; ibid., (1908), chap. 284, pp. 427-29; and, ibid., (1910), chap. 120, pp. 176-77.

\(^{6}\)Ibid., (1914), chap. 322, pp. 567-68.
conferred the title of Teachers College on each of the four public normal schools for white women, but at the same time retained centralized control, by proclaiming in the same Act: "The board of visitors for the State normal schools for white women of Virginia is continued and shall be and remain a corporation known as the 'board of Virginia teachers colleges.'" Legislation in 1930 conferred the title of Virginia State College for Negroes on the normal school for blacks, and at the same time centralized this school, as well as the normal schools for white women, under the State Board of Education.7

The purpose of this study was to describe the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public teacher-training institutions from the time of their creation as individually-governed, single-purpose normal schools to their transformation into teachers colleges and their direct control by the State Board of Education.

The study encompassed the period 1869 to 1930. The year 1869 was chosen as the beginning date because it was the Constitution of 1869 that mandated the establishment of a public school system by 1876, or as much earlier as practicable, and suggested the creation of normal schools as soon as practicable. The year 1930 was selected as the closing date since it was in that year that the State Board of Education, "in the interest of directness and simplification . . . . (undertook) the immediate supervision of the four State teachers colleges for the training of white teachers and the Virginia State College for

7Ibid., (1924), chap. 15, p. 14; and, Ibid., (1930), chap. 338, p. 768.
Negroes, the one State-supported college for the training of negro teachers."8

Justification

While there are those who believe that a history of education is valuable in its own right as a subject for study, justification for this study goes beyond that and focuses on the need for such a study to be written. While too little has been published about the manner in which educational policies were formulated for the public normal schools in Virginia, there seems to be considerable evidence to support the contention that the social and political forces in Virginia generated the educational policy which determined and structured the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools. While histories of Virginia abound, most of them are general in nature and concentrate on what happened during either the Colonial or Civil War periods. Histories confined to describing education in Virginia are few in number, and also general in nature. Even fewer in number are those that address themselves to specific relationships between particular public educational institutions and the State. For example, Heatwole and Buck surveyed the history of education in Virginia; Moger and Pulley presented the political aspect of this history; Dingedine and Moffett authored institutional histories of two of the normal schools for white women; Jeffreys wrote a Master's Thesis which traced the history of the normal school for Blacks at Petersburg; and, Alvey is

currently compiling an institutional history of the public normal school for white women at Fredericksburg. However, not one of these writers has adequately treated the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools.

Methodology and Procedure

This study represents an historical study. The materials used were drawn from both primary and secondary sources. Basic source materials used in the study were the Virginia Constitutions of 1869 and 1902; the House and Senate Journals and Documents; the correspondence of the various Governors; the Acts of Assembly; the reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction; the official proceedings of the Cooperative Education Association (CEA) and the Virginia Educational Association (VEA); the records, reports, and personal correspondence located in the archives of the five institutions; and pertinent newspaper articles.

The major questions investigated in this study were:

1. What educational policies were formulated by the State of Virginia?"
Virginia for the establishment and development of public normal schools in Virginia during the period 1869-1930?

(2) How and why did social and political forces influence the formulation and subsequent changes in these policies?

This study has been organized into eight chapters. An attempt has been made to preserve the value of the chronological approach, and at the same time to incorporate the advantages of the cultural approach. Chapter II provides the historical perspectives of the period under study. The evolvement of a public school system in Virginia during the period 1869-1882 is discussed in Chapter III. The fourth chapter considers the embryonic stages of the public normal school in Virginia, 1882-1901. The period from 1901 to 1910 is the focus of Chapter V, which describes the adoption of a new Constitution and the educational revival that was responsible for the establishment of three additional normal schools. Chapter VI addresses itself to the trend in centralization, from 1910 to 1924, and its effect on public normal school development in Virginia. A review of the simplification and efficiency efforts of the period 1924-1930, during which the normal schools were transformed into teachers colleges and brought under the direct control of the State Board of Education, constitutes Chapter VII. The general conclusions reached in this study are presented in a final chapter.

Finally, it is suggested that further historical studies of higher education in Virginia are needed. The relationships between the State and the former normal schools after 1930 could be investigated with profit, but more important, perhaps, a comprehensive history of higher education in Virginia remains to be written.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

It is always helpful for the reader if the historian clearly states his point of view, and reveals his value orientation, at the very outset. But, to do this, the historian is confronted with the usual dilemma in historical writing—that of how to present the material objectively that he has selected when his very selection ultimately reflects his personal beliefs and value system. And yet, all historians must come to some judgment of values if the reader is to be given a meaningful picture of the historical events being described. Although this researcher is not possessed of what Butterfield described as "a passionate desire to come to a judgment of values, to make history answer questions and decide issues," neither is he of the opinion that his selection and interpretation can be value-neutral.\(^1\) However, an attempt was made to present an impartial recounting of the facts by integrating the "traditionalist" with the "revisionist" value orientations.

It has been said that "traditional" historians, in tracing the development of public educational institutions, have too often contented themselves with merely presenting an impressive array of factual information, in chronological sequence, to describe the organization,

administration, curriculum and method of a particular institution, giving little or no attention to the relationships of the institution with the cultural milieu from which it developed. Many contemporary historians have attempted to revise this procedure by deemphasizing the chronological sequence and concentrating on the cultural aspects of the development. Consequently, "Some of the institutional histories seem designed to evoke pleasant memories from alumni rather than to provide solid data for the analysis of developments in the institution."\(^2\)

Neither of these two approaches, by themselves, at least in this researcher's opinion, is desirable, yet each has its own special merit. The "traditionalist" (chronological) approach remains one of the distinctive values of the historical method. The "revisionist" (cultural) approach provides an excellent vehicle with which to explain particular sequences of events.

American public educational institutions are responsible to three levels of governmental direction and control—local, state, and national. While most Americans do not question the value of education in society today, they will, at times, argue quite heatedly about which level of government should exercise control over these institutions. Too many times these discussions are carried on without the benefit of historical perspective and without the realization that "the State is the political

arena where the critical decisions are made about educational programs and resources."\(^3\)

**The Cultural Milieu**

The ability to analyze and explain the relationships which developed between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools during the period from 1869 to 1930 is dependent upon an understanding of the conditions that existed in Virginia when those relationships were formed and upon an understanding of the cultural milieu from which those relationships evolved. The cultural milieu of Virginia during this period will be considered and a paradigm provided whereby the interested individual might be enabled to discuss more meaningfully the relationships which developed.\(^4\)

To fully understand what is meant by the term "cultural milieu," a definition of terms seems appropriate. The word "culture," as used in this study, is a much broader term than is usually envisioned. It concerns not only the things of life, but also the ways of life. It includes not only our laws, our value systems, and our books, but also, to a large extent, our likes and dislikes. Members of a culture are bound to it by a degree far greater than they often realize. Members behave in culturally approved or sanctioned ways because they know no


\(^4\)Fred N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964). In a note on p. 275 says that a "paradigm" is a model, or example, but, while the model is also a paradigm, use of the word paradigm evades the value connotation of a "model."
other ways, because their culture is a complex admixture of groups and subgroups that determine the various patterns of behavior for all group members. The anthropologist or sociologist defines culture as the total man-made environment, the non-material as well as the material products of human endeavor. Kluckhohn stated that "by 'culture' anthropology means the total life way of a people, the social legacy the individual acquires from his group. Or culture can be regarded as that part of the environment that is the creation of man." Butts and Cremin described "culture" as "the distinctive way of life of a society, developed in the traditions of the past and living on in the institution, ideas, beliefs and customs of the people." The word "milieu," on the other hand, is a much less complex word, and means, simply, the environment, or the surroundings. Within this context, then, the "cultural milieu" can be viewed as the result of the social and political forces interacting within the environment. For example, the relationships which developed between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools were the result of an educational policy which was determined by the social and political forces interacting within the cultural milieu of Virginia when those relationships were formed.

On occasion it has been argued that the history of American education is one of remarkable progress. What began in the colonial period as an almost exclusively private, family affair became a


thoroughly public affair and was proclaimed by many to be "big business." The business expert will contend that any business must be efficient to be successful. The educational expert will just as invariably insist that "one key to the efficiency of any educational system is always the teacher." It is most certainly true today that teaching is a service of utmost importance to society. Although Americans have always placed a high value on education, no matter what the conception of that value, the average citizen has not always considered teaching to be an honorable and respected calling. Although it was to the teacher to whom the citizen looked for the perpetuation and improvement of society, for many years the average citizen regarded teaching, especially in the elementary and secondary schools, as a profession "entirely appropriate for persons of second- or third-rate ability." Today, however, the teacher and schooling are considered so important to maintain society that all advanced countries require children to be instructed by a teacher for a considerable portion of their maturing years. Although many communities throughout the world exist and flourish without the services of other professionals, "the teacher is everywhere."

---

7Ibid., p. 283.


Social Forces in Virginia

Historians have offered various explanations for the composition and importance of the social forces in Virginia during the period under study. Of particular note in this respect are those of Pulley, Maddex, Heatwole, Gottmann, and Butts and Cremin. Each of these explanations seems to involve the same basic concept of a traditionalism and a conservatism implanted during the colonial period and carried over into the days of Reconstruction and the establishment of a free public school system in Virginia. Pulley, for example, asserted:

It is a basic dictum of sociology that the cultural values, traditions, customs, and historic symbols play an important part in determining the political and social behavior of a people. . . Virginians, perhaps more than any other Americans, have derived their philosophy of life from customs and principles of conduct established many generations ago.10

Maddex addressed this point from a "restoration" and an "adaptation" viewpoint:

Recent discussion of the post-Reconstruction South has centered on its relationship to antebellum Southern society. One interpretation, long popular, has been the tradition of 'Bourbon' continuity—the belief that the dominant elite of the slavery era recovered its ascendancy after Reconstruction, restoring its traditional policies and most of its social institutions. . . The principal alternative interpretation has been the one that C. Vann Woodward has stated: . . . 'Redemption was not a return to an old system nor the restoration of an old ruling class. It was rather a new phase of the revolutionary process begun in 1865.' In the present study, . . . I have concluded . . . their effective leaders were, indeed, a new elite, agents of adaptation instead of restoration.11


Heatwole argued that "Virginia's social and political philosophy was traditionally aristocratic, owing to the dominance of a strong and powerful upper class and the absence of a strong middle class."\(^{12}\)

Gottmann, a French geographer commissioned by the Old Dominion Society to do an in-depth study of Virginia, carried the explanation even further in saying that:

Virginians are proud of their past and delight in their nicknames 'Old Dominion' and 'Cavaliers'. . . . Ever since the seventeenth century there has been a Virginia tradition, a Virginia mode of life, a Virginia spirit that permeates the whole history of the United States.\(^{13}\)

This tradition, this mode of life, and this spirit are distinctly different from those of any other state. The tradition of Virginia, Gottmann added is "individualistic, proud, and aristocratic." And, along with these characteristics goes a "conservatism which is as clear among the hollow-folk as among the Tidewater gentlemen farmers."\(^{14}\)

A more comprehensive explanation than any of the preceding was offered by Butts and Cremin who suggested that because the climate favored the growing of staple subtropical crops such as tobacco and cotton, the plantation came to dominate the Virginia landscape. The plantation represented not only a geographic unit for the production of cotton and tobacco, but, in a fashion, a whole culture—one that literally set the tempo of life in Virginia and inevitably determined


\(^{14}\)Ibid., pp. 535-59.
the pattern of social relationships. The agricultural society that developed around the plantation, thus, was not only aristocratic, but also fostered rigid, immobile class distinctions. A pyramidal class structure emerged, with a small select group of gentlemen landholders at the narrow top and the great mass of slaves at the broad base. In between was a caste-like array of classes—small planters, independent yeomen farmers, and "poor whites"--an arrangement based on the extent, location, and type of landholding.15

Whether one admits to the "restoration" or to the "adaptation" interpretation, it seems clear that although a restoration of traditionalism and conservatism did play a major role in the social reluctance of Virginians to accept the dual premises of equal educational opportunity for all and State support and control of public educational institutions, the ability of Virginians to adapt to changing social and political conditions eventually enabled them to accept the premises of educational opportunity and State support and control of education.

Political Forces in Virginia

The attitude of the aristocracy in Virginia toward the State's honor and their belief in a limited role for the State government must be comprehended to understand the political forces in Virginia after the Civil War. While local government provided the grassroots political power base, the masses were unable to take an effective part in

---

politics because of the social and political system which existed, and because there was no system of general education.16

While historians have not always agreed on the specific causes, most of them seem to agree on the general effect Virginia's aristocratic ideals seemed to have had upon the local governmental structure. For example, Eaton pointed out that "the aristocratic nature of local government in the South should be viewed in the light of English tradition and the lack of education of the masses."17 Heatwole argued that "the titled nobility from England formed the original nucleus of leadership in Virginia, bringing into their political offices English social and political traditions, customs, and ideals."18 Maddox's main thesis was that Virginians struggled against the same influences observable in all the original states during Reconstruction—the acceptance in theory of the political ideals of democracy but the retention in practice of aristocratic notions and institutions.19

Gottmann observed that:

Resistance to change, perhaps more than in other parts of the United States, is certainly characteristic of Virginia. This conservatism has often been explained as resulting from the local political system, from the 'party machine' that controls the Commonwealth's government. . . .

---


18Heatwole, op. cit., p. 4.

Resistance to change is a popular attitude among Virginians . . . . They know that they have been led and governed for a long time by an aristocracy: they feel it right and better to leave the matters of government to the same social group.20

Pulley expressed the same idea only slightly differently when he said that, inherent in the political philosophy of Virginia during this period was the belief that only those who possessed some vital stake in society, such as property or a profession, were qualified to take a leading role in politics.21

Writing in 1949, V. O. Key, Jr., observed that:

Of all the American states, Virginia can lay claim to the most thorough control by an oligarchy. Political power has been closely held by a small group of leaders who, themselves and their predecessors, have subverted democratic institutions and deprived most Virginians of a voice in their government. The Commonwealth presents characteristics more akin to those of England at about the time of the Reform Bill of 1832 than to those of any other state of the present-day South. It is a political museum piece. Yet the little oligarchy that rules Virginia demonstrates a sense of honor, an aversion to open venality, a degree of sensitivity to public opinion, a concern for efficiency in administration, and, so long as it does not cost too much, a feeling of social responsibility. . . . Withal, the Virginia machine is an anachronism. . . . Unlike most southern states, Virginia has had within the Democratic party two fairly well-defined factions. The 'organization' or 'Machine' is the dominant faction. The antiorganization group, which constitutes the opposition, is extraordinarily weak, has few leaders of ability, and is more of a hope than a reality.22

20Gottmann, op. cit., pp. 555-56.
21Pulley, op. cit., p. 8.
Moger seemed to support these contentions in stating that "State policy in Virginia during this period was the result of tradition, conservative principles, political expediency, and grasping self-interest."^{23}

Wherein lies the "genius" of Virginia politics? Boorstin saw the "genius" of American politics in the fact that it has no theory and is unique in two respects: (1) no attempt has been made to "sell" it to other nations; and, (2) it is continuously adapting to changes.{^24}

If an analogy is to be drawn here, it would seem that the "genius" of Virginia politics then, is the "genius of the Democratic organization--an indigenous conservatism continuing to function through delayed responses to change."^{25} "That the Democratic organization through the years has provided a dignified and reasonably honest government has undoubtedly been a source of pride to many Virginians."^{26} Whether the success of the State's political system has been: (1) largely a matter of its history and tradition; (2) an adaptation to changing conditions; or, (3) simply the result of a restricted electorate is still a matter to be decided.

---

^{23}Moger, op. cit., p. 13.


^{26}Moger, op. cit., p. 358.
Educational Policy in Virginia

At the present, very little empirical data is available to explain how educational policy is developed. However, Lindblom, Kimbrough, Eidenberg and Morey, Usdan, et al., Wahlke, et al., and Conant have provided a degree of information about the policy-making process. In light of their findings, two questions seem appropriate at this time in this study: (1) Where does the power to make decisions about educational policy reside in Virginia? and, (2) How is that power exercised in making educational policy decisions? The obvious answer to the first question would seem to be in the State Legislature. But, does this power actually reside in the Legislature? It is one of the aims of this study to answer that question.

The Public Policy Process

"As a structure of power, the legislature is functionally interdependent with other structures of power in the political system—the executive establishment, the political parties, the gamut of interest groups, and the aggregate of constituencies, to name only the most significant. Of course, these relations are subject to numerous constitutional requirements and limitations . . . . forever subject to changing conditions."28 "Most people—even poets and ballet dancers—know a good deal about policy making. They know, for example, that the immediate responsibility for policy making has to be delegated to officials, that


interest-group and party leaders greatly influence these officials, and that the rest of us play less active, though not insignificant, roles in the policy-making drama.\textsuperscript{29} Succinctly stated:

The essence of the public policy process, as we see it, is alternate conflict and cooperation over matters that make a difference to the individuals and the groups involved. In short, the policy process is neither random nor accidental in its major components. Those who play important roles in policy making have access because they have the skills, expertise, and/or power to participate.\textsuperscript{30}

\textbf{Educational Policy Making}

One of the myths that has stood in the way of understanding how the educational policy-making process actually operates at the State level is the insistence by many people that education and politics should not mix.\textsuperscript{31} And yet, "How and why a 'bill' becomes a 'law' has long fascinated the political imagination."\textsuperscript{32} How and why a particular educational policy was formulated can also be intriguing, since "the policy system that contributes to the making of educational policy is primarily an elite of individuals and groups who have a right to participate in the decisions affecting public education, based upon recognition of their particular interests in the issue. The extent and depth of that interest obviously varies from group to group and from time


\textsuperscript{31}Usdan, et al., \textit{op. cit.}, p. vii.

\textsuperscript{32}Wahlke, et al., \textit{op. cit.}, p. 237.
Conant supported this viewpoint with his comment that:
"I think it is easy to demonstrate that educational policy for our public schools has been largely determined by educators concerned directly with the schools."34

Although Lindblom addressed the issue of policy making and political science as a discipline, and Conant, Eidenberg and Morey treated educational policy making at the national level, their observations seem just as pertinent to State educational policy systems as those of Kimbrough, Usdan and Wahlke.

The power to make educational decisions in Virginia during the period 1869-1930 also resided in a policy-making system for education whose principal representatives formed an elite that shaped educational policy, and thus contributed significantly to the evolution of the public normal schools in Virginia. This educational policy system worked within the framework of the State Constitutions of 1869 and 1902 and consisted of the Governor, the legislators, highly-concerned educators, various interest groups, and the press. How such power was exercised constitutes the bulk of the discourse to follow.

33Eidenberg and Morey, op. cit., p. 4.

CHAPTER III

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IN VIRGINIA

(1869-1882)

The Civil War brought devastation and destruction to Virginia, and many troubled years passed during which Virginia was to lose and then regain her status as a member of the United States. Once her status as a member of the Union was lost, Virginia was forced to accept Negroes as free men and to extend to them educational opportunity in the form of a public school system to regain it. It is the aim of this chapter to describe briefly the events that led to the establishment of a public free school system in Virginia which set the stage for the emergence of public normal schools.

The Role of the State in Education

The final authority for education rests with the State. In each State, the people adopt a Constitution which may assign responsibilities for education and define the powers of any agencies created to implement a system of education. It is the Legislature, working within the framework of the State Constitution, that establishes the State's responsibilities for education. A Legislature not only determines the entire structure and organization of the State's educational system, it may also delegate power to the various agencies with responsibilities
for education. While local school districts are creations of the State, and thus subject to control by the State, in actual practice, Legislatures have established both State agencies and local school districts which share joint responsibility for the education of its citizens.

One of the most bitterly fought controversies in Virginia during the decades immediately following the Civil War pertained to the role of the State in the support and control of education. Three positions were considered. One position held that the State was fully responsible for providing whatever educational facilities were necessary to satisfy the needs of the people; thus, the State should sponsor schools from the earliest grades through the university. A second position saw the State as having a limited role, i.e., it could furnish and control schools up to a certain level or for certain special groups such as orphans or paupers and any institution above that level should be private. A third position maintained that the State had no responsibility at all in sponsoring and controlling education; any attempts to do so would violate the rights of parenthood and would thus be a most dangerous over-extension of the State's power. "Within the scope of these three proposals fell most of the arguments dealing with the problem of educational control."¹ Beginning with the outset of the Civil War, Virginia evolved, albeit slowly, from the position of no-role to the limited-role position concerning the relationship of the State to education. For understandable reasons during the war years, little attention was given to the

responsibility of the State for the support and control of education. The elements of traditionalism and conservatism proved to be formidable barriers that had to be overcome before a public school system could emerge.

Reconstruction "ushered in one of those periods of political and social struggle which make a necessity and a virtue of the besetting desire of the historian to make history answer questions and decide issues." In the last three decades of the nineteenth century, new political leaders emerged in Virginia. Businessmen, railroad executives, financiers, and corporation lawyers replaced the farmers and country lawyers as party spokesmen. The political issues they faced were new. More than 100,000 Negroes without even a reasonable degree of formal education had been added to the electorate, who would have to be educated to their new responsibilities. Rival parties began to alternate their actions between trying to win the support of the Negro voters and trying to keep them from voting. The resulting modification and reshaping of attitudes during the period 1869-1882 was a big help in removing some of the obstacles that stood in the way of developing a public school system in Virginia. And, the public school system had to be established and developed before a need would exist for the public normal school.

---


Neither the Underwood Constitution of 1869, which had clearly mandated the establishment of a "uniform system of public free schools,"^4 nor the Act of Assembly in 1870 which established that system,^5 can be interpreted as indisputable evidence that Virginians had begun to embrace the ideal of full responsibility for the educational needs of all citizens. "To a large extent, Virginians have kept in their educational system a love of the past and a deep respect for established authority based on a traditional social hierarchy. . . Education has always been treated in Virginia as being actually needed only for an upper stratum of society, and public schools have not been very popular here."^6 Such statements seem to indicate that Virginia possessed a cultural milieu in which the social and political forces seldom change. However, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the social forces interacting with the political forces within the cultural milieu in Virginia immediately after the Civil War differed markedly from ante-bellum days--perhaps due largely to the fact that most of the traditional leaders had been temporarily disfranchised as a result of their participation in the War against the Union. As Knight pointed out:

The final effect of the war was stimulating to education in the South though the change was so sudden as to bring temporary evil and to produce certain retarding results. The complete overthrow of a social order, which was superficial and which rested on an industrial structure

^4Virginia, Constitution (1869), art. 8, sec. 3, as it is printed in Virginia Acts of Assembly, 1869-70, p. 625.
itself an economic fallacy, stimulated the ideal of universal and free education—an ideal which never grows in communities of caste and class.

While the Underwood Constitution is a distinctive landmark in Virginia's history as the first unequivocal mandate for a public school system, before a public school system could be established and developed, and thus a need for teacher-training institutions generated, Virginia was destined to pass through an agonizing experience known as Reconstruction.

Virginia After the Civil War

The Underwood Constitution was an instrument of Reconstruction. It was the outcome of a Congressional mandate to provide for the social and political equality of the Negro in the South. But before consideration is given to the impact of the Reconstruction years on Virginia, the years immediately prior to Reconstruction should be examined.

The problems facing Virginia after the Civil War (social, political, and economic) were many and varied, but, to many Virginians, the most important question was how to honorably settle the State's debts. The Legislature, faced with these problems in December 1865 is said to have been the last one completely characteristic of ante-bellum Virginia. And, as Phillips related:

---


10Richmond Enquirer, March 3, 1866, p. 4.
Virginia resumed her governmental activities after the war...with an ultraconservative legislature which thought in terms of ante-bellum Virginia, despite the afflictions that war had brought. This Body was dominated by the sole consideration of state honor and of 'restoring the State's credit,' in its deliberations.\textsuperscript{11}

In this connection, it appears that two alternatives, either one of which could have been honorably followed in seeking an acceptable solution to the debt problem, were available to this Legislature: (1) Action could have been delayed until West Virginia had paid her just share of the debt; or, (2) the State could have declared bankruptcy and sought an equitable settlement with its creditors. "Fiscal integrity" and "State's honor" seem to have won out for after initiating correspondence with West Virginia officials urging payment of her share of the debt and reunion with Virginia, the Legislature on March 2, 1866, unanimously assumed full responsibility for the principal of the pre-War debt and authorized the issuance of bonds to cover the interest which had accumulated during the war.\textsuperscript{12}

This action did not settle the debt question, for it was to surface again in the second session of the same Legislature. It did, however, presage some of the difficulties educators would experience in attempting to establish a public school system. When the debt question came before the General Assembly a second time, conditions had changed little. State officials in West Virginia had taken no action, and


\textsuperscript{12}Virginia, \textit{Acts of Assembly} (1865-66), p. 79. Also see Allen W. Moger, \textit{Virginia: Bourbonism to Byrd, 1870-1925} (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968), and Pearson, \textit{op. cit.}
Virginia's creditors were insistent on being paid the money due them. Suggestions were offered in many quarters about "scaling it down," which, to a loyal Virginian, meant "repudiating" the debt. To counter such sentiments, a "Joint Resolution in Regard to Repudiation" was adopted December 20, 1866:

Whereas the public credit of the State of Virginia and the credit of our citizens has been injured, . . . therefore, 1. Resolved, That the general assembly will pass no such acts of repudiation. 2. Resolved, That such legislation would be no less destructive of our future prosperity than of our credit, our integrity and our honor.13

Referring to this Resolution, Pearson commented:

Similarly, . . . acts of this legislature (1866-1867) showed it to be following old prevailing tendencies, often failing to grasp or deliberately ignoring new conditions. No attempt was made to compel an equitable compromise of old private debts, the security for which was gone in whole or in part. Instead acts merely staying their collection until 1869 were passed. . . . Though the balance between debt and assets had been fearfully upset, this legislature recognized the debt as absolutely binding and tried to provide for interest payment. Most of the railroad assets, it permitted to pass into private hands but under careful restrictions. It made no provision for schools or for charities.14

Reconstruction in Virginia

During this same period, events were slowly building up to Reconstruction. After the national election of 1866, the radical Republicans were in control of Congress. They favored a harsh post-war policy against the defeated South, and they had the necessary votes to override any Presidential veto.


Reconstruction, as the term is known in American history, was the attempt of the majority in Congress to compel the Southern States to recognize the civil and political equality of the colored race. Such a program, in States where the two races were nearly equal in numbers, would necessarily produce the most novel and perplexing social and political phenomena.15

Stampp viewed the period somewhat differently:

In Virginia much of the history of Reconstruction concerns the rivalry of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the Southside line for control of the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad. Both lines fought to control elections and legislators and backed whichever party promised to serve them, until, in 1870, the legislature ended the dispute by approving the consolidation plans of the Southside.16

The Richmond Dispatch, recounting this phase of the railroad question facing Virginians in 1870, commented that, with the restoration of Virginia to the Union in January 1870, the consolidation question was renewed, and resulted in "the most terrific legislative railroad fight ever known in the history of Virginia."17 While this facet of Reconstruction would be an interesting one to pursue, this study will limit

15Hamilton J. Eckenrode, "The Political Reconstruction of Virginia," Johns Hopkins University Studies, XXII (1904), 339. Also F. A. Magruder, "Recent Administration in Virginia," Johns Hopkins University Studies, XXX (1912), 17, who said that at this time, numerically, near-equality had been reached in Virginia, and that for 700,000 whites to "educate themselves and 500,000 colored was a Herculean task in view of the prostrate economic condition of the State." The US Census of 1860 listed Virginia with a population of 1,600,000, of which about one-third was Negro, and only about 7% of the total white population over 21 as unable to read or write.


