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CREATING A TRADITION: EARLY CAMPUS PLANNING AT HAMPTON INSTITUTE, 1868-1893

ABSTRACT

The goal of this study was to explore the beginnings of higher education for freed slaves after the Civil War as reflected in the development of the built environment of one of the earliest and most prominent of the historically Black colleges, Hampton Institute which, from its beginning, inspired intense affection and loyalty among its constituents. The main purpose was to study the way in which campus planning was implemented at Hampton, its intentions and effects. The study had three hypotheses: 1) a master plan for the development of the campus of Hampton Institute was created by its founder, 2) this master plan was followed by the administration and builders during the early stages of the school's development and 3) the founder of Hampton Institute was aware of the symbolism of the architecture and used it intentionally to create a sense of specialness and to inspire strong attachment among the students of the school.

Educational researchers have just begun to study campus architecture and the processes through which it came into being and to use this data to reconstruct the status of higher education during various periods in American history. Helen Horowitz studied the evolution of the architecture of seven prominent women's colleges in order to better understand the beginnings of higher education for women. This study attempted to gather similar data on the origins and evolution of education for freed slaves.

The study of numerous original documents available in the vii
Hampton University Archives revealed the answers to several questions. First, there is ample evidence that a master plan did exist for the development of Hampton's campus and that it was, to a large degree, followed. The architectural intentions of Hampton's principal revealed a great deal about the beginnings of Negro education and the controversy which existed concerning the type of education which was best suited to the needs of Blacks. They also reflect the unique mission of the early Black schools. Hampton was the model for many schools which espoused one view of the type of education which would best prepare Blacks to take their place in post war society and, therefore, was an appropriate subject for this study.

The study also revealed additional information concerning certain common characteristics which, when present, produce coherent, consistent campus planning. This information is important for present day administrators trying to promote effective decision making regarding campus growth.

The extension of this study to include other prominent and influential schools, particularly a school such as Howard, which was a model for a different type of higher education for Blacks, would provide valuable insights into the evolution of higher education for Blacks. These schools were shaped by their unique mission which was in turn shaped by the unique educational needs of the group they were founded to serve.

SUSAN HICKS JONES

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA
CREATING A TRADITION: EARLY CAMPUS PLANNING
AT HAMPTON INSTITUTE, 1868-1893
INTRODUCTION

"In Hampton, fabled landmark honored" states the headline of a 1991 article in a local newspaper, recording the identification of Virginia-Cleveland Hall at Hampton University by the U.S. Department of the Interior as one of eleven buildings at predominantly black schools nationwide chosen to receive federal money for the preservation of their structures and history. This event presents another aspect of the urgent problem on many college campuses of conflict between new building and the preservation of older buildings. This is a complex issue and colleges confront their dilemmas with mixed results, on one hand seeking to preserve historical architecture, but on the other hand demolishing and forgetting other historic campus buildings. Only two years ago, this same university demolished some historic college barns to make way for a modern shopping center and apartment complex.

Ironically, while many newer colleges strive to create traditions, others destroy them without realizing their value. Therefore, while historic buildings and landmarks are lost on some campuses, others try to establish traditions which can serve as the focus for memory and affection. An older university such as Hampton demolishes historic college barns. A more modern university such as Old Dominion in Norfolk, Virginia, strives to evoke tradition and memory in a fund
raising effort focused on a visible, physical landmark, the "University Wall":

Remember the University Wall? Remember lining up along it to register for classes? Did you ever take a breather under the tall oaks and magnolias or lean against the wall on the north end of campus? Or ride your bike along its perimeter? Did you ever try to scratch your initials into one of the bricks? The University Wall has remained a lovely enclosure for the older part of our campus even as the University has expanded further down Hampton Boulevard."(2)

They then go on to solicit contributions to the university fund raising campaign, hoping that affectionate memories will inspire giving in alumni.

University fund raisers and recruiters recognize the value of using the special beauties of the campus and its landmarks to stake out a unique identity which helps to attract students, faculty and benefactors as well as promote strong attachment of alumni to their Alma Mater. This strategem appeals to the desire of all people to feel a part of something which is unique and special. The distinctive campus, its rituals and experiences confer that sense of specialness on those who join its ranks. The campus landscape gives visibility to a college's unique identity and tradition, enabling it to stand out from a host of similar institutions.

When colleges are confronted with decisions regarding the fate of older buildings, administrators and decision makers require a deeper understanding of the relationship between the past and present. The attainment of such understanding
requires study of the evolution of the built environment of the campus. This includes the determination of who made design decisions and why certain designs were selected as well as the role played by the architecture and its historical associations in the education and development of the students who study there. They must consider the effects that changes in the architecture of the campus will have on the ability of the college to inspire loyalty and commitment to the institution in students, alumni, faculty, and supporters.

Hampton Institute has from its inception had the ability to inspire intense loyalty in its constituents. Several factors contributed to this ability. First, Hampton was conceived as a spiritual enterprise, a form of missionary service, and thus inspired missionary zeal and devotion in those associated with it. Second, there was a sense of shared experiences in which hardships were overcome by hard work and persistence. Third, students and staff played a major part in the building of its impressive campus, whether by making bricks, carpentry work, building furniture, planting the ornamental shrubs and trees or raising money through concerts. Therefore, they felt a personal pride in the fine buildings and the beauties of the campus which led to intense pride in their Alma Mater.

Hampton's campus illustrates the conflicts which mark campus planning decisions. The college has both a distinctive and impressive "old campus" and a newer campus with sleek,
modern buildings. The conflict appears again whenever the need arises for more space for university activities. Therefore, I intend to study the building of the historic campus at Hampton, the planning processes which produced it, and the part it played in the evolution of the school into a beloved institution capable of inspiring loyalty and affection in order to illustrate the understanding which any college or university decision maker should bring to bear on decisions concerning the preservation or destruction of historic buildings on their campuses.

"Buildings cannot lie; they tell the truth, directly or by implication, about those who made and used them and provide veracious records of the quality of past and present civilizations."(3) They are among the most visible and permanent of historical artifacts and can provide much information about the institutions which are housed within their walls. This is particularly true of campus architecture which can provide fascinating insights into the development of institutional culture. However, higher education researchers have paid little attention to the study of campus architecture and planning as expressions of the culture of a particular campus and of the state of higher education in a particular period. Until recently, research on campus architecture has been done primarily by architectural historians who have focused on architectural style and coherence rather than on the role of campus architecture as
an expression of societal values and educational beliefs and values. Architectural design decisions, how and why these decisions were made and who made them make statements about educational cultures of the past and, when interpreted by historians, provide valuable clues to the evolution of these cultures.

Gloag attributes the failure to recognize architecture as a powerful historical and institutional document and to study it to a decrease in visual awareness which resulted from the rise of "book learning" during the Middle Ages and increasing dependence on the written word. Gloag proposed that, with the increase in literacy, men became increasingly indifferent to the form, color, and composition of buildings. Medieval men, most of whom were illiterate, had a highly developed visual awareness and sensitivity to their surroundings which enabled them to communicate through the visual symbols found in architecture. (4) Therefore, those who planned and built important buildings included many visual symbols which were designed to communicate with the populace in ways the written word could not. Modern educational historians need to cultivate this sense of visual awareness in order to interpret the architectural artifacts left behind by earlier cultures.

The study of campus architecture and the process by which it came into being can provide the answers to many questions about the structure and values of earlier educational
cultures. One major question is whether early colleges and universities did engage in coherent, consistent campus planning. The general belief has been that there was little real planning on the part of early American colleges and that, with a few exceptions, colleges have simply grown haphazardly, without conscious design. (5) The educational community has made little effort to either disprove or explain this view of early campus planning. Did conscious, long range planning exist or were buildings haphazard responses to needs as they arose? Is there evidence of a controlling plan or design in the development of college campuses and was this a prevalent practice?

Architectural Symbolism: Educational historians need to study the role of university buildings and landscape as symbols, both of societal and educational values and beliefs. Society determines the purposes of buildings and sets the price it is willing to pay for these buildings in competition with other things it wants, including how much it will pay for beauty transcending utility. (6) Therefore, its buildings can reveal what was valued by a society or culture. Construction of an imposing building to house certain social functions or activities implies that such activities are highly valued by that society. According to Gloag (7) the huge temples and ornate tombs of ancient Egypt reflect a society in which power was held by the priestly caste, religion was central, and the people were preoccupied with thoughts of death and life after
death while the monumental medieval cathedrals found in Europe reflect the centrality of religion in that society and the power of the Catholic church. The hedonism of the Greco-Roman world is reflected in the ruins of the great public baths and their passion for sport and spectacle, in the large amphitheaters found in or near most Roman towns. According to Turner (8) the size and style of early college buildings in relation to other structures built during the same period reflect the value placed on education by the founders of the American colonies. He describes Harvard Hall I as "the most imposing structure in the English colonies at the time" and the Wren Building at the College of William and Mary as "the largest building yet erected in Virginia and probably in any of the colonies". (9) Nassau Hall at Princeton was said to have been the largest building in North America at the time of its construction in 1753. In fact, during most of the Colonial period, the largest and most imposing buildings in the colonies were educational, reflecting a strong commitment to education which was a distinctly American trait. (10) The wide dispersal of colleges throughout the colonies and the desire of every colony, community, religion, and ethnic group to have its own college to educate its leaders and propagate its ideas emphasize the importance placed on education by those early colonists.

Changing campus design and architecture also reflect changing values within higher education. For example, the
monumental football stadia and athletic complexes found on many college campuses mirror the evolution of America's passion for college athletics and spectacle. The movement of athletics from the extracurriculum to the curriculum and the rise of the powerful collegiate athletic departments can be documented through the appearance of these facilities on college campuses in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. According to Turner (11), nearly 100 football stadia were constructed between 1900 and 1930, generally patterned after classical prototypes such as the Roman Coliseum. They created an image of strength and monumentality well suited to the pride and collegiate spirit engendered by athletics.

In some instances the literary aspects of buildings have gained precedence over the need to provide useful, well-constructed spaces for people's activities. A structure may become more valued as a symbol, outweighing any change in function or inconvenience. This is true of many of the "Old Mains" preserved on college campuses, despite costly upkeep and lack of suitability for the modern curriculum, because they express traditional values and the collegiate ideal. They help to project the image of the college campus as a place apart, an historic community of scholars, a source of pride for alumni, faculty, students, and supporters. University founders had a responsibility to create a campus identity which would set the college apart from other institutions and attract the students, faculty, and benefactors necessary to
promote their growth. This was particularly important in America where students had, and continue to have, so many more choices than the European student. In planning the architectural, spacial, and residential arrangements of their institutions, how aware were they of this responsibility and how much weight was given to symbolism over need for space? What image did the founders wish to project and what does this say about their educational purposes and beliefs? How do the choices made reflect the state of higher education in general during that period or of a particular institution during a specific period of its growth? How important were these planning choices to the eventual success and growth of the institution? These are some of the questions which need to be asked by those who study educational institutions as well as by those responsible for decisions affecting their campuses.

Architecture and Associationalism: Certain architectural styles have come to be associated with certain values and images. The visual experience of architecture is multidimensional: physical, emotional, and intellectual. It has the power to evoke certain moods and emotions in the observer. The size of a building in relation to the size of a man can produce feelings of awe and insignificance or of constriction and confinement. Architectural styles produce their impact both through the effect of their design on the senses and through associationalism, the ability to evoke reactions and emotions associated with their forms. (12)
According to Turner, the classical style provided links to ancient Greece and the early Roman republic, symbolizing democracy and democratic discourse. It was often chosen to house administrative activities and for buildings constructed to house the literary and debating societies on college campuses. (13) Gothic architecture was regarded as Christian architecture and was often chosen to assure supporters of the Christian character and moral intent of an institution. Augustus Pugin, in True Principles of Christian Architecture, not only asserted that Gothic was Christian architecture but also that Gothic buildings would influence people toward Christian beliefs and moral behavior. (14) John Ruskin who wrote extensively in the mid 1800's was another leading proponent of the idea that art and architecture must contain moral expression and that good architecture makes men good. (14) He influenced a generation of architects and builders, including many of those who were involved in campus planning and building. The study of campus architecture and its evolution could reveal to what extent American campus planners chose Gothic architecture for this association and why. Does it reflect a belief on the part of college leaders that the moral development of students was an appropriate goal for higher education and that environment played an important part in that development?

In addition, Victorian Gothic was strongly associated in the minds of the public with the liberal arts and the
traditions of Oxford and Cambridge. According to Turner, Gothic style was "laden with association" and carried connotations of "taste, piety, and venerability", therefore, it was eminently suited to the task of assuring students, their parents, and potential supporters of new universities of respectability, moral intent, and permanence.(15) The desire for respectability was a hallmark of the Victorian age and colleges of this era were often judged by their appearance. The association of Gothic architecture with Christian morality and the liberal learning tradition led to a love affair between Americans and Victorian Gothic architecture which can still be seen on many college campuses.

Creating an Image: Symbolism may lead to architectural scene painting. Buildings may be designed and built to project an image of a group, society, or institution as they wish to be perceived. This has been true of societies from ancient Greece and Rome to more modern American colleges and universities. According to Thelin, campus planners used architecture, monuments, and symbols to conjure strong historic images in the national culture.(16) The University of Pittsburgh invoked the tradition of the medieval universities in its "Cathedral of Learning" which combined modern skyscraper technology with 14th century stonework, style, and forms in order to suggest a learning tradition stretching back to the Renaissance.(17) The University of Chicago cloaked its innovative organization and curricula in
Gothic quadrangles, evoking the traditions of Oxford and Cambridge, in order to assure supporters of the permanency of this second University of Chicago. (18) People also have a stronger sense of nostalgia when they are dissatisfied with the present and uncertain about the future. These nostalgic longings can be satisfied by more traditional forms of architecture. Vital questions for educational researchers to explore include the reasons university founders and planners chose certain architectural styles and how successfully their purposes were achieved.

Creating a Distinctive Identity: Because of the associationalism and architecture's ability to evoke particular images and feelings, the campus became the ultimate form of advertising for colleges. Certain architectural styles were associated in the minds of the public with certain images and therefore, they became symbols which made certain statements to the public about the institutions they housed. Banks were designed to seem substantial and reliable; stores, enticing; and offices, imposing, in order to lure patrons. (19) Colleges and universities also had to create an image which would lure both students and benefactors in order to survive. This was particularly true of the large numbers of new institutions which appeared immediately before and after the Civil War as a result of the Morrill Acts. Historian Allen Nivens commented on some of the problems encountered by these new institutions in creating a distinctive campus identity:
One of the more difficult obligations of these new institutions has been the creation of an atmosphere, a tradition, a sense of the past which might play as important a part in the education of sensitive students as any other influence. This requires time and sustained attention to cultural values and the special beauties of landscape and architecture. (20)

The ways in which the distinctive personality of a particular college developed can reveal much about the values and educational beliefs of its creators. For example, the founders of the first women's colleges valued women's femininity and felt that it must be protected. It was also necessary to assure the families of female students and society at large that this protection would be provided. This led them to construct large main buildings designed to house all college activities, isolate the women from the rougher societal influences, and to protect their virginity. This design choice resulted in the isolation of the students in an all female world. While this campus design did protect the women from outside influences, it also had unanticipated effects on the character of the students which caused concern and led directly to changes in the architecture and design of later women's colleges. (21)

Architecture and landscaping contributed significantly to the development of institutional personality and to the transmission of this personality to students, faculty, and prospective students. It assisted in inspiring loyalty and commitment both to higher education and to the institution.
This commitment is most important in retaining students in an institution until graduation and in producing loyal alumni who support an institution after graduation. This support is critical to institutional health, particularly today when the pool of traditional age students is shrinking and financial resources are becoming scarce. According to Williams "today's buildings must not only accommodate students, but also attract them". (22) One college administrator told her that he tells his admission office to persuade the prospective student to visit the campus "...the architecture and the facilities should convince them to come". (23) She also found that, although alumni may remember only a few of their teachers and classmates, they retain stronger memories of the campus, its rituals and landmarks and their association with the traditions of the college. Administrators must understand the way in which the distinctive personality of a campus developed and the part played by the buildings and landscape in conveying their peculiar personality to the college's constituents as they make decisions about renovations and new construction on their campuses.

Institutional Saga: Burton Clark (1972) developed the concept of institutional saga, a collective understanding of the unique accomplishments of a formally established group which binds the group together. (24) He described the evolution of a formal organization into a beloved institution which inspires passionate devotion among its constituents and
demonstrated how campus artifacts, legends, and architecture contributed to this transformation. A strong institutional saga inspires loyalty and belief among students, faculty, and alumni and contributes to strong institutional commitment which is a major factor in institutional survival.(25)

The view of the college as a special place where scholars study and live together is ingrained in the American sense of what a college should be, a legacy from Oxford and Cambridge. Students and their parents often seek this traditional experience when they choose a college and campus design plays a major part in convincing students that they will receive such an experience as part of their education. This view necessitated the design not just of individual buildings, but of whole communities. The concept of the college as a community was and is a basic trait of American higher education. Adherence to the collegiate ideal was further manifested in the student unions, social clubs, and athletic programs which were seldom found in European universities.(26)

The word "campus" acquired meaning beyond the physical setting of a college. It came to represent the pervasive spirit of a school, its mystique. As Turner states: "There is no spell more powerful to recall the memories of college life than the word 'campus'."(27) This mystique has been described by many writers fondly recalling their own college days. Historian Helen Horowitz, in the preface to her book on the design of women's colleges, states that she has never lost the
sense that when she entered Wellesly as a student, she stepped on "special ground". Henry Seidel Canby recalled his own introduction to college as a student and the "Gothic Age" of the American campus and college town at the turn of the century:

A glamour hung over the college town and the college at its heart which was not to abate but to grow over the next four years... Its romantic soul had found expression in the Gothic dorms... a setting which shed distinction over our loyalties. The Gothic walls seemed to shut off our college competitions from the world outside... fostered the illusion of an American Utopia. Others less impressionable and more powerful were infected with a like romance and poured out millions into brick and stone to realize their ideal.

Canby's words illustrate the influence of that special campus personality not only on students but also on hardheaded businessmen who contributed fortunes to the support of colleges and universities.

The environment with its sense of community, seclusion, permanence, and specialness engendered a tradition of loyal gift-giving in alumni which was and is essential to financial survival. It also helps to attract today's more conservative students who desire a traditional collegiate experience as part of their education.

The architectural character of a college is extremely important because it conveys to its constituents a sense of place which both enhances the educational experience and inspires loyalty and a sense of belonging. The study of a college's attempt to create this special personality reveals
the values, educational beliefs, and purposes of its founders.

Need to Study Early Campus Planning: The evolution of a college or university, its built environment, and its special character are worthy subjects for historical research. However, few educational researchers have chosen to study them, leaving their study to architects and architectural historians who focus more on style and coherence than on their symbolism or the way in which they reflect early educational cultures. Researchers have virtually ignored the reasons for selecting certain architectural styles, their contribution to the development of institutional saga, and the question of whether any style actually advances distinctive educational, social, or human values. This reluctance to study the campus environment has been attributed, at least in part, to the belief that there was little real planning on the part of early American colleges, that, with a few exceptions, colleges simply grew haphazardly, without conscious design. Many agreed with architectural critic, Montgomery Schuyler, who made the following comment on the design of college campuses: "...successive buildings were placed wherever they would go without any thought whatsoever of their relation to each other. Neither in their ground plan nor in the actual aspect is there anything to be made out except higgledy-piggledy. There is no grouping, there are no vistas". (31) Turner alluded to many grand plans which existed only on paper but were never carried out; however, he failed to explore the
differences in structure or governance which may have influenced the degree to which these plans were implemented. An important question in the growth of a distinctive campus is whether a master plan existed and, if such a plan did exist, to what extent was it followed. If there were deviations, what factors produced these changes: lack of funds, changing vision, changing institutional needs, or changing leadership? Among those institutions which did follow their master plan, are there commonalities which helped to produce consistent, effective planning? Identification of such common threads would have implications for campus planning today.

Another issue which needs to be addressed in studies of campus planning is the question of who was making the decisions and how this reflects the changing power structure both within the individual institution and the higher education community. Who was the dominant decision maker and did this remain consistent over time? How did shifts in power affect architectural style, planning, and decisions? For example, the appearance of faculty representation on the buildings and grounds committees of colleges reflected the professionalization of the faculty and their increasing power and influence in planning decisions. Study of these issues can provide clues to the evolution of the organizational structure and saga of particular colleges. Modern administrators must understand this saga in order to be effective. It will also
provide clues to the influence of outside forces on the college and the way in which it responded to these forces.

Researchers need to study the role of university buildings and landmarks as symbols, both of societal and of educational values. Architectural symbolism has social consequences because it evokes certain responses and therefore it affects those who view it. Modern administrators need to understand this symbolism and its importance in the transmission of institutional saga. Other issues include whether a particular style was chosen deliberately for its symbolism or planners simply followed prevailing fashion, whether there is evidence of consideration of educational goals in design decisions, and whether certain architectural styles were chosen because of a belief that they contributed in some way to the students' education or personal development. Study of these aspects of campus planning can reveal information about the educational beliefs and practices of the time. Studies of the effects of campus design on students have implications for contemporary architectural design decisions.

Design of Colleges for Special Populations: The issues outlined above are of general interest in any study of the role of architecture and campus design in higher education and have implications for modern educational practice. However, the focus of this study is the development of educational institutions for a special group of students very different
from the typical white male college student of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Helen Horowitz, in *Alma Mater*, studied the evolution of higher education for women in America by studying seven distinctive women's colleges which profoundly influenced the structure of women's institutions. Special groups such as women and Blacks had special needs and faced special problems and constraints different from those of the typical college student of the time. The design of their campuses reflected the attitudes of society toward the learning capabilities of these groups and their place in society. Campus design responded to these special needs and constraints and played an important part in the evolution of these institutions.

**Development of Black Colleges:** In studying the evolution of higher education for Black students, an historically Black institution of similar distinction and influence was needed and Hampton Institute was chosen because of its unique position among predominantly Black colleges. Hampton was one of the first of the historically Black colleges to be established following the Civil War and served as a model for many that followed. It has retained a prominent and influential position as one of the "Black Iveys" and has even been referred to as the "Black Harvard". Hampton, like other Black schools, faced many unique obstacles not faced by the typical college established during the same period.

Like most of the early Black institutions, Hampton was
located in the South, a South only recently defeated in a bitter war fought over the institution of slavery under which any education of Blacks was forbidden. Although this site was near one of the largest concentrations of ex slaves and, therefore, accessible to them, it was also a hostile environment in which to try to foster the development of an educational institution for Blacks. This environment surely influenced the design of Hampton's campus.

From the beginning, Hampton has been able to inspire intense loyalty and affection among its students and alumni who speak fondly of the "Hampton experience" and its influence on their lives. This has translated into a high degree of alumni support. Some students are the third and fourth generation of their families to attend Hampton. How did the environment contribute to the shaping of this experience and how did it affect the vision these former slaves had of themselves? How was the architecture and landscape used to shape this common experience which was so highly valued by students and faculty and which served to create strong bonds between the school and its constituents? How did this struggling new school develop such a strong institutional saga and what part was played by the built environment?

Hampton has a distinctive and impressive "old campus", most of which was built during the late 1800s when campus planning was often neither coherent nor consistent. How then was the campus planning process implemented at this new and
experimental institution? Was Gothic architecture chosen to reassure the surrounding community of the respectability and moral intent of this educational experiment for former slaves?

Following the Civil War, a great deal of controversy arose over the best way to educate Blacks or whether Blacks were even capable of learning. A major disagreement involved the curriculum which was to be offered to the students. While many in the Black community desired the more traditional, classical education offered by northern schools, some of the founders of Black schools advocated a sound English education and industrial training as more suited to the needs of the majority of Blacks. Hampton was the leader among this second group which aimed to provide an education more suited to the masses than to an elite. Hampton remained a focus of much controversy during its early years. It is possible that the founder of Hampton, like the founders of the University of Chicago, sought to cloak a controversial and experimental educational plan in Gothic respectability in order to reassure prospective students, donors, and the surrounding community.

In contrast to students entering the more traditional colleges, those entering Hampton were 90% illiterate. Visual communication was very important in spreading the word about the new school in the Black community. These students had no strong learning tradition, it had to be created. The buildings and landscape of the campus had to play a vital role in conveying Hampton's message of hope and self respect to the
destitute contraband camps which surrounded it.

Hampton faced another problem unique to its mission to educate freed slaves. Few of its students had the money to pay for their education. The school had to rely on the federal government through the Freedmen's Bureau, the American Missionary Association, and wealthy northern benefactors for financial support and money was a constant concern. How then did this struggling school for newly freed slaves manage to construct a campus distinguished by impressive Victorian Gothic architecture which dominated the surrounding countryside? That they did so certainly suggests that they had purposes more important than simply providing needed space.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this research was to study campus planning as it was implemented at a prominent, historically Black institution, the degree of success with which it was implemented, its' purposes and effects. Did Hampton's founder have a master plan for the development of the campus? How was this plan developed and to what extent was it followed? If such a plan existed, and the design of the old campus suggests that it did, was it intended to serve other purposes than merely providing classroom and dormitory space? Was the campus design intended to play a role in accomplishing educational goals and achieving the overall mission of the school, how effective was it and what does it say about the status of and attitudes towards education for Blacks following the Civil War? These are some of the questions this study is intended
to answer.

**Hypotheses:** Three hypotheses are addressed in this study:

1. A master plan for the development of the campus of Hampton Institute was created by its founder.
2. This master plan was followed by the administration and builders during the early stages of the school's development.
3. The founder of Hampton was aware of the symbolism of the architecture and used it intentionally to create a sense of specialness and to inspire a strong attachment among the students of the school.

The primary focus of this study is the master plan for the development of the campus: whether such a plan existed, how it was created, and to what extent it was followed. Other points of interest include who was making these decisions, how they were made, and how this reflects the early organizational structure of the school. Attention is also given to the role played by symbolism in the choices of architectural style, how these choices contributed to the development of a strong institutional saga, and how campus design affected students and other constituents of the university.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:** Did coherent, effective campus planning exist at Hampton? If it did, what organizational factors facilitated the process? Identification of organizational characteristics which promote effective
planning is important for the modern university which must deal with rapid change- in students, faculty, curricula, and educational climate- in a period of shrinking resources. A clear picture of those organizational characteristics which promote the effective planning essential to institutional survival would enable colleges and universities to take steps to develop these aspects of their own organizations.

Who was making campus planning decisions? Answering this question will reveal who held power in these Black schools and how this power center shifted over a period of years. It will reveal information about how power was acquired and how it was used. It should also reflect changes in power and influence among groups within the higher education community. This will assist administrators in identifying power centers within their own institutions which must be negotiated in order to accomplish their goals. Institutional saga must be understood by administrators if they wish to be effective. This study will reveal the process by which institutional saga evolves and will assist administrators and faculty who wish to analyze and understand the saga of their own institutions and its effect on the functioning of their own organization.

How did architecture and campus design contribute to the development of a special atmosphere and tradition and to the promotion of feelings of attachment and devotion in alumni? Strong alumni attachment to an institution can have many positive consequences. Devoted alumni are valuable in
recruiting new students, a significant contribution in the face of shrinking applicant pools. They may not only send their own children to their alma mater, they may also encourage their friends and associates to do so. Their readiness to recruit new students is certainly influenced by their memories of their own college experience and their fondness and attachment for their alma mater. These alumni are also an important source of financial support. As federal and state funds for higher education decrease, alumni as a financial resource are becoming increasingly important. Therefore, it is essential that college administrators understand how campus architecture and landscaping have been used to create their special atmosphere, the part played by this special atmosphere in developing a strongly supportive alumni group, and the effect which changes in campus design may have on these important alumni groups.

Armstrong's educational plan for Hampton was new, innovative, and controversial among Southern Whites who both doubted the ability of the Negro to learn and feared the effects of education on the Negro and his place in society, as well as in the Black community, many of whose leaders regarded industrial education as an effort to impose a new type of slavery on the Negro. Did Armstrong decide to clothe his controversial educational program in Gothic respectability in order to reassure the doubters and detractors concerning its permanence and moral intentions? If it was both
intentional and successful, it has implications for the campus planners of today who must make decisions concerning the repair, renovation, or replacement of stately old campus buildings. It would support the inference that image is as important, perhaps more important, than strict utility. It would help convince planners that these buildings should be preserved for their value as part of the image which helps attract new students and inspire their loyalty. That loyalty plays a vital role in the retention of students in the institution until graduation and their transformation to supportive alumni.

Modern administrators must understand the importance of architecture and campus design in recruitment and retention of students, recruitment of faculty, securing financial support from both public and private sources, and the development of strong alumni support as they make decisions about the fate of older campus buildings and the design of new ones. They must be able to balance the financial costs of renovation and upkeep against the value of these old buildings as symbols and their contribution to institutional saga. I hope this study will contribute to that understanding.
CHAPTER 2
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

THE NATURE OF ARCHITECTURE: According to Burchard and Bush-Brown, because architecture is a social art, serving social purposes, and controlled by the wishes, beliefs and values of the society, every society casts an architectural history of itself. (1) A study of the architecture, the dominant buildings, their uses and their spatial arrangements reflect the values, beliefs and aspirations of the society. Some societies, such as those devoted primarily to mining and manufacturing, have been unwilling to pay the price for beautiful or permanent architecture. In contrast, other commercial societies learned to exploit architecture as the supreme form of advertisement. (2) The architecture which a society constructs and the uses to which the buildings are put make statements about the society and, when interpreted by historians, reveal the character of the society.

ARCHITECTURE AND THE STUDY OF SOCIETY: Scholars have addressed the question of the value of studying the architecture of past societies in order to obtain clues to their character and quality. John Gloag, in The Architectural Interpretation of History, illustrated the value of incorporating the architecture of past civilizations in any study of their
character. While written records are often biased, the history of a civilization comes alive through its buildings, the most visible symbols left behind of the beliefs, fears, values and pleasures of their makers. Gloag illustrates how past civilizations can be illuminated through the study of their architecture; archeologists have long used the remains of buildings and towns to study past civilizations and bring them to life. According to Gloag, the social, religious and military history of a society is marked by changes in the construction and use of buildings.

Changes in the use of buildings reflect changes in the power structure and values of the society as well as changes in technological ability and the distribution of wealth. Gloag illustrates this with many examples. Egyptian architecture, under the influence of the powerful priests, minimized the importance of the individual by creating structures of intimidating magnitude. The fact that the major buildings were temples and tombs reflected a society which believed that the earthly life was transient and only a prelude to a more important afterlife. However, the fact that there is little variation in the design of the monuments also reflects a society that was rigid and unchanging.

The classical buildings found in ancient Greek cities were designed to engender civic pride. The remains of the great cities and orderly countryside of the Babylonian empire reflect a technically skilled and highly organized society.
Roman architecture reflects a society which was practical, orderly and ambitious with a desire for grand effects. According to Gloag, a society which is open and extroverted will be reflected in the absence of surrounding walls and enclosed spaces, while a society in which fear and feelings of vulnerability predominate will construct fortifications. A society which feels vulnerable and uncertain or which is backward looking will produce architecture which is often redundant and lacks new, daring or experimental styles as its members seek to gain reassurance from familiar forms. (5) Certainly, Gloag illustrates the way in which architecture can be used to study a past society and bring it to life. However, he concentrates on monumental architecture; temples, civic buildings, and tombs as reflections of the character of the larger society. The architecture of institutions of higher learning, although important in many early societies, is not included in his discussion nor does he discuss the application of these same principles to the study of the character of smaller units within the larger society.

Burchard and Bush-Brown also illustrate the value of studying a civilization through its architecture. "Society prescribes what architecture may express" therefore, the architecture expresses the nature of the society. (6) They describe the way in which religious and political meaning may be ascribed to certain forms as in the association of Gothic architecture with Christianity and morality. They also
illustrate the ways in which buildings can change behavior patterns as in the influence of suburban shopping malls on the decentralization of modern American society. In their discussion of the social and cultural aspects of American architecture, Burchard and Bush-Brown include examples drawn from higher education but their focus is the evolution of architecture in America rather than architecture as an expression of educational beliefs and practices. Their discussion is also limited to extraordinary examples rather than the more ordinary and widespread collegiate campuses. Historians have only begun to study American collegiate architecture and campus planning as a means to better understand the evolution of higher education in America.

Bruce Allsop, in The Study of Architectural History also illustrates the importance of studying architecture in the effort to recreate past societies:

Architecture, which Michelangelo called the greatest of all arts, is certainly the one that most faithfully reproduces a people's attitude towards life. It is not history alone but character that is written in buildings. They are the expression of an intellectual and spiritual point of view; they measure the quality of a civilization just as surely as they reveal the taste and aptitude of the period to which they belong.

Architecture reflects man's efforts to create an environment for himself, an environment in which he could live, with which he identified, and in which he took pride. Therefore, the built environment directly reflects the character and beliefs of those who created it and should be studied in order to
better understand them, how they developed within the environment they created and the effects of what they created on what they became. Architecture and building are also influenced by social, political, economic and ideological forces within a society and therefore, reflect the interaction of these forces and their influence on the development of the members of the society.

"Architecture is the built environment which man has created for himself....and it cannot be considered in isolation from the general history of mankind". (9) This is also true of the study of the architecture of institutions of higher education in America. The colonial colleges were established by people who: 1. had a need for educated clergy and civil servants for their new society, 2. were often escaping from societies where their religious beliefs had made them outcasts and where educated members of society such as the clergy tried to impose more orthodox views on them and 3. distrusted officials trained in other orthodoxies. Thus they perceived a need to establish colleges which would educate clergy in their own religious beliefs. This led to the wide dispersal of colleges, many of them directly governed and supported by different religions rather than by the colonial governments, throughout the colonies, a very different pattern of higher education than that found in Europe. The evolution of such a radically different system of higher education in the American colonies can only be completely understood when
placed in the context of societal history.

Allsopp advocates the study and use of history by architects in their study of the evolution of architecture. (10) However, his arguments are also valid in promoting the study of architecture by historians in their study of the evolution of different societies. Because "its quality as architecture derives from Man's identifying himself with what he builds, using it as a means of self expression, taking some kind of pride in it or giving it, for reasons as varied as love of power or love of God, some special character, then it appears to be true, as has often been said, that architecture is the mirror of society". (11) Therefore, in studying past societies, scholars need to study the way in which the members of those societies shaped their environments through building and the forces—social, economic, ideological, political—which influenced their efforts, the ways in which their environments shaped them.

ARCHITECTURAL GENERALIZATIONS: David Oakley identifies four types of generalization which apply to the study of architecture in different societies and the attempt to draw inferences about past societies from the architectural choices made:

1. Those which draw attention to an empirical relationship between concrete phenomena, i.e. that pitched roofs are found in regions of moderate to high rainfall.
2. Generalizations formulating the conditions under which new architectural forms are said to arise: i.e. changes in cultural objectives lead to new human activities and so to new
building types and so to a new architecture and a new expression.

3. Generalizations that assert that changes in architectural form may be readily associated with other changes in the social and cultural and economic scene; i.e. in a world of technology we are not at all surprised to find 'an architecture of technology'.

4. Generalizations asserting the existence of phases in the development of 'styles'; i.e. simple and direct; stretched, perfection, distortion, decay. (12)

Such generalizations are an essential part of understanding architectural design decisions and their relationship to societal beliefs and values.

ARCHITECTURAL INTENTIONS: Oakley also developed the concept of architectural intention which provides a context for understanding architectural designs. Architectural intentions, the purposes underlying the design, are presented on levels beginning with a safe and stable building design which provides shelter and progressing to designs which are meant to serve cultural, aesthetic and social purposes.(13)

According to Oakley, once human needs have been adequately met and technology is under control, it becomes possible to address other social needs through design.(14) He contends that the architect has a responsibility to meet the client's needs in the context of, and not at the expense of, the general social good. Architectural intentions can include the desire to give expression to group beliefs and purposes. They may be primarily symbol oriented, socially oriented, activity oriented, structure oriented, or aesthetically oriented. Some
knowledge of the level of architectural intention incorporated in the design is essential to understanding the design, the way in which it developed and its impact on its inhabitants. These intentions are not produced by the architect alone but are the product of the client's wishes, the architect's skill and the mores of the society.

The design and construction of a building is a complex activity involving the interaction of many forces including; the wishes and beliefs of the client, the client's ability to pay, the characteristics of the site, the characteristics of those who will use the building, the nature of the activities which the building will house, the levels of technology which the society has achieved, and prevailing societal beliefs and trends.(15) The historian must consider the influence of all of these forces in drawing inferences from the pattern and design of buildings about the society which built them.

Burchard and Bush-Brown discuss the importance of symbolism in architecture and the way in which these symbols acquire social power.(16) Buildings may be designed to make certain statements about their builders and users. If part of the architectural intentions is to communicate certain messages to the larger society, those messages must be in a familiar and understandable language. The forms chosen must be recognized by the viewers and readily associated with the intended message. Even when symbolism was not a part of the original architectural intentions, buildings often acquire a
symbolism which subordinates their original purpose. As symbols, architecture acquires social power and importance which must be understood when decisions are being made about preservation or destruction.

By the mid 1850's, architecture in America had become more eclectic, depending for its impact on associationalism. "The chief merit of a building was thought to lie, not in its power to present a clear and distinct sensory impression nor in its power to display the useful and structural organization of volumes of space, but rather in its power to evoke secondary reactions associated with its form."(17) During the period just before and after the Civil War, new colleges and college buildings proliferated and their buildings reflect this attitude.

Burchard and Bush-Brown also discuss the use of various styles- Classical, Colonial, Gothic, etc.- by American colleges and universities. Symbolism was an important aspect of style choice and expression was often considered more important than use. Examples include the association of Gothic with Christianity and morality; of Greek Revival with democracy; of the rustic and natural with rural purity and escape from the decadence of the city. Influenced by their Puritan background, Americans guiltily demanded some justification for beauty beyond beauty itself, hence the belief that "good architecture" improved moral conduct. (18) Historians need to be able to read the symbolism in order to
understand the design choices that were made.

If historians wish to understand institutions of higher education and their constituencies, it is important to study their campus architecture and the way in which it evolved:

All the great architectural works of the past are modern buildings when viewed from the designer's viewpoint. They were designed and commissioned to meet what were then contemporary needs. They were the product of many influences; primary among these was the nature of the client. The client will have left his mark upon the work. The character of the client influenced the form of the buildings put up and the language of formal expression of whole cultures. (19)

Through the study of campus architecture, scholars may better understand the nature of educational cultures of the past and their influence on the colleges of today.

Allsopp points out the need to "consider the very urgent problem of the conflict between new building and the preservation of old buildings". (20) This is particularly true on college campuses where the conflict between the new and the old is most evident. "Without some deeper understanding of the relationship between past and present, the controversy tends to become unreal and preservation is only too likely to be misrepresented as the antithesis of progress." (21) Yet, there are few studies which address the evolution of particular campus environments and their influence both on their own constituencies and on other evolving campuses.

**CAMPUS ARCHITECTURE:** Educational and historical researchers are beginning to look at campus architecture and campus
planning as valuable aspects of the study of educational culture and values. Thelin and Yankovich identified several research themes in the study of higher education in which the study of the physical features of the campus have, or should have, played an important part including organization and governance, relationships between colleges and surrounding communities, the shaping of the learning environment and its relationship to the curriculum, and the impact of the campus setting on student development. (22) The impact of the presidential "edifice complex", as they used buildings as a method to leave tangible evidence on college campuses of their accomplishments, has resulted in difficulties for current administrations as they try to find funds for maintenance and repair and as they make decisions concerning the best ways to provide adequate space for current campus needs. (23)

In their decisions about the future of monumental campus buildings, colleges must take into consideration their status as "landmarks and symbols of civic and local pride". (24) Most Americans have long held romantic ideals of the college campus as a place apart, a special community where students are exposed to great thoughts which will change their lives. Destroying this ideal by destroying the campus mystique created by its historic architecture may add colleges to the list of public institutions with which Americans have become disillusioned, leading to a loss of sorely needed support. While the impetus for campus building in the 1960's and 1970's
was the need for more space and the values of mass education, the impetus for current campus planning is competition and the brighter the student, the more options they have and the more important it is for the campus itself to impress and attract. (25) This has led to a reevaluation of the values behind what is built on college campuses.

Crucial connections between the curriculum and campus architecture have influenced the campus plan of colleges such as the University of California at Santa Cruz. (26) Here the college tried to negate the effects of rapid growth and promote an alternative to the values of mass education and large impersonal lecture halls through the creation of the cluster college. This arrangement was meant to make the university seem smaller while it grew larger and to promote some of the values of the smaller liberal arts colleges within the larger university.

Studies of colleges as social and psychological environments which shape student attitudes and values have alerted the higher education community to the importance of the design of the campus to student development. Studies such as the one carried out by Alexander Astin in 1979, which illustrated the importance of the residential experience to the development of commitment and persistence in students, have led to a resurgence of dormitory building on college campuses and to increased availability of funds for such buildings. The growth in the population of commuting students
on many campuses with its perennial problems of parking, inadequate lounge spaces, and lack of meeting places are now being recognized and influencing new campus master plans. The lack of involvement in and commitment to the college on the part of these students which result from their feeling that they are outsiders on the campus have contributed to the numbers of drop outs, stop outs and transfers.

There was, implicit in many of these research themes, an invitation to higher education researchers to study the evolution and influence of the campus itself, its buildings and spaces, its distinctive personality which influenced its students and alumni and created a sense of devotion which would serve its future needs for students and financial support. The most disappointing finding is that, in recent decades, few higher education researchers have accepted the invitation.(28)

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORIES: Most colleges and universities have at some time commissioned "house histories", histories of their founding and development usually written by someone connected with the college and meant to celebrate the accomplishments of "Alma Mater". Institutional histories are also often written by alumni who wish to describe the particular achievements of their own institutions. Although neither of these sources can be expected to be unbiased or objective in their reports, they are a rich source of information about the attitudes of the college constituents
and their view of themselves and their campuses. Although few mention architectural plans and achievements directly, most do mention the importance of architectural landmarks as symbols around which significant college rituals and memories grew.

Edward M. Norris, a graduate of Princeton, published such a history in 1917. He described the selection of the site for the original campus in a small town on the main road between the growing cities of New York and Philadelphia as providing both easy access to students and rural seclusion which would decrease the number of distractions. This site threw students "in upon themselves and was the chief element in the development of that community life which ever since has been one of Princeton's most striking characteristics" (29). Here he provides an unconscious example of the influence of the campus location on student life. However, there is no indication of whether this was a conscious intention of the college's founders.

The theme of nostalgia runs through the history as he recalls traditions and rituals such as the seniors singing on the steps of Nassau Hall. Such memories illustrate the value of rituals in promoting the fond attachment of alumni to their Alma Mater and the association of such traditions and rituals with campus buildings. This area needs further study as alumni become an increasingly important source of support for colleges. Williams highlighted the importance of these
traditions through her finding that alumni tend to remember only a few of their classmates and teachers but their strongest memories and attachments center around campus traditions, rituals and landmarks. (30) Review of a few examples of histories written by alumni illustrate her point.

Schools emphasize their history and traditions in their efforts to recruit students and obtain support. New schools, lacking such history and traditions, recognized their importance when they tried to create "instant history". At the turn of the century, newer schools such as the University of California at Berkeley tried to create institutional saga and tradition through the identification of a campus landmark, a "great rock or outcropping ledge" which the university trustees "dedicated to the cause of learning" and which became known as the "Founder's Rock". (31) In 1926, the UCLA campus, having no such natural feature, had a 75 ton boulder hauled to the campus in order to have their own "Founder's Rock". (32) This attempt by UCLA to replicate the Founder's Rock at Berkeley shows an awareness on the part of new and distant campuses of the traditions of the central campus and their importance. Campus founders recognized the importance of a physical landmark as the focus of tradition and rituals. This continues today as newer urban schools founded in the 1960's also try to create their own similar campus landmarks such as the Greek Rock on the campus of Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia.
The importance of such landmarks is further illustrated by the fact that pamphlets recording a school's early history and featuring drawings or photographs of imposing buildings or campus landmarks are used to raise money. Norris describes the use of such pamphlets featuring drawings of Nassau Hall and the President's House as "campaign documents" by Princeton. (33) Such documents were expected to evoke feelings of alumni loyalty or respect for learning which would then lead to donations. Unfortunately, there is little data on how well this strategem worked. Such drawings and photographs are also found on the covers of college catalogs. Institutional histories are useful for the study of attitudes and perceptions but rarely do they pursue the actual purposes, processes, or impact of campus decisions. This is particularly true in relation to campus planning decisions.

THE COLLEGE CAMPUS REVISITED: Some significant exceptions to this neglect of an important aspect of the development and influence of American colleges and universities have been more recent studies by Paul Venable Turner, Bainbridge Bunting, Jean Block and Helen Horowitz. These authors have, to some extent, attempted to address some of the issues related to campus architecture and planning.

Turner, in Campus, undertook to present an overall view of the evolution of the American campus and its meaning beyond the physical. His purpose was to "study the relationship between ideas and physical environments in select cases of
campus planning through American history". (34) His contention was that American colleges and universities developed unique physical forms, very different from those found elsewhere, which reflected uniquely American social and educational values and beliefs. He focused on plans and designs rather than the actual execution of those plans because he felt that "it has often been the dreams of educators and their architects, whether fully realized or not, that have expressed most clearly the correlation of educational ideals to physical planning". (35)

Turner does not provide any information about the way in which the representative institutions were selected, whether they were atypical or representative of American institutions of the same period. The breadth of this study precludes studying any institution or group of institutions in depth. Also, Turner relies heavily on secondary rather than original sources as he read widely in the history of American education, conducted a survey of 350 colleges and universities, and visited the campuses of many of them. (36) His study addresses some of the important issues from the perspective of national trends in campus planning and the way in which these trends reflected changes in national educational beliefs and values. For example, he documents the movement of campus design from the closed quadrangles inherited from Oxford and transplanted to early American colleges to the three sided courtyard open on one end and
bounded by a wall, to the row arrangement of college buildings as ideas about the degree of desirable interaction between the college and the surrounding town changed. The Puritan ideal of the integrity of the whole community influenced this evolution.

Bunting and Block both conducted in depth studies of individual institutions which have been influential in the development of American higher education. Bunting studied the evolution of Harvard's campus over the 350 years of its existence, concentrating on the processes by which the present Harvard environment emerged. (37) He and Turner disagree about the degree of actual planning involved in the development of Harvard's campus. While Turner described Harvard's physical layout as the result of conscious, long range planning, Bunting found piecemeal acquisition of land and lack of foresight and planning in many phases of Harvard's development. Such a disagreement reflects the differences which arise when the findings of a broad general study such as Turner's and an in depth study such as Bunting's are compared and points out the need for further studies of different aspects of the development and impact of campus architecture.

In contrast to Turner, Jean Block, in The Uses of Gothic, presents a detailed picture of the planning process as it was implemented at one institution, the University of Chicago. (38) She has the advantages of being able to concentrate on one
institution and of extensive use of original sources from the university archives. Where Turner concentrated on the dreams, Block concentrated on the way in which the dreams were carried out. Turner documents the existence of many grand campus plans on paper which were never fully realized due to lack of financial support, difficulties in acquiring needed land, pressures from changing enrollment and curricula or lack of a strong guiding hand. However, he does not explore the process in any depth. Block focuses on the process as it applies to the development of a master plan which, while it underwent changes during the forty years covered by her study, was generally followed.

Block's case study explores the organizational features which contributed to the ability to adhere to this master plan. These features included: 1) continuity of leadership provided by an interested group of trustees which remained remarkably stable, 2) a need on the part of the university to assure potential supporters of the permanence of the second university, 3) the flexibility of Gothic style which allowed it to set the tone while allowing a great deal of variability in meeting the needs of various university constituencies, 4) the support and interest of the University's first president and 5) the flat, unornamented landscape in which the buildings were placed which forced the university leadership to provide its own landscape features which would beckon young scholars.(39)
Helen Horowitz, in *Alma Mater*, studied still another aspect of campus planning, the evolution of a group of colleges designed to serve a special segment of the population. In her study of the evolution of women's colleges, she places particular emphasis on the links between curricula, mission and campus design. A major point was that each of the women's colleges studied began as a vision, a vision influenced by the way in which American women were perceived by men and the way in which they came to see themselves. In each instance, she describes the way in which the creators of these colleges designed buildings and landscapes which would give form to their vision. She explores the effects, intended and unintended, of the environment on those who experienced it.

Another major point of her study was the awareness that each of these colleges had of each other and the way in which this awareness shaped their design. She focuses on the changes which occurred in the design of each succeeding college as the impact of the earlier designs on women graduates was realized. The first of these colleges, Mount Holyoke, chose the seminary model as the one best suited to protect women's femininity. Later, as the impact of the isolation of women students in an all female world was realized, the design was changed to a cottage system which was intended to recreate the atmosphere and values of the Victorian home and family. Campus forms are clearly and convincingly linked to the values and beliefs of
the founders as well as to prevailing beliefs about the proper education of women. Because the founders of these women's colleges were committed to the liberal arts curriculum and the collegiate ideal for women, they attempted in their designs to influence the communal life of the students.

The design of the colleges also reflected general attitudes toward higher education for women. Radcliffe, annex to Harvard, for many years constructed no buildings but rented homes in the area as they felt a need to be inconspicuous lest they arouse the ire of those Harvard faculty and students who did not agree with the idea of education for women. (41) In contrast, Barnard, annex to Columbia, needed to establish a clear presence in New York City and therefore, constructed monumental buildings compatible with the Columbia campus.

Horowitz's study of the founding and development of the early women's colleges is unique in its integration of their special architecture and landscape with changing conceptions on the part of educators of the special needs of women. She makes connections between the landscape and built environment and the student cultures which developed, convincingly illustrating the role played by campus design on the development of the students who study there.

She also addresses the significance of the buildings and landscapes and their association with student rituals which produced memories which created strong ties between alumni and their colleges. This is aptly illustrated in her documentation
of alumni protests and campaigns which arose when change threatened their remembered places.

The area which has received the least attention from these researchers, with the exception of Horowitz, is the issue of whether certain architectural styles do indeed inspire certain values, beliefs and behavior in those who are exposed to it. This is an area which greatly needs to be explored as decisions are made about the future designs of college campuses.

These studies point the way for current researchers in higher education. Campus design and its impact comprise a many faceted problem which influences every aspect of campus life and which will profoundly influence the future of colleges and universities in America.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY: NOTES ON HISTORICAL SOURCES

This study relied on archival resources available at Hampton University. The school has kept a large number of original documents some of which date back to the founding of the institution. The letters of Armstrong, written during his tenure as principal, were a major resource. These letters are arranged by date and bound in large books, the Principal's letterbooks. These letterbooks contain letters written in his official capacity, including letters to officials of the American Missionary Association (A.M.A.), officials of the Freedmen's Bureau, members of the Board of Trustees, potential donors, architects, etc. No personal letters remain. Most of his personal papers were donated by his family to his Alma Mater, Williams College.

Armstrong's early letters are in his handwriting and carry his signature. However, by the end of the school's first decade, as both the school and his responsibilities grew, letters appear which are not in Armstrong's handwriting although they still carry his signature. By this time he employed one or more clerks and probably returned to a method he had used when in the army, dictating letters to his subordinates who then wrote them out for him to sign. In the
late 1880s the school acquired a typewriter and there are fewer letters in Armstrong's handwriting. In some, his name has also been signed by someone else.

Finding those letters which referred to buildings and campus planning was complicated in several ways. The person who organized the letters and had them bound into the letterbooks also included a table of contents. However, this only provided the name of the person to whom the letter was written, not the subject of the letter. This necessitated reading completely through all of the letterbooks to determine which of the letters were pertinent to this study.

While many of the letters were written in black ink which fades less than blue, some of the related letters were originally written in blue ink which had faded so badly in places that they were indecipherable. The typewriter which was used to write some of the later records also used blue ink which faded badly and in some places had entirely disappeared.

Letters written to Armstrong were filed by year and stored in boxes. They were further separated in folders, again by the name of the person who wrote them. Letters related to the design and construction of the buildings could be found under the names of concerned persons such as C.D. Cake, Albert Howe, Richard Hunt, W.R. Ware, Marquand and others. However, it was necessary to know which names were relevant. Armstrong's own letters had provided clues to which names to look for.
While the archives contained none of Armstrong's personal letters, another source was found by serendipity which quoted them extensively. An article on Richard Hunt and his designs for Hampton appeared in a 1969 issue of the Daily Press-Times Herald, the daily newspaper published in the Hampton-Newport News area. (1) This article mentioned a history of Hampton which was at that time being written by Edward Graham, a history professor there. Archivist, Fritz Malval, stated that Graham left after a controversy with the school's administration and his manuscript was never published. Unfortunately, he had also taken some of the sources he had used even though they belonged to the school. However, a few of his early chapters remained in the archives. He had sent them to Margaret Mead, then a trustee, to read and make comments. When she donated many of her papers which related to her trusteeship to the archives, these chapters were among them. They were helpful in reconstructing the unique circumstances which led to the founding of Hampton. In reading these chapters, a manuscript by Helen Ludlow was often cited as a source and the archivist was able to produce one copy of it.

Helen Ludlow came to Hampton as a teacher in 1872, only four years after the school opened, and remained throughout the rest of Armstrong's tenure as principal, not leaving the school until 1911. During her time at Hampton, she worked closely with Armstrong. In writing her manuscript, she had
access to most of Armstrong's personal letters and quoted them extensively. Unfortunately, her manuscript was never published as Armstrong's widow and daughter, Edith, refused permission. The reasons for this refusal are unclear, however, Edith published her own biography of her father in 1904. They may have wished to avoid competition.