17Richmond Dispatch, October 9, 1895, p. 4.
itself to the social and political aspects of the period as it affected public education in Virginia.18

Historians who have "made decisions and come to a judgment of values" about Reconstruction have provided two basic interpretative patterns. The traditional pattern interprets the period as a time when attempts to restore white supremacy were dominant. The corruption and abuses of government under carpetbagger and Negro domination were emphasized. The more recent "revisionist" interpretation, which stresses the constructive social and political developments, suggests that honesty and dishonesty were not the monopoly of any single group during the period.19

When the southern states seemed determined to preserve white supremacy in the form of "Black Codes," even though the Negro had been emancipated, Congress passed a Civil Rights Act of 1866 which conferred the full rights of citizenship on the Negro. Congress apparently doubted the constitutionality of this act, for it immediately proposed instead the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment--a constitutional guarantee of the rights of Negroes which also barred certain southern leaders from holding public office, validated the northern and invalidated the southern Civil War debt. When Virginia and the other southern

---

18For a comprehensive treatment of this aspect, see Allen W. Moger, "Railroad Practices and Policies in Virginia After the Civil War," The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, LIX (October, 1951), No. 4, 423-57.

19Rozwenc, op. cit., pp. v-xi.
states refused to ratify this Amendment, Congress responded with the Reconstruction Acts of 1867. 20

The First Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, stripped Virginia of her treasured name and converted her into Military District Number One. The psychological impact of such an event is difficult to assess, even with the benefit of more than a century of hindsight. It is probably true, as Blake asserted, that "the loyal Virginians felt that no greater dishonor could possibly have come to the State." 21 In one respect, it seems that Virginia was fortunate in that the man who was placed in command, General John M. Schofield, used what were almost unlimited powers most reasonably. On assuming control of the State eleven days after the Act was passed, General Schofield appealed to "the people of Virginia and especially to the magistrates and officers, to render the necessity for the exercise of this power as slight as possible by strict obedience to the laws and by impartial administration of justice to all classes." 22 The people of Virginia responded by passing a Joint Resolution pledging the cooperation of authorities and the people of Virginia. 23

A Second Reconstruction Act of March 23, 1867, clearly granted the right of suffrage to all freedmen. The Negroes, long under the

20 Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 296.
22 Richmond Enquirer, March 14, 1867, p. 1.
23 Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1866-67), chap. 31, pp. 802-03.
dominance of the planter class, would most probably have united with their former masters and voted at their direction, according to Blake, if outsider influences, pressure by Union soldiers, northern settlers, and itinerant politicians, had not been brought to bear on them.24

Reconstruction in Virginia was, in large measure, an unfortunate chapter in Virginia's history. The conditions under which Virginia had to seek restoration to the Union were an overt design of Congress to insure Virginia's allegiance to the Federal government and to assure the establishment of a State Constitution embodying the principles of a republican form of government. Thus, a new constitution which guaranteed all Negroes a vote and at the same time restricted the vote of those Virginians who had been disfranchised by the Fourteenth Amendment had to be framed and ratified by popular vote; and, the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments also had to be approved by the voters of the State.

The convention called to frame such a Constitution met in Richmond on December 3, 1867.25 Of the 105 members, 72 were Radicals and 33 were Conservatives. Eckenrode asserted that "this convention was the most remarkable political assembly that ever met in Virginia," and went on to state that "it was the first legislative body in the history of the State in which Negroes sat as members." He then concluded that the little harmony evident was because "the old, long-dominant planter class, which had governed the State through its previous history, was now without power," and that the Constitution which resulted was framed

24Blake, op. cit., p. 96.

by Radicals, Negroes and whites, who were, for the most part, not even native Virginians. Pearson argued that "none the less, both its acts and its membership indicated, in however absurdly exaggerated form, social forces released or newly created that would have to be dealt with in the future." It is worthy to note that while many of the pre-Civil War leaders in Virginia--those who had given their allegiance to the Confederacy--had been temporarily disfranchised by the Reconstruction Acts, two clauses in the final draft of the Constitution, if approved, would have made that disfranchisement permanent, a situation few Virginians hoped would not materialize.

When it appeared that no action would be taken, General Schofield compelled the convention to adjourn on April 17, 1868, by stopping payment of the salaries and expenses of its members. However, before they disbanded, they adopted the Underwood Constitution by a vote of 51 to 36. They also called for a popular referendum to be held on June 2, 1868, to consider its adoption. General Schofield then exercised his "almost unlimited powers" and postponed the referendum indefinitely. As a consequence, Virginians, during the summer and fall of 1868, were faced with two alternative courses of action. First, they could accept the Underwood Constitution which, to many of them, meant relinquishing

---

26Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 87.

27Pearson, op. cit., pp. 17-19. Under these clauses, the franchise would be denied to thousands of Confederate leaders (more even than Congress had disfranchised), and no one could hold office or serve as a juror until he had sworn that he had not supported the Confederacy. Under these circumstances, it is fairly easy to understand why so much opposition was generated by these two clauses.

control of the State to illiterate Negroes and white groups; or second, they could prolong the military control that seemed degrading to the average Virginian who was so long accustomed to self-government. This dilemma was resolved by President Grant, who recommended to Congress on April 7, 1869, that the voters of Virginia be authorized to accept or reject the Underwood Constitution, and to vote separately on the disfranchising and test oath clauses. Three days later Congress accepted this recommendation and set July 6 as the day on which the referendum would be held. A majority of white Virginians seemed eager to end Reconstruction as quickly as possible, seemingly not doubting their ability to work out a way to control the electorate once restoration was complete. On election day there were 149,781 whites and 120,103 blacks registered to vote in Virginia. The Constitution was adopted by a vote of 210,585 to 9,136; the disfranchising clause was rejected by a vote of 124,360 to 84,410; and, the test oath clause by a vote of 124,714 to 83,458. Gilbert C. Walker won the governorship on the "True Republican" State ticket. The party also won the battle for seats in the General Assembly, seating 18 Negro Radical Republicans and 3 Negro Conservatives in the House of Delegates, and 6 Negro Radical Republicans in the Senate—a somewhat smaller proportion of Negroes than had sat in the convention. Thus, a white conservative majority was able to control the application of the Underwood Constitution, and


30Hemphill, Schlegel, and Engelberg, op. cit., p. 353.

31Code of Virginia (1873), p. 28.
to determine State policy—a policy Moger viewed as "the result of tradition, conservative principles, political expediency, and grasping self-interest." Accordingly, the General Assembly which began its session on October 5, 1869, ratified, on October 8, both Constitutional Amendments, the Fourteenth by a vote of 36 to 4 in the Senate; 126 to 6 in the House; and, the Fifteenth by a vote of 40 to 2 in the Senate; unanimously in the House. By these last two acts, Virginia fulfilled the Congressional mandate for readmission. The following day Military District Number One was dissolved and Reconstruction had ended officially.

"The reconstruction constitution was framed by adventurers in the interests of the 'mud sills of society.'" Its end was to create complete equality through such means as State support of common schools, universal manhood suffrage and jury service, taxation according to wealth, and an increased number of elective local offices. It was sponsored by the "Radicals," or Republicans, and opposed by the "Bourbons," the advocates of traditional policies. A new party, the "Conservatives," added their support to the Republicans as a matter of expediency in ratification. This combination of "Radicals" and "Conservatives" was "effected by city capitalistic leaders, and to this coalition was entrusted the inauguration of the new regime." "By passing from reasonably good military rule directly into the hands

---

33Richmond Enquirer, October 6-8, 1867, for details.
34Pearson, op. cit., p. 12.
of a government controlled by white conservatives, Virginia was able to
avoid a period of reconstruction such as occurred in most of the other
southern states."35

Whether one accepts the "traditional" or "revisionist" interpretation, Reconstruction was a landmark in Virginia's history because of
the powerful influence it had upon the political behavior of white
men in both the North and the South and the serious consequences that
resulted from it. Simkins referred to Reconstruction as the "great
American race question"; but, whether Reconstruction in Virginia was
a "blackout" of honest government resulting from political rule by
ignorant Negroes and villainous white carpetbaggers and scalawags, or
a number of "quietly constructive" political and social achievements
which are not adequately reflected by the "blackout" interpretation, is
still open to debate.36 It is apparent, however, that as ideas about
race have changed, historians have increasingly revised their interpre-
tations of Reconstruction in Virginia.37 Eckenrode summed it up quite
well with these words:

Reconstruction had for its ultimate purposes proven
a failure. For it was the desire of Congress and the aim
of the radical politicians in Virginia to place the two
races on an equality of rights and privileges—to abolish
the belief of the white man in the essential inferiority
of the black. They thought that a democracy should no more

35Moger, Bourbonism to Byrd, p. 12.

36See Francis B. Simkins, "New Viewpoints of Southern Recon-
struction," Journal of Southern History, V (February, 1939), 49-61;
and, E. Merton Coulter, The South During Reconstruction (Baton Rouge:
Louisiana State University Press, 1947), pp. 139-161 for details of
these two views.

37See Stampp, op. cit., for a complete discussion.
recognize racial distinctions than real class distinctions. And so they had endeavored with motives high and low to break down the separation of the races. It was impossible that any such attempt should succeed. But reason was lost in the humanitarian enthusiasm of the times. Men had such faith in the power of literary education that they thought it could raise, in a day, the black folk to the level of the white. The radicals indeed gained the privilege of suffrage for the freedmen, but it remained purely isolated. The negro might not hold office, serve on juries and exercise the other political functions of citizens. There were no actual prohibitions of these things for the colored people, but a general agreement existed among the conservative whites that they should not enjoy them. And the white men have used all the devices of politics to prevent the local supremacy of the blacks in portions of the State where they held the majority. 38

Education in Virginia

"The Act of Congress by which Virginia was readmitted to the Union in 1870 provided that 'the Constitution of Virginia shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the school rights and privileges secured by the constitution of said State.'" 39 The Underwood Constitution of 1869 stipulated that "The general assembly shall provide by law, at its first session under this constitution, a uniform system of public free schools, and for its gradual, equal, and full introduction into all the counties of the state by the year eighteen hundred and seventy-six, or as much earlier as practicable," and also that "The general assembly shall establish, as soon as practicable, normal schools." 40 Such wording

38Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 127.
40Virginia, Constitution (1869), art. VIII, sec. 3 and sec. 5.
was not meant to insinuate that Reconstruction brought about the first attempt of Virginia to provide for the educational needs of her citizens, for, as Knight so pointedly remarked, while the educational influence of the Civil War and Reconstruction in Virginia was very clear, the "educational efforts of that State were not inconsiderable before 1860." Most students of the history of education in America are familiar with the early attempts to provide for the educational needs of the common man, as evidenced by the Massachusetts Bay Law of 1642 and the "Old Deluder Satan" Act of 1647 in the New England States, as well as the English "Poor" and "Apprenticeship" Laws of the southern states. Often the importance of these early school laws is exaggerated. However, while it may be easy to exaggerate the importance of such laws, it is almost impossible to ignore the certain significant points they established. The State could require education; the State could require towns to maintain teachers; civil authorities could supervise and control schools; and public funds could be used to support education. Although it may be an oversimplification to suggest that these laws anticipated the publicly supported and state supervised schools that were established later, their impact certainly cannot be completely discounted. Such laws at least seem to attest to the fact that literacy was considered to be an important part of the nation's cultural milieu.

---

41 Knight, op. cit., p. 4.
The idea of education as a State function evolved rather slowly in Virginia, as it had elsewhere in the United States. "Before 1776 in Virginia there were very few ideals and there was very little legislation in regard to educational matters." Educational legislation concerned itself mainly with the organization of a college, with the initiative for education coming from the Governor. Ideals were embodied in a social and political philosophy that was traditionally aristocratic, attributable mostly to the absence of a strong middle class, and the exploitation by the aristocracy of a large mass of "poor whites." Public education was viewed by the aristocracy as for paupers only, a sort of charity, and, until the middle class became strong and powerful, there was no place for a system of public education in Virginia. The upper class in Virginia enjoyed reasonably good opportunities for giving their children an education through the tutoring system, until this gave way to the "old field" schools and academies. "The real problem ... was to provide public schools for the sons and daughters of the yeomen and poor whites." Knight identified the influence of Jefferson and his "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge" in 1779, the school laws of 1796, 1818, 1829, and 1846, plus the establishment of the Literary Fund in 1811 (sic) as educational endeavors prior to the


Civil War worthy of note in this connection. Maddox singled out the Law of 1796, the Acts of 1818, 1829, and 1846 as earnest efforts to "move rapidly toward a state system of free schools," in spite of such handicaps as the tendency to maintain distinctions in the education of the rich and poor; the fear that change in education would involve danger in civil government; and, the dread of taxation. Phillips contended that:

Beginning after the Revolution, establishment of a public school system in Virginia may be said to have fallen under three rather well-defined attempts, the last of which was crowned with success in the year of 1870, when the then designated 'Yankee system' was adopted and placed into operation. . . . The first outstanding effort . . . the Bill of 1818 . . . The second attempt occurred in 1846 . . . the third and successful attempt, as indicated, came in 1870.

In concluding this line of argument, Superintendent Stearnes observed that:

We are now in the very midst of the last of five great efforts which Virginia has made to secure a satisfactory system of schools. I shall call this the Twentieth Century Effort. The other four efforts had their respective beginnings in 1796, 1818, 1846, and 1870.

These depositions notwithstanding, there was still considerable opposition to establishing a public free school system in Virginia in 1870. The opposition came from three main sources: First, a strong

---

46Knight, op. cit., p. 4.
47Maddox, op. cit., pp. 72-127.
sentiment in favor of church schools; second, hostility among both the well-to-do and the poorer classes against the element of charity in such a system; and, third, a general feeling that the State's economic resources could not support it. In spite of the clear mandate from the Underwood Constitution, a uniform system of public free schools materialized rather slowly in Virginia. The normal schools, which were to be established "as soon as practicable," were delayed even longer.

A Public School System for Virginia

Agitation for public education through common schooling became a popular movement in the United States during the nineteenth century, and until the Civil War disrupted the usual pattern of life, Virginia, too, had been slowly evolving toward a system of public free schools. Many historians, some southerners included, have credited Virginia's Radicals with framing the Underwood Constitution and establishing a free public school system in Virginia. A few historians, however, have disagreed with this viewpoint. Dabney, for one, countered with the contention that the Radicals were responsible for the form of the Constitution and the school bill by citing the role played by Sears of the

50 Magruder, op. cit., p. 17.

Peabody Board, the large majority of conservative Virginians in the General Assembly, and the plan submitted by Ruffner and Minor, as proof "that the whole thing, beginning with the constitutional provisions and the act of Assembly, was the work of conservative Virginians and not of the Radicals." Moger cited these events from a different viewpoint: "Virginians would live under a 'reconstruction constitution' which had been framed by radicals for a political democracy, but Conservatives would control its application and determine state policies." It seems that one would not be too far out of line to insist that Virginia had followed the national pattern in establishing a public school system. Four major phases in the establishment of state supported and controlled public education in the United States have been identified. The first phase began with the passage of permissive legislation at the state level. Morrison's explanation of the Virginia School Law of 1829 fits this category. In the second phase, the States encouraged the formation of school districts by providing monies from a general school fund if a district agreed to support public schools. The description provided by Morrison of the Acts of 1846 seems to be a good example of this phase in Virginia. The third phase involved a mandate from the State to establish school districts, with no provision for adequate support.

52 Dabney, op. cit., pp. 149-50.
53 Moger, Bourbonism to Byrd, p. 12.
54 Morrison, op. cit., p. 11.
This was the case with Virginia's 1870 school act.\(^5^6\) The fourth phase involved compulsory and completely tax-supported schools, a phase Virginia would pass through at a much later date.\(^5^7\)

The public free school system which went into effect in Virginia in the fall of 1870 was, of necessity, a highly centralized one. This centralization was "a matter of expediency, a means of forcing upon the people a system which the majority of influential whites did not favor."\(^5^8\) Its administrators were a State Board of Education, a Superintendent of Public Instruction, division superintendents, and district trustees. The State Board of Education included the Governor, the Attorney-General, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. While given the power to invest and distribute the monies in the Literary Fund, the Second Auditor, a special officer created to take charge of the State debt and special funds, remained the custodian of the Fund.\(^5^9\) The State Superintendent of Public Instruction was elected by a joint ballot of the General Assembly for a period of four years.\(^6^0\) The division superintendents and the district trustees were appointed by the State Board of Education, with the consent of the Senate. In 1871 district trustees were organized into corporate bodies known as county school boards consisting of the county superintendents and all of the district trustees.


\(^{57}\)Gutek, *op. cit.*, p. 53.


of that county. Under this new plan for public schools, money for their support was to be provided from several sources—the annual interest on the Literary Fund; a capitation tax of one dollar; an annual tax upon the property of the State of not less than one mill nor more than five mills; and, those counties and districts which wanted to do so could raise additional monies for the schools by assessing an additional property tax.

Perhaps the most outstanding individual involved in the establishment of a public school system in Virginia was the man who was selected to prepare and present the plan and supervise the application of its provisions for more than a decade—William H. Ruffner. Pearson referred to him as "a man of broad intelligence, marked administrative ability, and indomitable energy," contending that: "Thus at once the schools were removed from the influence of ordinary politics and the foundation was laid for a system surprisingly good and destined to rapidly increase in popularity." In writing of the law which established "A Uniform System of Public Free Education in Virginia," Knight extolled Ruffner's qualifications to serve as the first Superintendent of Public Instruction in the following manner:

The excellencies of the law are no less remarkable than the rapidity with which the bill was drawn and presented. In twenty-three days after qualifying as superintendent Ruffner had prepared and presented to the assembly

---


62 Virginia, Constitution (1869), sec. 8, as it is printed in the 1869-70 Acts of Assembly, p. 625; also see the 1870-71 Acts of Assembly, chap. 193, pp. 274-84.

63 Pearson, op. cit., p. 60.
a bill, which with only a few slight alterations, was readily enacted and which combined many features of a modern school system.64

Magruder remarked that:

From 1870 until 1905 the General Assembly elected only one noteworthy superintendent of public instruction; and it did not elect him originally, but twice confirmed him. The reference is to Superintendent Ruffner (1870-1882) who was practically named by General Robert E. Lee. 65

Superintendent Ruffner had to overcome many obstacles in building, staffing, and maintaining the public school system in Virginia, obstacles stemming from an interaction of the social and political forces within Virginia's cultural milieu.66 Most historians would agree that the issue basic to the political problems in Virginia in the 1870's was her public debt, the resolution of which was to cause a new division of political parties and a diversion of funds from the schools. The Conservative party, or "Bourbons," became so closely identified with the full-payment policy that its members were often referred to as the "Funders," and

64Knight, op. cit., p. 14.

65Magruder, op. cit., p. 26 and 16n. "William Henry Ruffner, the 'Horace Mann' of the South, was born in 1824 at Lexington, Virginia, where his father was president of Washington College. There he received the degree of bachelor of arts at the age of eighteen, when he delivered an oration on the 'Power of Knowledge.' Three years later he received the degree of master of arts. He became a leader in Christian and temperance work; studied theology at Hampden-Sydney and at Princeton; was chaplain at the University of Virginia; married in 1850; was pastor of the Seventh Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. On account of ill health from overwork he retired to a Virginia farm. He was opposed to slavery, though he was never disloyal to his State. From 1870 to 1882 he was superintendent of public instruction; he was superintendent of Virginia's first State Normal School from 1884 to 1886; he retired near Lexington, and died in 1908."

payment of the debt, in the eyes of most Conservative leaders was more important than implementing fully the new public school system. Educated privately themselves, they had little sympathy for the public schools, schools they looked down upon as "pauper schools." Other Virginians, primarily those from the Southwest and the Southside, placed their emphasis on a reduction, or readjustment, of the debt and broke away to form what was to be called the Readjuster party through which they could more forcibly press their demands.

Memories of Reconstruction, experiences with the Freedmen's Bureau, the constant meddling in State affairs by the dominant party in Congress, especially the attempted passage of Sumner's Civil Rights Bill in 1874 which would have enforced mixed schools, all combined to turn public opinion against the public school system. "The fear of mixed schools caused many people of Virginia to oppose every proposal for the public schools."

In the meantime, Ruffner had incurred the wrath of several legislators and thus was faced with an uphill battle for reappointment in 1874. His insistent efforts on behalf of Negro education, for example, had always received a very "cool" reception among legislators who resented Ruffner's refusal to appoint "their" men to school offices. Many Virginians deplored his attempts to garner Federal funds to

---


68 Hemphill, Schlegel, and Engelberg, op. cit., p. 374.

supplement inadequate State support as certain to bring "humiliation first, and a precedent for intolerable aggression afterward."\textsuperscript{70} A few also resented his optional textbook policy because of the personal revenues they lost—authors and publishers leading the opposition. But, perhaps his greatest opposition came from those who did not agree with his consistent argument that the State was able to pay both the debt and the school costs. In the end, however, "Ruffner's supporters had secured enough votes to renominate him. On January 6, 1874, the General Assembly confirmed the nomination."\textsuperscript{71}

To further complicate matters, the four-year period from 1874-78 was one of the most painful and difficult in the history of the State. It was marked by the collapse of credit, the stagnation of industry, the prohibitive price of money, and the general, nation-wide depression.\textsuperscript{72} It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that the chief reason for the poor support of the schools during this period was Virginia's poverty and State policy on the debt. Under the Funding Act, the interest on the new debt principal just about equalled the estimated revenues less the minimum appropriated by the Legislature for public schools. Little remained for government expenses. Thus, faced with the choice of using either the interest or the monies appropriated for use by the schools to pay government expenses, the choice was easy for those who lacked any real enthusiasm for "public free schools." Their chief argument in

\textsuperscript{70}Fraser, op. cit., p. 272, quoting Minor's letter to Ruffner.

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid., p. 279.

\textsuperscript{72}Blake, op. cit., p. 145.
defense of their actions was "the preservation of the state's integrity and honor," for, to the leaders of this period the idea of fiscal integrity and State's honor completely overshadowed any concept of the need for education of the people. Governor Kemper expressed these sentiments clearly in his message of December 1877:

In an issue of life and death between the State and the school system, is it to be said that the State must perish and the schools survive? . . . if the claims of the school department upon the funds of the general treasury constitute a lien paramount to every other . . . then, the sooner it is shorn of its dangerous supremacy the better.  

"Obviously, the Funder-Conservatives chose to sacrifice public education, rather than to readjust the debt."  

Sectionalism was also to play a part in the struggle for public schools, as it always had. In the western and middle counties, with few slaves and a rapidly developing middle class, schools were highly favored. In the eastern counties, where extremes between the aristocratic and poorer classes were very pronounced, the rapid establishment of schools met stiff resistance. Illustrating this point, Maddex quoted an item from the Staunton Vindicator on January 12, 1877, in which a farmer reportedly told his legislator: "Kill the public schools, will you? Do it if you dare and this will be your last winter in Richmond."  

Thus, Ruffner "laid the foundations that irrevocably committed Virginia, a state which lacked a tradition of common schooling, to a...

73 Moger, Bourbonism to Byrd, pp. 27-29.  
74 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1876-77), pp. 10-11.  
75 Moger, Bourbonism to Byrd, p. 29.  
76 Maddex, op. cit., p. 213.
system of public schools for all the people. But the obstacles Ruffner encountered during his first term of office and his near defeat in caucus when up for reelection foreshadowed the herculean tasks which lay ahead and the powerful opposition which would eventually sacrifice Virginia's apostle of education on the altar of political expediency. "77 And so, Blake postulated, these deplorable conditions eventually and inevitably led to the Readjuster movement in Virginia.78

Readjusterism Comes to Virginia

To most historians who wrote about this period, Readjusterism represented a deep-seated dissatisfaction with traditionalism and conservatism. Even if this is an accurate interpretation of the movement in Virginia, such dissatisfaction did not manifest itself overnight. In speaking of the events which led to the Readjuster movement in Virginia, Knight proclaimed that: "It was evident, as early as 1876, that the force of the will of the people was at work," and since the men and the party had failed to capitalize on their opportunities to further the cause of public education, they were "tried and condemned at the bar of public opinion, and removed from power by the verdict of the people" in 1877.79 McDanel saw other forces at work, saying that while "the Readjuster Movement was, at first, purely a party struggle, ... it soon attracted many white Republicans and the possibility of securing the

77 Fraser, op. cit., p. 279.
78 Blake, op. cit., p. 164.
79 Knight, op. cit., p. 29.
Negro vote was realized in the election of 1879. Kirby offered still another reason for the movement in Virginia—the funding of the State's debt in 1871 by the Conservatives. This, he stated, is what brought about one of the most vigorous responses in Virginia's history—Readjusterism. He went on to clarify the intentions of the Readjusters by saying that while the Readjusters, as their name implies, did indeed want a downward adjustment of the debt, they also wanted to put an end to the dominance of the many railroad and business corporations. Morton described the Readjuster movement as growing out of the inability of the people of Virginia, in their crippled financial condition, to construct a satisfactory policy in regard to the State debt, along with a basic reaction, from 1876 to 1900, to the ancient order of things, and attributed their success to a solid Negro vote. Moore exemplified the usual treatment of this movement in his comments that the Readjuster movement was supported by the impoverished agrarian masses, both black and white, and was, basically, a manifestation of the resentment of these factions against government inefficiency and hard times—in short, a revolt against the Virginia tradition of government by the "best people" in the exclusive interests of the State's long-established agricultural-mercantile elite. Pearson, on the other hand, in his


82Morton, op. cit., p. 97.

83James T. Moore, "The University and the Readjusters," The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, LVIII (Jan 1970), No. 1, 87.
comments on the 1877 election of the General Assembly, saw no real proof for either of these two basic views. He expressed a belief that "an analysis of the election returns show that twenty-two Independents were elected to the House and that the idea of readjustment had won a sweeping victory." In a footnote Pearson added the comment that "the Southwest was solid and the Valley nearly solid. Some of the Negroes voted for Independents (who were generally for readjustment), and some for General Mahone, who consistently supported the regular ticket." He then went on to say: "But whether these results rested upon some deep-seated feeling of dissatisfaction with old methods and issues, as is indicated by the setting aside of old leaders such as William Smith and John Letcher, or upon mere intrigue, as is suggested by the lightness of the vote, is not clear. Nor is it certain . . . just what kind of readjustment was endorsed."85

The Conservative platform of 1877 asserted that the party would favor "all just and honorable means" for reducing Virginia's debt and "restore to the schools" the funds which had been used for other purposes.86 When assembled in December, the "Barbour Bill" was passed in an attempt to provide funds for the schools. Governor Holliday vetoed the bill with these words: (I) "felt called upon, in the discharge of my duty and under official obligations, to decline to approve."87

84 Pearson, op. cit., pp. 77-78.
85 Ibid., pp. 77n-78n.
86 Richmond Dispatch, November 8, 1877, p. 1.
A special session was called in December 1878 to reconsider the debt problem. The McCulloch Bill, providing for smaller debt payments over a longer period, and the Henkel Bill, which protected the school funds, were passed. 88

Pearson pointed out that: "This legislation, The McCulloch and Henkel Acts, represented the triumph of that moderate move for readjustment which had manifested itself in 1871 and 1874." 89 It did not, however, remove the dissension that had been building in the Conservative ranks.