Another possible reason for the refusal might have been that the manuscript contained some criticism of Armstrong or some quotes which presented him in what they considered to be a bad light. This view is reinforced by the fact that there is only one copy of the manuscript and there are pages and parts of pages missing. Where parts of pages are missing, it is obvious that they were cut with scissors. No one seems to know who did this. However, after Armstrong's death, the respect and reverence with which he was regarded by those associated with him and with the school grew into something like a cult and no criticism, open or implied, was permitted. This may have led to the destruction of documents which could be construed as critical which makes it more difficult to construct an accurate picture of the man who built up Hampton. However, Ludlow's manuscript was a valuable resource in recreating the events which led up to the founding of Hampton and its early years.

Another valuable resource was the Southern Workman, a monthly paper begun in January of 1872 and continued throughout Armstrong's tenure. Copies, separated by year and
bound, are available in the archives. Elevations and floor plans of buildings were often published in the paper as the school tried to raise funds for their erection. Articles related the laying of cornerstones and the dedication of new buildings also appeared in its pages. Armstrong, along with Helen Ludlow, edited the paper and often wrote for it, making it a rich resource for those who wish to study the beginning of the school. One problem arose from the fact that bylines were seldom attached to articles written by Armstrong and the school staff, making it difficult at times to distinguish the author of specific articles. For those references to articles in the Southern Workman which include no author's name, no name was attached to the article. The style and text which were so distinctively Armstrong's helped to identify some of his articles. Mr. Malval's guide to the articles appearing in the Southern Workman was also helpful in identifying those written by Armstrong.

Each year, Armstrong prepared a report on the status and progress of the school for the Board of Trustees. In the reports of the principal, which he himself regarded as similar to state papers, he would discuss educational issues related first to the Negro and later to the Negro and Indian, and his views on them. He also discussed buildings needed, in progress and completed and their financing. These documents also included reports of the treasurer on the financial status of the school and reports from the various departments of the
school, including the academic department, the farm, the industrial departments, the school engineer and others. They provide a fairly comprehensive view of the status, progress and needs of the school. These annual reports are available in bound volumes in the archives and provide extensive information about the building up of Hampton. They were also reprinted in school catalogs and in the *Southern Workman*. They were used extensively in this research.

The school's catalogs, which were available beginning with the very first one printed in 1868 and continuing through the period in which I was interested, were another valuable resource. The early catalogs often had on their covers reprints of woodcut pictures of the first permanent buildings. They also contained reprints of Armstrong's annual reports description of the campus, entrance requirements, programs available, etc.

Some papers of the American Missionary Association as well as early copies of their official magazine, *American Missionary*, can be found in the Peabody Collection which is part of the main Hampton University library's collection. Armstrong often wrote for the magazine in addition to editorials and articles on education for other publications. The Institute Press also printed the magazine for a time. However, most of the papers of the A.M.A. are stored elsewhere and the exact location is somewhat uncertain. They were, at one time, stored at Fisk University. However, they have been
moved to a school in Louisiana, which one is unclear.

The Armstrong League of Hampton Workers was formed in 1893 and consisted of those who had, at some time, been part of the Hampton staff. The group met annually to read papers and letters from early workers and to reminisce about the early years. In 1909, the League published a small volume of these papers and letters called Memories of Old Hampton. This small book, found in the archives, was a particularly valuable source of information about the beginnings of Hampton written by those who participated in it. It was, however, important to remember that some of these remembrances were written as long as twenty years after the events which they recorded took place. They did contain many references to the erection of early buildings such as Academic Hall and Virginia Hall as well as the first temporary buildings. They also provided records of the spartan life led by those early teachers, officers and students.

Other books found in the archives which proved helpful included Edith Armstrong Talbot's biography of her father and Peabody's history of Hampton, written for the fiftieth anniversary of the school. Peabody became a Hampton trustee in 1890 and thus did know Armstrong personally. He was also an educator, a professor of Christian Morals at Howard. Although each of these authors brought a different perspective to their recounting of the beginnings of Hampton, the repetition of certain events and themes by both reflected a
similarity of views, giving them more credence. However, in recounting the events which surrounded Hampton's earliest days, neither was speaking from first hand knowledge. Also, both had an interest in presenting Armstrong and Hampton in the best possible light.

A box of old maps of the campus allowed me to reconstruct the evolution of the campus and the placing of the buildings as indicated in Armstrong's campus plan. It was possible to identify the two parallel lines of buildings facing the waterfront and to note that none of the buildings in the second line was directly behind a building on the first line. They also revealed what new buildings were being planned and their proposed locations, an indication of continuing campus planning.

Another box contained information on many of the early teachers, including their education and their various responsibilities at Hampton. This made it possible to trace the links between Vassar and Mount Holyoke and Hampton and identify this as one of the influences which led Armstrong to choose the seminary style buildings and educational plan for the young women.

The records of the meetings of the Board of Trustees were incomplete and disorganized and much less useful than expected. Most of these documents have not been cataloged and it was very difficult to find those desired. Some of the actions of the Board were recorded in Armstrong's letters or
in letters written by the school's treasurer and thus could be found. It also appears that many of these early records are missing.

The letters of the treasurer have also been bound in large books similar to the Principal's letterbooks. These, however, are not as well preserved as the letters of Armstrong. This is particularly true of the letters of General Marshall. The paper has dried to the point where many of the letters are unfortunately crumbling into tiny fragments and could not be read. Much of this damage resulted from the years before the present archives were established when they were not stored in climate controlled areas.

An unpublished thesis on the development of Hampton's campus written by an architecture student at the University of Virginia in 1971 proved a valuable resource as several documents which seem to no longer be available were reproduced in the appendices. This includes letters from the treasurer's letterbooks which are now in poor condition. This thesis frequently mentioned the Old South Leaflets as a source of information but no one seemed to know what they were or where to find them so only Brown's references to them remains.

Most of all, the buildings themselves remain to provide information to the observer. Some like Winona, the Girls' Cottage, the Science Building and Marquand cottage have been razed to make way for newer buildings. The functions and appearance of other buildings have changed. The main building
of the Huntington Industrial Works remains but was converted many years ago to a boys dormitory as was the Pierce Machine Shop. Wigwam no longer houses Indian students. Instead it contains offices including that of the Dean of the Graduate College and the Summer Sessions office. A modern brick addition extends to one side to provide more office space but the original building with its double porches is still easily discerned. Stone Memorial Building also houses mainly offices. Marshall Hall became the main administration building when the new Huntington Library was built in 1904. It also has a later addition at the rear of the original building. Virginia Hall remains a girls' dormitory, housing freshman girls. A later addition was built on the rear of the building but from the waterfront, it still appears much as it did in 1875. The second Academic Hall looks as it did when it was built in 1880 without additions or significant changes. It currently houses the University Museum and the Naval ROTC. Memorial Chapel also has remained unchanged through the years. It remains the heart of the campus and, in addition to regular church services, hosts numerous weddings and other events throughout the year. The Mansion House, which has undergone several transformations and renovations, is still the home of the president of the university.

Changes in the buildings and their uses reflect changes in the school and the students who studied there. For instance, the evolution of the library from a single room in
the original Academic Hall, to the entire second floor of Marshall Hall, to an imposing separate building parallels the growth of interest in reading and in the ability to read among the students who attended Hampton as well as a shift to a more academic focus. Other campus landmarks provide continuity with Hampton's roots. Although a student's day is no longer as strictly regimented as it was in those early years, the chimes of the Memorial Chapel still mark the hours of the day. The Emancipation Oak, located at the opposite end of the campus from the waterfront, is a campus landmark which is a focus for many student rituals and activities. According to legend, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was first read to the contrabands under this tree and the earliest classes for contraband children were held under its branches. Access to education and learning was the mark of a free man and the first step to the attainment of political freedom. Student protest marches related to modern political problems always end at the Oak and rallies are held there as well as picnics and other recreational activities.

Although little original furniture can be found, there are numerous woodcut prints and photographs which reveal the appearance of the rooms in the early buildings. There are also photographs of early buildings both under construction and after completion. Photographs of interiors include pictures of students at work, in class and in their rooms, providing insights into their daily lives.
CHAPTER 4

HAMPTON INSTITUTE; THE EXPERIMENT

A Unique Set of Circumstances

The Place: The Virginia Peninsula, following the Civil War, was uniquely suited as the site for a school dedicated to the education of newly freed slaves for many reasons. First, there existed a pool of potential students. Large numbers of former slaves had gathered around the walls of Fort Monroe on the tip of the peninsula during the war seeking the protection of the Union Army which retained control of the fort throughout the war. Early in the war the commander of the fort, General Benjamen Butler, had refused to return fugitive slaves to their Confederate masters, declaring them contraband of war. This encouraged more slaves from the surrounding Confederate territory to make their way to the fort and large camps of "contrabands" gathered in the vicinity. By the end of the war, thousands of freedmen crowded the Hampton area in "contraband" camps without visible means of support and in need of education in order to be able to care for themselves.

The presence of large numbers of needy Negroes attracted the interest of missionary groups such as the American Missionary Association (A.M.A.) and the Society of Friends which began sending missionary teachers to the area as early
as 1861. When these missionaries arrived, they found a viable Black society and the beginnings of rudimentary schools already in place.\(1\) Circumstances unique to the area had fostered this development.

According to Graham \(2\), the Negroes who lived in and around Hampton before the war and who were stable, well-known members of the community occupied a position of relative advantage compared to that of their counterparts in other areas of the South. The area enjoyed a large degree of independence from the state capital at Richmond. The justices of the Hampton courts both performed the duties of a court of law and administered town affairs. They were casual in their enforcement of many of the laws which restricted the education or movement of Negroes and often disregarded state laws when these laws disagreed with their views on the best management of county business. Virginia laws prohibiting the teaching of reading and writing to Negroes were among those which were often ignored and many Hampton residents, both Whites and free Blacks, taught slaves to read and write without apparent fear of penalty. In addition, a school for Negroes existed in Hampton before the war, conducting day classes for children and evening classes for adults. As a result of these circumstances, there existed a group of literate and semiliterate Negroes who formed a nucleus which provided the backbone of the postwar education movement in the Hampton area.\(3\)
The diversified economy of the area before the war had also led to a very different developmental course for Negroes. Even the slaves had a greater range of contacts and more experience in independent action than their counterparts in other areas of the South. The area was less dependent on farming, there were fewer large plantations and fewer large slaveholders. The practice, widespread in the area, of "hiring out" also contributed to a different attitude toward the education of slaves. This practice consisted of allowing slaves to enter into work arrangements with other employers with the approval of their masters. Payments were made to the owner for the work performed, thus a skilled slave was of greater economic value to the owner.(4) This provided an incentive to the owners to teach their slaves skills as well as rudimentary reading and writing. In addition, these skilled slaves often received incentive payments made directly to them. These circumstances promoted a higher level of initiative and ambition among the Hampton slaves.(5) They had enough knowledge and independence to reach out for educational opportunities.

The desire for education had been created but the means had still to be provided. Schools sprang up like mushrooms in the contraband camps. Any Negro who possessed even rudimentary knowledge endeavored to share it with others. The first schools were staffed by Negro teachers who were later replaced by the missionaries sent down from the North. General Butler
constructed a schoolhouse for the children on the grounds of what would become Hampton Institute and teachers and supplies were provided by the A.M.A. Thus the A.M.A., which would play a vital role in the founding of Hampton, was already active in the area when its' future founder arrived.

The presence of large numbers of unemployed and destitute freedmen in the Hampton area resulted in the assignment of an officer of the Freedmen's Bureau to the area. The Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands, or Freedmen's Bureau, which was also to play a vital role in the founding of Hampton Institute, was created as part of the War Department by Act of Congress in March of 1865 and placed under the direction of General O.O.Howard.(6) Its original mission, as conceived by Congress, was not to educate the freedmen nor to elevate them but to disperse them from areas where large numbers had gathered, either returning them to their original homes or transporting them to other areas where their numbers were less and which were further from population centers. In regard to the postwar problem of what to do with thousands of newly freed slaves, General Howard himself stated that "though the idea of education or any legislation or work to elevate them did not commend itself to Congress or find any favor, the idea of transportation was popular at once. So then I got large appropriations for that purpose repeatedly, as often as I could ask for it, without any trouble, much more than I asked."(7) Many of the Negroes were willing to be transported,
either to their former homes or to new destinations in the West or abroad. After the population concentrations had been reduced, a surplus of funds remained. Howard then asked for and received permission to transfer the remaining funds to educational purposes. This "quiet flanking operation" provided the money to build up the campuses of many fledgeling schools for Blacks including the Hampton school. (8)

The marriage, at Hampton, of the AMA and the Freedmen's Bureau resulted in the auspicious beginning of what would become a prestigious Black school which would become a model for many that followed. The A.M.A. provided funds for the acquisition of land and organized the school, sending teachers and supplies. The Freedmen's Bureau, through its district agent, provided funds to put up the necessary buildings.

The Hampton area was also historically significant for the Negroes. Here the first slaves landed in America; here General Butler's contraband order changed forever the status of the Negro; in sight of the shore, the battle between the Monitor and the Merrimac was fought and here General Grant began his final campaign for the defeat of the Confederacy. (10) It was also geographically fit as the site for a negro school as it was easily accessible by both rail and water to the great cities of the North as well as to the Negro population centers of the South. It was seen as a center of future commercial and maritime development. It was also regarded as a healthful and beautiful situation.
The Man: The officer sent by the Freedmen's Bureau to conduct its business in the Hampton District was a young, ex-Union Army officer named Samuel Chapman Armstrong. Like the Hampton area, Armstrong possessed many unique qualities and qualifications which strongly influenced the beginnings of the school. He was the son of missionary parents, Richard and Clarissa Chapman Armstrong, who served from 1831 to 1860 in the Hawaiian Islands. His father served as the Minister of Public Education there from 1847 to 1860 during which time he oversaw and assisted in the development of the Hawaiian system of free schools as well as several institutions of higher learning. (9) Young Sam often accompanied his father on trips of inspection through the islands, developing an interest in both education and missionary work. He also developed definite opinions about the educational methods employed by the missionaries, opinions which would later strongly influence the course of the Hampton school. He later wrote: "It meant something to the Hampton School, and perhaps to the ex-slaves of America, that, from 1820-1860, the distinctly missionary period, there was worked out in the Hawaiian Islands the problem of the emancipation, enfranchisement and Christian civilization of a dark skinned Polynesian people in many respects like the Negro race". (11)

Two schools illustrated the two main lines of educational work carried out by the missionaries in Hawaii, the Lahaina-Luna Seminary and the Hilo Boarding and Manual Labor School.
The Lahaina-Luna school emphasized the more traditional classical curriculum while the Hilo school offered the simpler, English curriculum and emphasized the manual labor plan. At the Hilo school, students paid their expenses by working at carpentry, gardening, etc. It was the only school which required the Hawaiians to work with their hands. These two educational plans paralleled those that would be proposed for the education of the freedmen. Armstrong favored the Hilo plan as graduates of that school had become, he felt, the best teachers and workers for their people.

Armstrong was described as possessing strong personal magnetism and magnetic earnestness along with practical good sense and a gift for administration, qualities inherited or learned from his father who was a strong influence in his life. He had a gift for inspiring loyalty and devotion from those who worked under him.

He also had a strong sense of visual awareness which is illustrated in his letters home during his travels. In a letter to the Cousin's Society in Hawaii he describes a visit to a famous cave: "The cave hung with crystal white stalactites and frescoed in a wonderfully artistic manner, all illuminated with coal oil lamps whose rays played among the long slender stalactites in the most gorgeous manner..." In another letter to the society, he describes Broadway at night as "two long parallel lines of light and between them something that looks like a phosphorescent sea or the glitter
of a huge mantle of gems as it is waved before the light—between the long lines of light are countless omnibuses displaying lamps of every color, and the glare of signs, etc, all dancing up and down as you drive through the street, while over all there is a huge halo of light which gradually melts away into darkness— it resembles somewhat the zodiacal light in its paleness". (14) These observations indicate a degree of visual awareness unusual in a young man of 21.

He also expressed an interest in architecture. In a letter to his mother dated November 13, 1860, he describes the city of New York as "...sure enough a great city...It gratifies my curiosity to see the marble palaces and majestic buildings, but it excites no feelings, no emotion. Nothing looks as if it had been very hard to construct..." (14) He describes several of the mission buildings in New York, which housed societies dedicated to helping the poor, as "large, finely appointed buildings, very neat and extremely well conducted". (15) In 1862, he wrote to his sister from a "Camp of Parole" in Chicago where he had been sent after being captured at Harper's Ferry: "I don't find so much difference between the great cities; they are more or less splendid and there is a sameness about them such that one is satisfied after going once through their principal thoroughfares. So with Chicago; excepting one route, Michigan Avenue, which runs along the shore and the buildings are, in consequence, on only one side facing the water...The magnificent buildings on the
avenue not only command a fine prospect but catch a fresh breeze from the lake which is constantly blowing." (16) In these letters, Armstrong not only indicated an interest in architecture but also provided indications of what he expected from it, that it should excite feelings and emotions in the beholder. These expectations would later influence the architecture of the buildings erected at the Hampton school. His island background would also contribute to his choice of a site which faced a body of water.

Armstrong was a graduate of Williams College where he had studied under the well-known educator, Dr. Mark Hopkins. He had journied to Williams from Hawaii in 1860 to complete his education as his father wished. Hopkins became another significant influence in his life as he later wrote: "Let me say here that whatever good teaching I may have done has been Mark Hopkins teaching through me". (17) He lived in Hopkins' home during his senior year, sharing a room with Hopkins' son Archie who became a lifelong friend. This close relationship with Hopkins was a "strong, formative influence on his life". (18)

Armstrong had gained valuable experience in working with Negroes as an officer in the Ninth and Eighth Regiments of Colored Troops during the Civil War. He came to believe in the qualities and capabilities of the Negro, writing:

Their quick response to good treatment and to discipline was a constant surprise. Their tidiness, devotion to their duty and their leaders, their dash and daring in battle, and
their ambition to improve—often studying their spelling books under fire—showed that slavery was a false though, for the time being, doubtless an educative condition, and that they deserved as good a chance as any people. (19)

He believed in their capacity to learn when many doubted it. He also was free of many of the prejudices and strong feelings which had propelled his friends and classmates to join the union army. He regarded himself as an outsider, a Sandwich Islander, without strong emotional ties to either side of the recent conflict.

Despite his vision of a school for Negroes fashioned on the Hilo plan, Armstrong did not leave the Army with the idea of starting one. He was, in fact, uncertain about his future. In April of 1865 he wrote to his mother: "Now peace is come I don't know what I shall do, I have no plans whatever". (20) His brother, William N. Armstrong, later recalled that Sam came to his office on Wall Street and discussed his future, saying he had thought of teaching or looking into some business opening in either New York or San Francisco or possibly joining the Freedmen's Bureau. (21) He also considered entering politics, an idea he did not give up until he had been at Hampton for some time.

Following his discharge from the Army, Armstrong spent several weeks in New York with his brother while he tried to decide his future. He then traveled to Washington with the idea of applying for a government position, probably with the newly created Freedmen's Bureau. It seems likely that he
viewed this as temporary employment while he explored other possibilities. Although both his war record and his interview impressed General Howard favorably, there were no vacancies and he was turned away. After a brief stay in the capital, he prepared to return to New York and was, in fact, on the point of departure when he yielded to an impulse to check the Freedmen's Bureau once more. A position had become available and he received an appointment as Bureau agent for the 5th subdistrict of Virginia with control over ten counties. He was also appointed superintendent of schools with the responsibility of studying the existing limited educational opportunities for the freedmen and reporting the need for others. Unlike other Bureau officers, he reported directly to General Howard in Washington, another circumstance which increased his influence. This assignment directed his thoughts once more toward the question of education of the Negroes. (22)

The Time: The war had left the Negro facing an uncertain future. Emancipation and enfranchisement were driving forces behind the movement to educate the freedmen. Concern that, through ignorance, they might be manipulated by unscrupulous politicians or their votes be bought prompted support for their education. It was necessary to prepare these ex-slaves to be independent and to care for themselves as well as to prepare them for citizenship. The question of what to do with the Negroes was a major issue of the day and people looked to the Freedmen's Bureau for effective answers. (23) The place,
the time and the man had been brought together and the stage was set for the founding of Hampton.

The Beginning: Armstrong arrived in Hampton to take up his post March 15, 1866. He made his headquarters in an old mansion house near the residence of the teachers sent by the American Missionary Association. He was already familiar with the area as he had spent time in the military hospital at Camp Hamilton during the war and also had visited his sister who was a teacher in Norfolk during the war.

His duties were varied. The former confederate states were under marshal law, there were no civil courts and the Bureau officer decided all kinds of cases. Every three months he had to personally visit and report on conditions in each of the ten counties for which he was responsible, inspecting the local Bureau offices, each in charge of an army officer, investigating any problems and studying the relations between the races. Because his subordinates were army officers, General Howard had recommended that he use the title of "General" as this would increase his influence with them. Armstrong had been promoted to the rank of Brevet Brigadier General near the end of the Civil War but had never used the title and had been mustered out as a colonel. He agreed to General Howard's proposal and used the title to the end of his life.

As Bureau agent, he was also responsible for the welfare of the Negroes, many of them families of Union soldiers who
had lost their lives in the war, and assisted in reuniting many families separated by the war or by slave trading before the war. (24) These duties served to focus his thoughts on the needs of the Negroes, including their need for education.

Albert Howe was an ex-union soldier who had been sent to the Peninsula in 1863 to serve under Captain Wilder, Armstrong's predecessor in the Hampton District. Thus, he was already established in the area when Armstrong arrived. In an undated letter written sometime in the 1890's, Howe describes Armstrong's early days in Hampton: "The General, young and full of ginger, took a great interest in all the schools about here, Yorktown, Mathews County and Eastern Shore besides his duties as a Freedmen's Bureau officer. The natives were coming back to their farms and homes.....The owners of lots and farms wanted possession (colored had been put to work on farms and thought the lands were theirs) and also their furniture which had been scattered and General Armstrong was called on to smooth and settle all the difficulties....fully 10,000 colored people were in and about the town of Hampton and the problem was to get them back to the counties they came from. The government furnished transportation and many were sent. It took time to do all this. In 1867 the General conceived the idea of starting a normal training school to make teachers of these colored children so they could teach others. He advised the buying of this farm which was covered with hospital wards at the time as just the place and talked and worked for it..."
Here he was a young man, comparatively unknown, starting out to do what most thought an impossible thing." (25) This statement by Howe is one indication that the impetus for the founding of the Hampton school came from Armstrong. A report by a special panel of experts sent by the A.M.A. in 1869 also states that, though the first school for freedmen existed in Hampton, the idea of "the Institute as a normal school, and a seminary of the highest order" was originated by Armstrong and it was chiefly through his efforts that the original land was purchased and developed. (26)

Although Howe states that the General conceived the idea for the school in 1867, it appears that he had begun promoting the idea even earlier. In a letter to his mother dated November 4, 1866, he states that: "...General Brown received a telegram requesting him to send me to New Haven, Connecticut, to speak at a public meeting there and aid in starting an interest in a normal school at this place". (27) This was the first of what would be many fund raising trips. Enroute, he stopped in New York to see the Rev. George Whipple, then Secretary of the A.M.A. and it seems probable that he presented the idea to Whipple at that time. He also visited several other people who were influential in Northern missionary circles including the Woolsey family and the Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon. Both of these families would later be influential in the early progress of the Hampton school.

Armstrong proposed the idea of the school to the
American Missionary Association because he considered that it had "the strongest organization and school force already on the ground" and offered the organization all the aid which he, as Bureau superintendent, could offer if they would undertake to implement his plan. (28) His opinions carried weight within the A.M.A., not only because of his position in the Freedmen's Bureau, but also because of the prominence of the Armstrong family in Northern missionary circles. In a letter to his mother dated July 5, 1867, he states that: "Reverend Dr. Whipple, secretary of the A.M.A. has just left after a six days visit. We have been maturing a plan of operations on the Wood Farm and hope to start the thing next fall. I hope it will result in a great institution here. There is good prospect- Whipple has gone to Washington to get funds from General Howard to make a start." (29)

Armstrong's first focus was the physical plant of the fledgling school and he would retain a strong interest in the development of the campus to the end of his life. The A.M.A., as the founding organization, selected the teachers and provided money and supplies. As Armstrong was not a legal officer of the A.M.A., he had little influence over the selection of teachers and the academic program. He was also a very young man, only 27, and without actual experience in teaching. His major source of influence was his ability to acquire both federal funds and land for the enterprise. As an officer of the Freedmen's Bureau, he could and did
influence the selection of the site for the new school and the construction of the first buildings.

The idea of a school had apparently been in his mind and he had selected the site even before he proposed the idea of the school to the A.M.A. As part of his responsibilities as an officer of the Freedmen's Bureau, he reported information on the schools for the education of the Freedmen which already existed in his jurisdiction as well as investigations directed at the establishment of new schools under the direct jurisdiction of the Bureau. He was also responsible for the return of previously abandoned lands to their former owners. As part of this process, he noted in his reports property especially adapted to either present or future use for such schools. Wood Farm, which was to become the site of Hampton Institute, was always identified as "advisable to hold" in these reports indicating that the idea of establishing a school there was in his mind.

In September of 1867 he wrote to his sister: "I am here with plenty of work-am about to build a normal school-have $2000 (chiefly contributed by General Howard from the Bureau's school construction fund) and two good buildings". (30) The buildings to which he referred were most likely the Mansion House which was the home of the original owner of the farm and a brick grist mill which was later converted to a girls' dormitory. The Butler School building which had been erected during the war for the education of contraband children also
stood on the grounds.

He expected that his contributions to the new school would be limited to preparing the campus and buildings for occupation and then assisting with its' development in his capacity as Freedmen's Bureau officer. On October 1, 1867, he wrote to his friend Archibald Hopkins that the A.M.A. had secured the services of another, older Williams graduate, E.B. Parsons, to run the new school and they would be sending a fine group of teachers while he was busy "fitting up, whitewashing, etc, an active campaign."(31) However, the course of his life and that of the new school were soon to change. Less than two weeks later, he wrote again to his friend: "I have been asked to run the normal School here- have consented to take it in addition to present duty- if that will suit- I will do nothing else. Parsons has backed out".(32)

As its' official head, Armstrong was in a better position to control the destiny of the new school which had been his original idea. By continuing in his position as Freedmen's Bureau officer, he maintained a degree of independence from the A.M.A. while gaining the internal influence within the school which he had previously lacked. He retained the useful leverage and protection of federal office with broader influence and access than he could command as head of a single A.M.A. school.(33) In addition, because the Bureau continued to pay his salary, he relieved the A.M.A. of the need to pay him, freeing more money for other needs of the school.
Many aspects of the school as Armstrong conceived it were controversial. First, it was a school for the education of Negroes, considered by many to be incapable of learning. Second, he wished it to emphasize the dignity of manual labor and to prepare students to make an independent living. Third, he wished the school to be coeducational.

Many educators felt that the manual labor plan had been tried and was unworkable. Institutions such as Mount Holyoke, Wellesly, (both women's schools) and Oberlin College had required manual labor of students as partial payment of their expenses. These institutions had abandoned the experiment as many pupils, unused to the strain of combining academic work and manual labor, had given out at a rate which had turned the force of public opinion against the idea. However, Armstrong was familiar with the work of these schools and the problems they had encountered. He recognised the difficulty in combining mental and manual labor but felt that such a design was vital to the education of the newly freed slaves. He viewed manual labor as important as a moral force, strengthening the character of the Negro and promoting a sense of independence and self respect. He saw it as a way to enable students to earn an education they might not otherwise be able to obtain and learn to be teachers and examples to their people. Finally, such an education would prepare students to be able to support themselves by means other than teaching. This was important as school teachers were not
well paid and most public schools were open only three to six months out of the year. Teachers received no salary when schools were not in session so those who had no other means of support were likely to find it very difficult to support themselves.

There were very few institutions of higher education for women at the time, the education of girls being considered by many as unnecessary at best and detrimental to both their health and to the development of their femininity at worst. There were even fewer codeucational schools as it was believed necessary to protect women from the rougher societal elements experienced by male students. However, Armstrong believed that the education of its women was essential to the civilization and Christianization of any race. Women had proved themselves as teachers, both in the home and in the schoolroom. Their influence over the young made it imperative that they be properly educated if the elevation of a backward race was to be successful.

Armstrong was well aware of these and other controversies affecting the new school. The idea of a school for freed slaves was not well received for many reasons. Owners of adjoining land feared that property values would plummet as a result of the proximity of the school. The area was under the control of the Union army, an army of occupation, a circumstance that was strongly resented by Southerners. They viewed many of the actions taken by the army and the
government in Washington as attempts to put the Negroes over
them. It was difficult to obtain land for schools as even
those owners who desired to sell were afraid to do so,
believing that selling property for such a purpose would put
their lives in jeopardy. Only Armstrong's status as Bureau
officer enabled the A.M.A. to purchase the desired land. He
sought to reassure potential neighbors and supporters of the
school of its moral intent and Christian character through the
design of its campus and buildings.

The site he had chosen was ideal for the promotion of the
agricultural and industrial aspects of the school as he
conceived it, comprising 125 acres which fronted on the
Hampton river. It provided not only a fine prospect but also
easy access to the water which was the cheapest and most
convenient mode of transportation for both people and goods. It
also satisfied his own need to be near the water. There were
already two substantial buildings on the land facing the
river, the mansion house of the former owner and a flour mill,
as well as the great triangle shaped hospital building of Camp
Hamilton which would provide lumber for new buildings.

The first buildings were intended to be only temporary,
reflecting the experimental nature of the new school. Many of
the old hospital wards at Camp Hamilton were being dismantled
and the lumber sold at auction. The A.M.A. had sent down two
carpenters to put up some inexpensive wooden buildings for the
school using lumber from these wards. However, after tearing
down three of the wards and hauling the lumber to the new site, these carpenters left without having constructed a single building. Armstrong then asked Albert Howe to take over supervising the construction. Howe later described the building of these first structures:

We put three wards together. First, there was Uncle Tom's Cabin, separate, but connected with the building by a covered way. Then came a building 72 feet long and 10 feet high, used for a school room, dining room, and chapel; then I put a building 64 feet long on the end of it; that had a tower 8 feet above the roof; then beyond that was another building 124 feet long; there was a wooden porch the whole length of the buildings. Uncle Tom's Cabin was the kitchen and laundry, and was then only one story high. It was also connected with Griggs Hall. The buildings were 24 feet wide, with a hall down the middle and rooms on each side with wooden partitions. (36)

The importance attached to the architecture by Armstrong is revealed in the fact that even these temporary buildings had to have some feature of architectural significance such as the eight foot tower placed on one of them. The boys were housed in the barracks building while the former grist mill standing on the grounds was converted to a teacher's home and girl's dormitory known as Griggs Hall, named for the benefactor who provided the funding. Thus the practice of memorializing donors was begun.

From the beginning, raising funds was a major focus for Armstrong and the teachers and staff. Both Armstrong and those early teachers understood the influence of the "edifice complex" and they made good use of it in persuading
Northerners to contribute to the school. Armstrong encouraged Cecilia Williams, one of the early teachers, to appeal to potential donors "by attaching the name of the benefactor to whatever outward and visible sign his benefaction had made possible". (37) Few donors were willing or had the means to finance whole buildings but many had their names attached to students' rooms or parlors. Armstrong would often request a picture of benefactors to place in the room named for them so that students would know them better. The rooms were described as: "furnished with taste and attest to the whole souled benevolence of those who furnished them..." (38) For a contribution of $50 an individual, community or church could be memorialized in this way.

In his fund raising efforts, Armstrong appealed to the prevalent missionary spirit of the times as well as to the desire of people to be remembered. Many northerners who donated money to the school saw this as a contribution to the task of civilizing the newly freed slaves and making them into respectable, Christian citizens. The same feelings of responsibility for the civilization and conversion of backward peoples which had led northern churches to send missionaries to distant lands such as the Hawaiian Islands also led them to contribute to schools designed to bring Christian civilization to the newly freed slaves. Armstrong understood this spirit well and appealed to it in his efforts to finance the Hampton school.
No student was expected to pay for tuition, this was paid through the use of scholarships, again donated by northern benefactors. The cost of tuition was $70 per year per student. Armstrong and his staff assumed the responsibility for raising the funds necessary to cover these scholarships as well as the money for the physical plant, and the burden of fund raising was to be a constant drain on his strength. The donation of scholarships became a more personal form of benevolence as scholarship students, as soon as they were able to do so, were required to write to the donors, telling them of progress made and thanking them for their generosity. This practice produced two major benefits. The donors and the students often developed a relationship which lasted far beyond school years and the donors felt great personal satisfaction in helping students who were known to them. The students also developed an acute sense of responsibility which led them to make every effort to repay any debts still owed the school after graduation. Hampton's repayment rate was much better than that of more prominent schools such as Harvard during the same period.

That Armstrong regarded the early barracks buildings as only temporary and that he already had other plans for the campus is reflected in a conversation he had with Mr. Howe during their construction. He told Howe: "...don't take too much pains with these buildings. This is an experiment, to see whether we can make teachers of these colored people. If it
is a success, three years will tell the story. Do you see that knoll over there (pointing to where Academic Hall stands)? That's the place, if it is a success, for a large academic building. Right here is a fine spot for the building for the girls and teachers, dining room, chapel, etc. We'll keep the girls on this side and the boys on that. We'll call the girls' building Virginia Hall."(39) The General had a plan ready for the development of the campus and this plan for the construction of more permanent and lasting buildings would eventually be carried out with the buildings being placed and named as he had indicated.

Armstrong was already beginning to view the development of the Hampton school as his life's work. His commitment to his own view of the best way to educate the freedmen is illustrated by his refusal of another, more flattering offer which was made to him in the fall of 1867. In another letter to his mother, he records that General Howard, his superior in the Freemen's Bureau, asked him to take charge of another educational enterprise, Howard University, which was named for the General and was his pet project. The school was then under construction on a "splendid" site in the city of Washington and was designed to become a premier institution for the education of the Negroes. Armstrong turned it down, despite persistent urging by Howard, for two reasons: first, he felt a commitment to the A.M.A. which had invested money in carrying out his original plan at Hampton and second, he
considered his own plan for an industrial school to be the one which would best meet the needs of the freedmen. (40) That he was able to refuse this offer without offending Howard is reflected in the fact that he continued to receive money from the Bureau for the building of Hampton and that Howard retained a friendly interest in the school throughout his life.

Hampton opened its doors in April of 1868 with 15 pupils, a teacher and a matron (both selected and paid by the A.M.A.). Armstrong had earlier stated his educational philosophy which would guide the new school throughout its early years. "The thing to be done was clear: to train selected Negro youth who should go out and teach and lead their people, first by example, by getting land and homes; to give them not a dollar that they could earn for themselves; to teach respect for labor, to replace stupid drudgery with skilled hands; and to these ends, to build up the industrial system, for the sake not only of self support and industrial labor but also for the sake of character." (41) The emphasis on obtaining land was a wise move as the landowner, in the South, was accorded respect and status not granted to other citizens. The building of self reliance and self esteem were also important in the development of former slaves into solid citizens. Armstrong relied on the industrial system to develop these traits although he frequently acknowledged that the system might not pay well financially. The negro would play an important part
in the rebuilding of the South, and in the development of an industrial base, as the chief source of labor. As skilled artisans, they would gain a share of the wealth as well as respect. Armstrong set out to build a strong Negro middle class who would win the respect and eventually the friendship of their former owners.

Education of Head, Heart and Hand

Education of the Head: Armstrong designed the academic course to develop the mind, providing a sound English education rather than the Greek and Latin of the classical university course. Because of the lack of secondary preparation, a preparatory department was essential. The first catalog of the school, issued in 1868, described the "Normal Department of the Hampton College" organized with special reference to the "training of teachers" but also adapted to the training of young men who wished to enter the ministry or to acquire a business education. The "female department" was to be conducted on the plan of Mt. Holyoke Seminary. As was the case with many schools founded before and after the Civil War, the use of "College" was a misnomer as the school functioned more as a secondary school. The choice of the seminary plan for the female department would reassure supporters who had doubts about the coeducational structure of any school, especially one for Negroes who were regarded as having low morals and easily influenced.

The Normal course, designed to prepare teachers,
encompassed language, mathematics, history, natural science and miscellaneous subjects. Language studies included those subjects which would produce a graduate who could communicate effectively in both written and verbal English. Mathematics provided instruction in areas from arithmetic through geometry. Students studied U.S., English and World History. Natural science studies included geography, natural history, natural philosophy, physiology and botany. Under the heading of miscellaneous were subjects such as government, business principles, moral science, music and drill in teaching. (43) The major goal of the school was to prepare teachers for the Black free schools in the South. Object teaching, lecture and recitation were the principal methods used, therefore large recitation rooms had to be provided in the new buildings.

The Butler School had been turned over to the A.M.A. by the government in 1865. The A.M.A. also supplied teachers for this school until 1871 when the school was deeded to the Hampton trustees. Students in Hampton's Normal Course did their practice teaching there. Through these teachers, Armstrong would spread his philosophy of industrial education and the value of labor throughout the South much more effectively than by any other form of advertisement.

Education of the Heart: Provision of a sound Christian education was another essential aspect of the new school and a chapel was incorporated in the first building plans. Students received instruction in moral science and two
devotional periods were scheduled each day as well as compulsory church attendance on Sundays. Religion was viewed as central to the educational mission of the school. However, Armstrong was determined to avoid the problems associated with sponsorship by a single religious group. Reliance on a single denomination would limit support for the new school among the various church groups in the North, grant excessive power to the representatives of the denomination who would serve on the Board of Trustees, and perhaps eventually limit admissions to students who embraced the beliefs of that particular group. He insisted from the beginning that the school remain nondenominational though based firmly on Christian tenets.

Education of the Hand: Armstrong was consistent in his modeling of the school on the plan of the Hilo Boarding School in Hawaii which combined mental and manual labor and required that all students support themselves, at least partially, through their own work. Although tuition was to be paid through scholarships, gainful employment would enable them to pay at least some part of their other expenses. From the beginning, all students, no matter what their course of study, were expected to work and to pay some part of their expenses as a way of building strong moral character. This focus on the industrial aspects of education would strongly influence the development of the campus.

The farm was vital to his plans as it supplied not only food for the tables, but also a source of employment and
agricultural instruction for the students. The importance attached by Armstrong to the agricultural aspect of the school is reflected in a letter written to his mother in December of 1868 in which he described his personal efforts to find a qualified farmer to oversee the work and to instruct the students in the scientific principles of agriculture. "After a great deal of difficulty, I persuaded a first rate fellow to come down and try it. I think I now have a good man who will help me make a good success here. We must not fail."(44) This man was Francis Richardson who would also play an important roll in the design of the grounds of the Institute.

At first, the students did manual work in the mornings and studied in the afternoons. Later, Armstrong sought to avoid many of the problems encountered by earlier schools such as Oberlin in implementing the industrial model by having the students work in squads. Each squad worked two days and studied four in rotation. Thus, study would not suffer from daily interruptions for work nor would the work of the farm suffer because the minds of the students were on their books.(45) Students were paid for their work with credit in the books of the school which was then applied to the cost of their room and board. As the productivity of the farm increased, he expected to sell produce in the northern markets, providing additional income for the school.

In addition to the Normal course which prepared teachers, the school also offered an agricultural course, a commercial
course and a mechanical course. Students enrolled in these courses were also expected to complete at least part of the normal course. Expansion of the industries in which instruction could be offered was a major concern and building plans always considered the needs of new or proposed industries.

School life: Life at the new school was rather spartan for both students and teachers. The mansion house, an example of the old plantation model with broad piazzas and lofty pillars on two sides, had been fitted up as the teachers' home but could only accommodate all of them in the dining room. Some of the teachers lived with the girls in their dormitory, Griggs Hall, which was a substantial brick building converted from the old mill. Others had rooms in the Barracks building. The Barracks building also contained the chapel, schoolroom, industrial room, and dining room for students. The girls and boys were kept separate except for meals and academic classes. Separate industries were developed for each. The boys worked on the farm while the girls sewed and mended clothes in their industrial room in the Barracks building. As the campus developed, it would remain separated into a boys and a girls campus.

There were few amusements for either the students or the teachers. They were not always welcomed in the town and transportation was difficult. The school developed into an isolated little world where all needs had to be provided
within the campus. This led to the development of a strong sense of community. The life of the teachers was very plain but most did not seem to mind. One teacher later wrote of those early days: "...the interest in the work of teaching those people just out of slavery was so absorbing that I remember being sorry when the long summer vacation came and school broke up— an experience never repeated in my life as a teacher". (48) Visitors were few and far between and the principal recreation was boating.

The waterfront was the dominant feature of the campus, providing food in the form of the abundant fish and seafood of the Chesapeake Bay, cooling breezes in the long, hot summers; transportation, recreation and a beautiful prospect. Naturally, campus development centered around it. The Mansion House faced the water and both the mill, later the girls' dormitory, and the Barracks building were also on the waterfront. Most visitors to the campus arrived by water so that their first impression of the school would be formed by those buildings and Armstrong's plan for the development of Hampton's campus focused on the waterfront.

The students' daily schedule was strictly regimented, with periods designated for study, domestic duties, classes and meals. Bells marked the different periods of the day and called the students to classes or to work. Such regimentation was important as slavery had deprived the Negro of the qualities of self discipline and self direction as well as of
their self esteem. Also, most Negroes owned neither watch nor
clock so the call of the bell to various activities was
essential to prevent tardiness. There was little time for play
and many games such as marbles and baseball were often frowned
upon by the students' own churches so there were few
distractions to studying.

The first students were, on the average, somewhat older
than the typical college student of the day. They had personal
knowledge of what it meant to be a slave and reached out
eagerly for education as a means of improving themselves. All
students returned to the assembly room at the end of each day
to be formally dismissed. However, it was not uncommon to see
at least half of the boys return to their desks after
dismissal and remain there, studying, as long as one of the
teachers remained.(49)

Armstrong believed that military discipline had played
an important part in developing the character of those slaves
who had joined the union army and included drill, uniforms and
military instruction in the educational plan for the young
men. Although uniforms and the organization of the cadet corps
were to come later, the boys marched to and from meals, chapel
and classes under the direction of one of the teachers and
daily inspections of rooms and dress were held. He expended
much effort during the early years in soliciting the
assignment of a military officer to the school to oversee the
drill, instruction in military subjects. and the beginnings
of military discipline.

All forms of corporeal punishment were eschewed as too reminiscent of the treatment of slaves. Disciplinary actions might include extra duties or study time. It is indicative of the value placed on education by these early students that the severest punishment was to be sent away from school. For many, the banishment was temporary. They were encouraged to find work for a period of time, after which they might be readmitted. Steady work again was felt to be a moral force which would mature the students and improve their ability to successfully complete their course of study and go forth to teach and be an example to their own people. For the unfortunate few, the banishment was permanent.

The teachers: Armstrong felt that one of the major shortcomings of missionary schools and their teachers was their focus on conversion to Christianity and the teaching of the Gospel rather than on teaching students how to live like Christians. He viewed the teachers as the principal factor which would determine the success of the school and he desired a staff who would be different from the typical missionary teachers sent by the A.M.A. He therefore set out to replace that first staff. He managed to attract an impressive faculty from some of the most prominent Northern families: Jane Stuart Woolsey, member of a prominent Massachusetts family; Louise Gilman, sister of Daniel Coit Gilman of Yale; Mary E. Kingsley, a close friend of the Hopkins family and Rebecca
Miss Bacon served as assistant principal from 1869 until 1871 when ill health forced her retirement. She organized the academic department and made many other suggestions regarding the organization of the new school during the general's many absences on fund raising trips in the North. She was responsible for the arrangement of the routine of the school, the course of instruction, the assignment of the students to classes and the assignment of the teachers. She was also responsible for the management of the Sunday schools and the Butler and Lincoln schools, primary schools which served as practice schools for Hampton students as well as educating neighboring children. She would mature her plans and then present them to Armstrong for his approval when he returned from his trips. A large part of the credit for the early success of the school is given to her, along with Armstrong.
CHAPTER 5
BUILDING FOR PERMANENCE

Academic Hall: Although Armstrong had stated that three years would be needed to prove the success of the experiment and that he would then begin to build more permanent buildings, in reality, he continued to move ahead with his plans for permanent and imposing buildings. He believed that the influence of surroundings outweighed that of heredity, therefore it was essential to surround the student with "a perfectly balanced system of influences" in order to "waken genuine enthusiasm for a higher life". (1) He wrote to his friend Archibald Hopkins, as early as June of 1868, barely two months after the school had opened: "A great change is over the old farm, I wish you could see it. I am preparing for the final crowning effort of noble buildings on the broadest, most liberal basis." (2)

Armstrong certainly laid his plans for the new school, both its educational design and the development of the physical environment, before the A.M.A. Both were controversial and his radical ideas shocked missionaries and educators alike. Therefore, in the summer of 1869, the A.M.A. sent a "Commission of Inquiry" to evaluate the new school: its location, history, object and plan, and its prospects. The
distinguished group which was sent could be expected to command profound respect from a young man with little experience in the field of education. It included Dr. Mark Hopkins, president of Williams college and a leading educator and former mentor to Armstrong; Mr. Alexander Hyde, a member of the Massachusetts Board of Agriculture; Mr. B.G. Northrup, a clergyman and educator and member of the Connecticut Board of Education; and Gen. James A. Garfield, congressman, former teacher and Williams Alumnus. Their opinions and recommendations would certainly convince a young and inexperienced man such as Armstrong to yield to more conventional wisdom and, it was hoped, slow down his rapid pace which the A.M.A. found somewhat alarming.

The Commission was charged to conduct an investigation and to prepare a report. In order to meet the needs of the growing school for additional room, the A.M.A. had proposed buying another 40 acre site near the town on which already stood a large building, previously the home of a female seminary. The members of the Commission also leaned toward the purchase of this building but Armstrong vehemently opposed it. He argued that it was too far away from the other buildings making it most inconvenient and that, as it had been used as a hospital during the war, sources of contagion might still linger there. (3) Armstrong was determined to construct the first of the new, imposing buildings, Academic Hall, which he had proposed in his plan as outlined to Howe some years
earlier. The fact that he would continue to strongly promote his own views despite opposition from the older and highly respected members of the Commission indicates even stronger and more compelling reasons than those he gave and certainly beyond the task of providing more space for the school. These circumstances indicate the existence of a master plan for the development of the campus which Armstrong was determined to follow.

The Commission members also had doubts about the educational design of the school but Armstrong's energy and persistence persuaded them that, if he was to be the head of the school, he must be allowed to try his way first and that if it did not succeed, he would be the first to recognize this. (4) Their final report supported all aspects of his plan for the school, including the construction of the new Academic Building as he envisioned it. Armstrong had won the first battle but there were more to come. He hoped that the support of such prominent men as the members of the Commission would help to secure general confidence in the school and assist in raising needed funds.

Armstrong promised the A.M.A. that funds for the building's erection would be secured from the Freedmen's Bureau and private donors and that they would incur no additional expense. (5) He selected Richard Morris Hunt as the architect in order that the structure might be "a tasteful one". Hunt, at this time, was a leading architect in New York
City, the first American to have studied at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris. In a letter Armstrong describes Hunt as "a man of large experience, stands at the head of his profession, and will, I hope, give us something good". In choosing such an accomplished architect, Armstrong reinforced the importance he placed on architecture and the design of the campus as a means of character building and of gaining respectability for the new and controversial school. The role, if any, of other influential men associated with the school, many of whom were prominent New Yorkers, in the selection of the architect is not clear. However, in view of Armstrong's persistence in pursuing his own vision for the building, it seems probable that his was the deciding voice.

In the same letter, he described the building as "my monument, I care for no other. It will be, perhaps, the most complete, tasteful school building in the Southern states. It will stand on a beautiful site upon the shore, looking out upon Hampton Roads, receiving the cool, fresh sea breezes. I write this much about it because it is near to my heart and my present, principal work." The site was the same one he had chosen for it before the school opened, when the first temporary buildings were being constructed.

Although Hunt supplied the plans for the new building, he did not personally supervise its construction as did most architects of the time. Such services from the architect would have been very costly to the school. Armstrong wrote to his
mother in August of 1869 that he had been "flying around the country, looking up someone to put up our new building at Hampton". (8) His brother, Baxter, finally agreed to go and supervise the construction. The building foreman was C.D. Cake, a former Confederate soldier, who agreed to complete the Hall "according to plans and specifications of the architect, Mr. Richard Morris Hunt of New York City, and so far as plans are not supplied by the architect, according to directions furnished by... Armstrong or his agent, Mr. Albert Howe". (9) Both Cake and Howe were to play a major role in the development of the Hampton campus.

The bricks for the building were to be made on the school grounds, providing support for another industry, brickmaking, as well as reducing construction costs. The first brick kiln had to be abandoned because the clay was not suitable but the second site was a success and the making of the necessary bricks proceeded throughout the summer of 1869. The laying of the bricks began in September of 1869, the cornerstone for the building having been laid by General Howard. Armstrong expressed his anxiety about the construction of such an imposing building in a letter in which he described the task as "the most responsible and conspicuous and fateful single executive act of my life. The failure of it would be a crushing blow to body and mind. I could not bear failure. The success of it will be only an inspiration to other fields of effort..." (10)
Armstrong continued to generate controversy by paying white and black brickmasons the same wages for the same work, a practice unheard of in that area and time. He tried to maintain a work force that was half Black and half White and, although some of the white workers threatened to leave, most of them stayed and the work proceeded.

This first building designed by Hunt for the school lacked the irregular skyline and rich materials typical of most High Victorian buildings. It was a large, three story building, 110 by 85 feet, shaped like a Greek cross with a low cross gable roof with a large overhang supported by open stickwork similar to that of Swiss chalets. The buttresses at the angles were of Gothic derivation. The corners and window frames were trimmed with black brick, beginning the tradition of using decorative black brick trim which was to be a theme of the school's buildings. Black and red brick and plaster areas gave the walls polychromic variety and interest but the emphasis was on function.

Under Baxter's direction, the work went well and by December of 1869, one of the teachers, Miss Woolsey, was able to write: "The new building for the school is coming on fast. They expect to cover it soon. It looks better than its picture, less fussy. The ornamentation is effective and not overdone. The walls look solid and well built, the timbers and piers inside, tough and strong. The flat Swiss roof is questionable but may appear better by and by." (13) Inside, it
contained offices, an assembly room, library, reading room, recitation rooms, and dormitory space for approximately 50 male students on the third floor. The increased dormitory space was particularly important as the school had already been forced to turn away prospective students for lack of room.

The assembly room was described as large and handsome, well furnished with desks and blackboards and comparable to any similar schoolroom in the North. The ceiling was inlaid with a mosaic of Southern yellow pine and the walls were wainscotted with the same wood. Opposite the assembly room were the library and reading room, similarly decorated. Large windows around two sides of the building afforded magnificent views of Hampton Roads and the Chesapeake Bay. The best periodicals of the day were obtained by trading for copies of the *Southern Workman*, a periodical written and published at the school beginning in 1872 and distributed throughout the South. Students had free access to the reading room outside of school hours. No longer would they need to return to classrooms after dismissal to read and study. Studies of the records of books checked out by students revealed a special preference for history and biographies.(14)

Funding for the building continued to be a source of anxiety for Armstrong. Articles of Agreement between Armstrong and the A.M.A. state that the new building would be built and furnished "on or before May 1, 1870 for the sum of
Armstrong had obtained an appropriation of $20,000 from the Freemen's Bureau and had undertaken to raise the rest of the money himself from northern philanthropists.

Problems arose in February of 1870. Any appropriations by the Freedmen's Bureau for the erection of school buildings were made on the condition that the title of the land on which such buildings would stand be vested in an independent board of trustees to be used forever for educational purposes. The Bureau had assumed that the title to the land at the Hampton school was held by the A.M.A. and had therefore paid vouchers presented by that organization for the construction of the Academic building. The Bureau had also granted the Association rent for the school's buildings at a rate of $1500 per month beginning June 1, 1869. The building, still under construction, belonged to the Bureau. The land, it was discovered, had been conveyed by absolute deed to Rev. George Whipple rather than to the A.M.A. This meant that if Mr. Whipple should die, the land would pass to his heirs as part of his estate and also that it would be liable for his personal debts. The Bureau therefore requested that the land be conveyed to a Board of Trustees by deed of trust. Until this was done, the Bureau would provide no more funds nor would they turn the building over to the trustees. The school, at this point, owned neither the building nor the land on which it stood. However, a Board of Trustees was established, the transfer of the land was accomplished and
both the A.M.A. and the Freedmen's Bureau ceded control of the Hampton school to the Board. The continued good will of the A.M.A. was assured by the membership of several of its officers, including Rev. Whipple, on that Board.

The Academic Building was completed in time for the Fall term of 1870. A woodcut picture of the building and the waterfront show the way in which it dominated its surroundings.(Fig.1) At the time few people, including the Negroes themselves, believed in their capacity for education and improvement; they lacked self esteem. The early, imposing brick buildings conveyed an important message to the Negro that here were people who believed in his capacity for education and improvement and were willing to help him achieve. This was the message Armstrong intended to convey through this building which he had fought to construct despite considerable opposition. Armstrong's brother, Baxter, who had supervised its construction, died not long after the completion of Academic Hall and the building also served as a reminder of his brother, giving it a special place in his affections.