This dissension resulted in a vigorously-conducted campaign by both parties in 1879, with the Readjusters winning a sizable margin in both houses of the Legislature—a victory achieved with the help of their "colored allies." Readjusters claimed 56 of the 100 Delegate seats (11 by Negroes) and 24 of the 40 Senate seats, with two being filled by Negroes. 90 According to Maddex:

The election of 1879 brought to an end the era that the 'new movement' had inaugurated ten years before. As an organization the Conservative party would persist, becoming the 'Democratic party' of Virginia in 1883. Nevertheless, the movement that had defeated Radicalism in 1869 and governed during the 1870's had divided into two parties, both of which had absorbed Republican elements and which presented well-defined alternative policies on the financial questions that preoccupied vocal Virginians in 1879. Politics were taking a new turn and the era of the Virginia Conservatives was passing, but many features of their politics and ideology lived on to

89 Pearson, op. cit., p. 88.
90 Morton, op. cit., p. 107.
play important roles in Virginia and other Southern states during the ensuing decades.91

This Legislature had no better luck with the Governor than had the previous one. The Riddleberger Bill, which would have put the Literary Fund in the "most favored" class of creditors and directed that the interest in arrears be paid in cash, could not be passed over Governor Holliday's veto, and so the Readjusters had to wait until the election of 1881 to secure a sympathetic governor who would help them pass a revised Riddleberger Bill and other legislation which would bring about momentous changes in Virginia's public school system. As Pearson related: "The election returns (of 1881) indicate that the Readjusters won through the combination of the negroes and the 'West,' aided by acute and long-continued economic distress."92 In the long-run this support was not to continue, for the period of Readjuster control over the Legislature was to last only from December 1879 to December 1883 when the Democrats again achieved a majority. In describing the events which took place while the Readjusters were in office, Blake commented that during this period of "political supremacy" the Readjusters were able to enact all the legislation they had promised the people--by virtue of "a sympathetic Legislature, a friendly governor, and a liberal-minded judiciary," a Governor and a Legislature elected in 1881 "because they championed the interests of a majority of the white people and negroes in the State."93

---

91 Maddex, op. cit., p. 275.
92 Pearson, op. cit., p. 131.
93 Blake, op. cit., pp. 190-92.
In 1882 the Readjusters were at the zenith of their power with control of a majority of the State offices, the Legislature, and the courts. Public education was the major recipient of Readjuster benefactions, a prime example being the establishment of the first public normal school in Virginia. The claim of many historians that the public school system in Virginia was a gift of Reconstruction and outsiders, and that the public normal school in Virginia owes its inception to the sincere interest in public education of the Readjusters, has been disclaimed by several. Knight, for one, refuted the claim that the advancement of Virginia's public educational system during the period of 1869 to 1882 was a gift of Reconstruction and outsiders in this manner:

It must be recalled that although the constitutional provision for education was the work of outsiders, the school system was planned by a native, conservative Virginian, whose father thirty years before had recommended practically the same plan; that the school bill was drawn and revised by native, conservative Virginians and enacted into law through the leadership of native, conservative Virginians; and that the system was set on its way to success by the faithful and untiring efforts of a native, conservative Virginian whose one paramount and dominating conviction was his belief in the power of a state-supported and state-controlled system of public education, free and open alike to all classes.

Pearson questioned the sincerity of Readjuster interest in the public school system with these caustic remarks:

Despite the protests of even Republican friends of education, Superintendent Ruffner was replaced at the end of his term (in 1882) by R. R. Farr—a severely

---

94 Pearson, op. cit., pp. 142-49.
95 Knight, op. cit., p. 36.
ironic commentary upon the sincerity or the intelligence of Readjuster interest in the schools.\textsuperscript{96}

Phillips viewed Ruffner's removal as purely political and offered the comment that "the changing fortunes of politics and Superintendent Ruffner's high conception of the purpose of education (which) had compelled him at all times to rebel against suggestions for making political any of the functions of those entrusted with the administration of the system of public education of the state," ultimately resulted in his removal from office. He went on to document Superintendent Farr's contributions to the public school system as attesting to Farr's personal competence and to Readjuster interest in public education.\textsuperscript{97} Blake claimed that "the Readjuster legislation speaks for itself. . . . The Readjusters deserve lasting credit, too, for their loyalty to the public schools of Virginia. In strong contrast to the apparent indifference of the Conservatives was their generous support of public education."\textsuperscript{98}

In the final analysis, the public school system had been firmly established in Virginia by 1882, even though the specialized institutions for training and supplying teachers to that system had not yet materialized.

\textsuperscript{96}Pearson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 148.
\textsuperscript{97}Phillips, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{98}Blake, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 194-95.
CHAPTER IV

THE PUBLIC NORMAL SCHOOL IN VIRGINIA
(1882-1901)

The expansion of the public school system in Virginia and a reluctant acceptance by an increasing number of Virginians of the principle of State support and control of education combined to generate a parallel interest in teacher training. A moving force behind that interest was Superintendent of Public Instruction, William H. Ruffner. In addition to his tireless efforts on behalf of a public school system for Virginia that would be free to all children, Ruffner also waged a continuous, although fruitless, crusade for the establishment of public normal schools during his entire tenure in office (1870-1882). Ruffner was one of many educators who realized that before the American "ladder concept" of public education could gain acceptance in Virginia, an adequate supply of well-qualified teachers would have to be made available. In this chapter, an attempt will be made to describe the events which produced the missing rung of the ladder in Virginia's educational system—the establishment of public normal schools.

The Normal School Idea in Virginia

Although the Underwood Constitution of 1869 had clearly stipulated that normal schools should be established "as soon as practicable," the first public normal school was not to be established in Virginia
until 1882.\(^1\) It was a coeducational institution for blacks known as
the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute at Petersburg.\(^2\) Whether,
as the Virginia State College Catalog for 1971-72 averred, "The politi-
cal activities of Negroes in Virginia during the 1880s were responsible
for establishment of the College," or, as Buck asserted, that an obliga-
tion felt by the legislators "to do something impressive for Negroes"
brought about the establishment of this school, is largely a matter for
conjecture.\(^3\) Perhaps each of these views taken singly is too simple an
explanation; a fair answer to the question of why the first public nor-
mal school in Virginia was established for Negroes probably lies some-
where between these two extremes. Those historians who have written
about the normal school movement in the United States have described
the evolvement of public normal schools as the culmination of the efforts
of many interested educators and concerned citizens in their continuous
interpersonal relationships with key individuals throughout their
respective State's governmental structure. This pattern is clearly
distinguishable in Virginia.\(^4\) In analyzing the history of teacher edu-
cation, a few words of caution seem appropriate:

\(^1\)Virginia, Constitution (1869), art. 8, sec. 5.
\(^2\)Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1881-82), chap. 266, pp. 283-87.
\(^3\)Catalog, Virginia State College (1971-72), p. 28; and, J. L.
Blair Buck, The Development of Public Schools in Virginia, 1607-1952
\(^4\)For a detailed account, see John S. Brubacher, 2nd ed., A
History of the Problems of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966);
R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in
American Culture (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1953); J. P. Gordy,
"Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the U. S.," US Bureau
of Education, Circular of Information No. 8-1891; Charles A. Harper,
To appreciate fully the significance of the achievements in teacher education in this country, as is unquestionably true of similar developments elsewhere in the world, it is essential to be well informed with respect to the country's history. Social, economic, and political forces have influenced both the nature and the extent of teacher education in the United States.5

When analyzing the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools, one should realize the significance of the socio-economic and political forces and the role they played in generating the educational policy which was applied to these schools.

Students of education are still not in complete agreement as to the origin of the American normal school. Some contend that its origin was European, especially Prussian, while others feel that it was basically American, the logical outgrowth of the academy and experiments with teacher's seminaries and Lancasterian schools.6 Still others see both influences present. One historian has pointed out that

---


6Ibid., p. 36.
It is probably true, as stated by Gordy,\textsuperscript{1} that the idea of normal schools for this country was an original conception of the early writers on the subject, and yet... One needs only to read the history of normal schools to appreciate the debt we owe to Prussia for the ideal as well as for the form of these early institutions.\textsuperscript{7}

Another has commented in like manner, saying:

The fact that these European forms antedate the first American normal schools has led to considerable speculation over possible influences—particularly from Prussian sources—on American teacher education. It is, indeed, clear that a number of early normal-school enthusiasts patterned their proposals after the Prussian seminaries... On the other hand, it is equally evident that some of the most ardent American proponents of improved preparation of teachers knew little if anything about the European institutions.\textsuperscript{8}

It is probably safe to conclude that the American normal school stems from both native and European sources. The word "normal" was derived from the Latin word meaning a "model" or a "rule," and thus carried the connotation that the purpose of such a school was to provide the teacher with the rules for teaching.\textsuperscript{9} Typical of the normal school philosophy held by those most closely associated with such schools, were the words of a Massachusetts normal school principal:

Life is development. The work of life is production, objective and subjective. Education is the promotion of the development which is both natural and possible at the time.

\textsuperscript{7}G. W. A. Luckey, "The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States," Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology, and Education, XII (January, 1903), Nos. 1-4, pp. 52, 52n.

\textsuperscript{8}Harold E. Snyder, "Education of Teachers in the USA," The Education of Teachers in England, France, and the USA (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1953), p. 228.

The process of education is production. The test of education is personal efficiency in promoting social welfare. Thus, in this sense, normal schools should ostensibly prepare teachers to "promote the social welfare."

Superintendent Ruffner was not the first educator in Virginia to sense that if the teacher was to occupy a pivotal position in the maintenance and perpetuation of a healthy society in Virginia, his professional preparation could not be ignored. Examples of this concern by other educators are many. The Board of School Commissioners of Washington County, one year after the District School Law of 1829 was passed, released the following statement:

The Board consider it of vital importance to the success of a general plan of education that some mode should be adopted by the General Assembly to furnish the counties with qualified teachers, whose moral habits are known to the people or to the school commissioners. To effect this great and important object this Board would humbly suggest whether it would not be good policy in the General Assembly to authorize a school to be established in each county on the plan of Pestalozzi, for the education of young men for the express purpose of becoming teachers.

In 1840, Henry Ruffner, Francis H. Smith, and J. D. Ewing collaborated and presented a plan to the Legislature for a State normal school in which graduates would "serve the State as a teacher five years, in consideration of the expense of his education." In 1841, while Professor Dabney of Washington College was publicly denouncing Virginia's system of public education, the General Assembly passed a resolution which

---

instructed the President and Directors of the Literary Fund to report a system best adapted in their opinion to "secure the benefits of education to the people of this commonwealth." A committee, appointed by the Governor in March 1841 to devise a plan for a school system, reported that "the greatest obstacle to education in Virginia is the want of well-educated and moral teachers." It urged that either "a great normal school be established," or that departments for instruction in the art of teaching "be maintained in certain academies and colleges where students who would pledge to teach in the common schools upon graduation would be given state scholarships." Another outgrowth of this resolution to report a system of public education for the State of Virginia was the Education Convention of Northwestern Virginia held at Clarksburg, Virginia, on September 8, 1841. The general consensus of this convention was that "normal schools are the first step toward the perfection of a school system." The convention delegates suggested that either one central State normal school be established, or one for each Senatorial district. The district arrangement was preferred, since the neighborhood schools could serve as practice schools--an indispensable element of any normal school. 

However, agitation for the establishment of normal schools and even county training classes for teachers made little headway in Virginia before the Civil War. Randolph-Macon College, in 1839, experimented

12 Ibid., p. 13.

with a normal department; Virginia Military Institute, by an Act of the General Assembly in 1842, was authorized to accept no more than forty students who were admitted tuition-free if they pledged to serve two years as teachers in some school or college in the State; Emory and Henry College, in 1850, was authorized to accept sixteen "indigent and deserving young men as state students, upon their promise to teach . . . for two years at least in some school or college in the State," using the interest on a loan from the Literary Fund to pay their expenses; and, in 1856, the University of Virginia was allowed to accept fifty State students annually under similar conditions.¹⁴ No evidence has been found that any of these attempts were successful. Maddox observed that "the success of popular education waited upon the rise of a native teaching class in whose social ideals and classroom methods the country people would repose confidence."¹⁵ Morrison concluded that "these were the movements, under the old order for a 'normal instruction.' Young women were not in the purview, and often the young man must found the school in which he was obligated to teach. The facts were known from the first. The state needed a system of public education throughout the grades, with a sure supply of good teachers, under trained superintendence."¹⁶


¹⁶See Morrison, op. cit., pp. 12-16.
Ruffner, the first Superintendent of Public Instruction of the school system established in 1870, was in full agreement with the idea that the teacher was the key to the efficiency of Virginia's educational system. He felt that the teacher should occupy a position of first concern and interest to all Virginians and that close attention must be paid to teacher-training methods. The "normal school idea" that he proposed to accomplish the task of teacher training closely resembled the plan presented by Carter in 1824-25 and the one by his own father in 1840-41. Central to each of these plans was a review of the common branches of learning from a teaching point of view; work in educational theory; and, training in a practice school under complete supervision.

Publicly supported institutions for the preparation of teachers in America developed slowly. The first public normal school in the United States was established by Cyrus Peirce in Lexington, Massachusetts, on July 3, 1839. Peirce taught ten subjects in one term and a total of seventeen different subjects in one year. He also supervised a model school of thirty pupils, acted as a demonstration teacher, developed the professional materials to be taught, and served as both principal of the school and janitor of the building. This school, and the one established at Barre, Massachusetts, two months later, paved the way for similar schools to be established in other states. By the year 1860, at least


three kinds of normal schools--private, state, and municipal--were in existence. And, although opinions varied as to the number and purpose of these institutions, approximately twelve had been created with an avowed purpose of "training teachers for the public schools."  

The pattern of development of teacher education in Virginia replicated the national pattern in many respects. As elsewhere, normal schools were a prominent feature of governmental plans for state-wide teacher education. A major problem encountered by normal school founders was that of overcoming the common American notion that anyone could teach, and demeaning the idea that the acquisition of knowledge alone was the best preparation for a teacher. It did not necessarily follow that the more knowledge a person had, the better the teacher he would be. The plan that evolved was one in which State governments established normal schools by acts of legislation, decided how many normals were needed, and then contributed to the construction of the physical plant. These schools were responsible to the State legislatures, either through a State Board of Education or a Normal School Board. In either event, control was maintained by the State. The location of these schools usually reflected the political realities of the State and the social pressures of a given community. Quite often spirited bidding would develop among communities interested in these

schools, with a community sometimes donating a site for the school.
Thus, despite State control, the normal schools were still essentially
local in constituency and aspiration, as well as in operation. Although
criticized frequently, these schools performed a useful service in that
through them the idea of professional preparation for teachers was
advanced.\textsuperscript{20} The Virginia experience in establishing and operating nor­
mal schools was similar to the experiences observable in other states.

\textbf{The Education of Negroes in Virginia}
As Alexander reported, the philosophy that guided the education
of Negroes in Virginia followed the usual pattern of dominant cultures
and civilizations in dealing with submerged groups recently out of
slavery. The transition from the belief that Negroes lacked the ability
even to become literate, to accepting the fact that some of them could
become well-informed leaders in society was a feat not easily accom­
plished. In fact, many Virginians seemed to share the belief that the
Negro could not be educated adequately to meet his needs and discharge
his responsibilities.\textsuperscript{21} Disapproval of Negro social and political
rights persisted in the minds of many Virginians long after Recon­
struction had ended. However, according to Bullock, the educators of
the freedmen's school system persisted in their efforts and, as a
result, teachers for the Negro schools were often more adequate in both

\textsuperscript{20}Harcleroad, et al., \textit{op. cit.}; also Snyder, \textit{op. cit.}; Elsbree,
\textit{op. cit.}; Butts and Cremin, \textit{op. cit.}; and Brubacher, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{21}Fred M. Alexander, \textit{Education for the Needs of the Negro in
Virginia} (Washington, D. C.: The Southern Education Foundation, 1943),
p. 111.
number and training than those for white teachers at the time of Virginia's readmission to the Union. And, although there were no normal schools for white teachers at this time, there were two for Negroes—one at Richmond and one at Hampton—both privately supported, coeducational schools incorporated by special acts of the General Assembly.\(^\text{22}\)

The progress made in Negro education in Virginia during the period, particularly in the area of teacher training, was often the result of philanthropic aid and the concerted efforts of a few concerned local and State authorities.\(^\text{23}\) With the exception of issuing charters, the State of Virginia did not become legally involved in such matters until a much later date.\(^\text{24}\)

The Colored Normal School of Richmond opened its doors for pupils in October 1867 as a coeducational teacher-training school for Negroes. A board of directors was established to administer the school as a public charity. Funds for the school plant came from the Freedmen's Bureau. No tuition was charged, and operating funds came from charitable sources—of which the Peabody Fund was a principal donor. Its most renowned principal was R. M. Manly, who was Chief of the


\(^{23}\) See Alexander, op. cit., p. 111.

\(^{24}\) Until 1902, and the creation of a State Corporation Commission, the General Assembly issued all charters, public and private, as a matter of routine procedure. However, it was prone to treat, erroneously at times, all schools so chartered as public institutions in the fullest sense of the word.
Educational Department of the Freedmen's Bureau in Virginia from June 1865 to July 1870 and a member of the Richmond city school board for several years. The usual course of study encompassed three years, with pupils being drawn from the public school system of Richmond. In their senior year, students were required to manage the model school, under the supervision of regular teachers. Many of those who went on to teach were reported as being "uniformly successful." The school was absorbed into the Richmond public school system in 1876.

The American Missionary Association was mainly responsible for the founding of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. In June 1867 the Association bought the farm known as "Little Scotland"—a plantation of approximately 159 acres situated on the Hampton River—as a site for the school. General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a representative of the Freedmen's Bureau in Hampton who had been assigned there for the purpose of "relieving the situation and adjusting the difficulties that had developed there between the races," was engaged as Principal. General Armstrong set four goals that he hoped to achieve in this school for Negroes: first, to make the Negroes of service to themselves and to the whites; second, to dignify Negro manual labor by reinforcing it with intelligence; third, to develop a sense of responsibility in each pupil by giving him specific tasks to perform; and, fourth, to saturate the


entire program with useful forms of manual training. All of these goals were based on his own personal belief that the future role of the Negro was to be one of an industrial worker possessed of strong moral and Christian principles.

Under Armstrong's leadership, the first students enrolled at Hampton Institute in April 1868. Two years later, the Virginia legislature granted it a charter. Initial financial support was provided by the Freedmen's Bureau and a few northern philanthropists Armstrong had induced to finance the experiment. From 1872 until 1920, Hampton Institute received one-third of the Federal Land Grant Funds provided Virginia by the Morrill Act. Armstrong accepted, as a practical necessity, the southern system of segregation and its concept of the natural difference between blacks and whites. Negroes were to be trained in a manner consistent with their position in American society. Instead of gaining a classical education, which would be of little practical value, Negroes would acquire industrial skills. Industrial education would be used as a character-building force to give labor the dignity it needed. As Armstrong viewed it, the main objective of the school was to uplift the Negro morally through education. Over the years of its operation, Hampton Institute has compiled an impressive record of achieving that objective.²⁷

As late as 1882, opposition of conservative whites to the social and political equality of the freedmen still persisted. The more

²⁷The above condensation of the founding of Hampton Institute was derived from Bullock, _op. cit._, pp. 32-77.
sensitive element of the white population in Virginia resented the fact that their government was in the hands of the Readjusters, and were looking to the day when they could: "return to a simple, small, pure, and inexpensive government--the only kind of government Virginia could afford"; tighten their control over the Negro; and, restore "true Virginians" to governmental offices. Since the Readjusters were in control of both the Legislature and the Governor's office, and had promised the Negroes something for their election support, what better way to show them their appreciation than by establishing a college designed for Negroes?

The First Public Normal School in Virginia

Prior to 1882 there were no state-supported normal schools for Negroes or whites. While the greatest credit is probably due the Readjusters for establishing normals, it is certain that the idea of normal schools did not originate with them. Governor Walker, in a message of March 8, 1870, containing his recommendation for allocation of the Congressional land scrip funds, stated:

I would suggest, as a subject worthy of the serious and profound consideration of the general assembly, the propriety and feasibility of dividing this fund--appropriating one portion of it to that one of our colleges which, in your judgment, you may designate, and the other portion to a college or high school devoted exclusively to the education of our colored people. The colored people of our state are, equally with the white, clothed with the elective franchise. In order that they may intelligently exercise that right, the opportunity for education, should,

and under our constitution must, be afforded them... The true interests of the colored people themselves demand that they should be provided with separate schools,... I would extend to them inducements and incentives to advancement in mental and moral development, by the establishment of a college or university... wherein shall be taught all the higher branches of useful knowledge.29

Superintendent Ruffner, in his first annual report, devoted fourteen pages to what he considered to be "the most important part of our school system"--normal schools--and urged their establishment. He went on to admit that "a fully equipped normal school is a costly affair," but added that "the State should begin by allowing the Board of Education to employ a specific sum out of the school funds, not less than five thousand dollars annually, for the establishment of ONE NORMAL SCHOOL." He continued by saying that if this was not possible, then ambulatory normal schools, in which qualified professors would be employed and paid, partly by the State, and partly by the community utilizing their services, and who would pass from county to county conducting "training schools free to all who are or intend to be Teachers," should be established. He concluded that:

The elementary normal school is not the place to train college professors, nor is the college or university the place to train elementary teachers; and, as a rule, it is best to have all normal training conducted in separate institutions, where the whole cast and spirit tend to the one object.30

---

Needless to say, nothing came immediately of these efforts. Contained in the Appendix to this report is a letter from R. M. Manly to Superintendent Ruffner in response to an inquiry as to the "aptness of colored people to learn." Manly stated that "I am certain that colored normal schools, properly conducted, will turn out teachers with the scholarship and all other qualifications necessary for first rate success in the profession." Further, Senator Anderson introduced Senate Bill No. 251 "to establish and maintain a normal school, and to provide for the training of teachers for the public schools of Virginia" on February 21, 1872, which was read, ordered read a second time, and then referred to the committee on public institutions. The bill was reported, with amendments, on March 6, 1872, and on March 8, 1872, "was taken up, read the second time, and the question being on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the committee on public institutions--and pending which, On motion of Mr. Terry, the bill was laid on the table," where it eventually died. Additionally, the Third Annual Report of 1873 referred to the establishment the previous year at Roanoke College of "a normal department," which ultimately failed for lack of funds. Also, Governor Holliday, in his message of January 1, 1874, implored the Federal Government "to enable us to effectuate its policy of educating our newly-enfranchised (Negro) population, by supplying the State the

31Ibid., pp. 203-04.
33Virginia, Third Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (1873), Appendix, p. 149.
necessary means to that end," and promised that, "if not restrained and thwarted by superior power, we will perform (our obligation to our colored population) resolutely and effectually by promoting the best interests of both races. We intend to perform it . . . by affording him liberal facilities for education and inciting him to use them.34 And, in 1875, an act was passed by the General Assembly "encouraging an intermediate grade of instruction between that of the common school and that of the college," which authorized the district and county school boards to "admit into any one of the public schools of their district instruction in any branches necessary to qualify pupils to be teachers in the public schools."35 The high school did not emerge until much later in Virginia, nor was any evidence found to indicate that any of the schools took advantage of the 1875 Act.

The most effective campaign carried on in the interests of Negro higher education began during the Readjuster regime—and was the outgrowth of an originally unrelated Senate resolution dated March 31, 1879:

That the Superintendent of Public Instruction be and he is hereby requested to gather, and in his next annual report furnish to this body, such information and views in regard to higher female education as might be useful in considering the propriety and practicability of making, by this State, some provision in this direction; and that he enquire and report the cost of education in such female seminaries of other States as are assisted or supported at public expense, with any matters of interest concerning same.36

35Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1874-75), chap. 226, p. 269.
In his Ninth Annual Report, the Superintendent of Public Instruction suggested three possible solutions: one, appoint a committee or the State Board of Education to inquire into the feasibility of admitting girls to the present State institutions of higher learning; two, establish a thoroughly-equipped Female State College; or, three, create normal schools as required by the Constitution, as a part of the public school system, supported by public school funds, controlled by a special board or the Board of Education. Females were to outnumber males as students. As a result of these recommendations, Senator Smith offered a resolution on February 21, 1880, to have the Board of Education, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction in particular, investigate throughout the States and other countries, and report at the next session: first, on the possibility of admitting females to the public and/or private institutions of higher learning in the State; but, if this was deemed inadvisable, second, present a plan for establishing a female college on a par with the male colleges in the State to be funded by monies that might be forthcoming from the United States; or third, provide a suggestion as to how constitutionally-required normal schools could be established--for females preferably; or fourth, prepare guidelines for establishing a "permanent state institution for the higher education of the (Negro) race." On February 28, 1880, "Mr. Lovell, from the committee on public institutions and education, reported, without amendment, a resolution looking to the establishment of a state college for females out of funds to come to Virginia from the United States, to the education of teachers of free schools under the mandate of the constitution, to the education of females by other methods, and to the
higher education of the colored race." Senate Bill No. 93, pertaining to female higher education, had already been introduced as a result of the referral on December 10, 1879, to the committee on education with instructions to report by bill or otherwise on so much of the Superintendent of Public Instruction's Report as related to "higher education for females," and had passed on January 20, 1880. "An ACT for establishing a Female University at or near the city of Danville" was approved on March 3, 1880, and the Governor had appointed a Board of Visitors on March 9, 1880. It appears that, since no funds were forthcoming from the United States, this idea was dropped at this time. However, Superintendent Ruffner continued his crusade for normal schools in his Tenth Annual Report with these words:

Although every friend of education might anxiously inquire, what will be the history of the school system in the next decade, it is not proposed just here to allude to anything more than the developments needed in the direction of normal schools, and of female education; and even these are mentioned only to show that I am still as earnest as ever in my convictions, often expressed, as to the importance of at least making a beginning toward the preparation of teachers for their work, and also of making provision for the higher education of our daughters that will bear some remote comparison with what has been done for our sons. It would scarcely be opportune, however, to enlarge on these points in the absence of the Legislature, whose action is necessary before anything can be done.


38 See Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1879-80), p. 46; ibid., chap. 150, pp. 143-44; and, ibid., pp. 480-81.

With Readjuster control of the Legislature, the Governor's office, and the courts assured after the election of 1881, machinery was set in motion to "establish and foster normal schools as provided by section 6, Article VIII, of the Constitution," through a resolution offered by Delegate Pollard on December 15, 1881. The end result was a compromise--due to the peculiar combination of social and political forces in dominance in Virginia at that time--and brought about the establishment of a normal school which was to be at the same time an institution of higher learning for Negroes, the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute at Petersburg. The Superintendent of Public Instruction was asked to provide "certain information relative to teachers and pupils in the public schools," which he promptly did. On January 5, Delegate Farr offered a resolution that "the committee on schools and colleges be instructed to make immediate enquiry as to the propriety of establishing one or more normal schools in the state, and to report by bill or otherwise," which the House refused to refer. And yet, on February 1, 1882, Delegate Harris, a Negro from Dinwiddie county, introduced "a bill to incorporate the Normal and Collegiate Institute, and provide for the support of same," which was referred to the committee on schools and colleges. This became House Bill No. 271, and was reported from the committee and read the first time on February 7, 1882. Eight days later, Delegate Harris read a petition from one hundred fifty "colored citizens of Norfolk" asking for passage of the bill, which was then referred to the committee on schools and colleges. H. B. 271 was subsequently engrossed, taken up as the next
special order, read a third time, and passed on February 16, 1882, by a vote of 51 yeas and 24 nays.40

Several Acts of Assembly combine to provide the pattern of control maintained over this institution. "An ACT to incorporate the Normal and Collegiate Institute, and provide support for the same," was approved on the 6th of March, 1882.41 After a site was selected and approved by the State Board of Education, the sum of $100,000 was to be provided for the construction or repair of buildings for a school to educate colored persons exclusively. Six "well-qualified colored men" plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction comprised a Board of Visitors which, "in all things, and at all times, . . . was subject to the control of the legislature." Fifty young colored men were to be admitted each year as State students upon agreement in writing to teach or do educational work for two years after graduation.42 The commission appointed by the Governor to select a site for the Institute, reported in favor of a place called Fleets, near the city of Petersburg, and in spite of local opposition, the report was approved by the State Board

40See Virginia, House Journal and Documents (1881-82), p. 45; Document No. IV, December 17, 1881; and, pp. 87, 244, 285, 343-44, 353, and 442.