According to Miss Woolsey, the students were very proud of the new building.(17) One student later described his first impressions of the building and its effect on him: "...the first sight of the large, three-story, brick school building seemed to have rewarded me for all I had undergone to reach the place. If the people who gave the money to provide that
building could appreciate the influence the sight of it had upon me, as well as thousands of other youths, they would feel all the more encouraged to make such gifts. It seemed to me the largest and most beautiful building I had ever seen. The sight of it seemed to give me new life. I felt that a new kind of existence had begun—that life would now have new meaning. I felt that I had reached the promised land..."(18) The pride felt by all those connected with the school is also indicated by the appearance of the same woodcut picture in the 1871-72 catalog, on the letterhead of the school stationery, and on the school's diplomas. The landscaping was also completed in the summer of 1870 and, together with the new building, gave the campus a sense of order and permanence.

Another important step in the development of the school was completed in June of 1870 when the General Assembly of Virginia passed an act incorporating the "Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute for the instruction of youth in the various common schools, academic and industrial branches, the best methods of teaching same and best mode of practical industry in its application to agriculture and the mechanic arts."(19) The truly liberal scope of the school's charter is illustrated by the words "without distinction of color" which were included and which stimulated considerable discussion in the Virginia General Assembly before it was passed. Armstrong had to provide proof that monetary gifts given to the school had been given on the condition that students would be
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admitted regardless of race or color before the lawmakers would agree to such wording.

Shortly after the opening of the Fall term, the boys' quarters were moved from the south end of the Barracks building to the new Hall. This left room for the girls to expand and they soon filled all the rooms not designated for general use. (20) The refitting of the Barracks rooms for use by the girls was expected to cost not more than $500 and that sum had been promised by Miss Woolsey in June of 1870. (21) The large, low ceiling room on the north end of the building, next to the dining room, which had been used as the assembly and principal recitation room was converted to a chapel and used for evening devotions and singing. Next to the chapel was the girls' industrial room where they mended and made clothes for purchase by the other students. Such industry was important because there were far fewer opportunities for the girls to earn money toward their board and to secure the benefits of industrial education than for the boys. Next came the dormitory, rows of rooms on either side of a wide hall. (22) Teachers lived on either end of this corridor and were thus able to closely supervise the young women. The long verandah provided an area where, on warm evenings, the girls would stroll back and forth in pairs, singing their beloved plantation melodies. When they tired, they would sit on the steps and either sing or listen to the singing of the boys coming from their quarters in the Academic building. Music
was, from the beginning, a vital part of the school, and would provide not only pleasure but also a means of securing needed financial support.

Changes had also taken place in Armstrong's personal life. He had met the woman who was to be his wife, Miss Emma Dean Walker, in 1868, and they married in October of 1869. In order to provide space for the newly married couple, they divided the mansion house in two with the General and his wife occupying the south side while the teachers continued to occupy the north side. One of the broad piazzas was enclosed to give two rooms upstairs and two down for the use of the General's family and he continued to occupy these rooms until his death.

The school was better established now, having lost some of its temporary character. The task of developing a permanent and impressive campus and providing for the future growth of the school was well begun. Armstrong's plan for its development as he had outlined it to Howe several years earlier had thus far been followed. Armstrong had gathered around him a dedicated staff who were competent and whose primary allegiance was to the school and to his vision for it rather than to an outside organization. The student body was growing every day. Hampton was well on its way to becoming an influential school.

General J.F.B. Marshall joined the school staff as treasurer in 1870. He was well known in missionary circles,
having also served in Hawaii. His position as chairman of the Committee on Education in the Hawaiian parliament had brought him into close contact with Richard Armstrong as well as with his son who was a member of Marshall's Sunday School class. In 1870, Marshall, as president of the Hawaiian Club of Boston, had helped arrange one of the early fund raising meetings there for the benefit of the school. (23) Armstrong considered securing the interest of Boston philanthropists in the school as most important because once they made a commitment to a cause, they maintained their contributions throughout their lifetimes and passed such commitments on to their heirs. Consequently, they could provide a much needed, reliable, continuing source of income for the school.

Marshall was to serve as resident trustee as well as treasurer and the trustees hoped that his influence would enable him to restrain Armstrong's enthusiasm which often threatened to outrun the school's resources. They thought he spent too much money. However, in the words of Mr. Howe: "as well try to stop a whirlwind. As soon as one building was done, his fertile brain was planning another and he undertook to raise the money to pay for them...the money always came." (24) Armstrong had his plan for the campus and he was carrying it out despite the hesitation and concern of both benefactors and trustees. Only dedication to a definite plan could have enabled him to continue to this more difficult course. He would persuade the trustees to approve his plans
by committing himself to raise the needed money. This tactic committed him to constant travel to solicit funds, an activity which he disliked and which he described as a "campaign of the hardest kind" (25) which drained his strength and resulted in long, lonely separations from his family.

VIRGINIA HALL: The next priority for the Hampton school after the completion of Academic Hall was to provide adequate housing for its burgeoning student body. Unlike many of the new institutions founded after the Civil War which suffered declining enrollments and eventually closed, Hampton had a different problem. The student body grew steadily and often more rapidly than had been predicted. The very different attitudes both of society at large and of Armstrong toward the education of young women and young men are reflected in the different buildings constructed for them.

The first catalogue issued by the school in 1868 had stated that the female department would be conducted "somewhat on the plan of Mount Holyoke Seminary". (26) This plan required the construction of a large, seminary style building which would provide facilities for the housing and instruction of young women while separating them from the coarser influences of both male students and the surrounding society and protecting the development of their femininity. There were several probable reasons for the choice of this style for housing and educating the young women. First, it was the dominant plan for women's education at the time and therefore,
already tested and accepted by the public, especially in the North where the school's major support base was to be found. The school was already controversial in many ways and it was therefore important to reassure potential supporters of its essential respectability. This was particularly true in relation to the co-education of Negroes, as they were considered to have low morals and to be easily led into misconduct, especially with young women and men in close proximity. A large seminary-type building housing both teachers and female students would assure strict control over their conduct.

The seminary system was also the form of women's education which was most familiar to Armstrong as his older sister had graduated from Mt. Holyoke and many of the early teachers were graduates of Vassar or Mount Holyoke and committed to the seminary system for the education of women. Finally, the construction of an imposing building for women would reflect Armstrong's commitment to their education as an essential factor in the civilization of a backward race.

Armstrong's campus plan separated the male and female students except during meals, chapel and academic classes when they were under the direct supervision of the teachers. Even this limited and strictly supervised contact was a departure from the seminary plan as implemented at Mount Holyoke and Vassar which were exclusively women's schools. In order to educate both sexes on the same campus, they had to share the
large public rooms such as the dining and recitation rooms. Limited financial resources would certainly not have allowed the construction of totally separate facilities for girls and boys. In addition, Armstrong considered the influence of the young women on the men as an essential part of their education and elevation. Thus the campus developed into two separate areas, the girls' campus and the boys' campus, with the major buildings used by both in the center, a plan which continued well into the twentieth century. (1918 Map, Appendix I)

The construction of the seminary building for the girls was Armstrong's next priority after the completion of Academic Hall. The Barracks building in which many of them were housed had been intended to serve only temporarily, was rapidly falling into disrepair and was not considered worth the expense of the necessary repairs. It was felt that the only alternative to going forward with a new building for the girls would be to close the girls' school, at least temporarily. Armstrong never considered this as a viable alternative, feeling that once closed, it might prove extremely difficult to persuade the girls to return.

Again Armstrong got his way and records of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for September of 1872 indicate that a detailed plan for a large building to include a chapel, dining room, kitchen, laundry and industrial and dormitory rooms for the girls was to be prepared as soon as possible. This same record indicates that they intended to
secure an outline plan for a complete system of school buildings at the same time. (27) Unfortunately, the more comprehensive campus plan could not be found. However, the development of the campus continued to be consistent with Armstrong's vision as he had expressed it several years earlier.

In the catalogue for 1871-72 Armstrong stated that the school had outgrown its accomodations to the extent that, not only must some of the boys be housed in rooms in Academic Hall which were intended for recitation rooms, but also that some would have to be housed in tents in the coming year. The Barracks building which housed the girls was described as worn out and overcrowded. His emphasis on the education of women was reflected in his statement in the catalogue that they should have "the first and best accomodation". (28) He also proposed the first of three cottages for the boys.

Armstrong stated that $125,000 would be needed to erect and furnish the new buildings as well as to renovate some of the old buildings in order to provide a "complete and harmonious system". (29) This mention of a "harmonious system" provides another indication that a master plan was in existence and guiding the development of the campus. One of the major sources of funds for the earlier buildings, the Freedmen's Bureau, had ceased to exist in 1872. The American Missionary Association, another major funding source, had ceded both the deed to the land and control of the school to
the independent Board of Trustees when it was formally incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1870. Although several members of the Board were officers of the A.M.A. and the organization continued to provide support for the daily expenses of the school, it certainly would not provide the sum needed for the building program that Armstrong envisioned. The generosity of Northern friends had also been taxed nearly to the limit.

However, Armstrong was determined to carry out his plan. According to Albert Howe, Virginia Hall was begun with barely $2000 on hand for a building that was expected to cost approximately $75,000.(30) Armstrong therefore devised a plan which he was to use more than once in raising funds for campus construction. He instructed Howe to dig the foundation and to pile bricks and lumber around the hole to give the appearance that the building was already underway. He would invite a large party of influential people from the North to attend the Anniversary Day exercises, show them the work in progress and appeal to them for money. This plan was carried out and the contributions came.(31)

Although financial troubles continued to plague the project, including the financial panic of 1873, work was not suspended for even a day due to lack of materials. "At the height of the panic, when it seemed work would have to stop leaving uncovered walls exposed to damage from winter weather, two friends from Boston came forward with $10,000.00."(32) The
Boston connection which Armstrong had worked so hard to establish was paying off. The walls rose steadily through the panic although even the largest businesses were having difficulties. When Armstrong cabled to Howe that the work must stop because he could not see his way clear to pay them, Howe convinced the workers to agree to a monthly pay schedule rather than the weekly schedule which had previously been in force and the work went on without a break.

Armstrong also instituted another tradition in his efforts to raise money for his building program. He had been impressed by the success of the Jubilee Singers from Fisk and thought that Hampton might do something similar. He had not pursued this idea earlier due to the difficulty of securing a properly prepared leader for the group. However, the need for funds for his building program and the arrival of Thomas P. Fenner, a former professor at the music conservatory in Providence, Rhode Island, to establish a music department, favored the formation of a similar group to raise funds for the construction of Virginia Hall.

The first Hampton Singers, consisting of 17 regular Hampton students who, although anxious to complete their course of study, were willing to interrupt it for the good of the school, were formed and were ready for their first tour within six months. They were accompanied on their trips by Mr. Fenner, a lady teacher who was in charge of the girls, and often by Armstrong himself. Their first trip began in
February of 1873 and lasted ten months. They returned to Hampton in December of 1873 having raised less money than was hoped due to the panic which hit in October of 1873. However, they were sent out again during the Spring and eventually raised $10,971.30 toward the cost of the building. Their efforts reflected Armstrong's principle of self help which was the basis of the school's programs and established the tradition that Virginia Hall was "sung up" by the Hampton Chorus.

Armstrong was also able to secure, from the Virginia General Assembly, one third of the agricultural land scrip provided by the second Morrill Act. This amounted to $95,000, the interest on which was paid yearly to the school. While these funds could not be used for the construction of buildings, they did contribute significantly to everyday expenses, freeing money obtained through contributions for the purposes of building up the campus. These efforts demonstrate Armstrong's determination to follow his own vision for the development of the school's campus and academic programs.

Hunt was again the architect for this second of the imposing buildings in Armstrong's plan. He was at this time at the height of his career and had a national reputation. Albert Howe, farm manager and ex-Union soldier, was construction superintendent for the project and Mr. C.D. Cake, Hampton mechanic and ex-Confederate soldier, was the foreman. All three had been involved in the construction of Academic
Hall. The workforce was again to be half White and half Black as had been the case with Academic Hall. Whenever possible, students were to be employed in its construction, adhering to Armstrong's principle of self help as well as providing instruction for the boys in the construction trades and saving money.

The design of Virginia Hall was typical of Hunt designs of that period. It was a mixture of Second Empire and Victorian Gothic with polychromatic and multiply divided walls and an irregular roofline. (34) The design included many Gothic Revival elements such as pinnacles, finials, projecting doorways, corbelling and rose windows. A symmetrical building with a center and two end pavilions, it was four stories in height, 190 feet across the front and forty feet in width, with a wing extending 100 feet to the rear. The material was red brick relieved by lines and cappings of black. Although the financial difficulties prevented the use of the rich materials seen in similar Hunt designs of the period such as the Biltmore House, it was still most impressive. (Figure 2) It dwarfed even Academic Hall and its massiveness was emphasized by the flatness of the surrounding landscape. (35)

It was placed on the waterfront, just behind the Barracks building which was torn down after its completion. This location was the same one which Armstrong had indicated to Howe in 1867 was to be used for a girls' dormitory to be named Virginia Hall. His foresight and planning were also reflected
in the size of the building which was much larger than necessary to meet current needs. Some of the halls on the upper floors were to be left unfinished, to be completed at later dates when the need arose even though the larger size added to the burden of raising funds for its erection.

According to one of the earliest teachers, Susan Harrold, Armstrong had also pointed out the site to her in 1870 as the future site of a girl's dormitory and had discussed his plans for the design and details of the building. She described those earlier days as "days of large planning". (36) Armstrong conceived a monumental building which, he felt, would assure the future of the school. "Again, as in his vision of the whole undertaking, he saw the completed plan of an adequate building in imagination before it was ever drawn and fixed on its name, site and uses before a dollar was in hand." (37) According to the records of those who were part of the early days of Hampton, Armstrong's vision as he described it to them became the reality.

The first floor of the building contained a large dining room, kitchen, laundry, and girls' industrial room. The second floor was reached by means of twin staircases at either side of the dining room and contained a parlor, study rooms and sleeping rooms for the girls. Wide central hallways ran the width of the building as well as the length of the rear wing. The sleeping rooms opened into these central hallways. Teachers were to be housed on each of the floors to supervise
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the young women who were accommodated two to a room. The interior finish was to be primarily native Virginia pine, similar to that used in Academic Hall. Each room was to contain two iron bedsteads, made on the premises, two bureaus, two chairs, and a window for ventilation. In deference to the concerns expressed by some of those interested in Hampton that such comfortable and elegant surroundings might result in graduates who would be unfit for the more spartan life they would lead as teachers in colored schools, furnishings were later altered to provide only one bureau to be shared by the two students and straight hanging curtains rather than the ruffled tiebacks shown in Figure 3.

These furnishings also reflected Armstrong's belief that: "Costly buildings stimulate self respect...but beds, furniture and clothing should be good but simple, no better than what they can, by their own industry get at home". (38) The school had to walk a fine line between providing surroundings which would raise the self esteem of the Negro and a level of elegant living which would result in the alienation of the students from their own race, the people they were being trained to help.

In response to criticisms that students would be spoiled by such good accomodations, which were in such contrast to their past and probable future experiences, Armstrong responded: "The colored race responds wonderfully to good treatment. The Black man became a soldier when he was equipped
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and treated like one and "he will become a man when treated like one".(39)

In addition, well constructed buildings were less likely than temporary or inferior buildings to be abused, would suffer less wear and tear and require fewer repairs. In an article printed in the Southern Workman he also pointed out the economy of such a large building in providing much needed space for many uses, the decrease in the risk of fire due to the use of brick, and the lowered operating expenses due to the use of a steam engine to heat the building and provide steam power for cooking and washing.

Also included in that article was the following statement, which clarified his views on the role of architecture and campus design in the broader education of the students. "Had a simple structure been erected, in factory style, without regard to appearances, the feeling of pride among graduates in their Alma Mater would have been changed to something like contempt. As it is, the reputation and influence of the school have been doubled among the colored people by the mere fact that such a noble building is dedicated to their elevation."(40)

The inspiration provided by such an elegant building was particularly important for the girls, as an incentive to obtain an education. The acquisition of the status and rights of citizenship was a major factor in the desire of the young men to gain an education but the girls, who could not gain the
vote, lacked this incentive. They were "not so intensely alive to the importance of education" as the men who saw ignorance as the "badge of slavery". Armstrong felt that slavery had done more to degrade the women and freedom had done less to uplift them than the men therefore, their need was greater. In addition, their influence would play a major role in the success of this experiment in the civilization and uplift of the Negro, as they could either lift up or pull down their husbands and children within the family.

Armstrong also felt that such buildings helped to dignify labor by making its associations more respectable. This was important for the Negroes who associated labor with the degradation of slavery and often felt that efforts in industrial education were aimed at returning them to slave status.

The basement of the building had an eight foot clearance with windows which provided light and ventilation. It contained the printing office, store rooms and a repair shop. A boiler provided steam for heating the building. This was the beginning of a steam heating plant which would eventually provide heat to most of the major campus buildings. Water was pumped into two 1000 gallon tanks in the attic from which it was distributed. Both hot and cold water were available on each floor. Each floor also had 2-2 1/2" fire plugs through which water could be pumped for the purpose of putting out fires. Fire was a constant concern for the school and
decreasing the risk was an important consideration in the planning of any new building. The practice of providing relatively high clearances for the basements of buildings, allowing large windows for light and ventilation, and using them for industrial and other purposes was also carried out in the larger buildings which were constructed later.

A chapel with seating for 400 persons was planned for the top floor. In the early years, Negro students were often not welcome in neighborhood churches. Armstrong and the officers and teachers of the school therefore founded the non-denominational Church of God in Christ within the school, continuing Armstrong's practice of avoiding excess influence by any one denomination. This broadened support for the school among all Northern Christian churches. For many years they held services in the Bethesda Chapel on the grounds of the National Cemetery, but occupation of this building was uncertain as it belonged to the federal government and might be taken at any time to make more room in the cemetery. A chapel was also needed to replace the one in the Barracks building which was used for daily devotions and other school activities.

Virginia Hall's cornerstone was laid in June of 1873, as part of the school's closing exercises and the building was dedicated during the commencement exercises of the following year even though it was not finished. A large delegation of friends and patrons of the school came from New York and
Boston and throughout the North to attend the commencement, or Anniversary day, ceremonies, attracted, at least in part, by the dedication of the new building. Armstrong still needed the sum of $30,000 to complete the building and prepare it for occupation in the fall. The ceremonies might be expected to elicit more contributions.

The graduates "marched in procession to Virginia Hall, a large, handsome building erected in part through the efforts of the Hampton Singers". After refreshments, the company assembled in "the beautiful chapel" of the Hall to listen to addressess by distinguished visitors. A student speaker, in his dedicatory address, thanked the people of the country for the generous donations which had enabled the school to erect "this commodious building" stating that the graduates of the institution would "manifest their gratitude by carrying the blessings of education to the colored people of the South". (42)

Reporters from several prominent newspapers were also present, induced by the announcement of the dedication of the "elegant new college building" and described the ceremony, the school and its progress for their readers, providing the school with invaluable publicity in both Virginia and the North. (43) Armstrong always made the most of such occasions in furthering the interests of the school and made an appeal during the ceremonies for contributions to complete the building and to provide scholarships for worthy students.
In his efforts to raise the money needed to complete Virginia Hall, Armstrong also returned to a practice used successfully in erecting the first buildings. He asked individuals and various societies to furnish a room in the building, the cost being $60.00 per room for the sleeping rooms. Again, the sponsor's name would be attached to the room as had been done in the Barracks. The smaller sums would be easier to obtain and this practice would also allow Armstrong to retain control over the design of the building. A benefactor who provided the money necessary to erect an entire building would certainly expect to have a greater influence over the choice of the architect and design of a building carrying his name than would the donor of a single room. In his appeals for these donations, Armstrong again stated that the school "aimed to create no useless or expensive tastes" but rather a building designed for "plain living and high thinking".

By the Fall of 1874, Virginia Hall was sufficiently ready to be occupied by teachers and students but loaded with a debt of $25,000 including late payments to both suppliers and workmen. Lack of funds threatened the plans for the completion of the chapel. A contribution of $5000 came from a lady whose minister had attended an earlier commencement ceremony, on the condition that the remaining $20,000 could be obtained from other sources. The two Boston friends who had made the earlier contributions to complete the roof
contributed another $10,000 to help cancel the debt but funds were still insufficient to complete and furnish the chapel. Just when the task seemed impossible, a presentation by the Hampton singers in the town of Whittensville, Mass. led one of its leading citizens, Mr. John C. Whitin, to decide to donate $10,000 to the school for the purpose of founding a memorial to his deceased wife. This contribution was sufficient to complete the chapel which was then named the Whitin Memorial Chapel. (45) Although the donation was not attributed directly to the efforts of the Hampton Singers, it was the indirect result of their efforts.

An editorial in the Southern Workman dated November, 1874, describes Virginia Hall as nearly finished and already occupied by 65 girls and their teachers. With the completion of this imposing building the Institute "has taken a new departure: it has become a civilizing power and to that end it will more carefully regulate manners and habits and build up a true manhood and womanhood". (46) Against considerable opposition and through difficult times, Armstrong had pursued his vision and plan for the development of a campus which would contribute to the civilization and uplift of all those who studied there.

Attending the 1875 commencement exercises, Edward Everett Hale had written in an article for the Boston Advertiser: "there are now two of the finest buildings I have ever seen, Virginia Hall and Academic Hall, with arrangements of
admirable completeness for the purposes of the Institute. The farm buildings, the chapel and many smaller buildings make up a very considerable establishment. But the contrast between the old barracks and the present edifices is not greater than one observes between the pupils first collected here and the body of young people we see here today. "(47) A woodcut picture of the front elevation of Virginia Hall replaced the similar picture of Academic Hall in the front of the catalogue for 1875, reflecting the pride felt in this elegant new building which for many years served as the heart of the campus.

BOYS' COTTAGES: In contrast to the housing plan for the women, a cottage system was chosen for the young men. Each house or dormitory would house 35-40 young men who would be expected to govern themselves, thus preparing them for the duties of citizenship, duties which would not be required of the women. This goal was most appropriate as one of the major forces in the creation of the school had been the enfranchisement of the Negroes and the need to educate them for the responsibilities which this entailed. The cottage students were to have their own courts, make their own regulations subject to approval of the principal, elect their own judges and other officers, and function "like a little republic". (48)

One student was to be paid $5.00 per month for the general care of each building; sweeping, making up the fires, maintaining the supply of coal, etc. Each student was
responsible for the care of his own room and possessions and daily room inspections were held. No teachers would be housed in the boy's cottages as they were in the girls' dormitory. The aim was to prepare young men who would be independent of jealous political factions and to be strong leaders of their people. Also, in accordance with this goal, while students might be punished for infractions of rules governing conduct, they were never punished for standing up for sincere beliefs, however controversial they might be.

The first of three proposed cottages was built in the summer of 1875 and was called the Seniors' Cottage. The money to build it was withdrawn from the school's endowment as the need for accommodations for the young men, to get them out of the tents, was great. This money was finally replaced in 1879 by a donation from the Graves family and the cottage was renamed the "Graves Cottage". The second cottage, donated by Mr. John Marquand of New York and named for him, was built the following summer. Both were simple, two story, frame buildings in the shape of a "T" resting on high brick basements with open porches given distinction by arches resting on panelled pilasters. The Marquand Cottage differed from the Seniors' in that the upper portico was enclosed to provide a larger sitting room for the students as well as an additional sleeping room.(49) Washing and bathing facilities were in the basements to avoid water damage to the wooden floors. The majority of the young men were to be housed in single rooms
which was considered to be "especially favorable for growth in the Christian life" by providing for private devotions. (50)

The plan for self governance for the young men in the cottages was first tried in the Seniors' Cottage and proved so successful that Armstrong was able to write to Marquand a year later that it had "worked well" and was "a good discipline for them". (51) With the completion of these two cottages, the tents were no longer needed and they were taken down but the third floor of Academic Hall continued to house the young men who could not be accommodated in the new dormitories.

Armstrong planned a third cottage for the boys and solicited funds to erect it from friends in England. It was to follow the same design as the first two and would cost approximately $6500. It was to be called the "English Cottage". If they wished to donate a larger sum, say $10,000, a larger cottage with more architectural merit might be erected. An outline of the educational plan of the school and an agreement to take and educate "five colored youth between the ages of fourteen and twenty-five from...any British territory to be designated by friends in England" accompanied this proposal. (52) However, the English friends must have decided not to follow through with this plan as there is no record of such a cottage. The next boys' cottage to be erected would be the "Indian Cottage" in 1878.

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AT HAMPTON: The industrial feature of
education at Hampton made it unique among the early Black institutions and was considered by Armstrong to be vital to the progress of the Freedmen. Armstrong felt that "By building up here a system that shall embrace a number of light manufactures and the most profitable kinds of agriculture, Hampton can supply teachers experienced in good agricultural and mechanical methods and trained to regard labor as honorable". (53) The status of the Industrial department was equal to that of the more traditional academic departments and Armstrong used many strategies to build it up.

The first and most enduring trade to be taught at Hampton was agriculture and the original site selected for the new school was chosen because of the large farm attached and its access to both the water and the railroad for the transport of crops to Northern markets. One of his earliest tasks was to find the right person to manage the farm and to teach agriculture to the students. In a letter to his mother written in December of 1868 he describes a trip to Philadelphia to "hunt up a farmer", the first man engaged having proved unsatisfactory. He writes: "After a great deal of difficulty, I persuaded a fist rate fellow (Francis Richardson) to come down and try it. I think I now have a man who will help me make a good success here. We must not fail." (54) Richardson would not only help to restore the farmland which had been neglected due to the war, he would also assist Armstrong in laying out the grounds of the campus.
The farm would enable the school to reduce expenses by raising much of the food consumed at its tables. In addition, it would provide a source of income through the sales of crops in northern markets and a means by which students could earn the money for their expenses, thereby implementing Armstrong's concept of self help, a critical element in the elevation of the Negro. However, its primary mission would be the education of students in the principles of agriculture and farming. The importance of the farm's educational mission is reflected in the practice of using student labor even when it would have been less expensive and produced higher profits to use more skilled labor.

Armstrong stated his view of the place of manual labor in the education of the Negro: "Of course it cannot pay in a money way but it will pay in a moral way, especially for the Freedmen. It will make them men and women as nothing else will. It is the only way to make them good Christians." (55) From the beginning, young men were employed in the farm in five squads, each squad working one day of the week and all working on Saturday. The agricultural aspect of Hampton education was further assured by the allocation of one third of the agricultural land fund to Hampton by the Virginia General Assembly.

Like the barracks, the first barn and stables were built using lumber from the former hospital wards. They stood well back from the waterfront situated on the east-west axis, near
the National cemetery. The first barn was hit by lightening and destroyed by the ensuing fire in 1871. Temporary barns were put up while plans were developed for the "best barn in the state of Virginia". (56) Due to financial difficulties and other pressing needs, this new barn was not to be built until 1877.

The importance Armstrong attached to the agricultural aspect of Hampton's educational program is also reflected in the effort he expended in maintaining and adding to the farm. Armstrong first added to the school's farm in 1873, purchasing 72 acres of adjacent land, part of the estate of Joseph Segar. This purchase reflects a change in attitude on the part of neighboring landowners who, in the beginning, were unwilling or afraid to sell land for the purpose of educating Negroes. The school had been accepted as permanent rather than temporary and as a desirable neighbor. However, it remained isolated socially, a little world with virtually no social contact with its neighbors.

In 1877, the addition of another 500 acres to the farm was proposed through the purchase of "Shellbanks", a well known, "first family" farm nearby containing 300 acres and "Canebreaks", a neighboring 200 acre farm. He states that the addition of these two farms would "be equal to all future needs of the school". (57) Shellbanks, due to a rather isolated location with its own water access, was to be used as a stock farm. The acquisition of both parcels of land would enable the
school to employ more students and to grow more food for the school's tables where the demand was constantly increasing. Finding employment for students which would enable them to earn the cost of their board, thus supporting the concept of self help, was a constant concern. Canebreaks was bought that year but the purchase of Shellbanks was not completed until 1879.

Protecting the farm from encroachment by the National Cemetery required constant effort. The National Soldiers Home, which was established in 1871 in the former Chesapeake Seminary, drew more veterans of the Civil War to the area. As these veterans died, the need of the cemetery for more land for interments grew and the government turned to the land of the Normal School which surrounded it for expansion. However, Armstrong's plan for the school included establishing it as an agricultural extension station and a center for experiments in scientific farming methods and the land was a critical factor in its success.

Armstrong maintained a correspondence with the War Department over several years in an effort to prevent the seizure of parts of the Normal School's land for the cemetery. In 1884 he writes: "The land question is a vital one. We cannot give up the land that would be required (for the cemetery) as things now appear". (58) Again in 1888 he wrote that growth of the Institute which was a "state agricultural college" was already decreasing the usable acreage and that
a further reduction would cripple studies in practical farming. Armstrong's plan for establishing the Normal School as an agricultural extention station called for more experiments which would require not only land but "...more buildings for mechanical, scientific or manufacturing purposes. Since practical farming is the most valuable part of the instruction given to 600 students, more than half males of the Negro and Indian races whose future is to be chiefly in agricultural employment.... it would be a calamity not only to this school but to those for whom it has been built up...."(59) Instead, he proposed a separate site on the outskirts of the normal school land near the Zion Baptist Church.

In the 1889-90 budget, the government again proposed taking eight acres of land from the "very heart" of the school for the cemetery and again Armstrong, in protest, outlined his plans for the land, including extension of agricultural experiments and the erection of more buildings stating: "No money can make good the probable injury from the proposed extension of the present cemetery".(60) The work of the Soldier's Home could be expected to diminish over the years as the number of Civil War veterans declined but the work of the Normal School, which had grown steadily over twenty years, could be expected to continue to grow indefinitely and should be considered "...a national interest that no other national interest should prejudice".(61) The government eventually
purchased the alternate site first proposed in 1888 for a separate cemetery for the Soldier's Home. Armstrong's political ability and the ties he cultivated with congressmen had again proved beneficial.

Whipple Barn: The new barn, planned in 1871, was finally built in 1877. It was an "L" shaped building. The main section was 100 by 50 feet while the wing was 40 by 100 feet. (Figure 4) As in other important school buildings, the basement was eight feet in the clear, doubling the usable space. The basement contained the mill, horse stables, root cellar, and harness room. The main floor contained stabling for the herd of cows, feed and milk rooms, storage areas for grain, offices and tool room as well as housing for the milkmen and watchmen. Every effort was made to assure that this barn would be as fire proof as possible through the use of seasoned lumber and heart of cypress shingles as well as tarred paper to separate the sheathing boards and the weathering boards. Even the barn had a distinctive architectural feature in the open belfry placed on the ell. This tower also had a practical purpose as the watchman used it to survey the grounds for any signs of fire or other problems.

Other "light manufactures" were also established on the campus. These industries were expected to fulfill multiple purposes. First and most important, they supported Armstrong's goal of combining manual labor with academic studies, thus preparing students to both teach and to support themselves
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when the public schools were not in session. Second, they provided employment for students, thus supporting the principle of self help for the Freedmen. Lastly, although they were not always profitable in a monetary way, they often enabled the school to cut expenses by providing needed goods and services. For example, the establishment of the brick kiln allowed students to learn the brickmaking trade and provided bricks for all of the larger buildings except the Memorial Church. The shoe shop made shoes for students as well as for the market.

The high basements seen in all of the major buildings provided space for various light industries. The practice of placing workshops in these imposing buildings enhanced the idea of the dignity of labor through these associations. The basement of Virginia hall, the finest building on the campus, contained the printing press, a repair shop, and the boiler which provided the steam for heating and cooking. The basements of the boys' cottages also housed various light industries.

Armstrong used the campus facilities to attract the skilled mechanics he needed to establish these industries. As incentive to locate at Hampton, he might offer land or space in one of the buildings rent free for a specified period of time. He would offer to provide steam power free of charge or at bare cost, using the excess power generated by the school's boiler. In exchange, the mechanic would be expected to employ
a number of the Institute's students and to instruct them in
his particular trade. Profits, if any, might be divided or,
more often, given entirely to the tradesman. The trade school
students usually worked full time at the trade for one year,
attending the night school and saving money in preparation for
entering the regular course of study at the end of that year.
Armstrong considered these industries to be central to the
school's mission of providing a good practical education and
was constantly adding new ones. At one point, he even tried
silkworm farming. The legacy of this experiment is still seen
in the mulberry trees which continue to grace the campus.
A DECADE OF PROGRESS: The year 1878 marked the completion of
the school's first decade. The first temporary buildings had
been replaced by imposing permanent structures which were a
source of pride to students and faculty alike. This pride was
reflected in Hampton's display at the 1876 Centennial
Exposition in Philadelphia which featured a large oil painting
of a waterfront view of the school grounds, large ground plans
of both the academic campus and the Agricultural and
Experimental Farm, front elevations of the major buildings
and fifteen photographs of building interiors and exteriors.
(1876 map, Appendix I) The grounds around the buildings had
been landscaped with lawns, shrubs and ornamental trees,
adding to the sense of permanence and order. There were
several well established industries in addition to the
thriving farm which provided employment and instruction to
students. Armstrong had gathered about him a talented and stable staff who were dedicated to his vision for the school and the student body was steadily growing. Through his efforts and those of some of the trustees, the school enjoyed a growing national and even international reputation even though some aspects of its programs remained controversial.

Armstrong was able to write in his annual report of that year of the success of his experiments in the education of head, hand and heart. The academic course corresponded to the English education of a high school course without the classics. (62) It was considered to be foundation work, fitting graduates to teach in the free public schools in the South. Together with the education in manual labor and Christian ideals, it formed "a guild of earnest, high-minded, united and powerful workers" who would serve as "a nucleus of civilization, a barrier to the mischievous element among their people and, in connection with a similar class from other institutions, become a basis of hope for the race; they will be civilizers rather than mere pedagogues; the future leaders of their race, and occupy a place not yet taken". (63) The success of Hampton's program was reflected in the constant demand for her graduates, which always exceeded the supply, to fill teaching positions in Southern school systems as well as by the rarity of any complaints made to the school concerning their performance. This is particularly significant in light of the fact that most of the school officials in the
South were former Confederate soldiers. It was also important because, in contrast to Whites, the performance or deficiencies of individual Blacks were considered to reflect the potential of the entire race of ex-slaves to gain acceptance as equals in American society. This practice of judging the character and capabilities of an entire race on the performance of a few remains a burden for Blacks even today.

The co-education plan had also proved successful with few problems. Armstrong stated that "well regulated living is the condition of true growth, and it is to be had not at our students' homes but by creating it in their schools, thus supplying the sad deficiencies of their previous lives". (64) Due to the conditions from which its students came, the Hampton school had to establish the values and habits of a Christian life which would, in other circumstances, have been learned at home. Armstrong relied on the highly regulated twelve hour day of work and study as well as the practice of keeping them separate to prevent any misconduct between boys and girls and this appears to have been effective.

Dr. Mark Hopkins, who had been a member of that first committee sent to examine the conditions and objectives of the school in 1869, provided a progress report on the school during the 1879 commencement exercises and declared himself surprised and gratified at the changes and progress which had taken place.
The most obvious change was in the physical plant. Ten years before, the only buildings on the grounds had been the barracks and two houses occupied by the teachers. Now, in place of the barracks, stood Virginia Hall, "the largest and most conspicuous building on the grounds," which together with the three story Academic Hall, dominated the waterfront, commanding respect and contributing to the self esteem of all connected with the school. In addition, there were the two completed boys' cottages, Marquand and Seniors', each three stories high and accommodating 70-80 young men, and five "substantial and commodious residences" for the teachers and staff, including the original Mansion House. The farm part of the grounds showed even more marked improvement, having become a model with 190 acres drained, cleared and productive, planted with 2500 fruit trees as well as various other crops. These improvements had been attained through the outlay of over half a million dollars, of which not less than $200,000 had been expended on buildings, land and improvements, while $50,000 had been invested toward Armstrong's much desired endowment fund.(65)

Hopkins also saw much improvement in the academic sphere. Ten years earlier, the final exercises had been attended only by the committee and teachers with no public exercises. The commencement exercises of 1879 had excited much public interest and been well attended by a large number of persons, many of them quite distinguished, including two members of
President Hayes' Cabinet. He found in every department of the school success that was "not only greater than expected, but extraordinary, and well-nigh unprecedented" (66) He attributed this success, in part, to the eagerness of the Freedmen for education and to the conscience of the nation which led them to contribute to the cause. He also attributed the tremendous progress he saw to "the character of the Institution, as practical, economical, moderate in its aims, and as meeting an immediate, extensive and pressing want" as well as to the "combined energy and good judgement of General Armstrong, together with the high order of talent and of character of those associated with him" (67)

In this report, Hopkins also stated: "the Institution is now large enough. With the exception of one building now in progress, and necessary to enable it to avail itself of the generous gift of Mr. Geo. H. Corliss (a steam engine), more buildings are not likely to be needed." (68) Armstrong himself felt, at this time, that no more large, costly buildings would be needed but that the needs of the growing school could be met in the immediate future through the construction of less expensive, modest frame buildings. The greater need was for a permanent and reliable source of income such as would be provided by an adequate endowment fund well invested. He had written as early as 1875 in reference to a change in the mission of the Hampton Singers from raising money for building a boys dormitory to increasing the endowment fund: ..."it is
not intended to put up another large building. Not that we 
disparage the splendid sacrifices made in behalf of Virginia 
Hall or underrate the civilizing and elevating influences of 
that noble building, but having built a fine ship we should 
send it into its field of action in the best possible order 
and efficiency." (69) However, unforseen circumstances as well 
as a new mission would require modification of these plans.

Another of Armstrong's goals had been to foster a strong 
attachment between Hampton's graduates and the school. He felt 
that this was a critical element in protecting them from the 
often low tone of surrounding influences in their communities. 
The school was to be a center of moral as well as intellectual 
light, to occupy a relative position in the South to that of 
Harvard and Yale in the North, providing the tone for the 
education of the Freedmen.

A major aim of the Institution was "to make every pupil 
feel that the highest guild of all is that which he enters the 
day he graduates...". (70) Many strategies had been used to 
strengthen the ties of graduates to their Alma Mater 
including the encouragement of continuing correspondence 
between graduates and teachers, a summer teachers institute 
providing continuing education for them and publishing letters 
from graduates in the pages of the Southern Workman, to which 
most of them subscribed. Through the pages of this paper, 
graders could communicate with former classmates as well as 
with their teachers and principal. Armstrong also provided
subscriptions for educational journals for graduates who could not afford them, often paying for them out of his own pocket.

Armstrong had stated on more than one occasion the important role he felt that the impressive buildings which had been constructed for the school played in fostering pride rather than contempt for their Alma Mater among her graduates. In 1878, on the occasion of the celebration of Hampton's first decade, another event occurred which reflected the success of these strategies. An article in the February edition of the *Southern Workman* recorded plans for a reunion of graduates to be held during the commencement exercises and a meeting for the purpose of forming an Alumni Association.(71) This Association was to play an increasingly important role in Hampton's future.

The end of the decade which had seen so much progress in establishing the school was also marked by personal tragedy for the General. His wife, who had been in declining health for several years, died in 1878 leaving him with two small children to raise in addition to his work for the school.
CHAPTER 6

A DECADE OF EXPANSION

INDIAN EDUCATION AT HAMPTON: The beginning of its second decade also marked the beginning of a new mission for the Hampton school, one which would necessitate changes in the physical plant as well as other changes. In November of 1877 Armstrong wrote to General Howard of a proposal he had made to the Secretary of the Interior, Carl Schurz, and the Commission on Indian Affairs to admit the first Indian students to Hampton. (1) The Indian wars were virtually over and most of the Indians were confined to reservations, wards of the government. As had been the case with the newly freed slaves a decade earlier, a major question of the day was what should be done with the Indians. Unlike the Freedmen at the end of the Civil War, the Indians were under the direct control and supervision of the Federal government. The primary responsibility of the Freedmen's Bureau, part of the War Department, had been to disperse the Negroes. Providing for their education was a secondary mission. In contrast, the Federal government seemed to feel a greater responsibility for the Indians and was taking a much more direct role in their affairs. Both houses of Congress had committees on Indian affairs while their reservations were under the control of the
Department of the Interior. As government wards, any decision regarding their education or civilization would be made by politicians and government bureaucrats. If a decision was made to send them to school, the cost of their board and education would be paid by the government.

Armstrong drew parallels between the situation of the Indians and that of the Freedmen, proposing that the Indians would also benefit most from the type of education and the civilizing influences offered at Hampton, stating that it would be in the national interest to provide them with such an opportunity. By December of 1877, he was writing to Col. Rogers, secretary to President Hayes: "I am pushing the plan of educating the Indians. A good scheme needs pushing as much as a bad one. Prospects are excellent... I am working with all my might at this because it is so well worth doing. We don't need the job, the Indians do."(2) In his efforts to bring the Indians to Hampton he lobbied many influential persons including both the President and Mrs. Hayes, Virginia congressman, John Goode; Secretary Shurz and the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House, Mr. Alfred Scales, sending them literature and encouraging them to visit the school to see the facilities for themselves.

There are those who have advanced the theory that Armstrong sought to secure the Indians as students in order to establish a new source of revenue for the school as interest among donors in the cause of the Freedmen was waning
while interest in the cause of the Indians was on the rise. It is difficult to determine what was in his mind at this time but his correspondence indicates concern for the civilization of the Indians and their preparation for citizenship. The Indian who learned to be a farmer or mechanic and who gained his own land would be less ready to go on the warpath.

He wrote to Congressman Scales: "We don't need this job of educating Indians: the need is theirs; we have over $200,000 worth of educational machinery of which they are welcome to the benefit. It would cost $250.00 per year, apiece, about, to do all that was needed: perhaps a little sum, say $3000 the first year for barracks for not over thirty Indians."(3) He also wrote to Martin Townsend, New York congressman and an old friend, concerning this project, asking him to draw up a bill providing for the education of the Indians at "some manual labor institution" to be chosen by the Secretary of the Interior who had already indicated his support for Hampton. "We have just the system for these Indians. Would not the experiment be worth trying?"(4) Again, he proposed the sum of $3000.00 for barracks as Hampton's sleeping rooms were all full although there were sufficient dining and recitation rooms. Certainly, such an appropriation would help build the third boys cottage which had not been erected due to lack of funds. He may also have felt that the Indians would draw donations from people who were more interested in their welfare than that of the Negro.
Although Armstrong often disparaged politics and politicians, saying they were "not large men", he could be an astute politician when a cause such as Indian education interested him. He even used Hampton's campus as a political asset. During the long vacation, June to October, cottages and dwellings on the grounds were often rented to congressmen and other government officials. There was an excellent overnight steamer service to Washington three times a week and the proximity of the campus to the beach as well as boating and other water activities made it a desirable resort. According to Armstrong: "It is a capital way to reach congressmen - to invite them down - they like to come and then they can be got at to good advantage."(5) The importance he attached to Indian education at Hampton is reflected in his efforts to "get at them" through numerous letters as well as the visits he made to Washington to lobby them in person. He sincerely believed that no other institution could do the work of civilizing the Indians as well as Hampton and that both races would benefit from the proposed program.

His lobbying efforts were evidently successful as, by January of 1878, he was writing to Captain Pratt, who was in charge of a group of Indian prisoners at St. Augustine, concerning the admission of some of them to Hampton. Captain Pratt was to play an important role in Indian education, both at Hampton and later in the founding of the government Indian schools, most of which would be modeled on the Hampton plan.
He had initiated the idea by beginning education of the prisoners under his charge, proving that they could and would learn if given the opportunity.

The idea of educating the Indians at Hampton, like many of Armstrong's educational ideas, generated opposition. Indians were not used to manual labor and would not respond well to that type of education. Many Indians had themselves been slaveholders and would not be willing to attend school with former slaves. Mixing of the races was unnatural and would lead to nothing but problems. There was also concern that, once they returned to their western homes, the Indians would "return to the blanket" or revert to their old ways of living. However, Armstrong was able to meet these objections and persuade the Congress and the Department of the Interior to allow him to try this new experiment.

WIGWAM: In order to board the Indians, another boys' cottage was needed immediately. The first 15 Indians arrived under the supervision of Captain Pratt in April of 1878 and were quartered on the first floor of the Senior's cottage, worsening the already crowded conditions. Raising money for the third cottage continued to be a problem. This cottage, originally intended to be similar to the first two, would cost approximately $6500.00. If the government could not provide the money for construction, he then requested that the Secretary of War, under whose jurisdiction these first Indian students were, appear with him at four or five meetings in
Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston for the purpose of raising the needed funds. The fifteen Indians were to be only the beginning. He had already proposed that fifty more Indians between the ages of 14 and 20 years, equally divided as to sex, be sent from the reservations to Hampton. The boys would be housed in the long planned third cottage, now to be called the Indian Cottage, while the girls would be housed in new rooms to be outfitted for them in Virginia Hall.

Ground was broken for the new Indian Cottage on September 12, 1878. It was designed by Mr. C.D. Cake who had worked on all of the school's earlier buildings, but Hunt also contributed to its final plan. A change had occurred between the first proposal for a boys' cottage similar to the two already built and the drawing of the plans for the third cottage. It was now to be quite different, larger and more elaborate in design and thus, more expensive.

Armstrong and Hunt had become friends and during the summer of 1878, Armstrong had had Cake's plans mailed to him in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, where he was visiting his wife's family. He presented them to Hunt for comment and suggestions. This appears to have been an informal arrangement as there is no record of payment to Hunt for these services. Hunt wrote a series of "notes on the building" which were carried out in its erection thus assuring that the design would be harmonious with the other major buildings.
Three possible sites had been proposed; the one chosen faced the sea with its end toward the Hampton waterfront and its back to the road which ran from the barn to the Mansion House. Another possible site had also fronted the sea. If this site had been chosen, the cottage was to be "far enough back from the front to allow a larger building in the future to be put up fronting the same way only nearer to the sea". (7) This indicates that such a building was in a master plan.

Construction on the Indian cottage, like other major buildings, was begun "although not a dollar was in hand for the purpose" but again "Providence" favored the institution and, ten days after the groundbreaking, a Boston lady contributed $2000.00 while three others donated $200.00 each, the cost of a room. Armstrong's work in cultivating the philanthropists of Boston continued to prove its value. (8)

The building was 35 feet wide by 95 feet long and three stories in height with a high basement of seven feet as was typical of all Hampton's major buildings. It was to be built of bricks made on the premises. Its design was high Victorian with architectural effect derived from the bands of decorative black brick, segmented arched windows and a two story central porch. (9) In a letter to Armstrong, Albert Howe described it as "a long, plain building" without a break although the "ends are quite pretty". (10) In the same letter he also indicated that it was Cake who began calling the cottage the "Wigwam" which meant lodge or dwelling. (11) The estimated cost of
completing and furnishing this building was $10,000, much higher than the first estimates of only $3000. This cottage, so much more impressive than the first two, would reflect Armstrong's belief in the capacity of the Indian for education and help to raise their self esteem and cultivate an attachment to the Hampton school as Academic and Virginia Halls had done for the Negro.

The cottage was to be divided by solid walls into three separate compartments with three separate entrances providing 50 student rooms, ten of which were to be occupied by colored young men. This number was later increased to fifteen. There are at least three separate theories for this unusual design. Legend states that the design was intended to separate Indians from warring tribes. Although there is evidence that the Indians did not like to have an Indian from another tribe placed in a position of authority over them, there is no evidence that fighting among the representatives of various tribes was a problem.

The second possible reason for the dividing walls was to decrease the risk of fire. Certainly this was a consideration and brick partitions were used in other school buildings to enhance their fireproofing, but it does not explain the three separate entrances. In addition, the fireproofing would have been affected by the flues which were placed in the dividing walls in order to better heat the rooms.

The third and most likely explanation states that the
separate sections were intended to house different groups who would require some degree of privacy. The middle section was intended to house the Indian boys while one end was intended for the colored boys who had been living in the attic of Academic Hall. The other end was intended to house a White family who would act as chaperones for the Indian boys who were described as very childlike in many ways and requiring close supervision. This requirement for closer supervision required the construction of the larger building, so different from the original plan. The design was similar to a row of modern townhouses which provide privacy for the different occupants while reducing costs through shared walls.

Two large rooms, 16 by 35 feet, were to be finished in the attic for use as hospital rooms. This was the first mention of the provision of separate rooms for the care of ill students. Until this time students who were ill had remained in their own rooms and were cared for there. The Indian students presented a new problem. A larger number of them became ill due to the change in the climate from their homes and to a less hardy constitution. This was particularly true of the young men and was attributed to the fact that they were accustomed to little physical work, their only exercise having been periodic hunting trips. They were particularly subject to diseases of the lung, especially consumption. Grouping them in special hospital rooms made it easier for the physician to oversee their care and decreased the risk of spreading the
disease to healthy students. The Indians also required special dietary attention and, as their numbers grew, would require separate kitchens for the preparation of their food.

Two corridors in Virginia hall were to be finished and furnished for the Indian girls at an estimated cost of $2000. Armstrong's foresight in giving Virginia hall a larger than necessary capacity enabled the school to provide for the girls at a much lower cost. It also allowed Hampton to continue the seminary style of education for the women and provide for their close supervision by the teachers. Both projects were under way simultaneously although no girls arrived until November.

After delivering the first fifteen students, Captain Pratt had gone west to escort the rest of his former prisoners back to their homes and to select the additional fifty new students for Hampton. He returned in November of 1878 with 49 new Indian students including nine girls. Armstrong was dissatisfied at receiving so few girls as he felt that the education and improvement of its women to be a condition of progress for any backward race. He felt that the experiment in civilization of the Indian which was being carried out at Hampton was "imperfect and the value of its results depreciated" unless there was equal elevation of both sexes.(13)

After considerable negotiation, the government had agreed to pay $167.00 per year for each Indian student but Hampton
had to raise the money to pay for the new accommodations needed for them, a total of $18,000. This included the cost of the Wigwam, the finishing of the two corridors in Virginia Hall and an Indian Workshop to provide instruction in the mechanic arts to the young men. Again, Armstrong traveled north to attend meetings in order to raise money for the needed buildings. In February of 1879 he wrote to one of the trustees of the struggle he was having in raising the necessary funds. Although there was much general interest in the work, it did not translate into donations. Both he and the school's chaplain had given money from their own pockets and he asked the help of some of the trustees in raising the needed funds. He also appealed to the A.M.A. for support for the Indian students. If he had indeed expected that the Indian students would bring more money to the school, he was disappointed as they were costing much more than the government was appropriating for their education. During the years that the Indians were being educated at Hampton, the government never appropriated the full cost of their care which was increased by their susceptibility to disease and their need for special medical and dietary attention.

Armstrong felt that, if he could get the buildings up and paid for, that phase of the work would be done and would cease to be a burden. By June of 1879, he was able to write to Dr. Strieby that the Wigwam had just been completed but that the school's funds had been "hard-squeezed". However, the
Indian students were now suitably housed and the severe crowding in the other cottages had been relieved although some colored boys remained in the attic of Academic Hall.

The care and cleaning of the "Wigwam" was done by the Indian boys. They were required to keep the halls and stairways clean and were detailed by twos every Saturday to carry out this task. The clean halls led to a desire for a "clean house all through" and Saturday became a general cleaning day. Armstrong felt that this was an important part of their education, inculcating habits of neatness and order as well as engendering pride among the students in their building.

The rooms in Wigwam were small, accommodating two boys to a room and assuring their privacy. Armstrong believed that these circumstances, privacy and habits of neatness, would lead the boys to lose their taste for the "old way of living with ten or twelve in the same apartment" and decrease the likelihood that they would return to the old ways when they left Hampton.(15)

WINONA LODGE: Armstrong continued to advance the need to educate more Indian women and by March of 1880, twenty were attending Hampton. In order to admit thirty more girls and equal the number of young men attending, he proposed to build another building on land owned by Mr. Augustus Hemenway of Boston. The land was secured and a solid, comfortable and attractive building was designed by W.R. Ware of the firm of
Ware and Van Brunt.

Like Richard Hunt, Ware was also a nationally known architect who designed buildings for prominent families and institutions in the northeast. He had close ties to Hunt, having studied under him and he also moved in the same social circles as many of Hampton's northern supporters. Hunt, by this time, had become famous as the architect of the Vanderbilts and was in great demand. Although he would design one more building for Hampton, it is possible that he recommended Ware to take his place.

Ware designed a rather plain, cruciform, high Victorian, three story, brick building on a high basement. Like the Wigwam, it derived its architectural merit from the decorative bands of black brick; tall, narrow windows with segmented arches and a roof whose overhang was supported by open stickwork. The projecting wing in the front of the building had a wrap around veranda and provided a large playroom on the first floor and teacher's rooms on the upper floors. A similar projecting wing to the rear contained the bathroom and laundry facilities on the first floor with sleeping rooms on the upper floors. Large attic rooms provided additional sleeping rooms if needed. The first floor contained features unique to the Indian buildings, a large hospital department and a diet kitchen, as well as industrial rooms. Faithful to the seminary style, the sleeping rooms opened off wide central hallways and teachers had rooms on each of the upper floors in order to
closely supervise the girls. (Fig. 5 and 6)

Like the boys, the girls would be assigned two to a room to decrease their taste for the old life. Each room would be furnished in the same manner as those in Virginia Hall, containing iron bedsteads, a table, wardrobe and bureau and two chairs. The first three items of furniture were to be made on the school grounds by the Indian boys in their workshop. Although Ware supplied the general plan, it appears that these plans were modified by Mr. Cake, the builder, to more closely correspond with the Wigwam. Photographs of Winona reveal a building which appears somewhat taller and narrower than that shown in Ware's plan and a letter written by Armstrong indicates approval of payment of "a reasonable charge" to Cake for his preliminary plans. (16)

The building was located on the waterfront facing the Hampton River, 150 feet to the right of Virginia Hall, to which it was connected by a covered walkway. It was called Winona Lodge, which meant elder sister and symbolized the protection it provided to the Indian girls, similar to the love and protection of an elder sister for a beloved younger sister.