41Ibid., chap. 266, pp. 283-87.

42A. W. Harris, "Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute Circular," Educational Journal of Virginia, XIV, No. 5 (1883), 156, in which he stated that applications must be submitted in the applicant's own handwriting; the applicant must be at least twelve years of age, furnish proof of good moral character, and pass an examination in Arithmetic, Reading, Spelling, Geography and Grammar to enter the Normal department. Also see Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1881-82), chap. 266, pp. 283-87. This condensation is intended to serve mainly as a "paradigm" with which to compare later acts establishing other normal schools.
of Education. 43 No evidence has been found to suggest that the Governor, a former mayor of Petersburg and a voting member of the State Board of Education, influenced this decision in any way. A House Bill, No. 309, to "authorize the common council of the city of Petersburg to purchase and donate a site for the Normal and Collegiate Institute," was introduced on April 20, 1882, and was passed on April 21, 1882. Also on that same day, provision was made in "An ACT to return to the public free schools a portion of the moneys diverted therefrom," for payment into the treasury $100,000 on special deposit, "subject to the future action of the general assembly, the same being intended for the erection and maintenance of a normal school for colored teachers to be hereafter established." 44

The foregoing events were subject to various interpretations. The Superintendent of Public Instruction, in speaking of the decision to begin classes in 1883, commented that "The Board (of Education), recognizing the great need for more competent colored teachers, have decided to open the normal department the 1st of October." 45 The first report of the Board of Visitors stated that "There being a commodious building on the purchased premises, it was decided to open the school not later than the first Monday in October, 1883." The school opened accordingly, "with the teachers elect . . . all present and ready for duty, anxious to begin their work. About sixty-six students presented themselves

for enrollment." Subsequently, "An ACT providing for an eight weeks course of instruction for the colored teachers in the state," provided for a "summer session," in which the president and faculty of the school would conduct, "during each and every year, a normal course of instruction for the benefit of the colored teachers in the public schools of this state, or those who expect to make teaching a profession --said normal course to commence on some day between the eighteenth and twenty-fifth days of July, to be fixed by the state superintendent of public instruction, and to continue for eight weeks." The Act further provided that "The President of the said normal and collegiate institute . . . shall be appointed for a term of three years by the state board of education," and that "the teachers, in attending such normal course, may occupy the rooms of the school and receive certificates for proficiency and attendance." This was later modified to "commence on or about the first day of July, and not later than the tenth of the said month, in each and every year." The president's term and salary was specified as "a term of three years from January the first, eighteen hundred and eighty-five, at such salary as said board of education may determine: provided such salary shall not exceed fifteen hundred dollars per annum." All colored teachers were required to attend at least one session every three years, and failure to do so would result in revocation of "said teacher's" license, and "said teacher" would not be allowed to teach again until after attending one session. It was


further stipulated that "In all matters with reference to the Virginia normal and collegiate institute, the board of education shall approve the same to make them valid, and the said board of education is hereby made responsible for the proper management of the said school in all of its departments. This shall apply to all matters of the erection of buildings, the appointment of teachers, and all other matters, as well as to the summer session for the public school teachers." The Board of Visitors was also placed under "the direction and supervision of the state board of education," and members could be removed, for cause, by the Board of Education. This Act was subsequently repealed and replaced by "an ACT to provide for a normal school in the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute," approved May 21, 1887, which reduced the summer term to five weeks. The pattern is clear--control was at all times highly centralized, at first under the broad supervision and direction of the General Assembly, and then under the State Board of Education--with the usual duties of a Board of Visitors and President of a college reserved solely to the Board of Education.

The Female Normal School at Farmville

Concurrent with the establishment of the institution at Petersburg, a concerted campaign was also underway to effect the establishment of normal schools designed exclusively to train white, female teachers for the public schools.


49 Virginia, Acts of Assembly (Extra Session of 1887), chap. 357, pp. 454-55.
In speaking of the need for normal schools in his first annual report, Superintendent Farr delivered what might be considered the keynote address of the campaign:

In our great prosperity, when the funds set apart by the Constitution for the support of public education, are promptly paid; when life and vigor characterize every department of our great school system, defects, which formerly were crowded out of sight by more pressing matters, now come prominently to the front; and perhaps none call more loudly for a remedy than our great need of more professional or trained teachers. . . for up to the present time Virginia has made no provision for teaching the teachers . . . What we want is at least two good normal schools, if it is desired to separate the sexes, or one, if it is not; and especially do we want a normal school for girls; for to the ladies must Virginia look for her teachers. The Board of Education has the matter under consideration, and will strongly urge the next Legislature to establish normal schools for training professional teachers.50

Governor Cameron, in his message to the General Assembly on February 2, 1884, stated:

Since the reestablishment of the public revenue and the consequent increase of funds available for the cause of free education, the greatest want experienced in the administration of the public schools has been that of competent teachers. In the past few years this need has been measurably supplied, and it may reasonably be hoped that the normal schools now in existence, and those in progress of institution, will, in the near future, meet the demands.51

The press gave visibility to the campaign by devoting front page space to agitation for normal schools by prominent educators. The Richmond Daily Dispatch, for example, made these comments about the appearance

50Virginia, Twelfth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (1882), pp. 63-64.

of J. L. M. Curry, Agent for the Peabody Fund, before the education committees of both houses of the General Assembly, arguing the need for normal schools in Virginia:

In conclusion, Dr. Curry urged the passage of a bill for the establishment of a normal school for the education of white teachers. He said that it was only a question of time; that if not passed now it would be only a few years before public sentiment would demand it. He promised that if such a school were established at least a third of its current expenses would be defrayed by the Peabody Educational Fund.

The committee passed a resolution asking Dr. Curry to draw up such a bill as he thought would accomplish the end aimed at for their consideration at an early meeting.52

On the 27th of February 1884, a bill was passed in the Senate without a dissenting vote to create a State Normal School for women at Farmville. The town of Farmville donated the building, the State appropriated $10,000, and the Peabody Fund gave $5,000 to fund the school. The Act differed in some respects from the one which established the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. The Board of Trustees could "make all needful rules and regulations for the good government and management of the school"; students were required only to give satisfactory evidence of an intention to teach for at least two years after graduation; and, the State would provide monies annually from the public school fund to meet operating expenses of the school.53

The greatest difficulty encountered in this respect was the issue raised as to the constitutionality of section 7, which provided for a

---

52 Richmond Daily Dispatch, February 12, 1884, p. 1.
continuing appropriation to be paid from the public free school fund.\textsuperscript{54} The issue was ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court of Appeals in Virginia.\textsuperscript{55} Section 7 was declared unconstitutional and void. The Legislature was informed that it could make the appropriation out of the general fund of the State, if it so desired. The Court declared: "It cannot be doubted that the legislature in its wisdom will provide the necessary annual fund out of the general funds in the treasury, and the scheme for the establishment of the school suffer no serious detriment."\textsuperscript{56} The Legislature responded accordingly with an amendment to section 7 which corrected the original deficiency.\textsuperscript{57}

The pattern of control established over the Farmville normal school was quite different from that established over the institution for blacks. While the white normal board was afforded the usual discretionary decision-making options, the black normal board was held in tight rein. Perhaps this was because it was honestly felt by the governing authorities that Negroes were incapable of effectively governing themselves, or, perhaps, this was the first manifestation by the ruling elite of a movement to reassert control over an undeserving, uninformed and ill-prepared segment of the electorate--and thus only lip-service was being given to an awareness of, and an interest in, 

\textsuperscript{54}Virginia, Fourteenth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (1884), p. 141.

\textsuperscript{55}Trustees of Normal School vs Auditors, 79 Va 233 (1884).


\textsuperscript{57}Virginia, Acts of Assembly (Extra Session of 1884), chap. 12, August 23, 1884.
satisfying the educational needs of the Negro. At any rate, a comparison of these two acts will reveal that the difference between the two is inescapable—the black normal institution was highly centralized, with very little local option, while the white normal school Board was fully empowered to exercise the normal prerogatives of the typical college governing board.58

A Normal Department at William and Mary

Although two schools, one for the education of Black teachers and the other for the education of white females, had been established, the General Assembly of Virginia was acutely aware of the fact that there was no school in the State where instruction was regularly imparted to white male teachers. Action was initiated to redress this imbalance. Propitiously, as it eventually proved to be, a movement was in progress at the time to restore the College of William and Mary, which was facing virtual extinction, to its previous prestigious position among institutions of higher learning. After much concerted action, highlighted by persistent efforts on the part of interested educators and politicians, both ends were achieved by the establishment of "A normal school at William and Mary college in connection with its collegiate course" on March 5, 1888.59 Due primarily to the loss of her endowments through investment in Confederate bonds and the burning of her main buildings


by Federal soldiers during the war, the College of William and Mary was in financial straits. From 1865 to 1881 the College was barely kept open, and finally, in 1881, the College was closed.\textsuperscript{60} On January 19, 1886, Delegate Payne presented the following resolution to the House:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Resolved, That the committee on schools and colleges be instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill for the establishment of a male normal school in connection with the College of William and Mary.\textsuperscript{61}
\end{itemize}

The resolution was referred to committee, where it eventually died. Delegate Payne introduced in addition to the resolution two bills to establish a normal school at William and Mary. Both failed to pass.\textsuperscript{62}

Two years later, however, Senate Bill No. 53 that established a male normal school at William and Mary passed the Senate on February 14, 1888, and was sent to the House. After an unsuccessful motion to recommit the bill in the House, a motion to reconsider passed by a vote of 42-37. After the reconsideration, the bill was passed by a vote of 57-27 on March 1, 1888.\textsuperscript{63}

In his history of the College, Adams stated that:

\begin{itemize}
  \item The primary objects of this present investigation have been to discover the historical beginnings of the higher education at the South; to trace the causes of the early prosperity of William and Mary College; to show its influence upon Virginia statesmen and the Southern States, its relation to the university ideas of Jefferson and
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{60}F. A. Magruder, "Recent Administration in Virginia," Johns Hopkins University Studies, XXX (1912), 61-62.

\textsuperscript{61}Virginia, House Journal and Documents (1885-86), p. 213.

\textsuperscript{62}Ibid., pp. 291, 325-26, 374, and 401; also Ibid., (Extra Session of 1887), p. 132.

\textsuperscript{63}Ibid., (1887-88), p. 339.
Washington, and its significance to the whole country; to point out the causes of the decline of William and Mary College; . . . The most practical of all results from this historical study of William and Mary College is the suggestion of a possible revival in the city of Washington and throughout the country of the original Virginia idea of political education, which made Williamsburg a school of statesmen who were fitted in the college capital to prepare the so-called Virginia Plan, from which our present Constitution grew.64

A possible explanation for the reluctance on the part of Virginia's legislators to approve the establishment of a normal school for white males at William and Mary College might be traced to an animosity over the insistent refusal of William and Mary officials to agree to a relocation of the institution at Richmond. Governor Pierpoint, in his annual message to the General Assembly in 1866, when speaking of a possible allocation of the Morrill Act funds, reported that:

It may become your duty at the present session, to designate the location of the institution which shall receive the benefit of this donation. William and Mary College is now without proper buildings to carry on successfully its operations. I am in great hopes that you will make it the interest of that institution to change its location to this city, by adding to its present endowment the proceeds of the sale of the lands donated by congress. I think it would be grateful to the feelings of the friends and alumni of that ancient seat of learning to see it transferred to the metropolis of the state.65

William and Mary College did not receive the Morrill Act funds, nor was it relocated in Richmond. The Act that established a normal school at


William and Mary did, however, restrict attendance to white male students, provide a $10,000 annual appropriation from the State treasury, place control of the school in the hands of the Board of Visitors, establish quota and selection procedures for State-sponsored normal school students, and, require each student attending the school tuition free to "give satisfactory assurance of his intention and willingness to teach in the public schools of the state, for at least two years after leaving said institution." The Act further stipulated that a system of normal instruction and training must be established to educate and train white male teachers for the public free schools and an additional board of 10 associate visitors must be appointed by the governor to control and expend the State funds appropriated for this purpose. It also declared that if and when the General Assembly failed to appropriate the prescribed annuity the provision of the Act and the terms of office of the associate visitors would immediately terminate. Thus the College was placed in the unique position of being operated by two Boards from 1888 until its real estate and personal property was transferred to the State in 1906.66

Forces for Reform

During this period, forces for reform were attempting to generate enough support for a full-scale revolt against what the Conservatives had labelled "Mahoneism." Encouraged by the dissension evident within the Readjuster ranks and by the closeness of the margin of Wise's

victory over Massey in the Congressional race of 1882, the Conservatives decided they would build an organization even more powerful than Mahone's. To win western support, they held their 1883 convention in Lynchburg, instead of in Richmond as usual. They also took the name Democrats for the first time since the war, adopting a platform of "Anti-Mahoneism" and "Anti-Negro rule." The Danville race riot, which occurred just shortly before the election, worked to the advantage of Conservative appeal to the voters, for the Democrats won a sweeping victory. Once back in power, they quickly erased Readjuster control of the State government. With a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly, they were able to override Governor Cameron's vetoes, and in 1885, they placed their own man, Fitzhugh Lee, in the Governor's office.67

Although the negroes had voted without hindrance in this election, it was at this time that the people of Virginia resolved to eliminate them from politics regardless of any means short of violence. They were tired of the danger and friction which their presence in government always posed.68

Morton then went on to state that "The next fifteen years (1885-1900) were marked by an increase of race friction and the increased use of loose political methods to defeat the negro vote."69 Pearson argued that post-bellum Virginia history ended in 1885, with the next ten or twenty years constituting an appendix "which may be included or omitted without material difference."70

A major purpose of this study, in addition to describing the evolutionary pattern of Virginia's public normal schools, has been that of providing answers to the questions of what educational policies were formulated by the State for the establishment and development of the public normal schools and how and why the current social and political forces in Virginia influenced these policies.

The establishment and evolution of Virginia's public normal schools from 1882 to 1901 revealed a diverse and complex pattern. For example, the coeducational Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute was founded at Petersburg in 1882 to be used exclusively for the education of colored persons; a State Normal School was created at Farmville in 1884 expressly for the training and education of white female teachers for public schools; and, a normal school was established within the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg in 1888 for the purpose of educating and training white male teachers for the public free schools of the state. Although the pattern of control over these three public normal schools differed greatly, certain definite trends in formulating educational policies for the establishment and development of public normal schools in Virginia were clearly emerging. Two basic criteria became immediately apparent: one, political considerations were important in the policy formulated; and, two, sectional rivalries, based on social premises, strongly influenced the changes in policy that were brought about. The General Assembly not only defined the purpose of these institutions as that of training teachers for the public schools of Virginia, but it also determined the length and dates of school sessions; set admissions and graduation requirements for all students;
specified the courses of instruction and established the conditions for conferral of certificates and diplomas; fixed the salary of professors; and, met operating expenses by State appropriations. The basic relationship between the normal schools and the State was determined at the time of their founding as teacher-training institutions. In each case, control was exercised by the State--at first through the General Assembly and then through the State Board of Education. Changes in this educational policy in Virginia would not come about until a new Constitution was adopted and an educational revival had renewed citizen interest in the public normal school movement.
CHAPTER V

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION AND EDUCATIONAL REVIVAL

(1901-1910)

A new Constitution and a crusade for better schools were the most notable aspects of the first decade of the twentieth century in Virginia. "Sentiment against the Reconstruction constitution finally culminated in the calling of a constitutional convention in 1901," and it is but a truism to conclude that "Virginia's history was to be greatly influenced by the new constitution which would be proclaimed in 1902."¹ As Moger contended, "the first decade of this century saw a new spirit and new action in the Old Dominion. The Commonwealth seemed to be throwing off its long years of poverty, stagnation, and despair which had followed defeat and bitterness. . . . The new spirit was well illustrated by the size and nature of the appropriations made by the legislature in 1903 and 1904."² In a similar vein, Larsen commented:

If the Virginia legislature of this period showed evidence of a new spirit of change, the Virginia populace


demonstrated a more impressive reawakening--politically, socially, economically. Nowhere was this more evident than in the ardent crusade for better schools that swept the state after the turn of the century.3

Pulley, on the other hand, viewed this "new spirit" and "new action" as marking the beginning of a tradition-oriented reform movement which considered the 1869 Constitution as embodying all of the evils that had plagued the Commonwealth since its return to the Union, and thus was obsessed with a desire to replace it. This movement in Virginia coincided with the national progressive movement, and was frequently interpreted as a basic reaction to Reconstructionism and Readjusterism.4 Whether it was an attempt to "restore" traditionalism or to "adapt" to the spirit of the time is not a major question for consideration here. Whether the motivation behind the 1901 constitutional convention was simply that of restoring the "Old Virginia system of controls over society and politics," as Pulley claims,5 or the somewhat deeper one of adapting the system of controls to more adequately cope with the realities of the times, is also of lesser concern. The major issue here is the effect the new Constitution had upon Virginia. It seems certain that although the old social and political leadership did return to guide Virginia's destiny, an educational revival also materialized that was to have a significant impact upon Virginia's future. Most important, to this study at least, was the progress made in

---


4Pulley, op. cit., pp. 4-16.

5Ibid., p. viii.
public education. In this chapter attention will be given first to the progressive changes brought about by the new Constitution, and then the educational revival and the consequent establishment of additional public normal schools to meet the ever-changing needs of Virginia's system of public education will be considered.

A New Constitution

Once the members of the convention of 1901-02 had decided upon the content of the constitution, it was necessary for them to determine how the document would be put into effect. "The Democratic state convention of 1900 had pledged, and an Act of the General Assembly had required, that the Constitution would be submitted to the qualified voters for ratification."\(^6\) Nevertheless, "On May 29, 1902, by a vote of 48 to 38, the convention decided not to offer its product to the old electorate for ratification but simply to proclaim that it was the fundamental law of the Commonwealth."\(^7\)

The progressive changes this Constitution brought about were significant. "The system of education provided for in 1870 was centralized to an extreme degree in the General Assembly and a political state board," which gradually became less centralized, until "the new constitution of 1902 . . . again centralized the administration in the state board of education. The centralization in 1870 was a matter of


expediency, . . . the centralization of 1902 . . . a matter of efficiency, a means of improving a system which practically all acknowledge(d) to be a prime necessity for the progress of the State. The education article contained in the new Constitution included several changes. First, the Superintendent of Public Instruction was required to be "an experienced educator" elected by "the qualified voters of the State at the same time and for the same term as the Governor," with duties as prescribed by the State Board of Education on which he would serve as "ex-officio" president; second, the State Board of Education, instead of having the Governor, the Attorney-General, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction as sole members, would now have those three plus three educators selected "from a list of eligibles, consisting of one from each of the faculties, and nominated by the respective boards of visitors or trustees of higher learning, and two (one county and one city) from the local superintendents of schools"; third, the duties and powers of the State Board of Education would include the "authority to make all needful rules and regulations for the management and conduct of the schools, which, when published and distributed" would have the effect of law, subject to the authority of the General Assembly to revise, amend, or repeal. While power was concentrated in the State Board of Education, admittedly for purposes of centralization of control, the composition of the Board was apparently changed "so as to prevent the probability of graft or ill-considered rules."
"Placing educators on the state board made it conform to Cubberley's third type," and requiring the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to be "an experienced educator with duties prescribed by the board was in line (with national trends). . . Thus the conclusion is justified that the educational provisions of the 1902 constitution, while not perfect, contained several progressive changes."^11

Disfranchisement of the Negro under the new Constitution also brought about several changes in the State's relationships with the normal school for blacks. First of all, in keeping with the Negro's altered social position and the national trend toward industrial training, the institution's name was changed from the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute to the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. While its normal department was retained, the collegiate department was replaced by an industrial one. Although the Board of Visitors was retained, its membership no longer had to include Negroes. And, since Negroes would no longer control the Board of Visitors, the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was now permitted to "direct and do all things not inconsistent with the laws of the State, which to them shall seem best adapted to accomplish the legitimate objects of said institute."^12

An Educational Revival

While the year 1901 is a landmark in Virginia's history because of the Constitutional Convention which had its beginning in that year,


^12Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1901-02), chap. 401, pp. 397-400.
it is important to this study for an additional reason. "To the year 1901 has been credited the real beginning of Virginia's campaign for better schools." The impact of the new Constitution on Virginians appeared to be significant. The Times-Dispatch described what may have been the feelings of most white Virginians in the year 1902:

The new Constitution has done its work well. It has eliminated the negro vote, taken the negro question out of politics and removed every pretext for dishonest elections. Nor has the negro been wronged. All who paid as much as a dollar a year in taxes, and all others who could by their answers show that they had sufficient knowledge of the principles of government to qualify them to exercise the right of franchise—whites and blacks—are now upon the same footing in the matter of registration and the educational test will apply without discrimination.

When all the difficulties are considered, it seems almost wonderful that a plan of suffrage so satisfactory in its operation should have been devised. It is high tribute to the wisdom and patriotism of the Constitutional Convention.

However, this cannot, by itself, account for the general air of optimism and the increased general interest in public education that was so prevalent throughout Virginia by 1902 and contributed so markedly to the success of the educational revival which later materialized.

Several elements had combined to handicap all previous efforts of Virginia's educational crusaders—general poverty, a hostile public attitude toward the principle of public education, and the problem of the Negro. The success which eventually resulted from the continued efforts of these educational reformers can be attributed to several factors. The fact that the debt question was not only settled by 1902, 

---

13 Larsen, op. cit., p. 156.
14 Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 1, 1905, p. 4.
but that increased revenues were also becoming available, most certainly
contributed heavily to public optimism,¹⁵ nor can the fact that in 1870
about one-half of the white people who had been born in Virginia had
left the State to become residents in another, while in 1902, over three-
fourths of all Virginia-born white people maintained residency in the
Old Dominion, be discounted as an attitudinal determinant.¹⁶ To what
extent the new Constitution generated an increased general interest in
public education that was so evident to the educators of this period,
however, is difficult to gauge. Magruder insisted that this interest
was not the result of the Constitution, but rather an outgrowth of
several conditions. First, "by 1902 . . . the generation which had
opposed the system of 1869, or in fact any system of public free schools,
had largely passed away"; second, "the system, though inefficiently
administered, had become a reality." Because of these factors, he rea-
soned, "the committee on schools of the constitutional convention strove
to remove the system as far as possible from party politics and to make
it efficient."¹⁷ Magruder went on to cite what he believed to be the
main reasons for the success of the public free schools in Virginia as
the financial assistance provided by the Peabody Fund and the General
Education Board and the support generated by the Peabody agents. He
further observed that "while the Constitutional Convention of 1869 was
in session the Peabody Fund came to assist in the establishment of
public schools in Virginia. In 1902 the General Education Board came

¹⁵Moger, op. cit., p. 231.
¹⁷Ibid., p. 23.
to revive education," and had it not been for this support, he con­
cluded, the public school system mandated by the 1869 Constitution
would have been a short-lived affair in Virginia.\(^{18}\) But, credit must
also be given to: "the able coterie of middle-class leaders who spear­
headed the campaign"; capitalization by the educational reformers on
"the general spirit of innovation" which characterized the progressive
movement; and, "disfranchisement of the Negro."\(^{19}\)

Several educational interest groups, some composed of teachers
and others of concerned citizens, also helped to advance the cause of
public education in Virginia. On the national level, the National
Education Association (NEA) worked aggressively for legislation it
believed would promote public education and advance the welfare of
teachers. The NEA is the oldest and the largest of the general organi­
izations of teachers. Founded in 1857 by forty-three educators as the
National Teachers Association, in 1870, when Virginia established its
public school system, this organization had become the National Educa­
tional Association with a membership of 170. By the year of its cen­
tennial celebration, however, its membership had risen to 700,000. In
1906 it received a charter from Congress under its present name. Over
the years the NEA has wielded a measure of influence in American educa­
tion, with the nation's leading educators actively participating in its
conferences and serving on its committees.\(^{20}\)

\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 23.

\(^{19}\)See Larsen, op. cit., pp. 152-53.

\(^{20}\)See Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York:
Harper, 1957) for a complete and thorough discussion of the history of
this organization, as well as the minutes of the annual meetings.
The most notable of the organizations working at the state level to advance public education in Virginia were the Virginia Education Association (VEA) and the Cooperative Education Association (CEA). The VEA was organized at Petersburg on December 29, 1863, as the Educational Association of Virginia, by President J. M. P. Atkinson of Hampden-Sydney College as an exclusively male teachers' organization. Its last meeting was held in 1882. The First Virginia Teachers' Reading Association, organized at Wytheville on August 12, 1884, and the Virginia State Education Association, formed in 1891, both seem to have been extensions of this same movement. The Virginia Teachers' League, acknowledged by some to have been a successor to the Educational Association of Virginia, was organized at Mount Jackson in 1898 and reorganized at Staunton in 1901 as the Virginia State Teachers' Association. In 1925 this became the Virginia Education Association (VEA) as it is known today. Its major contribution came through its official organ of communication which, from 1869-1891 was known as the Educational Journal of Virginia; from 1891-1895 as the Virginia School Journal; from 1896-1902 again as the Educational Journal of Virginia; and, since 1907 as the Virginia Journal of Education.\(^1\) The Journal's effect on the educational revival in Virginia was not inconsiderable. Through it the indifference and occasional hostility of the VEA to the concept of public education was

eventually changed to a most cooperative attitude. Ruffner used the
Journal as the official channel of communication between the office of
Superintendent of Public Instruction and the various school offices.
Through it he implored public school officers to actively support the
cause for public education and constantly reminded them that "before
anything effective can be done, there must be an educational revival
among the people." 

The greatest influence on the twentieth century educational
revival in Virginia, however, seems to have been wielded by the CEA.
While agreement has been tacitly reached on the chronological evolution
of the Cooperative Education Association of Virginia, at least three
variant views have been expressed as to its origin. The CEA began as
the Cooperative Education Commission in 1904, changing the word Commis­
sion to Association the next year. In 1933 it merged with the Virginia
Congress of Parents and Teachers, adopting the nam e Cooperative Educa­
tion Association, Virginia Branch of the National Congress of Parents
and Teachers. Buck, Dabney, Heatwole, and Moger, in tracing its effect
on the educational revival, attributed its beginning to the Southern

22 See Larsen, op. cit., p. 153, and Jack P. Maddex, Jr., The
Virginia Conservatives, 1867-1879 (Chapel Hill: University of North


24 See J. L. Blair Buck, The Development of Public Schools in
Virginia, 1607-1952; Charles W. Dabney, Universal Education in the
South, Vol I; George W. Guy, "The Cooperative Education Association
of Virginia," Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin,
1923, No. 53; Cornelius J. Heatwole, A History of Education in Virginia;
William A. Maddox, The Free School Idea in Virginia Before the Civil
War; and, Allen W. Moger, Virginia: Bourbonism to Byrd, 1870-1925.
Education Board which had been founded in 1901; Maddox reached farther back in Virginia's history and assigned its "roots" to an educational conference in 1845; and, Guy traced its origin to a meeting in Richmond in 1904 of a group of young men and women searching for a "wider democracy in education." But, in spite of these seeming discrepancies, the role played by this citizens' group in the educational revival in Virginia during the first decade of the twentieth century was a prominent one.

"At the meeting of the Cooperative Association in Norfolk in November 1904, a resolution was adopted requesting Governor Montague and President Alderman, of the University, to lead a campaign in the state in the Month of May following, planned to interest the people in a more thorough system of public education. This became known as the 'May Campaign.'"

In this so-called May Campaign one hundred of the ablest speakers of the State delivered three-hundred addresses in ninety four counties at one hundred and eight meetings; two hundred thousand pages of educational

---


literature were issued, and fifty citizens' school associations were formed.29

The educational revival was also sustained in Virginia by the press. Typical of the releases which supported the activities of the CEA and the May Campaign are these extracts from a Richmond paper:

Harmony, enthusiasm and progress marked the quarterly meeting of the Cooperative Education Commission of Virginia, which was held yesterday at the John Marshall house. The main business of the meeting was to make final plans for the great May Campaign of education, especially in behalf of the rural schools of this State.

Most gratifying has been the response from the hundred or so speakers who will take part in the May Campaign. These patriotic men without exception signified their readiness to do all in their power to advance a cause which they deemed so vital to the welfare of this Commonwealth.

Two days later the list of speakers was published, and an even later issue commented on two educational rallies as follows:

The educational rally in Smyth county yesterday brought together a great crowd at Mt. Carmel, three miles east of Marion... A Citizens' Improvement Association, with a membership of almost the entire assembly, was organized. A marked feature of the day was a vote taken in the audience which showed the people unanimously in favor of raising the taxes for school purposes.

Still another article reflected similar optimism: "The people of Waynesboro were favored with an educational treat today, thanks to the Cooperation (sic) Education Commission of Virginia."30

The results of the May Campaign were gratifying. "The tremendous enthusiasm generated by the May Campaign represented a fulfillment, an apex, of the agitation begun four years earlier.... The public was


30 Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 9, 1905, p. 6; April 11, 1905, p. 9; and May 20, 1905, p. 2.
aroused as never before to the necessity of higher state appropriations, for higher local tax rates, for higher salaries, for higher standards.\textsuperscript{31} "The May Campaign was a prodigious success. It was described in the papers as 'a tidal wave' for education. It proved epochmaking in that it secured the enactment of laws for the betterment and extension of the schools authorized under the new constitution, and marked the beginning of a new era in public education in Virginia."\textsuperscript{32} But, most importantly, the May Campaign seemed to provide the impetus for a reawakened general interest in the public normal school in Virginia.

The Need for Additional Normals in Virginia

The problem of supplying enough trained and competent teachers for the public schools of Virginia had plagued Virginia's educators since the inception of the school system in 1870. However, until the educational revival, spurred on by the CEA and the May Campaign, focused attention on the need for additional facilities for the training of teachers, the combined efforts of educators and legislators had made little headway. But once the general interest was aroused, both educators and legislators were not the least bit hesitant in using this interest to further their crusade for additional normal schools in Virginia.

The "LeCato Resolution," in calling for the appointment of "a committee to gather information bearing upon the establishment of an additional normal school and report to the next session of the General

\textsuperscript{31}Larsen, op. cit., pp. 166-67.

\textsuperscript{32}Dabney, op. cit., p. 327.
Assembly," represented the first twentieth century effort of the legislature to establish additional normal schools in Virginia.\(^{33}\) The committee so appointed reported on "the subject of the establishment of another normal school for females with industrial training," on December 7, 1903:

> The civilization of today has no place for the ignorant and incompetent man. . . The people of the Commonwealth are becoming more and more alive to the importance of education in all its phases. They are turning their eyes and ears to that political party which plans and performs the most liberal things for the uplift of their children and which best fits them to meet the new conditions of life . . . we find that nine-tenths of the teachers in the white schools are females. . . . The State . . . cannot afford to neglect the training of female teachers. . . . Industrial training is no longer a fad nor an experiment. Its warmest advocates are those expert educators who, though trained under the old system, have tested the new by its effectiveness in the increased accuracy, studiousness, discipline and comprehensiveness of the pupil. In conclusion, we recommend that there is imperative and immediate need for the establishment of another normal school for females with industrial training.\(^{34}\)

The day after the committee on Public Institutions and Education began to study this report, Delegate West, of Louisa, introduced a bill to establish the "Northside Normal School" which would offer industrial training to women desiring to become teachers. Senator Keezell, of Harrisonburg, submitted what was referred to as a substitute for the "West Bill"—a resolution for a special committee to be organized to investigate and report on the matter.\(^{35}\) Subsequently, on January 11, 1904, a special


\(^{34}\)Ibid., (1903), pp. 974-75.

joint commission, consisting of five members from the House and five from the Senate, was appointed to investigate and to report to the general assembly all the facts, as far as they may be able to ascertain them, in connection with the establishment and location of another female normal school, and they are specifically directed to report the names of such towns and cities as make special propositions, giving in detail, as far as practicable, the nature of the gifts, donations of grounds and buildings, bonds, or other valuables, and the natural advantages and drainage of the grounds, buildings, and sites, hygiene of the vicinity, the water and lighting facilities, the railway and steamboat connections, and the approximate and relative cost of living.36

The report of this special Joint Commission was read to the House on January 13, 1906, and to the Senate on January 15th of the same year. The report stated that "The Commission visited those cities and towns which submitted such propositions as were contemplated by the aforesaid act." Listed in the report were the questions put to the representatives of the various localities by the Commission and the most important features of the answers given by these twenty-eight representatives. It came as somewhat of a surprise when it was noted that The Commission believes that the wisest policy of the State to adopt is the establishment of a sufficient number of normal schools to supply efficient teachers, to be accessible to all sections, and to meet the health conditions of the State. The Commission, therefore, recommends the establishment of three more normal schools for white females and that they be so located as to meet the conditions herein set forth.

The Commission further reported its vote in recommending the preferred locations. Radford received 10 votes and Harrisonburg 6; Fredericksburg

and Newport News each had 5 votes; Front Royal received 3; and, Manassas garnered only 1. And, although originally charged with seeking a site for only one additional normal, the Commission reiterated:

... in view of all the facts ascertained by its investigation, (the Commission) is of the unanimous opinion that it would be unwise, inexpedient and improper to establish but one school, and that the best interests of the State would be served by establishing a system of schools as hereinbefore recommended, and that any action on the subject should look to this end.\(^37\)

Political and social pressures seem to have precipitated this decision. The ensuing fight over which locations should receive these schools was bitter indeed.

No sooner had the Joint Commission been appointed in 1904 than several communities had begun to bid actively and to maneuver for a school to be established in their respective areas. On February 10, 1904, H. B. No. 70 was introduced, referred to committee,\(^38\) and emerged on March 2, 1904, as "An ACT authorizing the board of supervisors of Prince William county to issue bonds and appropriate the proceeds there-of to the establishment of a State normal school for girls in said county," requiring that "the bonds hereinbefore authorized shall not be issued unless the said State normal school for girls is located at or near Manassas, Virginia."\(^39\) On February 16, 1904, S. B. No. 149 was introduced to authorize the town of Salem and/or the county of Roanoke

\(^37\)Virginia, *Journal of the Senate* (1906), pp. 50-51.


to issue bonds to secure a "State Female Normal School."\textsuperscript{40} This resulted in an Act being passed on March 10, 1904, to authorize it.\textsuperscript{41} And, on March 3, 1904, S. B. No. 258 was also introduced to authorize the town of Harrisonburg and/or the county of Rockingham to appropriate money to secure a location for the school at or near Harrisonburg.\textsuperscript{42} It was enacted into law on March 14, 1904.\textsuperscript{43} Although both Manassas and Salem had requested the issuance of bonds to raise the money, and thus by an Act passed on April 27, 1903, were required to submit the issue to the qualified voters in their respective communities,\textsuperscript{44} Harrisonburg merely asked for authorization to appropriate money for such a school.

It was not, however, until increased interest had been aroused by the activities of the CEA and the educators responsible for the May Campaign that any further action was taken by the Legislature. Governor Swanson, "Virginia's second educational Governor,"\textsuperscript{45} after writing at length about the needs of the public school system, set the tone for the appeal for additional teacher training institutions in his message to the Legislature on February 1, 1906:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Virginia, Journal of the Senate} (1904), p. 143.
\textsuperscript{41}\textit{Virginia, Acts of Assembly} (1904), chap. 86, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Virginia, Acts of Assembly} (1904), chap. 151, p. 267.
\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Virginia, Acts of Assembly} (Extra Session of 1902-03-04), chap. 184, pp. 259-60.
\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Moger, op. cit.}, p. 252.
\end{quote}
Another educational need is increased facilities to colleges engaged in normal work, so that the schools may be provided with more teachers, who are efficient and capable and purpose to make teaching their life profession. These institutions are indispensable to our educational system and should be substantially sustained and continuously improved.46

Bills were introduced in the House in rapid succession in 1906 by legislators anxious to secure a female normal school for their community. For example, on January 23, 1906, Delegate Johnson offered a bill to establish a "State Female Normal School" at Front Royal; on January 26, 1906, Delegate Slaughter suggested Culpepper as a site; on February 13, 1906, Delegate Lion suggested Manassas; on February 17, 1906, Delegate Swift added Fredericksburg; Delegate Good did the same for Harrisonburg on February 19, 1906; and, Delegate Barrett countered with the addition of Newport News the next day.47 The House Committee on Schools and Colleges had also gone on record as favoring additional normal schools on February 17, 1906, by referring to the Committee on Finance, the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this committee that there should be three normal schools established in Virginia, in addition to the one now at Farmville, for the education of teachers, and that there should be appropriated therefore, one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, if in the opinion of the Finance Committee the financial condition of the State will justify it. It is further recommended that this report be referred to the Committee on Finance.48

---

48 Virginia, ibid., p. 425.
In addition to this resolution, an Act was passed on March 7, 1906, transferring ownership of the real estate and personal property of 'William and Mary College' to the State; continuing the requirement for a normal department to be maintained to prepare white male teachers; providing for a board of ten Visitors "to be appointed by the governor from the State at large," with the Superintendent of Public Instruction an ex-officio member; incorporating the Board under the style of "the College of William and Mary in Virginia"; and, conveying to the Board the authority to "control and expend the funds of the college . . . make all needful rules and regulations . . . appoint the president and all professors, teachers and agents, and fix their salaries, and generally direct the affairs of the college." "Thus was the College of William and Mary placed on the footing of a regular State institution."  

During this same period, agitation had also begun for establishment of a State system of public high schools in Virginia. The first American public high school, established in Boston in 1821, was the result of citizen-interest in new educational opportunities for their children. In Virginia, many counties "had an academy to furnish the equivalent of a high school education for those who could pay the tuition," but it was generally felt that public high schools had no place in Virginia's school system. The high school, when it came to Virginia, was not meant to replace these academies, but to make the same advantages

49Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1906), chap. 92, pp. 94-96.  
available to those children whose parents could not afford to send them to an academy.⁵¹ On March 14, 1906, the Virginia General Assembly passed the Mann High School Bill "to establish and maintain a system of public high schools." This Act made it lawful for any district school board to establish and maintain a public high school; permitted two or more districts in the same or adjoining counties to establish and maintain a joint high school; stipulated that no State funds would be appropriated for such high schools until the districts had provided for the maintenance of their primary and grammar schools for a term of at least five months, providing for matching funds in certain instances; designated the State Board of Education as the agent to prescribe admission requirements and assure inspection by competent persons of all proposed high schools before any State funds were allocated; and, authorized annual appropriations.⁵² The Superintendent of Public Instruction suggested that normal training classes be established in some of the State's best high schools replicating the pattern pursued in Michigan and Wisconsin. In this manner, "the young men and women who have graduated from the high schools, or those who have equivalent training, or those who have held third or second grade certificates and wish to improve themselves, could enter the training schools for a year of study, . . . the cost to the State should prove moderate. . . A few of the best of these training schools


might easily be enlarged into regular State normals whenever the financial and educational conditions of the State justify the step."

Newspaper editors reported regularly on developments and often added their support to the crusade for better educational opportunities for women in Virginia. Typical of this reporting were these Times-Dispatch remarks in quoting a joint committee on the need of an education for women:

The period is rapidly approaching, say the committee, when the condition or the system of government that permits a child to grow into an untrained citizen is a crime against civilization and a reproach to the government that fosters the crime... Necessity has made woman a co-worker with man; chivalry demands her equal preparation for the struggle; injustice alone consents to less.

Three days later an editor of the same paper supported the cause of education for women:

(Education) is a work for men as well as for women. It is a work in which the men of the land should take a deep interest, for it is a matter of vital concern that ample provision be made for the education of women. The moral tone of society is largely determined by women, and the better educated they are, the greater will be their influence.

Here in Virginia we are spending out of the public treasury large sums of money for public institutions of learning, and we are not spending a cent too much. But the women are not getting a fair deal. We have (four schools) for the education of men, while we have one normal school, and that by no means adequate to the demands upon it, for the education of women. It is a mistaken policy. It is not only ungenerous, but it is unwise, and sooner or later the taxpayers of the State and their representatives in the General Assembly will find it out for themselves.

54 Richmond Times-Dispatch, December 6, 1903, p. 1.
55 Ibid., December 9, 1903, Editorial, p. 4.
The papers also kept before the public the conflict that was developing in the Legislature in 1906 over how many normal schools would be established and where they would be located. The Times-Dispatch reported the decision of a special joint committee to report in favor of three, instead of one, additional normal schools, as follows:

The special joint committee named to recommend a site for an additional normal school yesterday determined to report in favor of a system of these institutions, definitely declare the city of Radford as the site for one, and adjourned to meet at Murphy's at 10 o'clock this morning. The session yesterday was lively from start to finish, and strong speeches were made in favor of several places. The committee will ask for three additional normal schools, one of which will be located at Radford, the location of the other two to be yet determined. On a tentative vote between Fredericksburg and Newport News, the latter won, but this question will be brought up again. Front Royal and Harrisonburg tied for the third school and this will have to be fought over again in order to break the deadlock.

The members are giving the matter a great deal of thought and attention and each seems to be greatly interested in the success of the proposed system. The matter of State normal schools is considered one of vital moment to the people of Virginia, and a need of more of these institutions has been keenly felt for some years. The committee will likely complete its report today.56

The Newport News Daily Press reported the political maneuvering by Norfolk to beat out Newport News for one of the schools in the following manner:

We will get one of the new normal schools unless Jamestown beats us, said State Senator Saxon W. Holt. The special committee has recommended Newport News as the location for one of the proposed new schools and there seemed to be no doubt about the recommendation being adopted until Norfolk, in an indirect manner, began to reach out for the prize. The plan by which it is proposed to land the school on the other side of Hampton Roads is

56Ibid., January 10, 1906, p. 2.
as follows: When the bill making an appropriation for a Virginia State building at the Jamestown exposition is offered, it would provide that the building be a permanent structure, suitable for use after the exposition as a normal school. The idea is to advance the plan that to name the site of the Jamestown exposition as the location for the new normal school would be the means of saving to the State the cost of erecting a building for the school.

Senator Holt states, however, that he is confident of defeating the plan and landing the school here after all. He declares that if the representatives from the other side of the Roads insist upon pushing their scheme he will oppose the exposition appropriation bill, and as representatives from some parts of the State are not enthusiastic about the exposition, the Norfolk people cannot afford to have a Tidewater Senator against the appropriation.57

The Daily Press expressed their support in an editorial, titled, "Exposition in No Deal," as

We note with interest and pleasure a specific denial from authorized representatives of the Jamestown Exposition Company that there is any deal on foot by which the Company is to help boost Norfolk's claim for one of the State normal schools.58

This concerted crusade for better education was instrumental in securing a significant improvement in the support of public schools in Virginia, with the normal school idea being advanced quite rapidly. Within five years from the advent of the May Campaign in 1905, Virginia had provided for the establishment of an additional three normal schools. Politics, prodded by an aroused public opinion, a Governor dedicated to the cause of education, and educators possessed of the vision and the wisdom to capitalize on such opportunities, were the major factors in the battle for additional normal schools.

58 Ibid., January 17, 1906, Editorial, p. 4.
A Normal for Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg

Although there were many persons in Virginia in 1870 who opposed a public school system as unnecessary and a senseless waste of government funds, the interaction of political and social forces in the cultural milieu contributed measurably to overcoming this opposition and to the establishment of such a system. By 1906, a public school system supported by government funds was firmly established and socially accepted. The same cannot be said of the public teacher-training institutions—although the idea of locating a female normal school in a specific community rapidly gained acceptance among those citizens who stood to profit from a normal school. As a result, an intense rivalry began to develop between such cities and counties, with socio-economic and political forces combining in a campaign to secure a normal school for their respective communities. Skillful political maneuvering and, at times, even vicious infighting became the order of the day in both houses of the Legislature whenever the subject of normal schools came up. In spite of (perhaps more correctly, because of) this increased activity, no decision was reached during the 1906-07 Legislative session to establish even one normal school, but, when the 1908 session began, one of the major items on the legislative agenda was that of naming the location of one additional normal school.

The joint commission appointed to investigate the matter had, in 1906, recommended the establishment of three female normal schools, in addition to the one at Farmville and had unanimously endorsed Radford as the most desirable location for one normal with Harrisonburg and
Fredericksburg generally favored for the other two. The locations actually selected, and the manner in which these selections were made, constitute an excellent example of the social and political forces combining to generate educational policy in Virginia. One member of the 1908 Legislature described the contest waged for normal school facilities as "the fiercest parliamentary battle of the session." The Senate and House Journals, personal papers of the contestants, and newspaper accounts furnish a detailed running commentary on the manner in which these selections were made.

Senator Holt, from Newport News, attempted to strike the first blow in what soon developed into a battle royal and a supreme test of the political acumen and finesse of the participants by presenting the following resolution:

1. That the best interests of the public school system require that there should be established at present, one, and only one, additional Female Normal School in the State.

2. That such additional Female Normal School should be located at Newport News. This resolution was only presented; it did not pass. Delegate Charles A. Johnston, of Montgomery, in accordance with the intentions of the joint committee in their unanimous recommendation of the site for one of the schools, "offered a bill, which was referred, providing for the establishment of a State normal school at Radford. This measure was sent to

59Supra, pp. 111-12.

60Moger, op. cit., p. 252.

the Committee on Finance.62 At about the same time, the Manassas Business League, during its annual meeting, appointed a committee "to proceed at once to Richmond to secure the establishment at Manassas of the proposed Ruffner Normal School for Girls."63 The Times-Dispatch described the action which took place in the Senate to name Harrisonburg as the site for the new school. Senator Keezell, Chairman of the Finance Committee, member and former chairman of the Committee on Public Institutions, dominated the session. According to the Times-Dispatch:

The Senator from Rockingham loomed high in the debate, in every sense of the word. Earnest and forceful, he was at times somewhat personal, and once or twice it looked as though the importance of the question under discussion was nearly overshadowed by the personal considerations involved.64

Several amendments were proposed to locate the school elsewhere, but each was killed and Harrisonburg emerged as the Senate's choice for the school.

By the evening session, however, these acerbities had been sugared over, or at least modified. Senator Keezell was as aggressive as ever and kindly and flattering, but none the less fatally opposed every proposed amendment. Fredericksburg and Radford shared the fate which had befallen Manassas and Front Royal at the morning session.65

During this same period the House was also actively engaged in their selection of the site for the new normal. Many delegates expressed

62 Richmond Times-Dispatch, January 16, 1908, p. 3.
63 Ibid., January 18, 1908, p. 1.
64 Ibid., February 20, 1908, p. 1.
65 Ibid., February 20, 1908, p. 2.
their dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Senate had reached their decision, believing that a joint sitting of the Assembly, recom-
mended by the House, was the only way to select the site. Delegate Goolrick, of Fredericksburg, one of these dissatisfied legislators, was quoted as saying:

The action of the Senate in passing the Harrisonburg Normal school bill in no way settles the matter of the location of the school. Senator Keezell has won out in the Senate it is true, but even there his majority over Fredericksburg was only six, the vote standing 20 to 14. He had a distinct advantage in that body by reason of his position as chairman of the Finance Committee and as a member of the Committee on Public Institutions and Education, both of which committees had consideration of the normal school bills. . . The only fair way of settling this fight was by the method set out in the joint resolution, which passed the House, providing for a joint conference of the House and Senate, a location to be selected in this conference by the process of elimination. This resolution unanimously passed the House and was killed in the Senate by Senator Keezell, who now charges that some one is fighting under cover. His reason for killing this resolution arose from the fact that he had an unfair advantage in the Senate, and from the further fact that Harrisonburg was unwilling to take her chances at a joint meeting, though the county of Rockingham has two delegates in the House and none of the other locations more than one. The House Committee on Schools and Colleges, in the interest of fair play, has so far refrained from recommending any location, and thus giving that location an advantage, but now that Senator Keezell has refused to take his chances at a joint meeting the House Committee will act, and it is safe to say that the committee won't indorse Harrisonburg.66

While diligently reporting on the political maneuvering of the legislators in their attempts to secure the normal school for their individual districts, reporters for the Times-Dispatch also addressed the more basic issue of the need for normal schools, editorializing:

66Richmond Times-Dispatch, February 21, 1908, p. 3.
The Times-Dispatch has felt no special interest in the contest which has been going on between the towns of Virginia for the location of the new normal school. The location is a matter of small concern, provided it be eligible and healthful. But the Times-Dispatch is deeply interested in the school itself. One of the greatest needs of the public school system of Virginia is better trained teachers. Teaching is a profession.

It is not enough that the teacher be a person of education, as that term is usually applied. The successful teacher must have hard training in the art of imparting knowledge, in discipline and in the scientific methods of dealing with boys and girls, so as to incite them to study.67

Senator Keezell wrote of his "immediate connection with the matter of additional normal schools" twenty years later and commented that "I have often been urged to give an account of my connection with the establishment of the State Normal for Women, and of its location at Harrisonburg."

He recounted his role in the matter, beginning with his appointment on the committee authorized to investigate and report on the location for the proposed new normal school, explaining: "I did something I had never done before during my service in the Senate, that is, to ask for a committee assignment." His reply to the charge that he must have "an axe to grind," was that he ground an axe no more than any other Senator you may name, and I am sure, if I have, I cannot succeed unless I show the committee I have the place that should be chosen and the axe that ought to be ground." He presented basically the same version of the conflict that took place in the Legislature in 1908, but in more personal detail.

When the session of 1908 met, I had become chairman of the Senate Committee of Finance, and was still ranking member of the Committee of Public Institutions and Education.

67 Ibid., February 24, 1908, Editorial, p. 4.
My bill for Harrisonburg was very promptly introduced, referred to the Committee of Public Institutions and Education, and again took its place ahead of all similar bills on the calendar of the committee. It was reported by this committee to the Senate, naming Harrisonburg as the location, and referred by the Senate to the Committee of Finance for the consideration of its financial aspect. A little later this bill was favorably reported by the Committee of Finance, carrying an appropriation of $75,000 --$50,000 for the first year and $25,000 for the second year. Then it was that the battle was really on, and it was a battle royal.68

Keezell cited his "thorough canvas of the Senate membership of forty" during which he gained assurance from twenty-four Senators that as long as their locality was not in contention, they would support Harrisonburg. After the bill's referral to the House, and the House's refusal to act on it, Senator Keezell related how he went to Governor Swanson to "enlist his aid to get the bill before the House." He quoted the Governor as saying, "Why don't you do as is frequently done in Congress, write this bill, as an amendment to, and a rider on the appropriations bill," which the Senator promptly did. He recalled the reaction, when this amendment was reported to the Senate, as "the greatest stir I ever saw in legislative circles."69

When the House refused to act on the Senate bill, the Times-Dispatch opined that "some conference report must be accepted, or the $11,000,000 which the bill provides for running the State government for two years cannot be appropriated. To avoid this calamitous result, or some other distasteful to one or the other branches of the General

68George B. Keezell, "History of the Establishment of the State Teachers College at Harrisonburg," The Virginia Teacher, IX (May, 1928), pp. 133-40.

69Ibid., pp. 135-36.
Assembly, it is likely that a compromise be reached." Keezell described how the compromise was eventually effected, saying:

Friends of Fredericksburg came in great haste to know whether I would agree to name Fredericksburg along with Harrisonburg, even if no appropriation of money should go to Fredericksburg. My answer was: 'I will treat Fredericksburg better than Fredericksburg's friends on the House Committee of Schools and Colleges were willing to treat Harrisonburg. I will agree that Fredericksburg be included and that she will receive $25,000.00 of the $75,000.00 carried for Harrisonburg.' So, by agreement, Fredericksburg was written in the bill, and instead of providing for the establishment of one normal school for women at that session, two were named. Two years later a bill, establishing the school at Radford, was passed, thus carrying into effect the recommendations of the Committee on Locating a Normal School.]

The compromise was not that easily effected in the House. It was explained some few years later by Delegate Charles A. Johnston in great detail:

Senator Keezell was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. This committee passed on all appropriations. Through his influence, he passed the bill in the Senate, naming his own town, Harrisonburg. In the House of Delegates, the Harrisonburg, Fredericksburg and Radford friends contended, and the fight became exceedingly warm with some feeling exhibited. I, with the assistance of members from the Southwest (most of them Republicans) led the Radford fight. O'Conner Goolrich (sic) led the Fredericksburg fight and the House members from Rockingham led for Harrisonburg. Harrisonburg was a poor third, Fredericksburg won over Radford by one vote. In this way, the Senate named Harrisonburg and the House named Fredericksburg. Therefore, the only way to settle between the two was by appointment of a Committee on Conference. Keezell, who dominated the Senate, was Chairman of the Senate conferences. The Speaker of the House had promised he would give me and two other friends of Radford each membership

70Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 7, 1908, p. 3.
on this committee, but at the last moment, some unseen influence prompted him to change his appointment, with a result that I and my friends were left off.

The Conference Committee recommended that two normal schools be established, one in Harrisonburg and one in Fredericksburg. I was very much incensed over the treatment I had received, and at once proceeded to gather our friends around me with request that they vote against the adoption of the Appropriation Bill. To pass the bill it required a constitutional vote of a majority of the whole (51). It only received 46 votes. Therefore, we accomplished the defeat of the Appropriation Bill. This situation continued for three days, and I was charged by the Governor with the responsibility of defeating the bill, which I readily assumed, and stated that unless the way was open to add Radford to the bill, I would gladly assume the responsibility of forcing an extra session. The friends of both the other schools talked with the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, stating if I would break the deadlock on the Appropriation Bill they would pledge me unreservedly their support for Radford at the 1910 session. I relented, and the Appropriation Bill passed, carrying provision for Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg. I went home seemingly defeated, but in 1910 my friends (enemies in 1908) stuck to their promises which resulted in the Radford bill passing at that session with only an appropriation of $25,000.72

The rider to the Appropriation Bill that provided for the establishment of the two schools was approved on March 14, 1908, and stipulated that: Of the sum of seventy-five thousand dollars appropriated "for the establishment of the State normal and industrial schools for women, at Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg," twenty-five thousand was for the school at Fredericksburg, a sum not available until "on and after February twenty-eighth, nineteen hundred and nine, but not before"; The schools were placed "under the supervision, management and government of the boards of trustees, which shall consist of ten members each, to be

appointed by the governor, by and with the consent of the Senate," with
the Superintendent of Public Instruction named as an ex-officio member
of each board; The Boards were incorporated "under the name and style of
State normal and industrial school for women at Harrisonburg and State
normal and industrial school for women at Fredericksburg, respectively,"
and were required to make annual progress reports to the State Board of
Education; and, The town of Harrisonburg was required to appropriate
not less than fifteen thousand dollars cash and the town of Fredericks-
burg not less than twenty thousand dollars cash—as a condition for the
establishment of a school in their respective communities.\textsuperscript{73}

President Burrus, of the Harrisonburg Normal, who submitted his
first report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction on December 1,
1909, commented as follows:

In accordance with an act of assembly, March 14,
1908, the Board of Trustees was duly organized, and
selected a site and approved the plans for two buildings.
The site consists of about forty-eight acres in a beauti-
ful location within the limits of the town of Harrisonburg.