The cornerstone was laid during the Anniversary exercises of 1881. The newly inaugurated President Garfield, a former trustee of the school, had agreed to perform this service but was prevented from doing so by the press of business. The Rev. Henry Potter took his place, describing the new building as
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"the expression in brick and mortar of the interest recently roused in New York and Boston and elsewhere..." in the plight of the Indians. Reverend Potter, a trustee of the school, was the pastor of Grace Church in New York and had been active in helping to raise money for the building. In addition, Armstrong again solicited funds by asking donors to give the cost of a room to which their name would then be attached, a method which had been successful in the past.

Three other major buildings were under construction at the same time as Winona. Cake, who had joined the school staff in 1877 to oversee the operation of the sawmill, was builder on all of them. His change in status and inexperience as a millwright led to problems with the running of the sawmill and there were many complaints of delays and unfinished work on the buildings as well as disagreements concerning delivery of materials and payment of charges made by Mr. Cake. A letter written by Armstrong in July of 1882 describes the interior of the building as still unfinished, especially "so far as carpenter's work is concerned". (17) As a result of these disagreements, Cake resigned as superintendent of the sawmill, returning to his general contracting business. The building was finally completed and occupied in the Fall of 1882. It became a center for social activities for the Indian students on campus.

The final step in the provision of facilities for the Indian students was the erection, over a period of several
years, of six small cottages for Indian families who attended Hampton. These cottages were intended to provide instruction in Christian home life in addition to the academic and manual education provided. On arrival, husbands and wives were separated and placed in the girls' and boys' buildings respectively until they learned the routine and the language. They then were given a cottage where they could live together as a family, receiving an education which included the "whole range of life". Armstrong believed the cottage life contributed significantly to their elevation by decreasing the contrast between a great building like Winona or Wigwam and the little Indian cabins on the reservations. This transition reduced the likelihood of reversion to the old ways of living after they returned to their homes.

Hampton's early work for the Indians influenced the development of the Eastern Indian schools such as Carlisle, established by the government, and helped to win the support of the public and of Congress for Indian education. The system of buildings built for them reflected Armstrong's belief that the central issue in their education was teaching them how to live as well as how to read and write.

THE SECOND ACADEMIC HALL: In November of 1879, calamity struck when Academic Hall caught fire and was destroyed despite the efforts of the school fire brigade as well as engines from the Soldier's Home and Fortress Monroe. The fire began in a corner of the attic and spread rapidly as water from the school fire
engine could not reach that high. The location of the starting point and the rapid spread led to suspicion of arson and one student was eventually dismissed but the actual cause was never confirmed.(18) Although the efforts of the fire fighters enabled some property to be saved, much was lost including many of the artifacts from the Sandwich islands which had made up the small museum and three forths of the library books. It is indicative of the change in Hampton's relations with its neighbors that citizens from nearby also came to help fight the fire.

The most immediate need was to provide substitutes for the lost offices and recitation rooms. Recitation rooms were improvised: four in the Mansion House, four in Virginia Hall, four in the Wigwam and one over the engine house.(19) These arrangements were made so promptly that only one day of classes was lost. As soon as all were settled in their temporary quarters, plans were begun to rebuild.

Fortunately the building was well insured. The ability of the school's brickyard, sawmill and woodworking shop to provide needed materials would significantly reduce the cost of rebuilding. The new Academic Hall was to be erected on the foundation of the old and Richard Hunt was asked to design it; it was to be his last design for Hampton. Mr. Cake, who had worked on the original building and had a thorough knowledge of the old plans, was in charge of the construction.

The school was now well established with a growing
national reputation and there was less need to establish respectability or permanence through the architecture. The more secure position of the school is reflected in Armstrong's instructions to Hunt regarding the design of the new building. It was to be "a strong, plain building....no attempt at ornament" with a "good outline effect" provided by "simple, strong walls". (20) He felt that the effect of the buttresses on the first building had never been good and they were eliminated from this second design. In accordance with Armstrong's wishes, Hunt provided a more simple and balanced design which reflected his own maturity as an architect as well as that of the Hampton school.

The high basement or first floor and the second floor were to be divided into recitation rooms. The third floor was to contain a large assembly room. All partitions were to be brick, making them more fireproof. The windows were tall, narrow and arched with decorative bands of black brick at top and bottom. The bands of black brick extended from the windows around the building. Hunt again used the polychromatic variety of plaster, red and black brick for the walls. The attic was to be designed so that rooms could be finished as needed and was to be reached by an iron staircase. As might be expected, Armstrong put great emphasis on making the new building as fire proof as possible, especially the roof, and he made several suggestions to Hunt for the achievement of this goal. He asked for a "slow burning roof and a slow burning
Construction progressed at a good pace. By the summer of 1880, the foundation was in and the walls of the first floor were up. The students were proud of the new building as they had been of the old. One senior student wrote in the students' section of the Southern Workman in January of 1881 that the new Academic Hall, "a very stately looking piece of architecture", was being finished with "great rapidity". It was hoped that the class of 1881 would soon be able to begin reciting in it.(22) Cake had resigned his position as supervisor of the sawmill the previous summer but continued his work on the campus buildings. The second Academic Hall was completed by May of 1881, a year and a half after the fire.

General 0.0. Howard, former head of the Freedmen's Bureau and then superintendent of West Point, dedicated the second Academic Hall as part of the Anniversary Exercises of 1881. This was particularly fitting as Howard, through the Freedmen's Bureau, had provided a large portion of the money to build the first Academic Hall and had laid its cornerstone eleven years earlier. He called the new Academic "a new and really better building... grand and complete... dedicated to the uplifting of young men and young women ..destined to become the leaders and teachers of the peoples to whom they belong".(23) His participation in the dedication of this second building communicated a message of continuity and
permanence rather than experimentation in the education of the Negro and Indian.

STONE MEMORIAL BUILDING: The growing school continued to require additional space for the housing of some of the Negro students as well as space for the growing number of industries. In 1879, Armstrong proposed construction of a three story brick building over a high, well-lighted basement for these purposes to the "Garrison Memorial Committee" of Boston which wished to erect a memorial to the famous abolitionist. The proposed building was to be 125 feet in length with a thirty foot extension to the rear providing valuable additional room on each of the three floors. The building was to provide space for the printing office, which had become overcrowded in the basement of Virginia Hall; additional girls' industrial rooms, parlor, reading and recitation rooms; offices for the principal and the school's treasurer which had been lost when Academic burned; and sleeping rooms for colored boys on the upper floors as well as an infirmary. Such a memorial, if approved and funded by the Committee, would be placed in a prominent position at the heart of the campus, "a most beautiful situation fronting the water" which had been "reserved for a choice building in the future", a site which Armstrong had not at first been ready to give up.(24)

Less than a week after sending the above proposal to the Garrison Memorial Committee, he sent a letter to another
potential donor, proposing another boys' cottage, to be modeled after the Marquand and Graves (Senior's) cottages. One difference in this proposed cottage was an extension or wing to the rear of the building which would provide study rooms on each floor for the boys. Lack of such an extension and of study rooms was described as a defect in the first two buildings which would have to be remedied when the school could afford it. The proposed cottage was to be 165 by 32 feet, two stories and a commodious attic over a high basement, costing approximately $6000.00. In this letter, he mentions the proposed "Garrison Memorial" but does not indicate that it would contain any sleeping rooms. He states that "the work presses as never before" and that additional room is needed to house both colored boys and girls. He appeals: "Give us a place to put our students and we will educate them. The grand purpose of the war was to elevate the negro race and we must be about it". (25)

Neither of these appeals proved successful. The Garrison Memorial Committee did not have sufficient funds to erect such a large building, estimated to cost $20,000. In a letter written in May of 1880, Armstrong regrets submitting such an expensive plan and offers a less costly memorial to built on the campus if the committee so desires. However, there is no record that such a memorial was ever built. Nor is there any record of the additional cottage for the boys. It seems probable that, when funds were found, Armstrong submitted the
original plan for the Garrison Memorial, providing room for both industries and boys' dormitory. This building became, instead, the Stone Memorial Building.

Daniel Stone was a Boston businessman who had accumulated a considerable fortune. In his will, he designated one and a quarter million dollars to be placed in a fund to be administered, first by himself and his wife, and after his death, by his wife and three trustees. This fund was to be used for benevolent work, especially for education in the South. Mrs. Stone's principal advisor in the distribution of the money was the Rev. Dr. Wilcox of Boston. Armstrong made an appeal to the Stone Fund, through Dr. Wilcox, for $7000.00, approximately half the estimated cost of the proposed building. His appeal was supported by Mark Hopkins who had maintained close ties with his former pupil and who had supported the school in numerous ways. Dr. Wilcox replied that Mrs. Stone desired to give the entire cost of the building to be a memorial to her husband. She ultimately contributed $20,000.00 for its construction although she evinced no desire to control its design. This had been a concern of the General in allowing one person to contribute the entire cost of a building, as he wished to retain control over building design.

The Stone Building was originally designed by Mr. Cake as indicated in a letter written by Armstrong in July of 1882, in which he states he is ready to approve payment of a "reasonable charge" to Mr. Cake for the plans of the building.
"which he once made". (26) However, controversy had arisen between Cake and the school and the plans, which were later lost, were not resupplied when requested. Mr. Howe, who included Superintendent of Buildings among his titles, most probably oversaw the completion of both Stone and Winona. Whether any alterations were made in Cake's original plans is not known. The building was certainly very close in design to the one described in Armstrong's letter to the Garrison Memorial Committee, a three story brick building on a high basement, of High Victorian design, with a wing extending to the rear. The typical high, arched windows and decorative bands of black brick were included. However, the building had a unique feature not included in the original plan, a tall central brick tower.

The cornerstone of the Stone Memorial building was laid during the Anniversary Day exercises of 1881, by Garfield's Secretary of War, Mr. Robert T. Lincoln. That Mr. Lincoln was not only a member of Garfield's Cabinet, but also the eldest son of Abraham Lincoln, was of special significance. His link to the emancipation and elevation of the Negro could be expected to point out the need to continue the work and touch the conscience of those who attended. It would also prevent the cause of Negro education from being overshadowed by the interest in the Indians. President Garfield himself had also been asked to attend to lay the cornerstone of the Indian girls' building and large contingents of people were expected
from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington as well as from the neighboring cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth. The school had already gained national recognition from the participation of the cadet corps of Negroes and Indians in Garfield's inaugural parade. The place of Hampton Institute among the nation's prominent educational institutions would be assured.

Armstrong had long used the occasion of Anniversary Days to lay cornerstones and to dedicate important new buildings. These occasions attracted a great deal of interest from both the press and potential donors, enabling him to enhance the image and further the interests of the school. The Anniversary Day exercises of 1881 were especially significant. General Howard was to dedicate the new Academic Hall and the cornerstones of two other new buildings, Stone and Winona, were to be laid, "signifying new and greatly increased efforts for the Indian and Negro races". (27) The presence of such prominent people as Garfield, Lincoln and Howard would assure the attention of the national press and enable him to keep Hampton's needs and the importance of the work being done for the two races before the public.

Despite delays and the controversy with Mr. Cake, the Stone building was completed during the summer 1882. It provided accommodations for the following: the printing office, a book bindery, the knitting industry, a shoe factory, and the girls' sewing and tailoring establishment. These industries
only half filled the building, so, in his annual report for 1882, Armstrong proposed providing "temporary" sleeping quarters for some of the young men in the upper stories.(28) This is presented as a temporary use for extra space although such accomodations had been in the original plans on which Stone was modeled. Armstrong states in the report that, within a few years, all of the space in the Stone Building would be needed for industrial classes, necessitating the construction of a building for the boys "on the site now indicated by the excavation near the office".(29) Armstrong was using his familiar ploy of presenting visitors with "work in progress" to raise money for the additional boys' cottage which he had already planned. In his view, no part of the education of the Negro and Indian was "more important than proper quarters". He preferred that each student have his own room or, if that was not possible, that no more than two students share a room. In his opinion, solitude was civilizing.(30)

Mrs. Stone was particularly interested in advancing the opportunities for young women and Armstrong may have thought that she would not approve of the use of the building to accomodate young men who, she felt, had sufficient opportunities. It is, therefore, probable that Armstrong planned Stone purposely "on a liberal scale to meet future needs" which he already had in mind. While satisfying Mrs. Stone's goal of improving opportunities for the girls by employing "95 colored and 28 Indian girls", he was also able
to provide additional accommodation for the boys. (31)

The building was located, not on the choice site originally proposed for the Garrison Memorial, but back from the waterfront on a line with Wigwam, in the area between the girls' and boys' campus. This location was appropriate as the building was used by both while neither group entered the special domain of the other. It also allowed Armstrong to save the waterfront site for another, more important building to be erected later thus preserving his original campus plan.

**INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS:** The industrial aspect of education at Hampton was a prominent feature of the school and one which made it unique among the early Black schools. Armstrong wished "...every graduate of the school, boys and girls, to have some technical training that will make their education more rounded, more valuable, make them better citizens and better fitted for the exigency of their lives, especially as teachers". (32) Despite the desire of many Negroes for the classical education provided in the northern colleges, Armstrong felt that industrial education was "that phase of the Hampton work which has most commended it to thinking people" and which would "open the door of education to many a poor and deserving youth whose capital in life is a stout heart and willing hands". (33) In the effort to elevate the Indian and Negro, he focused on a sound, basic, English education and technical training as most appropriate for educating the masses rather than on the classical training
which could benefit only a few.

Most of the earliest industries were housed in the basements of buildings intended primarily for other uses. Only Academic Hall did not house an industry of some sort. However, the expansion of technical training during the schools' second decade required new accommodations and two major buildings were erected for this purpose, the Huntington Industrial Works and the Pierce Machine Shop, in addition to several smaller workshops.

In 1879, encouraged by the gift of an 80 HP engine from Mr. George Corliss and by the rapid growth occurring in the Hampton area, Armstrong proposed erecting a sawmill on the school grounds. This would enable the school to cut and dress its own lumber and to engage in the woodworking trades as well as provide training for students in these areas. Timber could be easily obtained within fifty miles of the campus and its situation on the water made transportation easy and less expensive. Also, the school already had in its employ a "first rate engineer", a sawyer described as "one of the best in the state", and a reliable manager. (34) Typically, construction of this "Industrial Hall" was begun before any money had been donated toward its cost. A loan of $5500.00 had been obtained to begin construction.

When these plans were mentioned to Mr. C.P. Huntington, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway and one of the school's benefactors, he evinced an interest in funding the
project. Huntington had previously donated scholarships, including an endowed scholarship covering the tuition of a colored student. However, he felt he knew more about sawmills than academics and could contribute more effectively to the school in this way. After a thorough investigation of the school's organization and holdings, Huntington was ready to provide the necessary funds for the project, construction of which had already begun. Because he wished the gift to be entirely his, he paid Mr. Corliss the cost of the engine which he had donated, a total of $4000.00 which Mr. Corliss immediately donated to the school. (35) In all, Huntington donated $31,000.00 for the erection and outfitting of the "Huntington Industrial Works". The name was selected by the Board of Trustees but was neither suggested by Huntington nor a condition of the gift.

In choosing the site for the Industrial Works, Armstrong made a statement concerning the importance of manual labor and technical training to his educational plan. The building was located in the first line of buildings, on the waterfront, near Academic Hall. It was near the mouth of the river and would be the first building seen by visitors approaching by water from Hampton Roads. In his annual report of 1879, Armstrong described the proposed building as "crowning the finest site on our grounds, commanding the broad waters of Hampton Roads, joining with Academic hall on its right in offering to youth the true way to manhood and
usefulness...". (36) This "industrial hall" would establish the manual labor feature of the school, the perfecting of which Armstrong considered to be of primary importance. After a three year course, students would graduate from both the "Normal" course and the "Works"; independent, self-reliant, educated citizens. (37) Armstrong felt that one of the major accomplishments of the school was the successful combining of academic and industrial education. The location of the building gave emphasis to Armstrong's belief that Hampton should focus on scientific rather than classic instruction and that practical knowledge was most vital to allow the Negro to share in the wealth of the South. (38)

The building was brick with a slate roof and a central tower in which the apprentices were quartered. The main two-story building was 50 by 140 feet with a boiler house attached. A one story annex, 30 by 60 feet, was later added on one end. (39) On the first floor, lumber was sawed into framing and building materials, both for the schools buildings and for sale. The second floor contained various kinds of machinery for wood working. In an early recycling effort, waste materials such as sawdust, bark and wood scraps were burned in the boiler, providing steam to heat many of the large buildings. The engineer, Mr. Goff, designed a network of underground pipes which carried the steam to the various buildings and which is still in use today. The building underwent various improvements over the years which allowed
shops scattered about the campus to be gathered under one roof. By 1890 it was described as the most complete industrial building associated with any school in the country. It continued to carry out one of Hampton's major missions, combining production with technical instruction, with unprecedented success.

In 1882, Mr. Moses Pierce of Norwich Connecticut donated money for a machine shop where repairs would be carried out for the sawmill, engineering department and farm. It would also contain a grist mill and a bone mill which would provide corn meal for the boarding department as well as bone meal for the farm. Although it is described as an example of Early American Industrial architecture, it also had many of the distinctive features of the earlier, Victorian buildings. It was a two story, brick building with tall, narrow, arched windows marked top and bottom with decorative bands of black brick which also extended around the building. (40) It also had four dormers and an arched doorway. Located on the boys' campus near the saw mill, it was completed in 1883.

Both of these buildings and the machinery they housed enabled the school to provide more technical training and decreased the cost of running the school. The sawmill decreased the cost of the lumber and wood products needed for construction and repair of campus buildings as well as the cost of heating the large buildings. Prior to the completion of the Pierce machine Shop, the nearest facilities for
carrying out necessary repairs were in Norfolk, 15 miles distant. As the area around the school grew, Armstrong expected to attract more business for the machine shop from outside. In addition, the Indian workshops were able to sell shoes, tinware and harness to the government Indian agencies. These industries also enabled destitute students to earn an education. Most importantly, the manual labor feature of the school was well established as Armstrong intended.

ADDITIONAL BUILDINGS, THE LIBRARY: In 1880, Armstrong was at last able to take a long planned journey to his boyhood home in Hawaii. During his absence, the officers and teachers formed a plan to provide a building to house the library and offices which would be called the Armstrong library in honor of both the General and his father. It interesting to note that this is the first time in the history of the institution that a separate library building had been proposed. While the library was usually a separate building and often a prominent one on more traditional college campuses, the focus on technical and practical training had somewhat reduced its importance at Hampton during the early years.

The library/administration building was the second of the buildings designed for the school by Ware. Again, as in the case of Winona, he supplied the general plans which were then modified by Mr. Cake to better meet the specific needs of the school. It was a brick, two story building, 65 by 30 feet, and featured a central porch in addition to the narrow arched
windows and decorative bands of black brick typical of Hampton's major buildings. (Figure 7) The second floor housed the library, reading room and museum while the offices were on the first floor. Like the other buildings, it was built on a high basement to allow additional offices to be placed there. The site was between Virginia Hall and Academic Hall, in the second line of buildings which faced the waterfront.

The building was begun during Armstrong's absence in the summer of 1880. However, the severe winter weather of 1880-81 not only delayed construction, but also damaged some of the first floor walls which were already up. In October of 1881, General Marshall wrote to Cake asking the cost of finishing the building and how soon it could be completed. The need was great as, since the fire which destroyed the first Academic Hall, the library had been housed in the kitchen of the Mansion House and offices had been scattered about in outbuildings. In January of 1882, he wrote to Mr. Fessenden that the library and reading rooms had finally been moved into the "new, commodious and elegant room in the Armstrong Building". (41)

Funds for the building were solicited from Armstrong's personal friends. General Marshall headed a library committee of teachers and school officers which was charged with raising the necessary funds. This committee raised $8500.00 of the cost of the building which, completed, cost $11,000. The effort of the teachers and staff to erect this building in
Library Building (later Marshall Hall)

Hampton University Archives
honor of Armstrong reflect the respect and esteem in which he was held.

Armstrong, however, "was unwilling to have anything on the grounds bear his name". (42) Although this was attributed to modesty, there may have been other reasons. Attaching his name to a building associated with one aspect of the work at Hampton or with one particular group of students may have resulted in feelings of favoritism or jealousy. Such concern may have contributed to the establishment of this policy. Whatever the reason, the Armstrong Library became simply "the Library" for several years. After General Marshall's death, Armstrong suggested to the trustees that the library for which he had raised the funds be named in his honor and the library became Marshall Hall. Although the library later moved to another building, Marshall Hall, with its addition, continues to house the main administrative offices of the university including the office of the president.

GIRL'S COTTAGE: In all of his efforts for the Negro and Indian, Armstrong continued to emphasize the need to educate women. Despite continuing efforts to recruit women, their numbers had remained small for many years. However, in 1881, the term opened with 160 girls on the roll compared with only 90 the previous year. (43) This was regarded as a significant milestone in the development of the school and the completion of Winona and the Stone Building would allow the school to offer even greater opportunities to women whose influence,
Armstrong believed, was far reaching, both as teachers and as wives and mothers. It also marked the beginning of a growth spurt in the number of women attending Hampton.

By 1884, the number of female students had grown to the point that the crowding in Virginia hall was severe. While there was ample accommodation for the young men and for the Indian students, both male and female, no additional accommodations for colored girls had been provided since the completion of Virginia Hall in 1874. Three and four girls were crowded into rooms designed for two while some were living in corners, called "pens", fenced off from passageways. (44) While the girls endured these conditions with patience, Armstrong felt that they resulted in the sacrifice of an important part of their education, acquiring the habits of civilized, Christian living. The Executive Committee of the Trustees, of which Armstrong was a member, determined that an additional girl's dormitory was needed. The new building was to be located on the waterfront between Virginia Hall and Winona. The covered passage which had been built to connect Winona and Virginia hall would now link all three buildings.

This annex, or Girl's Cottage, was to be a brick building, 84 by 38 feet, three stories high, containing thirty seven sleeping rooms in addition to a large sitting room on the first floor for gatherings of various kinds. It would also provide four rooms for teachers for whom additional accommodation was needed. Housing teachers in this new
dormitory continued the seminary style of education for women at Hampton. Each sleeping room, thirteen by eleven and a half feet, would house two girls, restoring the privacy which Armstrong considered an essential part of their education.

The cost of the building was estimated at $16,000.00. Armstrong again asked donors to contribute the cost of individual rooms, estimated at $300.00 each, a method which had been successful many times in the past. The construction costs were also decreased through the use of student labor directed by skilled foremen and the contributions of the industries on campus such as the Huntington Industrial Works which would prepare all the needed lumber. As with all of the other buildings, the bricks were to be made on the school grounds. Furnishings such as bedsteads, wardrobes, tables and washstands were to be made in the Indian Workshop. The principle of self-help, so important to Hampton's educational plan, continued to be applied in the erection of its major buildings.

A drawing of the proposed annex shows a rather plain building with the narrow windows topped by segmented arches and decorative bands of black brick typical of Hampton buildings. (Figure 8) The high basement with large windows is missing. Some architectural distinction is provided by a three story wooden porch and floor to ceiling windows on one end. To enhance the fireproofing, the building was to have a tin roof, double walls and interior partitions of brick. The
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interior design was simple and faithful to the seminary tradition with rooms opening off a wide central hall and access to the upper floors provided by one central staircase.

This building, completed in that same year, was regarded as completing the system of dormitories. The student body, by this time, numbered 600. There was a growing feeling that Hampton had grown large enough, that the enrollment should be fixed at that number although it was in the enviable position of having the demand for its graduates constantly exceed the supply. Hampton's emphasis on influencing the whole life of the student; head, heart and hand, raised the cost of the education provided. It had necessitated an extensive system of dormitories as Armstrong believed that only by boarding at the school did the student receive the full benefits of the education provided. This led him to severely limit the number of day students who attended the school. In addition, the effort to accommodate too large a number of students would jeopardize the success of the individual student which was so important to Hampton's mission. The final phase of Armstrong's plan for the school's development was reaching its culmination.

**KING'S CHAPEL HOSPITAL:** The health care needs of the school had also grown as the student body grew. The first separate facilities for caring for the sick had been provided in the Indian buildings. However, it was still necessary for the school physician and nurses to visit each of the dormitories
separately, reducing the time which could be spent in directly supervising the care of ill students. In his annual report of 1885, Armstrong proposed construction of a hospital, in the form of a Greek cross, each wing to have a capacity of four beds. (45) The hospital was to serve both Indian and colored boys, the boys having the highest incidence of illness. Dr. Waldron, the school's resident physician, appears to have been the driving force behind this proposal.

Funds for the one story, frame hospital were provided by the members of King's Chapel, Boston, whose pastor, Rev. Henry Foote, was a trustee of the school for many years. Church members held fund raising activities to collect the necessary money for constructing and equipping the new hospital, completed in 1886 and named the King's Chapel Hospital. The Boston connection which Armstrong had so assiduously cultivated, had again proved its value.

MEMORIAL CHAPEL: The building of a church on the campus for the exclusive use of the school was to be the culmination of the second building phase at Hampton. The provision of a chapel for the school was a continuing concern throughout most of Armstrong's tenure. Except for a period following the completion of the chapel in Virginia Hall, which the school soon outgrew, the students and staff had worshipped in Bethesda Chapel on the grounds of the National Cemetery. School staff had also boarded in one wing of the chapel at various times. However, their tenure there had always been
precarious as the building and the ground on which it stood belonged to the government and might be taken at any time as the need for room for the internment of veterans grew.

Bethesda Chapel, a simple frame building, had been erected with private funds during the Civil War for the use of the soldiers in the neighboring camps and hospital and turned over to the Presbyterian Home Missions Committee of New York in 1865 by Edward M. Stanton, Secretary of War. The frame construction did not fare well in the damp Tidewater climate and required frequent repairs. Such repairs were the subject of frequent communication between Armstrong and the federal government's Department of Cemeteries. The school's use of the building led the government to request that they be responsible for needed repairs. However, since Hampton did not own the building, they were not always ready to assume the cost of such repairs.

As early as 1876, Armstrong's correspondence reflects the uncertainty regarding the school's tenency in the chapel. In March of that year, he wrote to the person in charge of National Cemeteries inquiring about the possibility of that department providing assistance to the school in moving the chapel outside the cemetery to the grounds of the school. Such a solution was beyond the financial means of the Church Committee and would require government aid.(46) In another letter written that same month, he stated that Bethesda Chapel would soon need repairs or it would become an eyesore.
However, the school did not propose to undertake these repairs as they would probably build a new church for the school "in one or two years". (47)

Twice, in 1876 and again in 1881, the Quartermaster Department had ordered the removal of the chapel from the cemetery grounds. The first time, Armstrong appealed to the Secretary of War who visited the school with General Sherman and, afterward, wrote a letter granting Hampton Institute permission to repair, occupy and use the chapel "where it stood". (48) The school did make the needed repairs, investing a substantial sum of money in doing so. In 1881, Armstrong again appealed a similar removal order to President Hayes, saying that the institute did not have the money to move the chapel. In addition, the construction was described as so flimsy that it probably would not survive such a move. He describes it as "a pretty, symmetrical building and an ornament to the cemetery". (49) President Hayes did indeed reverse the removal order and Hampton continued to use Bethesda Chapel. However, Armstrong knew that it was only a matter of time before the chapel would be lost and plans were made for the erection of a new church on a special site reserved for it on the school grounds.