He reported that "the first session of the school began on September 28,
1909,"--with 150 students enrolled, mostly in the industrial classes, and
ended with a plea for double the appropriation for maintenance for the
coming years "if we are to continue in an effective manner the work that
has begun and also provide for needed extensions."\textsuperscript{74} The officials of
the normal school at Fredericksburg encountered difficulty in completing
arrangements for opening, not the least of which can be attributed to

\textsuperscript{73}Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1908), chap. 284, pp. 427-29.

\textsuperscript{74}Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public
Instruction (1907-08), (1908-09), pp. 647-48.
what Moger described as "the chilly indifference or open hostility toward the support of public schools" exhibited by Virginia's Democratic organization after 1909. As a result, the school at Fredericksburg was not able to be opened until September 26, 1911.75

A Normal for Radford

In his last message to the Legislature, January 12, 1910, Governor Swanson set the general tone for this session with these comments:

The last two General Assemblies have been noted for the many progressive policies inaugurated. These extended through a wide range of governmental effort and development . . . The amazing educational advance; the splendid public school buildings now adorning every section; . . . bear testimony to the stimulating influence of these wise acts of legislation and of the great and manifold benefits they have brought.

Our system of public education should be continuously enlivened, enlarged and improved. . . No expenditure of money brings greater benefits to the State than that given to equip teachers for the primary and high schools. The success of every educational system begins and ends with the efficiency of the teachers. Prudently, but progressively, the State should continuously improve and perfect its vast educational system, extending from the university and colleges to the primary schools, until it shall be surpassed by that of no State in this Union.76

On that same day, Senator Hart presented Senate Bill 12, to appropriate $75,000 for establishment within the corporate limits of Radford a State Normal and Industrial School for white women, which was taken up and referred to the Committee on Public Institutions and Education. The next day, Senator Chase submitted Senate Bill 37, to establish a female

75Moger, op. cit., p. 255.
normal at Lebanon, Russell County, which was taken up and referred to
the Committee on Special, Provisional and Local Legislation. On
February 14, House Bill 138, for establishing a normal school at
Radford, was taken up, read the first time and referred to the Com-
mittee on Finance. Two days later, Senator Noel presented Senate Bill
355, to establish a normal school at Big Stone Gap, which was taken
up and referred to the Committee on Special, Provisional and Local
Legislation. However, on the very next day, House Bill 138 was reported
out with amendments, and on March 5, passed the Senate with amendments
by a vote of 21-2. The House agreed to the amendments on the same day,
and the bill was signed by the President of the Senate on the 5th day
of March, 1910.77

In spite of a noticeable indifference and the slight trace of
hostility toward the schools mentioned by Moger,78 the expressions
of "good will for Radford" alluded to in the Times-Dispatch,79 and the
"promises" referred to by Keezell and Johnston80 which effected the
compromise in 1908, were honored, and Radford received a normal school
on March 10, 1910. The provisions of this Act were quite similar to the
Appropriation Bill rider which established the schools at Harrisonburg

77Ibid., pp. 28, 33, 280, 317-18.
78Moger, supra, p. 128.
79Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 11, 1908, p. 1, which said in
part: "It would not be fair to say that there was a deal, or that dis-
tinct pledges were made, but it is certain that there were expressions
of good will for Radford and concessions from sources that this town
was the logical and proper place for a normal school when the State
should be in a position to establish another."
and Fredericksburg, in stipulating that: The school would be "Under the supervision, management and government of a board of trustees, which shall consist of ten members, to be appointed by the governor, by and with the consent of the senate," with the Superintendent of Public Instruction an ex-officio member; The trustees were to be a "body corporate under the name and style of State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Radford," with authority "to make all needful rules and regulations for the government and management of said school, fix the number and compensation of teachers and employees of said school," making an annual report to the State Board of Education; and, The Act was contingent upon the city of Radford donating the "Adams site," or an equivalent one--or, in lieu of a site, $20,000--for establishment of the school.81

Thus, in the first decade of the twentieth century, "transition and leadership had brought new times, new spirit, and new programs to the Old Dominion... An aroused public and more prosperous conditions had led to great improvement in its public schools, colleges... The foundation... had been laid during the term of Governor Montague, and his successor had consciously given the political leadership which had caused the programs to be enacted, for Swanson's 'most persuasive weapon was practical politics,'"82 and, "practical politics" is most descriptive of the events which transpired during this period in Virginia's history.

81Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1910), chap. 120, pp. 176-77.
82Moger, op. cit., p. 263.
The first decade of the twentieth century can be viewed as a transitional period in Virginia's history. The period also marked the beginning of a trend toward centralization in education. The greatest period of achievement for the educational phase of what Pulley described as the progressive impulse in Virginia "lay between 1900 and 1910," and the educational reforms undertaken by Virginians during this period "were closely related to the political changes of the same period." The actual turning point toward centralization in education, however, came with Mann's election to the governorship in 1910, at which time "permanent Democratic control of the Commonwealth was virtually assured, (and) . . . as social stability and oligarchic rule were reestablished in the Old Dominion, political decision-making tended to move more and more into the hands of professional politicians and further away from the popular influence."1 Another historian has commented that "Governor Mann was elected without any commitment to schools, a fact which is reflected during the four years of his administration (1910-14).

---

He described himself as 'no educator.'\textsuperscript{2} Neither of these writers claimed, however, that the educational reform movement disappeared after 1910. Although Pulley described it as assuming a "diminished and redirected form," Moger commented that the "friends of education" continued to insist that the State support the public schools. Both agreed, however, that the lack of commitment to education by the Governor and the consolidation of power by the Democratic organization, plus the decentralization, or scattering of interests, of the reform group which rendered them less effective, was concomitant with a general movement toward centralization for economy of effort and money.\textsuperscript{3} This chapter will address itself to the trend toward centralization and how it affected the public normal schools in their evolution during the period 1910-1924.

**The Education Commission of Virginia**

Concern for the unwieldy, burgeoning State system of higher education was expressed as early as 1891 by Governor McKinney in an address to the General Assembly. After warning that "such different laws for the various institutions are confusing, . . . (and) may lead to trouble," he spoke of the need for one general law regulating the appointment of the Boards of Visitors for the public institutions; cited the variations in number, pay and terms of office of Board members; and, asked that Boards be simplified and made uniform.\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{3}Pulley, *op. cit.*, p. 150; Moger, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

\textsuperscript{4}Virginia, *Journal of the Senate* (1891), pp. 28-29.
This concern was next expressed in 1908 when the General Assembly established a "Commission to devise a stable method for the maintenance, management and expansion of the educational institutions of the State."\(^5\) Nothing more is heard of this Commission until March 15, 1910, when the General Assembly, concerned that the "demands made by the higher educational institutions for money at each meeting of the general assembly should be met by some systematic method"—since the "present tendencies of these institutions appear to be toward educational duplication and consequent financial waste"—passed another Act to continue the Commission created in 1908. This Act directed the Commission to devise a method whereby a "harmonious educational system" could be maintained, managed and expanded according to the needs of each institution and report its recommendations to the General Assembly at its next session.\(^6\) Moger pointed out a prime consideration behind the General Assembly's actions to continue the Commission with his observation that many of the citizens throughout the State in 1910 were becoming increasingly alarmed "because there were now 'four colleges for each sex' to make demands on the state's budget."\(^7\)

The task facing the Virginia education commission in 1910 was complex. A brief comparison of pertinent parts of the Acts of Assembly that created the five public normal schools should illustrate the problems faced by the Commission. For example, The Virginia Normal

\(^7\)Moger, *op. cit.*, p. 253.
and Collegiate Institute, founded in 1882, had a Board of Visitors of six well-qualified colored men plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with no term of office specified; was "in all things, and at all times, subject to the control of the legislature"; obligated to accept fifty young colored men as State students who, in turn, had to agree, by written contract, to teach or engage in educational work after graduation. Subsequent amendments introduced these significant changes: the Board of Visitors consisted of four qualified persons, plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with a term of office set at four years; the collegiate department was replaced with an industrial department; the Board was authorized "in general to direct and do all things not inconsistent with the laws of this State"; and, the number of State students to be admitted would be equal to "twice the number of members of the house of delegates, to be apportioned in the same manner."9

The State Female Normal School for (white) women at Farmville, created by an Act of Assembly on March 7, 1884, had a Board of Visitors of thirteen, plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with a term of office (set in 1903) of four years; the Board was authorized to "make all needful rules and regulations for the good government and management of the school"; State students would be apportioned on the basis of one student from each city of five thousand inhabitants and each county in the State, as well as one for each additional representative in the House of Delegates above one; and, the State students

9Ibid., (1901-02), chap. 401, pp. 397-400.
were required to "give satisfactory evidence" of an intention to teach in the public schools for at least two years after leaving the school.  

The State Normal and Industrial School for (white) women at Harrisonburg and the State Normal and Industrial School for (white) women at Fredericksburg were established by the same Act of March 14, 1908. Each had a Board of Trustees of ten members, plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with a term of office of four years; the Board was granted the powers "necessary and proper to accomplish the end for which said schools are created"; State students would be nominated by division superintendents of schools, and would number one from each county and city in the State plus an additional one for each city and county with additional representatives in the House of Delegates above one; and, students would be required to give satisfactory evidence of an intention to teach for at least four years after leaving the school.  

The State Normal and Industrial School for (white) women at Radford, created by an Act of March 10, 1910, had a Board of Trustees of ten members, plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with a term of office of four years; the Board was authorized to "make all needful rules and regulations for the government and management of said school"; State students would be apportioned as for the Harrisonburg and Fredericksburg normals, and would have to give "satisfactory evidence of an intention to teach for at least four years after leaving the school."

---

10 See Virginia, Acts of Assembly (Extra Session of 1902-03-04), chap. 268, pp. 411-12; also ibid., (1883-84), chap. 311, pp. 417-18.  
evidence" of an intention to teach in the public schools of the State for at least four years after leaving the school.\textsuperscript{12}

**Another Normal School Opens**

While this Commission was busily engaged in detailed research, the Fredericksburg Normal School opened. According to the first annual report submitted to the State Board of Education,

Notwithstanding the fact that the buildings were not completed, the school began its first session September 26, 1911. During the first session there were enrolled 131 students, representing thirty-five counties and four cities.

The school offers two years of regular professional work in advance of the regular high school course. In addition there are the manual training course, the household arts course, the rural arts course. A large number of students have entered the industrial courses, while practically all study some of the industrial branches.

To the time of the closing of this report, March 1, 1912, the session has been one of unusual success and the work of the student body has been most satisfactory.\textsuperscript{13}

This left but one public normal school to complete arrangements for opening--an act that would bring to an end the crusade for public normal schools in Virginia, and assure an efficient system of public teacher-training institutions. That event was to occur in 1913.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12}Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1910), chap. 120, pp. 176-77.

\textsuperscript{13}Virginia, Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (1911-12), pp. 447-49.

\textsuperscript{14}For a detailed report on the status of normal schools in the United States at this time, see U. S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1916-1918 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1921), Part IV, pp. 10-17, which reported that by 1910 a total of 264 normal schools were in existence with a student enrollment of roughly 132,000. Of these, 151, enrolling some 94,000 students, were reported as state normal schools; 40, enrolling
The Education Commission's Report of 1912

The Education Commission, charged in 1910 with devising an ideal method of coordinating the interests and duties of the higher educational institutions in Virginia and reporting at the next session, filed its 102-page report with the General Assembly in 1912. As the Act of 1910 had stipulated, the Commission consisted of seven members, at least four of which were experienced educators. E. A. Alderman, President of the University of Virginia, served as its Chairman. C. G. Maphis, Professor of Secondary Education at the University of Virginia, performed the duties of Secretary. Other members included J. D. Eggleston, State Superintendent of Public Instruction; C. M. Hazen, Professor of Psychology at the Medical College of Virginia; W. W. Smith, Chancellor of the Randolph-Macon System; J. R. Saunders, a member of the Senate of Virginia; and, R. E. Byrd, Speaker of the House of Delegates.\(^\text{15}\) A total of sixteen recommendations resulted from the Commission's investigation. Of particular concern were the provisions that: all institutions for education chartered by the State would be under the supervision of the State Board of Education; no institution chartered by the State would be allowed to give the A. B., B. S., or C. E. degree for less than four years of college work based on a four-year high school course, or not less than fourteen units; the normal schools, for the session of 1913-14, were to require at least two full years of high school work, or eight

\(^{15}\)Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1910), chap. 221, p. 335.
units, for entrance, and after that time would raise the entrance
requirements if the conditions of the high schools and the development
of the school system should warrant it; four full years of high school
work (not less than fourteen units) would be required for entrance to
any advance course leading to a degree in any institution; instead of
four separate boards with forty-one members, a Normal School Board with
thirteen members would be created; the Presidents of the normals would
advise the Board and comprise an executive council as well as serve as
a committee on courses of study; a permanent education committee was to
be formed and granted authority to carry out the wishes of the General
Assembly and continue to study the State's educational system for the
purpose of making further recommendations to the next General Assembly.16

All of these recommendations seemed to be predicated on the
premise that a harmonious, highly effective educational system—with
all its parts functioning to the utmost of their individual abilities—
should be the grand aim of every truly democratic state. To quote the
Commission:

The supreme duty of this generation in the direc-
tion of educational progress is to rise above institu-
tional exclusiveness and the atomistic conception of
education and to behold primary schools, secondary schools,
normal schools, colleges, technical schools, professional
schools and university working together as one great benef-
icent agency, feeding, stimulating, guiding, understanding
and supplementing each other. Out of such common and
united efforts alone can a modern State hope that intel-
ligent citizenship and patriotic leadership will come forth
able to guide and enrich the civilization of a democratic

16Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1912), Senate Document
No. 3, pp. 7-10.
community no longer hindered by insurmountable obstacles but free to run its course and to fulfill its destiny.\(^{17}\)

Placing all educational institutions under the general supervision of the State Board of Education could help greatly in achieving this goal—for the good of the institution, society, and the State. The State Board of Education would thus serve as an overall coordinating body, assuring that each institution was achieving its purpose and meeting the conditions set forth in its charter. As the logical agency for articulating the various parts of the educational system (from the elementary school up to the university) it could thus preclude a duplication of work which might be wasteful of both financial resources and human effort. It appears that the permanent education commission recommended was intended as the agency which would assume the operative role and perform the various duties of a statewide coordinating body under the State Board of Education.

The other recommendations cited in this study seem to embrace the need for a purification in all educational institutions within the State, a purification of functions and of admission and graduation requirements at all levels of the educational "ladder." The motive seems to have been not only one of saving money and human effort, but also one of attempting to achieve at least a modicum of standardization which would provide the basis for future professionalization of the entire educational system.

The Commission members admitted a complete awareness of the fact that the normal schools in Virginia had become involved in the

\(^{17}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p.} \, 13.\)
instruction of high school subjects because the conditions warranted, but at the same time felt that "conditions have so improved as not to justify a continuance of the practice of devoting so much time to purely high school work." That the normal school personnel shared this concern over devoting so much time to high school subjects is best evidenced by a statement in the first school catalog at Fredericksburg in 1911, which averred that

As soon as State high schools become sufficiently numerous and are developed so that conditions permit, it is the aim of this school to require for entrance to the regular course the equivalent of two full years of high school work, as outlined in the course required by the State for accredited high schools.

Until these conditions prevail, the entrance requirements will be a thorough knowledge of Arithmetic, Geography, English Grammar, United States History, Virginia History, Physiology and Hygiene, and other branches taught in the Grammar Grades of Virginia public schools.19

Harcleroad et al. viewed this as somewhat fortuitous for the normal schools, indicating that a relatively common pattern followed in most states was to prescribe four years beyond the common school for entrance to the normals. Thus students with no secondary education would enroll in a four-year course, and those with two years secondary education would take a two-year course. And,

Although many favored the purist approach, the majority of normal school students who came with only a common school education were poorly prepared in the subjects to be taught. Thus, the normal schools were forced to devote a substantial part of the program to further

18Ibid., p. 28.
19"Courses of Instruction, Regular Course," Bulletin of the State Normal and Industrial School for Women at Fredericksburg, Virginia, 1911, I (June, 1911), No. 1, p. 19.
subject matter education. Subjects such as arithmetic, algebra, natural science, chemistry, botany, art, agriculture, music, grammar, and geography formed the basis for the introduction of secondary school subject matter courses. Later they provided the foundation for movement to the teachers college and eventually to the development of multi-purpose institutions. Had these schools been able to attract students better prepared in the subject fields, the normal schools might have remained single-purpose, semi-professional institutions for a much longer period of time.20

As the Commission expressed it, the public normal school was an educational instrument of the State, an agency of the State for the professional training of teachers. Such institutions, they felt, could best accomplish their purpose by being centralized under one board which would insist upon a unity of purpose and action. It was of the utmost importance that the normals themselves realize and accept the fact that their major purpose was that of training teachers for the elementary schools of Virginia. Regardless of how many normal schools were in existence, nor how widely separated they might be, the Commission felt that their functions were identical and that each school had been established for exactly the same purpose--

the training of teachers for elementary schools. There should be no confusion of function. They are not high schools, although the subject matter of their courses is partially of secondary grade. They are not colleges. They are professional schools, and in a sense, technical and vocational--but their place in any educational system is clear-cut and definite. They should be built upon the four-year high school and articulate with it without reaching down and overlapping, in the sense of duplicating the work... They should think and act as one great educational instrument of the State to be used for a very

important but very definite and specific service. . . .
Under the present plan of having separate boards of
trustees for each normal school, . . . competition of
the wrong type is almost sure to enter. Institutional
selfishness, sectional pride, partisan bias, unrelated
efforts of ambitious presidents and loyal boards, are
almost sure to manifest themselves at some time, some­
where, and cause some friction and hurtful and wasteful
rivalry.21

The obvious answer, according to the Commission, was to place the
management of these homogeneous institutions under one common board—
"The Normal School Board." This Board would be given the authority to
direct the affairs, prescribe the functions, fix and enforce clearly
defined standards of admission as well as of work, unify the efforts,
apportion the funds of all public normal schools in the State. Members
of the Commission felt that such a Board would not only be economical
and thus be able to avoid a needless duplication of special departments,
but also that

Such a board would take a livelier interest in the
work of the schools and have a more intimate acquaintance
with their needs, rather than exercise, as is now fre­
quently the case, only a ratifying function. Progress
would be more uniform and substantial because fewer mis­
takes would be made when any proposition would be subject
to the criticism and approval of the other presidents and
members of the board.22

But, above all, the schools should grasp the significance of their
social connections and relations, and come to realize that their ful­
lest and truest function would be fulfilled and their highest reward
secured, through social efficiency. No matter how appropriate these

21Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1912), Senate Document
No. 3, pp. 29-30.
22Ibid., pp. 7-30.
recommendations may have been at that time, nor how urgently needed the reforms were, little came immediately from this Commission's report.

Still Another Normal School Opens

In the intervening period, plans were being finalized for the opening of the normal school that had been authorized for Radford. A Board of Trustees had been appointed, incorporated, and a site for the school selected in 1911. However, the site selected was other than the one specified in the Act establishing the school, and the citizens of West Radford were insisting that the original site be utilized. The Board persisted in its selection and the ensuing litigation was not resolved until the following year. The building was dedicated on August 9, 1913, and the school officially opened its doors to students on September 17, 1913.23 In his first annual report to the State Board of Education, President McConnell remarked:

Notwithstanding the limited accommodations, the total enrollment for the regular session opening September 17, 1913, ... was 182 students. ... The normal school has made an effort, in a large measure successful, to extend its work to the rural and village schools. ... Much attention has also been given to the enrichment of rural life and the improvement of public and personal hygiene. ... Too much praise cannot be given the students for their enthusiastic and cooperative spirit in bearing and overcoming the hardships and inconveniences of the early days of this institution.24

---


This school nominally required two years of high school work for admission, however, its catalog carried a statement which modified the requirement somewhat:

Many mature persons who have not had as much as one year's high school work can profit by the work of the Normal School. Such persons should correspond with the president, who will decide whether they are sufficiently advanced in their work to take advantage of the courses offered in the Normal School.25

Emerging Centralization

The Education Commission's report of 1912 was not completely forgotten, especially as it pertained to the normal schools, for on February 20, 1914, Senate Bill 472 was introduced to establish a Normal School Board. This Bill emerged on March 27, 1914, as "An ACT to create the Virginia normal school Board." With its enactment, the idea of centralization of State control over public educational institutions began slowly to materialize. To recount some of its provisions, the Virginia Normal School Board would be composed of twelve members, plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction, with a term of office of four years; the Governor of the State, at his own discretion, had all the rights and privileges of a member of this Board; a major duty of this Board would be to "prevent, as far as possible, unnecessary duplication of work in said schools with each other and with the primary and grammar grades and high schools of the State"; and if, in the Board's best judgment, it was deemed advisable, "the said Board may appoint the presidents of the respective schools as an executive council, which

25 See the Radford Normal Bulletin, I (July, 1913), No. 1, p. 18.
shall constitute a committee on the courses of study, entrance requirements and the proper correlation of the work of the said schools with each other and with the public school system of the State."  

This Education Commission had insisted that a normal school should restrict itself to the training of teachers for the elementary schools and leave the training of secondary school teachers to the professional department of the college or university, using the rationale that "both economy and efficiency require the professional school for secondary teachers to be closely associated with the most advanced sources of scholarship and scientific method."  

Many of Virginia's educators, and in particular the Presidents of the Normal Schools, did not share this sentiment. Their feelings were best summed up in the words of W. H. Ruffner who, almost thirty years earlier, while serving as Principal of the State Normal at Farmville, reported to his Board of Visitors:

A Virginia state normal school ought not to be confined to elementary work. . . . we should not stop here. The mind does not receive its strongest development when confined to primary studies. It must wrestle with more subtle principles, it must move in a wider area, it must climb higher, it must see farther. It must enter the larger halls of science and philosophy of language, of mathematics, of history, of art, and literature. And when such studies as these are pursued with normal thoroughness and practical direction, and under the guidance of pedagogical philosophy, we shall presently have among us a well-equipped and versatile style of teachers, who will be equally at home in all the grades of academical instruction.

---


This will meet the demand for superior teachers in public schools and in private schools throughout the State.\textsuperscript{28}

The period of evolution of Virginia's teacher-training institutions from 1914 to 1922 was one of continuing centralization. As a public normal school system began to solidify in Virginia, a rapidly-increasing enrollment of students in the public high schools throughout the State generated an urgent demand for additional high school teachers as soon as humanly possible, a challenge the public normal schools were eager for and ready to accept. The versatile, enterprising normal school presidents had foreseen this possibility, and as expertise was gained by their faculty, a natural upgrading of high school courses was instituted. The \textit{Radford Normal Bulletin} of April 1914 mentioned a "State Normal Certificate, which entitles the holder to teach both high school and elementary branches" as being available to those who could qualify by completing the required courses.\textsuperscript{29}

In 1915 the entire program of studies at the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was "rewritten and raised to a standard four-year high school and to a standard normal school."\textsuperscript{30} At its April 6, 1915, meeting, the Virginia Normal School Board replaced the rural arts and manual arts courses at the four normal schools for (white) women with work in the industrial arts, and permitted students with less than two years high school work to be admitted only after gaining special


\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Radford Normal Bulletin}, I (April, 1914), No. 3, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Virginia State College Gazette}, Catalog 1930-31, XXXVI (June, 1931), No. 2, p. 20.
permission from the normal school president. In recognition of the professional development of the four Normal Schools, the Virginia Normal School Board petitioned the General Assembly of 1916 to grant the four Normal Schools the privilege of conferring upon the graduates of their four-year standard college courses for the training of teachers the Bachelor of Science degree in Education, which it did on March 21, 1916. The Farmville Normal School bulletin also reported that

In January (sic) 1916, the Legislature granted the Virginia Normal School Board the privilege of conferring degrees in education. At the next meeting of the Board this school was authorized to extend Course IV—"Leading to teaching in high schools"—to a four-year course, leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education. The Radford Normal Bulletin stated that "those who do the four-year curriculum above a four-year high school course will be awarded the Degree of Bachelor of Science in Education." Lewis-Smith commented that

On March 21, 1916, the Virginia Normal School Board secured an amendment which allowed the four institutions under their control to confer the bachelor of science degree. Academic adjustments were started immediately, but the first such degrees were not conferred at Radford until June, 1921. (And), . . . whereas high school students previously had been admitted according to demand, the legislature in 1916 provided for elimination of high school courses in the 4 State Normal Schools, thus making admission requirements higher than for other

---

31 Virginia, Minutes of the Normal School Board, 1915, State Library, Archives.
33 Bulletin of the State Normal School for Women at Farmville, 1917-18, III (June, 1917), No. 4, p. 19.
state supported colleges and the state university. However, there was an escape clause in the normal school legislation to avoid hardships for the colleges, and the students, during the period of transition. . . . The period between 1916-22 saw the dropping of high school courses and the expansion and professionalization of other courses.

**Economy and Efficiency**

The House of Delegates, acutely aware of rising citizen concern with the spending of public funds and expecting that a situation would soon arise in which public expenditures would most likely exceed public revenues, submitted a Joint Resolution to the Senate on February 10, 1916, to name a committee on economy and efficiency. Senate Bill 341, introduced on February 16, 1916, became "An ACT to provide for the appointment of a commission on economy and efficiency to make a survey of the State and local governments of the Commonwealth and to submit a report to the next general assembly of Virginia." This report, submitted to the General Assembly in 1918, had far-reaching effects. After commenting at length on what they believed to be the inadequacies of the public school system—that: responsibility was not clearly fixed; power and responsibility did not go hand-in-hand with popular control, as it must; financial administration of the State Board of Education was deplorable; and, there was a great need for standardization of teacher certification procedures and requirements—the Commission recommended the establishment of an education commission of 5-7 members, a majority

---

35Lewis-Smith, op. cit., p. 24.

of which should be educators, to investigate and report to the General Assembly in 1920 on the educational conditions in Virginia. Delegates Fuller and Rolston introduced House Bill 72 on January 17, 1918, to provide for such a commission which, after referral, was reported on January 24, 1918. A legislative hassle ensued between the Senate and the House which resulted in "An ACT to provide for a commission to study educational conditions in Virginia and elsewhere, and to report to the next general assembly its findings, together with recommendations for a revision of the school laws and amendments to Article IX of the Constitution, and authorizing the State Board of Education to meet the expenses thereof" being passed on March 16, 1918. Membership of this Commission would include two from the House--to be named by its Speaker; two from the Senate--to be named by its President; the Superintendent of Public Instruction; plus three persons associated with the public free school system--to be named by the Governor.

The Virginia Normal School Board indicated its concern with economy and efficiency by instituting, in 1918, a plan of differentiation of the work of training high school and special teachers and rural supervisors which would avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, and contribute to the most economical use of public funds--thus making it unnecessary for each one of the State Normal Schools to carry the heavy

---

37 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1918), Senate Document No. 8, provides the entire report.


39 Virginia, House Journal and Documents (1918), pp. 11, 1085.
burden of a large number of special courses paralleling similar ones in other schools. The Board insisted that the primary responsibility and function of the State Normal Schools was that of training teachers for the elementary schools, but also admitted a secondary responsibility as that of training high school teachers and rural supervisors, and consequently assigned the differentiated work of advanced grade leading to degrees: to Farmville—a four-year course for the training of high school teachers; to Harrisonburg—a four-year course for the training of teachers in home economics; to Fredericksburg—a four-year course for the training of teachers in music, industrial arts, and commercial subjects; to Radford—a four-year course for the training of supervisors of elementary schools and for specialists in rural education; and,

In view of the fact that all of the Normals have heretofore been allowed to offer four-year courses for the training of high school teachers, it would be an apparent hardship on students who have entered these courses not to allow some period in which readjustment can be made. The operation of this resolution will therefore become effective July 1, 1921. In the meantime, no Normal School will accept new students for the third and fourth years in any special department other than that assigned to it by this resolution.40

This resolution in no way affected the work which was common to all of the schools—i.e., the two-year course for the training of teachers, or the modified two-year courses to meet the needs of students who might desire to pursue any of the specially assigned four-year courses at any of the Normals.

As a result of the Smith-Hughes Act, the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute was selected by the State Board of Vocational

---

40Radford Normal Bulletin, IX (May, 1922), No. 4, pp. 45-46.
Education to train Negro teachers of vocational subjects in the public schools. This action added two-year vocational courses in agriculture, auto mechanics, and electricity to the curriculum.\textsuperscript{41} Action was also initiated to improve the educational opportunities of women in 1918 with introduction of Senate Bill 63. This Bill emerged on March 15, 1918, as an "ACT to provide for the admission of women to the College of William and Mary in Virginia," and directed the College to "admit properly prepared women to its collegiate and normal courses, and upon graduation shall grant them degrees upon the same terms as those upon which like degrees are granted to men."\textsuperscript{42}

Also of great concern during this period, along with that of simplifying the administration of the school system to provide uniformity throughout, was that for the status of the teacher—as a practicing professional and as a citizen within the community. Dr. Jarman, President of the Farmville State Normal, exemplified the professional educational administrator's views on this subject by remarking in May 1919 that

\begin{quote}
The teacher's place in our democracy is, at this time, considered as more important than ever before. It is a well known fact that the public school teacher has not been appreciated and, therefore, has not been afforded the recognition which was her due; this is shown by the paltry salary she has been receiving. Since the beginning of the war thousands of teachers have left the profession and gone into more remunerative work, partly for patriotic reasons and partly for monetary reasons. This has done much to arouse the masses of the people to a realization of the fact that the teachers (who are the real makers of democracy) have been underrated and underpaid for the invaluable service they render.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{41}Virginia, Bulletin State Board of Education, II (September, 1919), No. 3, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{42}Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1918), chap. 420, p. 424.
One reason why trained teachers are underpaid is that the majority of the teachers in this State are not trained teachers, do not regard their work as a profession, and consequently do not create in their communities a proper public sentiment with regard to the public school, nor can they set a proper standard as to what the teacher should mean to a community.43

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, in his annual report of 1919, after commenting on the educational commission created in 1918 and due to report in 1920, made these comments about the status of teachers in Virginia:

One of the most important problems we have faced in the past, and easily the most serious to be met in the future, is the question of teacher's salaries. It is very trite to say that the public school teacher is paid by far the smallest annual wage of any other worker, skilled or unskilled. . . . There is of necessity a close relationship between the amount of salary and the quality of instruction secured. If the schools are to be much improved in internal school work, if teachers are to be encouraged to a higher degree of preparation, and if we are ever to develop a real profession of teaching in Virginia, the whole thing must be pitched on a higher scale of remuneration. After all, the teachers are the real crux of the school. In order to have efficient schools it is of fundamental importance to make provision to pay for efficient teachers.44

The report of the Virginia Education Commission in 1920 not only followed closely the recommendations of its survey staff, but also confirmed in general the findings of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency which had recommended its creation in 1918. State Superintendent

---


of Public Instruction, Harris Hart, served as President of the Commis-
sion, and Alexander J. Inglis, of Harvard University, directed the sur-
vey staff. While the investigation and report included a survey of the
entire public educational system of Virginia, of most interest to this
study were the recommendations that: general supervision of the public
school system be vested in a State Board of Education, appointed by the
Governor, subject to confirmation by the Senate, consisting of such a
number and tenure of office as fixed by law; the Superintendent of
Public Instruction, appointed by the State Board of Education, would
serve as the Board's executive and administrative officer; the Univer-
sity and other State institutions of higher learning would be placed on
a twelve months basis, and offer a summer quarter for men and women of
equal grade with any other quarter; the control and supervision of all
normal schools and all teacher training departments of the State insti-
tutions would be centralized in the State Board of Education, and the
several Boards in existence exercising such control would be abolished;
the high school departments of the four State Normal Schools for Women
would be abolished; the four State Normal Schools for Women would be
restricted to training elementary teachers, and the law giving them the
power to train high school teachers, provide college courses, and grant
college degrees would be repealed; a training school would be estab-
lished at any of the State Normal Schools for Women which at that time
did not have one; the scope of apprentice training would be expanded to
include preliminary teaching under the closest supervision in the normal
training school, apprentice teaching in the local city schools, and
trial teaching in non-local schools; the full normal course for white
teachers would be extended to three years, and State students would be required to teach three years in the public school system; normal training departments in high schools would be abolished; immediate help would be given to the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute—i.e., more money, better facilities, and more sanitary conditions; apprentice teaching by colored students would be extended to local schools; and, "in due time a second normal school for colored teachers be established by the State."45

Had such sentiments prevailed—and all of these recommendations been adopted—the history of the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools would have been a vastly different story. As it was, only a few of these recommendations were instituted almost immediately, with a few more being implemented a few years later. As previously discussed, the Virginia Normal School Board had already initiated action to phase out the high school courses taught in the four Normal Schools, so no further action was taken on this recommendation. The few recommendations which were adopted almost immediately by the Legislature were the following: House Bill 60 was introduced, and subsequently passed on February 25, 1920, as "An ACT to provide that the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, and the several State normal schools for women, be placed on the year-round basis of instruction as soon as their financial resources will warrant, and that the summer term

be organized on the basis of a quarter of the years' work of equal grade and degree credit with the work of any other quarter. On March 19, 1920, in what seems to have been an effort to improve the financial condition of the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, the General Assembly passed an ACT which withdrew from Hampton Institute the one-third portion of Morrill Act funds it had been receiving since 1890, and transferred that portion to the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. Senate Joint Resolution 17, which sought to delete Section 132 of the Constitution and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Sec. 132. The powers and duties of the State Board of Education shall be prescribed by law," was passed on March 19, 1920, but was subsequently defeated in 1922.

Governor Davis, an Independent, neither favored nor supported by the Democratic organization, addressed the General Assembly in 1920, and spoke of the activities of his administration which began in 1918:

When inaugurated I promised a business administration for the State. To this end, inspections and surveys have been made by me and for me by experts under authority of the law providing for the preparation of the budget, and by public spirited citizens, who, as members of advisor boards, were glad to give of their time and talent to the study of State problems. The effect of these studies, and of the more efficient management of the State's affairs, has enabled the State, with the dollar decreased by one-half in its purchasing power, to live within an income fixed when money was not so cheap. The more closely I study government the more I am impressed with the need of

---

46Virginia, Acts of Assembly (1920), chap. 86, pp. 73-74.
47Ibid., chap. 324, pp. 492-93.
48Ibid., chap. 353, pp. 527-29.
This "business administration applied to government" theme continued under Governor Trinkle's term (1922-1926), beginning with an ACT of March 24, 1922, which established a Commission on Simplification and Economy of State and Local Government--a Commission of nine members, appointed as follows: two from the Senate, by its President; three from the House, by its Speaker; and, four from the qualified voters of the State, by the Governor. After due investigation, the Commission was to report to the General Assembly in 1924 a plan for the reorganization and simplification of all the component parts of the government, State and local, with a view toward elimination of unnecessary duplication of effort.50

The executive council of the Virginia Normal School Board (the Presidents of the four Normal Schools), undaunted by the Commission's recommendations and the movement afoot to restrict the activities of the Normal Schools to the training of elementary school teachers, persisted in their attempt to professionalize and upgrade their institutions, and advised the General Assembly of 1924:

The Virginia Normal School Board at a recent meeting passed a resolution requesting the General Assembly of Virginia of 1924 to enact a statute which will change the names of the four State Normal Schools for women at Radford, Farmville, Fredericksburg, and Harrisonburg, respectively, to that of the State Teachers College at Radford, Farmville, Fredericksburg and Harrisonburg, respectively.

49Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1920), Senate Document No. 1, p. 6.

The . . . presidents of the four Normal Schools have studied this question in all of its aspects for several years, and, after becoming firmly convinced that the proposed change in name will not only result in great benefits to these teacher training institutions themselves, but also to the general educational interests of the State at large, respectfully request your consideration and support of a bill to designate the four Normal Schools as suggested above.51

In support of their request, the Presidents of these schools cited the fact that the Normal Schools were already colleges in character of work done and in admission requirements; the B. S. degree was already being conferred by these schools; more than 60% of the states of the Union designated their teacher training institutions as colleges, and in most cases as Teachers Colleges, but in a few instances as Normal Colleges; not only would more students be attracted, but they would be superior students, which would provide better staffs of instructors and raise the professional and social standards; and, the four Normal Schools were already sufficiently prepared from the standpoint of financial support, teaching staff, plant and equipment to assume the title of State Teachers Colleges.52

Since this was in keeping with the movement in Virginia toward simplification and standardization of the public educational system, as well as in tune with national educational trends, it met with almost immediate success. Thus the proposals for economy and efficiency, begun in the Davis and Trinkle administrations, set the stage for the development of a "dramatic program of 'business progressivism' which

51"Regarding the State Normal Schools for Women," 1924, Radford College, Archives, McConnell Papers File.

52Ibid., pp. 1-5.
reached its own peak of efficiency and effectiveness during the governorship of Harry F. Byrd."53

CHAPTER VII

FROM NORMAL SCHOOL TO TEACHERS COLLEGE

(1924-1930)

The public teacher-training institutions in Virginia replicated
the national pattern of transition and transformation from normal school
to teachers college. Nationally, "the transition from the normal school
to the teachers college took place over a period exceeding half a cen­
tury . . . . the forces for change were at work as early as the 1860's
and culminated in the 1920's and 1930's."\(^1\) The major forces behind the
transitional impetus were an increasing "respectability" of education--
i.e., the term "college" meant a higher degree of social desirability
and greater professionalism than did the word "school," an increasing
number of high school graduates, an increasing insistence upon quality
as well as quantity in education, a rapidly growing demand for high
school teachers in possession of a bachelor's degree, the growth of the
normal school curriculum itself, and, the appearance of accrediting
agencies and a trend toward the standardization of teacher certifica­
tion.\(^2\) The combined effect of the interaction between these factors

\(^1\) Fred F. Harcleroad, H. B. Sagen, and C. T. Molen, Jr., The
Developing State Colleges and Universities (Iowa City: American College

\(^2\) R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education
usually generated the pressure for taking the necessary steps toward the transformation from a "school" to a "college." Five steps in this transformation have been identified: first, the entrance requirements were raised to include high school graduation; second, the curriculum was enriched and expanded by adding liberal arts subjects to the courses on professional education and methodology; third, the program of studies was lengthened from two to four years; fourth, the privilege to grant degrees was secured through legislative action; and, fifth, facilities were improved generally.³

While most of the public normal schools were under the supervision and control of individual boards at their inception, "in the 1920's the normal schools and teachers colleges in many states were deprived of individual boards and placed under a single governing board, frequently the state board of education."⁴ By the advent of the year 1924, the public normal schools in Virginia had undergone the changes observable in the normal schools in the nation at large. In fact, these were the very same steps suggested by the executive council of the Virginia Normal School Board in support of their plea to the General Assembly to grant them the status of Teachers Colleges. This chapter will review the period 1924-1930 during which the public normal schools of Virginia became State teachers colleges and were centralized under the State Board of Education.


The Transformation

The arguments of the executive council of the Normal School Board and the political realities of efficiency and centralization of the period combined to bring about the introduction of Senate Bill 121 early in the 1924 legislative session. The bill enacted changed the name of the four Normal Schools to that of Teachers Colleges. And, although a Commission report recommending consolidation of the Normal Schools under the State Board of Education was in the hands of the Legislators at this time, the ACT continued the Virginia Normal School Board under the title "board of the Virginia teachers colleges," with full authority to "manage and control the four said State institutions of learning, located at Farmville, Harrisonburg, Fredericksburg, and Radford."\(^5\)

Simplification and Economy

The Commission on Simplification and Economy in Government, appointed in 1922, had their report ready for consideration by the General Assembly of 1924. The Commission took cognizance of the national movement toward administrative consolidation of State and local governmental agencies and based its recommendations on a simplification of all agencies for economy and efficiency. The Commission's approach was one of viewing the State as a large scale business enterprise and applying then-current public administration and political science standards to an evaluation of all its agencies. The idea of a short ballot was an integral part of the concept of efficient public administration since by such a process the number of elective officers

could be limited and those few could be assigned definite areas of authority and held strictly accountable for the results of their agencies, something not previously done in Virginia. While this report was a very comprehensive one and covered all the State and local governmental agencies, consideration here will be given primarily to those findings and recommendations which affected the public teacher-training institutions and their relationships with the State of Virginia.

The major criticisms by the Commission centered around the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the State Department of Public Instruction. The State Board of Education consisted of eight members "chosen in three altogether different ways." Board members had no official responsibility either directly to the people or indirectly to them through any single branch of government, and some members helped to determine policies affecting their own institutions. All terms of office of Board members ended at the same time. The Commission, therefore, recommended that the Constitution and the statutes be amended to provide for a State Board of Education composed of seven members to be appointed by the Governor for seven-year terms with appointments staggered to preclude the entire composition changing at the same time and losing continuity of educational policies and efficiency of administration; to assure a lay Board, "restricted to the exercise of general legislative and judicial supervision over public education, leaving the administration and executive functions to an educational expert whom the Board would appoint"; to require the Governor to make his appointments to the Board on the basis of fitness and merit; and, to confer upon the Board specific authority and attendant responsibilities.
Since the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was elected by popular vote for a term of four years, the Commission felt that this office was thus "political, and the candidate . . . constantly tempted, encouraged, or perhaps forced, to be guided by the dictates of political expediency rather than those of sound educational policy." And so, to remove politics from the selection of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Commission recommended that the Constitution and law be so amended that the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction be abolished and the State Board of Education appoint a State Commissioner of Education "who shall be a trained and experienced educational administrator, and who shall be the chief executive officer of the board, and that in making this appointment the board shall be free from restriction." In addition, the State Commissioner of Education was made an ex-officio member of the board of control of all educational institutions, supported in whole or in part by the State, with full powers and duties of membership.

The Commission also recommended that a State Department of Education be established "under control of the State Board of Education, of which the State Commissioner of Education shall be the chief executive officer, with such assistants in charge of subdivisions as may be determined by the Board on recommendation of the Commissioner," and having direct control of: the four State Normal Schools for Women, the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute for colored people, and "the departments of education in all State institutions of higher learning and other departments where the training of teachers is undertaken."

The Commission further recommended that "The Virginia Normal School
Board and the Board of Visitors of the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute be abolished, and that the law be made to provide for the direct control of these five institutions by the State Board of Education, with advisory boards appointed by the State Board of Education in their discretion.\(^6\)

A further recommendation led to the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 6 which amended the Constitution to add one member to the State Board of Education nominated jointly by the board of the Virginia teachers colleges from the faculty of the four State teachers colleges.\(^7\)

**Reorganization of Virginia's Government**

Several Constitutional amendments, based primarily upon the recommendations of the Commission on Simplification and Economy, were initiated by the General Assembly of 1924 and agreed to by the General Assembly of 1926. While none directly affected the public educational system in Virginia, these amendments were the first of several constitutional amendments which would ultimately result in a large scale revision of Virginia's Constitution in 1928. The movement for a thorough reorganization of Virginia's government by constitutional amendment was led by the man who assumed the governorship in 1926--Harry F. Byrd.

Pate claimed that "three things are necessary in order to secure a thorough reorganization of the government: first, an expert survey;
second, competent leadership in the governor's office; third, a Legislature willing to be led. Virginia had all three of these things in 1926.

One of Byrd's first official acts as Governor was the appointment of three study groups. A Commission on the Consolidation and Simplification of Government, a citizens' committee, headed by William T. Reed, and a second citizens' committee, the Commission to Suggest Amendments to the Constitution which was headed by R. R. Prentis, were appointed by Governor Byrd. The New York Bureau of Municipal Research, a group of business consultants headed by Luther A. Gulick, was employed by the Consolidation and Simplification Commission to conduct a survey of State and local governments in Virginia and to present their recommendations to the Commission.

The consideration of these separate reports submitted by the three groups was responsible for the extra legislative session called by Governor Byrd on March 10, 1927. In a message to the General Assembly, Governor Byrd justified these actions in "thus interfering with your inconvenience or imposing upon the State the expense of this extra session," by the urgency of the business to be conducted. He further supported his actions by pointing out that:

Two notable reports of two commissions and a report by business specialists offer the General Assembly the opportunity to simplify governmental processes and enable substantial savings of public funds. This saving will not be made at the cost of efficiency, but the changes proposed will promote efficiency.

--

9Ibid., pp. 102-03.
A program for the consolidation of governmental departments and simplification of governmental processes has been reported for your consideration by the Citizens' Commission of which Mr. William T. Reed is chairman.

The enactment of some of the laws necessary to carry out the recommendations of the Reed Commission require amendments to the Constitution and two years would be lost were we to defer action upon constitutional changes until the regular session convening next winter. This was pointed out quite clearly by the Commission to Suggest Amendments to the Constitution, of which Hon. Robert R. Prentis, President of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, is chairman.10

The Reed, Gulick, and Prentis reports were laid before the Senate on March 16, 1927. Two recommendations presented by the Reed Commission which affected the Department of Education were of particular interest.

The Commission recommended:

(1) That the Constitution be liberalized so as to permit the Governor to appoint the members of the State Board of Education, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, that the number be fixed at five, and that legislative control of the Board be made almost plenary. It is also recommended that the Constitution be amended so as to authorize the Governor to appoint the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(2) That the four State teachers' colleges for white women be placed under the management and control of the State Board of Education upon its recommendation, and that the Board of Virginia Teachers' Colleges, composed of thirteen members, be then discontinued. It is also recommended that the school for colored pupils, located near Petersburg, known as the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, be likewise placed under the management and control of the State Board of Education upon its reorganization, and that the existing board of visitors for that institution be then discontinued. The State Board of Education should be authorized to appoint a

---

10Virginia, House Journal and Documents (Extra Session of 1927), House Document No. 1, p. 3.
board not exceeding five members to have direct charge of such schools.\(^\text{11}\)

The New York Bureau of Municipal Research report on the Organization and Management of the State Government of Virginia presented the following suggestions:

It is generally agreed that an office like that of the Superintendent of Public Instruction should be filled by appointment, not by election. We, therefore, recommend an amendment to the Constitution which will abolish the State Board of Education and the superintendent. In their place, we propose the creation of a Department of Education, headed by a commissioner, appointed by the Governor, and a board of education of five laymen appointed by the Governor for five-year overlapping terms. The commissioner should be ex-officio chairman of the board. There should be no secretary of the board, except for a stenographer drawn from the office of the commissioner. The board should have no direct administrative authority for the work of the department. It should, however, approve the general orders and standards of the commissioner with regard to teachers certificates, courses of instruction, and text books, and should serve as the board for the four teachers colleges and the normal school. It should also act as the vocational education board, as provided under the statutes of the United States, and should be the teachers' retirement board.\(^\text{12}\)

The Prentis Commission made these comments about the provisions of Article IX, Education and Public Instruction, Section 129, of the Constitution:

The pending amendment provides for the appointment of a Superintendent of Public Instruction by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly, until January 1, 1932, after which date, guided by experience, the General Assembly may adopt some other method

\(^{11}\)Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (Extra Session of 1927), Senate Document No. 1, pp. 11-12.

\(^{12}\)Ibid., Senate Document No. 2, p. 141.
of selection. The Governor, being elected by the people, is responsible to them for the efficiency of the administration.

This change is in harmony with the best modern practice which authorizes the appointment rather than the election of all officers who must have technical training and equipment as a prerequisite to the performance of their official duties.

Many educators urged that the State Board of Education be appointed by the Governor, and that this body be empowered to select a Superintendent of Public Instruction. The present complicated method of selecting the State Board of Education is unsatisfactory both to the educators and to the people, and the change proposed is that the members of the State Board of Education be appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation of the General Assembly.13

A direct outgrowth of the Prentis Report was House Joint Resolution 1 that proposed certain amendments to the Constitution which emerged as an Act of Assembly on April 15, 1927.14 Senate Bill No. 1 also emerged on April 18, 1927, as a direct response to the Reed and Gulick reports. Section 15. (a) and (b), under "Department of Education," destined a change in the relationships between the State of Virginia and the public teacher-training institutions with these provisions:

Section 15. (a). All existing provisions of law concerning education, the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction are continued in force, except as otherwise provided in this act.
(b). Teachers' colleges--If and when the State Board of Education shall be so organized by constitutional amendment, or if and when such board shall be reorganized by legislative act effective after the Constitution of Virginia shall have been amended so as to make such reorganization constitutional and valid, the board of the Virginia Teachers' Colleges, shall, upon such reorganization,


be ipso facto abolished, and all of their powers and duties conferred or imposed by law shall be transferred to, vested in, and shall be exercised or performed by, the State Board of Education; provided, however, that the State Board of Education, upon or at any time after the abolition of the board of the Virginia Teachers' Colleges, may appoint a State Board of Teachers' Colleges of not exceeding nine members to serve at the pleasure of the State Board of Education and may delegate to such board the direct management and control of the schools now under the management and control of the board of the Virginia Teachers' Colleges.

If and when the State Board of Education shall be reorganized by legislative act effective after the Constitution of Virginia shall have been amended so as to make such reorganization constitutional and valid, the board of the visitors of the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute shall, upon such reorganization, be ipso facto, abolished, and all its powers and duties conferred or imposed by law shall be transferred to, vested in, and shall be exercised or performed by the State Board of Education.15

An Educational Survey

Once provisions were made for the reorganization of Virginia's governmental agencies in an effort to enhance their efficiency, Governor Byrd turned his attention to Virginia's educational system. In a message to the General Assembly in 1927, he explained his seeming indifference to the State's educational deficiencies in this manner:

I have not been unmindful of the needs of the public free schools and of the increasing difficulty with which our higher institutions of learning have tried to discharge their duties to a student body which has increased many times in the last few years. I have felt, however, that the wise course was to revise our tax system and reorganize our State government before we studied how to help our educational institutions.

In the first year of my administration it became my duty to recommend to you plans for the redemption of the pledges I made to the electorate to simplify and make

15 Ibid., chap. 33, p. 114.
more effective the processes of government. As a foundation for this program you authorized me to have a thorough study made of the State and county governments. The result of that survey by experts has been illuminating and helpful to the committee of citizens who determined the particular recommendations that appeared of most benefit to Virginia.

I believe that we should follow a similar method in studying our public school system and our higher institutions of learning in our efforts to increase efficiency. . . It is doubtful if a committee of laymen could afford the time for an understanding survey of our educational system unless this system were analyzed and appraised in advance, much as the Bureau of Municipal Research analyzed and appraised the State and county governments.

I realize that a survey of the public schools, the colleges, and the University will be a tremendous task, but I think that such a survey should be made in order that we may improve the administration.

The people of Virginia believe in education in the public schools at public expense. . . But the public should be satisfied that the dollars now available are well spent, economically spent, before additional dollars are appropriated. To ascertain this we must have a survey of the public schools. A careful study by a disinterested organization technically competent should precede a study by a committee of able Virginian men and women in order that the practical minds of these citizens may be informed by expert knowledge, and that the recommendations may be considered and understood and checked by practical men and women of varying vocations familiar with Virginia conditions.

. . . I recommend that you authorize a survey to be made as suggested, the unexpended balance standing to the credit of the appropriation made to survey our State and local governments to be transferred to pay at least part of the cost of the survey.16

House Bill No. 16 that provided for the appointment of a commission " . . . to survey the educational system of Virginia and to prescribe the powers and duties of said commission; also to make certain appropriations to carry out the provisions of this act into effect,"

---

16Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (Extra Session of 1927), Senate Document No. 3, pp. 6-7.
was passed by both houses of the General Assembly and enacted into law on April 18, 1927. The act provided for a Commission to "cause to be made by persons experienced in educational matters ... a survey of Virginia and of the educational institutions partially or wholly supported by the State of Virginia," with no restrictions levied; and, that all reports, with conclusions and recommendations, be published by January 1, 1928, and forwarded by the Commission to the Governor and all members-elect of the General Assembly.17

The Commission appointed Robert T. Barton, Jr., as its Chairman, and Ashton Dovell as its Secretary. In August 1927 the Commission engaged Michael V. O'Shea of the University of Wisconsin, to direct the survey staff. The Barton Commission report was completed and in the hands of the Governor and all legislators-elect prior to the convening of the 1928 General Assembly as specified in the Act creating the Commission. The report followed closely the recommendations of the survey staff. While this was one of the most comprehensive surveys ever conducted of Virginia's educational system, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations considered here will be limited to those affecting the relationships of the public teacher-training institutions with the State of Virginia. In highly condensed form, the survey staff's recommendations were that: (1) the proposed amendment of the Constitution providing for appointment of the State Board of Education by the Governor for a four-year term was in general accord with modern State

17Virginia, Acts of Assembly (Extra Session of 1927), chap. 69, pp. 163-64.
administrative practice, and should be adopted; (2) the State Board of Education should have, in general, the legislative and judicial powers which it then had, along with the power to appoint the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to fix his salary and to determine his duties as the chief executive officer and expert of the State Board of Education; (3) a Chancellor of Higher Education, who would have charge of all higher institutions with a view of securing coordination among them, should be appointed; (4) the salary scale for teachers in the State teachers colleges should be increased at least 20 per cent, to put them on a par with teachers college faculties in other States; (5) all teachers colleges should establish immediately a one-year training course for teachers in rural schools, that specifically related to their needs, and also should establish branches in the rural areas as well as offer correspondence work for rural school teachers; (6) dormitory facilities should be increased in all the teachers colleges; (7) teacher certification requirements and procedures should be revised with a view toward professionalization; (8) a close articulation of the teachers colleges with the University of Virginia in the area of graduate studies should be effected; (9) the State Board of Education should closely control the preparation of teachers of special subjects by the teachers colleges with an eye toward the elimination of needless expenditures and duplication of effort; (10) persons preparing to become high school teachers should also be prepared to teach the intermediary grades of the elementary schools; (11) salaries should be paid Black teachers that would retain the abler ones in service and attract to it more capable and better prepared new teachers; (12) high schools for
Black youths should be increased in number, in order to supply more entrants for the teacher-training and other colleges of the State; and, facilities for the training of Black teachers should be increased, especially at the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute. The members of the Commission believed that the greatest waste in the school system was reflected in the employment of incompetent teachers and commented on the report of the survey staff thusly:

The commission has received with great satisfaction the report of the survey staff indicating the generally satisfactory work which is being done by the four teachers colleges and the colored normal institute. Their service becomes increasingly important as the demand for trained teachers grows and the ability of the State to pay trained teachers increases. Virginia is not now training a sufficient number of competent teachers for the rural schools and the elementary city schools, which must be overcome.

In another section of the same report, this theme was expanded by these remarks:

The school system is weakest in the rural sections. As Virginia is predominantly a rural State, rural education is of the first importance, and the first duty of the State should be to improve the school facilities, equipment and teacher personnel in the rural districts, at the same time adapting education to the situations and problems with which the rural population must deal in their everyday life.

---


19 Virginia, House Journal and Documents (1928), House Document No. 4, p. 10.

20 Ibid., p. 8.
The Commission recommended:

(1) That the colleges at East Radford and Fredericksburg devote their resources entirely to the training of teachers for rural and for elementary schools.
(2) That all the teachers colleges shall immediately establish a one-year training course for teachers in rural schools, the work in this course to relate specifically to the needs of rural school teachers.21

Administrative Consolidation

Governor Byrd's plan to consolidate the administrative leadership of the State in the same individual who exercised the political leadership was soon to bear fruit. It will be recalled that the General Assembly had, in the extra session of 1927, enacted into law a reorganization bill which had abolished thirty "minor and useless administrative agencies," consolidating the remaining governmental agencies into twelve administrative departments and four agencies in the Governor's office, and had passed a joint resolution which would further centralize administrative authority in the hands of the Governor through constitutional amendment.22 This constitutional resolution, together with the one establishing the short ballot policy, was adopted a second time at the regular session in 1928 and submitted to the people.23 And, as Governor Byrd commented in a 1930 address to the General Assembly: "On June 19, 1928, by popular vote after a

21Ibid., pp. 26-27.


free and full, and sometimes heated, public discussion of all the changes proposed, the people of Virginia adopted the new Constitution."24 Byrd was thus the first Governor of Virginia, almost wholly by reason of his own unquestioned political leadership, who enjoyed the exercise of those administrative powers that properly should belong to the responsible head of State.25

Administrative consolidation of the public teacher-training institutions under the State Board of Education, as had been recommended by each survey and commission report, was soon to become a reality. Immediately after his inauguration as Governor in 1930, John Garland Pollard appointed a new State Board of Education in accordance with the provisions of the revised Constitution.26 A Board composed entirely of laymen could have been appointed, but the Governor took the position that at least two educators should be included, and in keeping with that view commissioned a board consisting of five laymen and two educators. Since the State Board of Education had the option under the Reorganization Act of 1927 to either assume direct control and supervision of the four State Teachers Colleges or to appoint a Board for that purpose, the State Board of Education, "in the interest of directness and simplification," assumed immediate and direct supervision.27

---

24 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1930), Senate Document No. 1, p. 17.
27 Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1934), Senate Document No. 1, pp. 31-32.
"Whereas, under and by virtue of the provisions of section fifteen of chapter thirty-three of the Acts of General Assembly of nineteen hundred and twenty-seven, approved April eighteenth, nineteen hundred and twenty-seven, entitled 'an act to reorganize the administration of the State government, et cetera,' and upon the reorganization of the State board of education under the provisions of section on hundred and thirty of the Constitution of Virginia, as amended, the board of the Virginia teachers colleges was abolished and all its powers and duties were transferred to, and vested in the State board of education."28 In the case of the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute, though, special legislation was needed to abolish its Board of Visitors. This was accomplished on March 24, 1930, by an Act which changed the name of the institution to the "Virginia State College for Negroes," placed them under the "management, supervision and control of the State board of education," and abolished its Board of Visitors.29 In this manner, "five of the ten institutions of higher learning were placed under a single board . . . an important step in the direction of centralized control for higher education in Virginia."30

Thus, the history of the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public teacher-training institutions from 1869-1930 has been traced. By 1930 the public teacher-training institutions in Virginia had not only become centralized under the State Board of

30Virginia, Senate Journal and Documents (1934), Senate Document No. 1, p. 32.
Education, they had also been instrumental in raising the general quality of instruction by the continued improvement in the training of teachers. In order to be fully qualified to teach in a high school after 1929, a teacher was required to hold a degree from a four-year college. After 1931, elementary teachers were expected to have completed at least one year of college education. As a greater degree of preparation was demanded for teachers, their salaries were raised, and teaching began to become a profession. In the opinion of Governor Byrd:

... the most fundamental thing in the school system is the quality of instruction, and this is immediately reflected by the preparation of teachers. The State Board has followed the very wise policy of gradually raising the requirements for teaching in this State in order to guarantee accurate and thorough instruction to pupils. Of the 12,900 white teachers employed in the counties and cities, 2,464, or 19%, were college graduates; 4,644, or 36%, have completed two years of college training; and 4,206 have completed one year. About 88%, therefore, of the white teachers employed in the public schools of Virginia have, in addition to four years high school training, professional equipment ranging from one to four years. When this fact is considered in conjunction with the further fact that 80% of the division superintendents are now graduates of standard four-year colleges, it will be observed that the teaching profession and administrative force is fast becoming thoroughly equipped for the important task of training all of the children of all of the people.

What Byrd failed to show was the relationship between this purported happy state of improvement and the structural changes that had been made over the years. The precise relationship between the structure and the quality of the educational product continued to remain unclear.

---


CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to describe the evolutionary pattern of Virginia's public normal schools and thus provide answers to the two questions of (1) what educational policies were formulated by the State for the establishment and development of its public normal schools during the period 1869 to 1930, and (2) how and why did social and political forces in Virginia influence those policies?

Several conclusions were reached about the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public teacher-training institutions during the period under consideration. In matters of policy, the State replicated national patterns in both the establishment and in the development of public normal schools. In terms of how and why social and political forces in Virginia influenced those policies, it was concluded that the Conservatives who restored Virginia to the Union and formed the Democratic organization which ruled Virginia during this period consistently imposed their aristocratic social and conservative political principles and ideals upon the State in formulating educational policies.

More specifically, the General Assembly not only determined the number of normal schools to be founded, but also specified the location of the schools. This was accomplished in an indirect manner.
The Virginia legislators were generally of the opinion that the town with the most interest in receiving a normal school would by that very fact be the most satisfactory place in which it could function. As a general rule, the political realities of the State and the pressures which a given community could exert combined to determine the exact location. The commissions appointed to study the establishment of normal schools were thus instructed by the General Assembly "to visit, to view, and to investigate the proposed gifts, donations and sites, and to report on the same." In all cases, political and social reasons tended to override educational considerations. Policy was structured so that prime consideration was given to those sites with facilities already available and adequate. For example, a condition for establishing a normal school at Farmville in 1884 was that the town convey the deed of the Farmville Female College to the State of Virginia. It was expressly stated in the act that if the town refused to do so, the school could be located in any place that would convey suitable grounds and buildings to the State. Under like policy restrictions, William and Mary, a school on the verge of total collapse in 1888 because of financial distress, contracted with the State to provide the financial means for survival in return for the creation of a normal department in the existing facilities to train white male teachers for the public schools of Virginia. It is also a matter of record that scant consideration was given to locating normals in the populated areas where they would be accessible to the people. All the schools were located in rural areas--for social and political reasons. Virginians were generally of the philosophical opinion that urban areas were not
appropriate locations for schools, that urban areas were, in fact, unsafe and dangerous to the health of students--to the extent that a student could be retarded and often defeated in his best mental activities and achievements. A more important consideration, perhaps, is the fact that the rural areas in Virginia have traditionally held a disproportionate share of political power.

It was concluded that the State of Virginia meddled extensively in the substantive matters of the educational issues which were of paramount concern to the public normal schools. Although the organization, curriculum and management of these schools could have been based upon local needs and demands, the State of Virginia rigidly structured the substantive laws which regulated the operation of these schools. The General Assembly not only defined the purpose of these institutions as that of training teachers for the public schools of Virginia, it also determined the dates and length of school sessions. It not only set admission and graduation requirements for all students, it also extracted a promise from each student to serve a specified term as a teacher or a worker in the public school system upon graduation. (In the case of William and Mary, the General Assembly not only specified that pupils should receive gratuitous instruction, but also that the charge for board, washing, lights and fuel should not exceed ten dollars per month.) These laws also specified the courses of instruction and established the conditions for conferral of certificates and diplomas. Even the salaries of professors were specified. And, although the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was defined as an educator, he was often but a tool in the hands of the politicians
and was used to further the interests of the party in power. Consequently, a degree of political favoritism and nepotism in the appointment of teachers occurred.

Further, the State severely limited the efforts of these institutions by failing to provide adequate financial support. The schools were financed essentially from State appropriations and student fees, and, in the early years of their evolution, received only sparse funds from the State—because of the large public debt which had accrued during the war and which Virginians would not repudiate. In time, however, the normal schools came to be treated as a code department by the State, received a line appropriation from the Legislature, and were subject to close scrutiny and intense political pressure. Few endowments or scholarships were made available by the State for even the most deserving individual in quest of training as a teacher, since it was universally believed that no specialized training was needed for teachers.

In addition, the State gave preferential treatment to the normal schools for white students—mainly through the imposition of stronger controls and closer surveillance over the Blacks. Not only has the State traditionally given preference in policy to internal improvements over popular education, it has just as traditionally discriminated against the Negro in its educational policies. To many Virginians an education for the Negro seemed theoretically desirable, but a wasted effort and not practical; to others, even if it was practical, it was not desirable. Many Virginians also resented the actions of Congress which demanded social and political equality for the Negro, and a
general agreement was reached among conservative whites that Negroes in Virginia should not enjoy the general political privileges of citizens. This resulted in the use of all the devices of politics to deprive the Negro of these privileges. Virginians of this period further seemed to share a common belief that the Negro could not be educated adequately to meet his needs and to discharge his responsibilities. Consequently, the pattern of control established over the normal school for Blacks was quite different from that established over the normal schools for whites. While the Boards for the white normal schools were granted the usual discretionary decision-making powers, the Board of Visitors for the Black normal school (six Black men plus the Superintendent of Public Instruction) was placed under the "direction and supervision of the state board of education." This seems to have been either an example of an aristocratic social philosophy which perceived the Negro as incapable of governing himself, or the first manifestation by the ruling elite after the Civil War to reassert political control over "an undeserving, uninformed and ill-prepared segment of the Virginia electorate." The continuous opposition of conservative whites to the political and social equality of the Negro ultimately resulted in a new Constitution in 1902, and with the disfranchisement of the Negro under the new Constitution, the collegiate department of the Black normal was replaced with an industrial department. As a result, the Board of Visitors no longer had to include Negroes as members and was permitted to "direct and do all things not inconsistent with the laws of the State."
Then, too, control of these institutions was exercised in varying degrees by the State government. Although the normal school for Blacks was under full control of the State Board of Education from its founding in 1882, the normal schools for white students were controlled only indirectly by the State Board. The entire period from 1869 to 1930 was marked by an increase in State control over the entire public school system in Virginia. From 1882 to 1902 a measure of decentralization in the administration of the normal schools for white students was apparent and desirable to the extent that it permitted some degree of independence, some flexibility, and some autonomy to these institutions. However, the centralization brought about by the new Constitution in 1902 presaged a concerted movement toward economy and efficiency in Virginia's government. From 1902 to 1930 the relationships between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools for white students became increasingly centralized. Administrative consolidation of all public teacher-training institutions under the State Board of Education was a recommendation of every commission and survey report submitted to the General Assembly between 1902 and 1930. The General Assembly, however, was slow in responding to these observations, perhaps because of the continuing press for time in its too-brief biennial sessions. The trend toward centralization progressed in steps. A Virginia Education Commission created in 1908 to devise a stable method for the maintenance, management and expansion of the educational institutions of the State, and continued by an Act of Assembly in 1910, recommended in 1912 that the four normal schools for white students be placed under the supervision of the State Board of
Education through the medium of a Normal School Board; that admission requirements for all five teacher-training institutions be raised; and, that these five schools train teachers for the elementary schools only. After the creation of the Virginia Normal School Board in 1914 the idea of centralization of the public educational institutions for whites began slowly to materialize. Further steps toward centralization were taken in 1916 when the General Assembly and the Normal School Board authorized the four schools for white students to offer four-year college courses leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education. A commission appointed in 1916 on economy and efficiency in State and local government reported in 1918 on the several inadequacies of the public school system and recommended the establishment of a commission to study and report in 1920 on educational conditions in Virginia. The subsequent survey report in 1920 strongly suggested that the State normal schools be transferred from Normal Board control to State Board of Education control; that normals restrict themselves to training elementary teachers; that authority for normal schools to grant the B. S. degree be revoked; and, that a standard law be passed to pay teachers according to their professional qualifications. A commission on the simplification and economy of State and local government was established in 1922 and reported in 1924. It recommended that the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction be replaced with that of a Commissioner of Education; that both the Normal School Board and the Board of Visitors at Petersburg be abolished and the five normal schools be put under the control of the State Board of Education; and, that the total membership of various educational boards
be reduced from 407 to 50. Social and political pressures again prevailed, at least temporarily, when the executive council of the Normal School Board (the Presidents of the four normal schools for white students) succeeded in engineering a bill through the General Assembly to change the name of the four normal schools for white students to that of teachers colleges, with the Normal School Board being converted to a Teachers College Board. Successive commissions and survey teams were formed. Each urged a centralization of all teacher-training institutions under the State Board of Education for "economy and efficiency" in the State government. By 1930 the General Assembly had passed the necessary acts to place the five public teacher-training institutions under the "management, supervision and control of the State Board of Education" and at the same time abolished the Teachers College Board and the Petersburg Board of Visitors. By 1930, then, the normal schools had existed under several arrangements for control.

Finally, the pattern of the establishment and the evolution of the public normal schools in Virginia did, in fact, replicate national patterns in many respects. Not only did the history of teacher training in Virginia parallel that of most other States in the Union, the educational policies formulated by the State for their development also followed the national pattern. This was not a peculiar phenomenon, for, although natives of Virginia possessed personalities different from those of the Massachusetts natives, as well as different traditions and a somewhat different cultural milieu, Virginia's educational leaders and influential members of the educational committees in the State Legislature were cognizant of educational developments as they
materialized nationally. Realistic social and political restraints, however, demanded that they move slowly. Thus, the normal school movement in Virginia can be viewed as a late chapter in the evolution of public normal schools in the United States.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

Although histories of Virginia abound, adequate documentation of the manner in which educational policies were formulated by the State for the management and operation of the public normal schools which were established by legislative action has not been provided. The majority of sources consulted seemed to present an ample array of evidence to support the contention that the social and political forces in Virginia combined to generate the educational policy which not only determined, but also structured the relationships between the State and the public normal schools created by the State. Because this study was documented in detail, it was felt that a conventional bibliography would serve no useful purpose. It was decided, therefore, to provide general comments on the various works which constituted the source materials for this study.

Recorded histories of the five public normal schools of Virginia are few in number and vary greatly in quality, content, and scope. The few writings available, however, provided the foundation for this study. For details of the movement credited by most historians as precipitating the establishment of the first public normal school in Virginia, see Charles C. Pearson, The Readjuster Movement in Virginia (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1969).
VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE. There is no formal history of Virginia's first public normal school. Richard L. Jeffreys, "A History of the Virginia State Teachers College for Negroes, Ettrick, Virginia" (Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Michigan, 1937), and the Virginia State College Gazette Catalogs (1883-1931) were the only sources available in the school's library and archives.

LONGWOOD COLLEGE. No formal history has been written of this school as yet. A few typewritten pages of what appears to be an initial attempt at writing a history of this school, along with Bulletin of Longwood College, "A History of Longwood College" (Farmville, Va.: Vol XLIII, Number 1, Jan '57) and the State Normal School at Farmville, Virginia Catalog(s) and Circular(s) (1884-1918) constituted available material.

MADISON COLLEGE. A study by Raymond C. Dinkledine, Jr., Madison College: The First Fifty Years, 1908-1958 (Harrisonburg, Va.: Madison College, 1959), is a well-written, precise institutional history of this school, prepared by a member of the institution's faculty. Additional useful anecdotes were provided by the Madison College Bulletin (1909-1930).

MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE. No formal history of this college has been written. However, Dr. Edward Alvey, Jr., a former Dean and Professor of Education at the school, is currently completing a history of the College. Of great help were the Bulletin(s) of the State Normal and Industrial School for Women, Fredericksburg, Virginia (1911-1930).

RADFORD COLLEGE. Although two institutional histories of this school have been published, the best is by the school's first head of

Since the ability to analyze and explain the relationships between any State and its educational institutions is dependent upon an understanding of the social and political forces, an attempt was made to establish a frame of reference before discussing the social and political forces interacting within Virginia's cultural milieu during the period under study. Clyde Kluckhohn, *Mirror for Man* (New York: Premier Books, 1959) was consulted first to place the relationship of anthropology to modern life in its proper perspective. C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951) provided the necessary background on the social conditions in and the history of the southern states. Robert E. and B. Katherine Brown, *Virginia, 1705-1786: Democracy or Aristocracy?* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1964) supplied a picture of education in colonial Virginia in terms of the public attitude toward education and especially the extent to which education was necessary and available for the lower classes. The fact that education in Virginia has been treated historically as being actually needed only for an upper stratum of society is a point repeatedly stressed in
governmental system was described by James E. Pate, *State Government in Virginia* (Richmond: Appeals Press, 1932). Valuable insights into the inner workings of Virginia politics during the period of this study can be gained from Nelson M. Blake, *William Mahone of Virginia, Soldier and Political Insurgent* (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Publishers, 1935) and Paschall Reeves, "Thomas S. Martin: Committee Statesman," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol 68, No. 3, Jul 60, which portray the role of Virginia's political "bosses"; and, from William Larsen, *Montague of Virginia: The Making of a Southern Progressive* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965) and Jack T. Kirby, *Westmoreland Davis, Virginia Planter-Politician, 1859-1942* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968) which examine the careers of two of Virginia's "non-organization"-backed Governors. Although no satisfactory studies of the relationships between the social and political forces in a State and the educational policies of that State were found, Allen W. Moger's *Virginia: Bourbonism to Byrd, 1870-1925* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968) proved the most helpful. Also useful in tracing social and political interrelationships in Virginia during the period of this study, and one that provided a different perspective than Moger's, was Raymond H. Pulley, *Old Virginia Restored: An Interpretation of the Progressive Impulse, 1870-1930* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968). Charles E. Lindblom, *The Policy-Making Process* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968) featured an interesting look at policy making as an extremely complex analytical, political process—as a complex set of forces which, taken together, produces
effects called "policies." Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964) was most useful for details of what is currently known about the educational decision-making process at the local school district level.

A difficult period in Virginia's history, and one of particular importance to this study, was treated by Kenneth M. Stampp in The Era of Reconstruction, 1865-1877 (New York: Vintage Books, 1967). Especially useful to this study was Jack P. Maddex, Jr., The Virginia Conservatives: 1867-1879 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1970). Most helpful in polarizing ideas about southern reconstruction were articles by Francis B. Simkins, "New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction," in the Journal of Southern History, V (Feb 1939), and E. Merton Coulter, The South During Reconstruction: 1865-1877 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1947).

No State is heir to a greater tradition of constitutionalism than is Virginia. From the adoption of the Constitution of 1776 to the general revision of 1928, there were five general revisions of the Virginia Constitution, either in the form of a new document produced by a constitutional convention or a revision proposed by a study commission, passed by the General Assembly, and approved by the people. Several works provide detailed accounts of the constitutional conventions and the documents which resulted. Most notable are Jacob N. Brenaman, A History of Virginia Conventions (Richmond: J. L. Hill Printing Company, 1902); David L. Pulliam, The Constitutional Conventions of Virginia From the Foundation of the Commonwealth to the Present Time (Richmond: John T. West, Publisher, 1901); Armistead R. Long, The Constitution of Virginia,

The annual reports, bulletins, circulars, and other publications of the United States Office of Education are invaluable to any study of American education. Many volumes on the history of higher education in the United States were published between 1887 and 1903 by the United States Bureau of Education as Circulars of Information. Although a majority of these volumes contained a state-by-state survey of the educational history of the American people, some did not. The most remarkable ones which did not, and those most relevant to this study, were Herbert B. Adams, The College of William and Mary (No. 1-1887) and J. P. Gordy, Rise and Growth of the Normal-School Idea in the United States (No. 8-1891).

Official materials of the State of Virginia which formed the basis of legal documentation were the Acts of Assembly (Richmond: Superintendent of Public Printing, 1823-1932); House Journal and Documents (Richmond: Superintendent of Public Printing, 1823-1932); Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (Richmond: Superintendent of Public Printing, 1871-1932); Senate Journal and Documents (Richmond: Superintendent of Public Printing, 1866-1932); of particular value to this study were the reports of two government-sponsored educational surveys--the Inglis and O'Shea reports--which were published as Virginia,

There are a number of general histories of education in the United States. R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1953) provided a sound historical foundation upon which to base judgments about American education by portraying education in its vital relationship to the culture of its times. H. G. Good, A History of American Education, 2nd ed. (New York: MacMillan Company, 1962) provided a useful paradigm of the public school as an instrument of public policy, by depicting the changes in American education as resulting from external pressures or inner growth. Of great interest was Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1934). Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University, A History (New York: Vintage Books, 1962) presented an excellent history of how and why and with what consequences the American colleges and universities have developed as they have. Although there is no adequate history of American education in the twentieth century, Edgar W. Knight, Fifty Years of American Education (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1952) is a very useful and concise treatise. Also relevant to an understanding of current education was the series of essays on the history of education

training suffered from anti-intellectualism, see James D. Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1963), which includes an introduction by Sterling M. McMurrin and consists of a survey of selected writings, reports of visits to institutions of every type, size and section of the country, and sample questionnaires used to collect the data. For the various policies proposed and put into effect to remedy the anti-intellectualism of teacher training, see Brubacher, op. cit., pp. 491-92. The annual Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association provide a reflection of the thinking of the teaching profession at any given time, but it should be kept in mind that the restricted membership of the NEA during certain periods of its operation might not necessarily have constituted a representative sampling of teacher opinion. Worth reading is Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper, 1957), an informative account of the rise and progress of the NEA from 1857 to 1957.

Richmond's newspapers, in particular the Enquirer and the Times-Dispatch, although highly biased, did provide an open discussion of the public questions then current. The Enquirer, before it became defunct in 1877, valiantly espoused the cause of the Virginia Conservatives. The Times-Dispatch ardently supported Virginia's educational crusade and urged the acceptance of any kind of help from any source that would raise the standards of Virginia's public schools.

Out of Teachers College have come fundamentally useful studies. Published as a series of Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology, and Education (1900-1951), the most significant to this
study was: G. W. A. Luckey, The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States (Vol XII, Nos. 1-4, 1903).

Professional education elsewhere has also been responsible for a small body of historical literature of which the American historian should be aware. The Johns Hopkins University Studies (1900-1932), and, in particular: Hamilton J. Eckenrode, The Political Reconstruction of Virginia (Vol XXII, 287-414, 1904); F. A. Magruder, Recent Administration in Virginia (Vol XXX, 1-204, 1912); and, Ralph C. McDanel, The Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1901-2 (Vol XLVI, 243-403, 1928) are excellent sources of these particular phases in Virginia's history.

Perhaps the most useful professional historical journal consulted was the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography (1950-1972). Articles of special interest were: James A. Bear, Jr., ed., Henry A. Wise and the Campaign of 1873: Some Letters from the Papers of James Lawson Kemper (Vol 62, No. 3, Jul 54); Charles E. Wynes, Charles T. O'Ferrall and the Virginia Gubernatorial Election of 1893 (Vol 64, No. 4, Oct 56); Robert A. Kohner, Prohibition and Virginia Politics (Vol 74, No. 1, Jan 66); Wythe W. Holt, Jr., The Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1901-1902: A Reform Movement Which Lacked Substance (Vol 76, No. 1, Jan 68); James T. Moore, The University and the Readjusters (Vol 78, No. 1, Jan 70); and, Walter J. Fraser, Jr., William Henry Ruffner and the Establishment of Virginia's Public School System, 1870-1874 (Vol 79, No. 3, Jul 71). Of special merit was Edgar W. Knight's article, "Reconstruction and Education in Virginia," published in the South Atlantic Quarterly, XV (Jan 1916), and Clayton B. Phillips,
"Education in Virginia Under Superintendent Richard Ratcliffe Farr--1882-1886," which appeared in *Secondary Education in Virginia*, XVIII (1932). Also helpful was the official communication of the Virginia Education Association (VEA), variously known as the Educational Journal of Virginia or the Virginia Journal of Education (1869-1932).

Of the manuscripts and unpublished studies consulted, the most useful were the Edwin A. Alderman Papers, the Carter Glass Papers, the J. L. Kemper Correspondence, the William Mahone Correspondence, and the William W. Minor Diary located in the University of Virginia Library; Marvin G. Maiden, "History of the Professional Training of Teachers in Virginia" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1927); Richard A. Meade, "A History of the Constitutional Provisions for Education in Virginia" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1941); E. F. Overton, "A Study in the Life and Work of J. D. Eggleston, Jr." (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1943); H. C. Ferrell, Jr., "Claude A. Swanson of Virginia" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1964); and, Robert R. Jones, "Conservative Virginian: The Post-War Career of Governor J. L. Kemper" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1964).
ABSTRACT

Although histories of public education in the United States are numerous, only a few describe public education in Virginia, and most of these make only slight reference to public teacher-training institutions. Not one has addressed the social and political relationships between the State of Virginia and its public normal schools. It was the purpose of this study to provide a history of these relationships and to consider their effect upon the development of these schools.

The study was designed as a history of the evolution of public normal schools in Virginia. Discussion centered on the relationships between the State and these schools during the period 1869 to 1930. The questions of what educational policies were formulated by the State for the establishment and development of its public normal schools and how and why social and political forces in Virginia influenced those policies were of major concern. The chronological approach of the traditional historian was integrated with the cultural approach of the revisionist to trace events from the creation of these institutions as individually-governed, single-purpose normal schools to their transformation into teachers colleges directly controlled by the State Board of Education. Primary source materials such as the Virginia Constitutions of 1869 and 1902, Virginia Acts of Assembly, Virginia Senate and House Journals and Documents, reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, official proceedings of the Virginia Educational Association and the Cooperative Education Association, records, reports and personal correspondence reposed in the archives of the public normal schools, and pertinent newspaper articles were the basic references used.

Several specific conclusions were reached. An aristocratic social and a conservative political conception of education as a family responsibility, with no specialized training needed for teachers, presented the greatest obstacle to normal school development. However, once a free public school system was established and had begun to grow, Virginians realized the need for specialized institutions to train and supply competent teachers for the public schools and began to pressure the General Assembly for their creation. The General Assembly not only determined the number, but also specified the locations of these institutions on the basis of social and political pressures, meddled extensively in the substantive matters of the schools, failed to provide adequate financial support, granted preferential treatment to the schools established for white students by openly discriminating against the Blacks, and varied the controls imposed upon these schools in the interest of "economy and efficiency" in government. Five schools evolved between 1882 and 1913 and developed along national patterns. They were created by legislative act as public normal schools under individual boards, centralized (except for the Black normal) under a Normal School Board, transitioned into State Teachers colleges, and consolidated directly under the State Board of Education. Although the normal school, when established in Virginia, was looked upon as merely a shortcut to the teaching profession, it eventually provided the missing rung for Virginia's educational ladder and proved a vital, moving force in the professionalization of teacher training in Virginia.
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