In 1882, Frederick Marquand, a frequent benefactor of the school, indicated an interest in donating a new church to Hampton. In response to a request from him, General Marshall made inquiries into the size and style of chapel which the
school required. In a letter to Marquand, a seating capacity of approximately 800 persons was suggested in order to accommodate the student body which had grown to nearly 500, the teachers, officers and employees, neighboring families who regularly attended the church and visitors to the area who might wish to attend. The design first suggested was similar to Bethesda Chapel, a simple building to be built of brick with a steep, slate roof and a plain, open timbered finish inside. In order to seat the larger number of worshippers, the body of the church would be somewhat wider in proportion to the transept. (50) A ground plan of Bethesda Chapel was included in the letter to Marquand and later, a design for such a building, estimated to cost around twelve thousand dollars was submitted to Mr. Marquand.

From the beginning, the arrangements for the design and construction of the chapel were different from the other major school buildings. In Marshall's letter, he indicates that, for the first time, Armstrong was willing to cede a major part of the control of the design of the building to the donor: "General Armstrong thought you would prefer to have your own architect design the chapel under your instructions". (51) Although the letter includes suggestions as to the design and materials which might be used, Marshall again indicates that the final decision will be the donor's: "if you decide to erect the chapel you will of course have it built after the design and of the material that seem to you best suited to
your wishes and our need". (52)

In the past, Armstrong had preferred to attract many small donations in order to preserve his control over the design of major buildings. The arrangement with Marquand was a radical departure from this policy. There are several possible reasons for this change. The need for a new chapel was pressing as the school might be evicted from Bethesda at any time. Contributions were increasingly difficult to obtain and the new chapel would be a major expense. A church would not contain numerous individual rooms to which a donor's name could be attached making it more difficult to attract smaller donations from many sources. Marquand had enjoyed a long association with the school and with Armstrong. He was familiar with the character and aims of the school and could be trusted to erect a building which would support them. Finally, Armstrong's plan for the development of the campus was nearly complete and the school was well established. The need for the buildings to convey Armstrong's message of hope, worth and respectability to the Negro and to the rest of the community was less and he may have felt less need to control every detail of the design as he had with the earlier buildings.

Mr. Marquand's unfortunate death in the summer of 1882 delayed the plans for the new chapel. Mr. E.B. Monroe, a trustee of the school, was also executor of Marquand's estate. In 1885, he determined to use funds from the Marquand estate
to erect a chapel for Hampton which would "worthily complete the group of noble school buildings as their center and heart and give visible emphasis to their character as an institution founded and inspired by religious consecration". (53)

Mr. Monroe chose J. Cleveland Cady of New York as architect for the project. This was consistent with the school's policy of hiring nationally known architects to design buildings which would have important functional or symbolic roles. Cady had designed several buildings for Yale University, including one donated by Monroe.

Cady had also designed several churches and had written an article on church design in which he described the most desirable qualities as permanence, dignity, simplicity and welcome. These qualities could be obtained through the design and the use of appropriate materials such as stone. A generous and attractive entrance would convey welcome to the worshippers. The site for such a building should be large, with attractive, natural foliage. (54) These views and his belief that a church was more likely than other buildings to become a work of art and to enhance the beauty of its location were consistent with Monroe's desires for Hampton's new chapel.

The site selected for the new church was a choice one and certainly satisfied the requirements of both Monroe and his architect. It was the site which had earlier been offered to the Garrison Memorial Committee and which Armstrong had been
saving for a future choice building. Facing the waterfront with Academic Hall on one side and the library and Virginia Hall on the other, it was described as "the heart and center of the campus". (55) The placing of the chapel on this site was intended by Armstrong to give visible emphasis to Hampton's character as a Christian institution and to symbolize the centrality of the building of Christian character to its mission. In choosing the site for the Huntington Industrial Works, Armstrong had made a statement about the importance of manual labor and industrial education in the elevation of the Negro and Indian races. Academic Hall, first of the imposing buildings on the waterfront, had given emphasis to the importance of educating the head. The erection of the church next to Academic would complete the triad; the buildings would represent his educational plan for Hampton; education of hand, head and heart.

The building designed by Cady was Italian Romanesque Revival, emphasizing lightness rather than the massiveness of other Romanesque buildings and serenity rather than boldness. (Figure 10) It was in the shape of a maltese cross with the central section or lantern supported by piers and posts under a dome which provided most of the light to the interior and a semicircular chancel. (56) The large, cubic area under the lantern was supported by large rounded arches on massive stone pillars. It was 132 by 84 feet and could accommodate 800 to 1000 people in seats so arranged that few,
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if any, did not have a clear view of the platform. The pews
and all of the interior woodwork were of yellow pine and were
prepared by the woodworking department of the Huntington
Industrial Works, continuing Armstrong's principle of self
help. The walls were of brick, red for the exterior and cream
color, pressed brick for the interior. In contrast to the
other buildings, most of the bricks for the chapel were
purchased rather than made on the grounds although the
school's brick kiln did contribute "filler" bricks for the
building. Large windows on either side were paned with
cathedral glass in graceful designs of blue and yellow. In
accordance with Cady's belief that the entrance should be
generous in order to convey a sense of welcome to worshippers,
he used double, overscale, panelled doors.

A unique feature of Hampton's chapel are the corbel
blocks of the miniature arcade under the dentil cornice and
celestory windows which are carved in the forms of alternating
Negro and Indian heads.(57) The original drawings for these
blocks represent flowers. There is no information as to who
made the change or why. It seems probable that the change was
made by either Armstrong himself or the school's chaplain,
H.B.Frissell, as both were aware of the role of symbolism in
architecture. Both, at various times, spoke of architecture
in Ruskinian terms. Frissell, in 1887, described the completed
chapel as having "an unconscious influence toward honesty and
truthfulness. The whole building, with its noble tower and
great arches, is an education to the whole school". (58)

A free standing, square bell tower, 150 feet in height, was erected in front of the chapel and connected to it by a short covered passageway. This tower was designed to hold both a chime of bells and a four faced, illuminated clock. The inspiration for the tower can be traced to Armstrong who had long wanted such a campanile on the campus. As early as 1877, he had proposed to Hunt that a bell and clock tower be added to Academic Hall to replace the bell which was rung by students to mark the different periods of the day. A free standing tower was recommended by Hunt who stated that this design would give the tower more importance and originality as well as diminish the chances of damage caused by unequal settling of two parts of a building which were of unequal height and weight. Hunt sent for the plans of the old building in order to prepare a design for the tower. Although this tower was never built due to lack of funds, it seems probable that Armstrong kept the plans for use at a later date. He certainly retained the idea of such a "Tower of Chimes" in his plans for the campus.

Albert Howe, also in 1877, states that he is having "a kind of tower" put on the new Whipple barn which, in addition to providing a good view for the watchman, would also be "a good place for a town clock if you want one". (59) In January of 1878, Armstrong wrote to a clock firm for an estimate of the cost of such a clock and tower but again, finances
interfered. Beginning in the summer of 1878, the burden of erecting buildings for the Indians as well as for the industrial enterprises forced Armstrong to shelve his plans for the campanile. In his letter to Hunt discussing plans for the second Academic Hall, Armstrong instructs Hunt to "plan a tower for a bell and clock - to be carried up at first only to the previous entrance: to be completed when funds allow". (60) Again, his plans were thwarted by lack of funds for the tower was never completed. Finally, with the erection of the new chapel, Armstrong got his "Tower of Chimes", very similar in design to the one originally proposed by Hunt in 1877.

Hampton's first experience with building construction funded and controlled by a single influential donor was not an auspicious one. The arrangements made with the donor for the erection of the chapel, although more typical of collegiate construction of the period than the other buildings, led to problems. Cady, not unnaturally, regarded Monroe as his client rather than the school. As the supervising architect, Cady also selected the builder who would oversee the on-site work. The money was paid by Mr. Monroe into a special account from which the school's treasurer drew funds to pay bills as they were presented. Monroe then left the country on an extended journey. School officials had little control over the construction and were, at first, not even aware of the estimated cost of the chapel.
There were delays, particularly in the completion of the tower, as well as budget overruns. Delays in paying bills were embarrassing to the school which had always prided itself on prompt payment of bills in cash. Both Armstrong and Monroe, on his return, expressed frustration with the costs and delay.

In accordance with his policy and in order to derive the maximum benefit for the school's image, Armstrong wished to dedicate the new chapel during the anniversary exercises of 1886. He refers to the anniversary exercises as "the time" for the dedication; no other suitable time could be found and, if the chapel was not ready, the dedication would probably be postponed until the next year's anniversary day which would be absurdly late. Reflecting his awareness that Cady regarded Monroe as his client, Armstrong states that such a delay would "deeply disappoint Mr. Monroe". (61) All was going well except the tower which was delayed due to settling and cracking of the brick which necessitated repair and Armstrong asks Cady if he cannot push this forward so that the church might be dedicated on May 20.

Armstrong's appeals were successful for the new Memorial Chapel was dedicated in May of 1886. He had intended to name the building Monroe Memorial Chapel for Mr. Monroe. Not only was Mr. Monroe executor of Marquand's estate and president of Hampton's Board of Trustees, he had followed Marquand's wishes and built the Chapel although there were no specific written instructions to that effect and he could have gained more
financially by not building it. After Mr. Monroe's demur, it was decided to name the church the Marquand Memorial Chapel. However, the full name is rarely used and it is doubtful that many people today even know the correct name. Even Armstrong refers to it simply as the Memorial Chapel. (62)

The dedicatory sermon for the new chapel was delivered by the Rev. Mark Hopkins. This was particularly fitting as the building was regarded by Armstrong as the culmination of his plan for the building up of the Hampton campus. Mark Hopkins could attest to the growth and development of the school as he had dedicated the first of the buildings, spoken at the school's celebration of its first decade, and now dedicated the last of the major buildings of which Armstrong had said: "It will complete and crown them all". (63) Hopkins spoke of the great work which had been done in providing farms and buildings of which there were now forty-five, twenty-nine for the academic and boarding departments and sixteen for the industrial department. He describes the Memorial Chapel as completing the circle and as the last of the buildings which should be needed for years to come. (64)

More than any of the other buildings, the chapel is described by those present in Ruskinian terms. "Let no one think that this perfection of beauty in the house of God is thrown away upon these Negro and Indian youths. With reverent natures open to religious impressions, its simple beauty not of outer adorning but of simple form, where there are no
shams, but every part is and does what it seems to be and do, we believe will have a salutary effect. It is fitting and fortunate that the most beautiful building on the grounds, central to the front, should be one specially set aside for the worship of God." (65) Inside, it was described as creating an effect of the "most perfect and quiet harmony, an atmosphere of worship and peace". (66) Even Montgomery Schuyler, one of the severest critics of collegiate architecture and campus planning, later praised the chapel as "an extremely satisfying piece of work and a very successful Protestant church". (67)

SCIENCE BUILDING: Although Armstrong had repeatedly stated that the Memorial Chapel was the last of the large buildings the school would need for many years, he was planning one more, less expensive building to be devoted to science. It would provide laboratories and recitation rooms for the study of chemistry, physics and natural philosophy. He felt that Hampton should concentrate more on the sciences as "not one school in the South for Blacks has specialized to any extent in this way: untold work has been done in dead languages but the new South will be built up on its hitherto neglected natural resources, on the use of its great power of providing minerals and agricultural wealth by better methods". (68) The Negro had proved his capacity for science and such training would be most practical and enable the Negro to share in the wealth of the New South. The third story was to contain rooms
for thirty post graduates who were pursuing additional work at Hampton.

The plan for such a building had been in his mind for a long time. He proposed a plain, solid brick building to stand on the waterfront between Academic Hall and the Huntington Industrial Works. It would contain two laboratories as well as four additional recitation rooms which could also be used for some other classes, thus relieving crowding in Academic Hall. It would also contain a natural history museum and cabinet of minerals. The estimated cost was ten to fifteen thousand dollars. (69) In a letter to the school's insurers, he described a three story, brick building with double hollow walls and a tin roof. The interior partitions were to be of brick, making it as fire proof as possible. (70) These were measures which had proved effective when used in earlier buildings. Also like the other buildings, it was to be heated with steam.

The architect who drew the plans for the building was a Mr. Bosworth of Boston, about whom little is known. He was to be paid $250 for five or six drawings or plans of the building. Armstrong indicated his wish for a building which would be "artistic but simple and plain". (71)

Armstrong had hoped to build the Science building that spring but his efforts were slowed by ill health. In the summer of 1886, he had suffered the first of the heart seizures which were eventually to end his life. However, by
August of that year, he was able to write to a potential donor: "We are just erecting a new Science Building with class rooms, museum, laboratories, etc. and will be very glad to dedicate one suitable room."(72) He was again asking donors to contribute the cost of a room which would then be named for them. This stratagem which had been used successfully in the past proved successful again and the building was completed in the fall of 1889 at a final cost of $20,000.00, although it was frame rather than the brick originally planned. It supplied a pressing need for better facilities for practical instruction in the natural sciences which Armstrong regarded as of special value in the development of the negro and Indian races.(73)

The Science Building was the last of the major buildings planned and erected by Armstrong. He was to live only three years after its completion. However, Armstrong had been able, through extraordinary individual effort and devotion, to build up a premier school for the education of Blacks and Indians, one which was a model for more than twenty similar schools. The campus had, to a large degree, developed according to his plan for it and had fulfilled those purposes for which it was intended, promoting his educational plan which included head, hand and heart, as well as contributing to the development of a strong and enduring attachment of graduates for their Alma Mater.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

Although no written plan for the development of Hampton's early campus has been found, there is sufficient evidence that such a plan existed. Buildings were not placed haphazardly, but according to an orderly scheme which existed in the mind of one man, Samuel Armstrong, the founder. It was the continuity of his leadership and his power and influence which enabled the campus to evolve according to his vision. Like William Rainey Harper at Chicago, Armstrong was interested in every detail of the architectural plans of his institution and, also like Harper, he used the allocation of spaces in buildings to accomplish education goals. However, unlike Harper who had to deal with an interested and informed board of trustees who made significant design decisions, he had nearly complete control over the design of Hampton's buildings. To an almost unprecedented degree, Hampton was the creation of one man and its campus has been called the "expression in bricks and mortar of his own inner self". (1)

Certain common characteristics have been found in those schools which were able to produce coherent, consistent campus planning. One of these common threads is the existence of strong leadership. Plans of early colleges were more likely
to express the vision of a single influential person; trustee, president or benefactor. The longer that person retained both position and influence, the more likely that the plan would reach fruition. At the University of Chicago, such leadership and continuity were provided by two influential trustees who served for forty years. While President Harper was certainly consulted about design decisions and had control of the allocation of space within the buildings, the trustees made the final decisions. At the University of Virginia, it was Jefferson whose vision guided early campus development. At Hampton, it was Armstrong who provided the guiding vision for the development of the campus. Contemporaries describe him as a charismatic leader, able to persuade others to share his vision and to contribute to its realization. He remained principal of the Hampton school for 25 years, providing the continuity necessary for his plans to be realized. He also served as a member of the Board of Trustees as well as a member of its Executive Board, increasing his influence over financial and construction decisions.

A second characteristic necessary for plans to be realized was adequate available funds. Many of the colleges founded around the same time as Hampton had to abandon early building plans due to lack of funds. Others relied on large, philanthropic benefactors who saw the college buildings as monuments to themselves and often erected buildings as different as possible from their neighbors in order that they
might stand out and impress those who viewed them. This was true of Harvard. The University of Chicago also relied on wealthy donors however, the flexibility of its Gothic style and the continuity provided by the trustees prevented the disharmony of buildings which appeared on many campuses.

With the exception of Memorial Chapel and the Stone building, Armstrong was able to raise needed funds for buildings while avoiding the large single benefactor who would expect to control the design of the building. Mrs. Valeria Stone, who contributed the cost of one large building, did so through a trust set up by her husband for the aid of education and evinced no desire to control the design of the building although she did have ideas about the uses to which it would be put. Armstrong usually concentrated on eliciting many smaller contributions by asking donors to give the prorated cost of a room to which their name would then be attached in order to satisfy their "edifice complex". Thus, he was able to retain control over the design and location of the major structures, producing a more harmonious system of buildings.

Finally, it was necessary to have in a position of leadership a person who was interested in architecture and the design of the campus. Charles Eliot certainly provided strong and consistent educational leadership for Harvard but he had no interest in or appreciation for architecture. His idea of a successful building was one which was well built and suited to the purpose for which it had been built. The period of his
leadership produced a hodgepodge of buildings the design of which was primarily determined by individual donors and their architects. Armstrong, on the other hand, had a strong sense of visual awareness and an interest in the architecture of the new school. Even when he had secured the services of a nationally known architect such as Richard Hunt, he wrote detailed letters outlining the features he wished to have included in the building. He would also include suggestions as to the materials to be used to improve fireproofing, the location of storage spaces, bathing and toilet facilities, etc. No detail was too small for his attention and it was said that he knew more about the buildings than anyone else on the campus.

In evaluating early campus planning at Hampton, it is important to consider its rather unusual mission which was, first, to civilize, then to educate the Negro. Armstrong intended to correct errors which he felt had been made in earlier missionary efforts to educate native people. He felt that missionary teachers focused too strongly on converting them to Christianity rather than teaching them to live a civilized, Christian life. In order to civilize the Negro and, later, the Indian, he felt that it was necessary to surround the student with what he described as a "perfectly balanced system of influences" which touched on every aspect of the student's life. Armstrong subscribed to the views of Pugin and Ruskin that the architecture of buildings could influence a
person for good and that it could be a vehicle of moral uplift. These views strongly influenced his design for the Hampton campus.

**A MASTER PLAN:** Evidence supports the first two hypotheses; that a master plan for the development of Hampton's campus existed and was followed. Armstrong noted that on at least two occasions before the founding of Hampton, he had visions of the school that were very near to its eventual reality. According to the accounts of more than one person associated with the school in its earliest phases of development, Armstrong pointed out to them the proposed location of major buildings and described their features in some detail years before they were built. The buildings he described were subsequently erected on the spots he indicated and their design was consistent with his earlier descriptions.

His dedication to his vision for the campus is evident early in his tenure as principal when he insisted on building Academic Hall on the site he had selected despite the desire of the officers of the A.M.A., which at that time was the major source of funds for the school, to purchase a nearby seminary building and adapt it to the school's use. Certainly, he would have needed to have a definite plan for the campus which he considered as vital to achieving the school's mission to strengthen his arguments against the plan of the A.M.A. and its Committee of Inquiry which consisted of several prominent educators. Only a sure vision for the development of the
campus and its role in the elevation of the Negro could have enabled him to assume the additional burden that the building of Hampton's impressive buildings imposed.

In his annual report of 1885, Armstrong describes the campus plan which was then nearing completion thus: "The school's twelve (all but three of them brick) structures, fronting the Hampton river, stand in two parallel lines, in echelon, each unmasking the other...". (2) If one approaches the campus by water from Hampton Roads, up the Hampton river, as did most early visitors to the school, this effect is still visible despite the addition of some newer buildings and the growth of foliage. In letters to potential contributors to the erection of various buildings, he described the location of proposed sites as being in the first or second line of buildings, indicating that he continued to adhere to this master plan in locating new structures. Armstrong stated on more than one occasion that most of the major buildings were placed in these two lines facing the waterfront while buildings which were further away from the river were oriented on the east-west axis.

Early maps (3) of the campus include not only buildings already standing but also proposed buildings, another indication of a guiding plan. The map prepared by Armstrong for the 1876 centennial exposition shows three proposed student dormitories or cottages on the boys' campus. (4) Two of these cottages were eventually built on the sites indicated. An 1878
map shows a proposed workshop to be built behind Virginia Hall which was eventually built on that spot. This supports the contention that a campus plan existed and that it was, to a great extent, followed. His letters to potential donors also usually included a drawing or map indicating the location of the proposed building in relation to those already standing indicating that he continued to see the campus as a unified whole and that the relationship of new buildings to that whole was considered.

These early maps also reveal the pattern of growth of the early campus. On the 1876 map, (Appendix 1) school buildings are clustered on the waterfront. Armstrong's plan for the parallel lines of buildings is already visible. Academic Hall, the Mansion House, Griggs Hall and a small cottage form a fairly straight line along the shore. Virginia Hall stands between and to the rear of Griggs Hall and the Mansion House, separated from the shore by a large open area where the Barracks had formerly stood. It is, at that time, the only major building in the second line. On a much later map, (Appendix 1,) the Huntington Industrial Works and the Science Building have been added to the first row of buildings while Winona Lodge, the Girls' Cottage, the Memorial Chapel and Marshall Hall have been added to the second line. (5) Each of the buildings on both lines commanded an unobstructed view of the river. The Stone Memorial Building is directly behind the Chapel and parallel to it while the Wigwam is to the right
of Stone and at right angles to it. These three buildings along with Academic Hall are in the center of the campus, separating the girls' and boys' areas. Whipple barn and the farm manager's residence are located much further back from the waterfront, along the road leading to the National Cemetery. The development appears orderly and according to Armstrong's plan. In his annual reports, Armstrong yearly addressed the progress of the physical plant; buildings completed, in progress or needed. He frequently referred to Hampton's "system of buildings" and the way in which any new structures would add to the harmonious effect rather than concentrating on individual buildings. This also indicates the existence of a campus plan and illuminates the various stages of its development. The Southern Workman frequently contained articles about campus buildings, including drawings and floor plans. This gave visibility and importance to the physical campus among Hampton's friends and supporters and indicates the importance attached to it by Armstrong himself. Armstrong's planning is also evident in his practice of constructing buildings of a larger capacity than necessary to meet immediate needs, allowing for future expansion.

**Symbolism and Hampton's Architecture:** Armstrong was certainly aware of the symbolic function of the school buildings. In writing about the various campus buildings, he frequently included his views on the symbolic value of their form, design or location, thus supporting the third hypothesis of this
study. He combined costly and imposing buildings with a simple and spartan life inside them in order to stimulate self respect, pride and esprit de corps in the students while avoiding raising expectations which would alienate them from those they were being trained to serve. In response to critics who felt that such elegant buildings would "spoil" the students, he stated that the construction of lesser buildings "in factory style" would have resulted in contempt rather than pride in their Alma Mater among the students. The reputation and influence of the school in both the Black and White communities was enhanced by the erection of its Victorian style buildings which, as early as 1875, had been described as worthy of "Amherst, Williams or Harvard".(6)

Armstrong often repeated his belief in the influence of environment on the education of both the Negro and the Indian. In his plans for the development of Hampton's campus, he spoke of the need to furnish a complete circle of influences which would stimulate in the student a desire for a higher life than the one he had known before coming to the school. For many of the early students, Hampton was the first real home they had ever known. Armstrong planned the school to strengthen these feelings of Hampton as home in order to extend its influence to every aspect of their daily lives and to prolong that influence beyond their student days. He felt that feelings of affection and pride for the school would help them to avoid bad influences in their communities in much the same way that
fond memories of home helped other young people avoid temptation. Hampton became known among those associated with it as "our home by the sea".

The status of various departments within a college can often be determined by the spaces allotted to them. Armstrong used the campus buildings to give visible emphasis to the principles on which the school was based. The Huntington Industrial Works, an imposing brick building, was placed on one of the finest sites on the campus, fronting the Hampton river in order to establish the industrial feature of the school. Other fine buildings housed various industries in order to support the dignity of labor by making its associations respectable and impressive. This was particularly important for both the Negro, who associated manual labor with the degradation of slavery, and for the Indian, who regarded manual labor as fit only for women or slaves.

The most elaborate and imposing building on the campus, designed by a nationally known and respected architect, was a women's dormitory. The lofty pinnacles of Virginia Hall towered over the flat country which surrounded it and made a statement concerning the importance of educating its women to the civilization of any backward race. It was intended to provide an incentive to the young women, who lacked the opportunity of gaining the rights and responsibilities of citizenship which inspired the young men, to obtain an education. In his annual report of 1880, Armstrong makes the
following statement concerning the importance of educating young women: "The wife lifts up or drags down the husband. Woman's influence is more subtle and far reaching than man's. This has not been sufficiently recognized in the missionary work of the day". (7) Virginia Hall was intended to convey his belief in the value of educating women and to inspire in the young Negro women the desire to obtain such an education.

As the school's position became more secure and the need to enhance its reputation through its architecture decreased, building plans became simpler, more balanced and dignified. Armstrong's instructions to Hunt for the design of the second Academic Hall reflect this change as he asks for a "strong, plain building without attempt at ornament", one which will rely on a "good outline effect". Even the first plan submitted by Armstrong for the Memorial Chapel was for a simple brick structure with a central bell tower modeled on the Bethesda Chapel. Its location facing the waterfront at the "center and heart of the campus" was meant to reflect the importance of educating the heart, building good Christian character and inculcating sound moral principles in Hampton's students.

Much attention was paid to Hampton's system of dormitories because Armstrong believed that "no part of education is more important than proper quarters". (8) He would have preferred that every student have a single room and insisted that no more than two students be assigned to a room. Hampton's mission was to "civilize" as well as educate and he
regarded solitude as a civilizing influence. The spacious but simply furnished rooms allotted to them increased the students' self respect and ambition to improve. Their pride in the buildings and in their own rooms instilled in them habits of tidiness and order which they would carry into their lives after leaving Hampton. They, in turn, would influence those around them in the communities in which they lived and worked.

The landscaping of the campus also received attention. While much of the land was given to farming, the appearance of the lawns around the buildings was also important and the ornamental was never neglected for the purely practical. Francis Richardson, in consultation with Armstrong, laid out the grounds and set out trees and shrubs in addition to managing the farm and giving agricultural lectures. A nursery for ornamental trees as well as fruit trees was begun as early as 1870. As the campus evolved, green, well tended lawns surrounded the buildings and the trees set out by Richardson grew to maturity, providing pleasant shade. Smooth shell roads and cement or board walks were constructed to provide easy movement between the buildings.

The Hampton river remained the dominant feature in the landscape and provided the focus for the development of the grounds. Some low lying, marshy areas were filled in both for health reasons and to provide additional room for buildings and gardens which contained flowers as well as cabbages. The
grounds enhanced the beauty of the campus and made it a spot to be remembered fondly by those who studied there. That the campus inspired such affection is reflected in Booker T. Washington's design for Tuskegee where he tried to a great extent to recreate the Hampton campus he loved.

The pride the students and officers of the school felt in its fine buildings is evident in the use of their pictures on many of the school's documents as well as in their writings. The woodcut picture of Academic Hall appeared on the cover of early catalogs, on the letterhead of school stationery, and on the early students' diplomas. After the completion of Virginia Hall, a similar picture of it replaced the one of Academic Hall on the cover of school catalogs. The emphasis given to the buildings and grounds in Hampton's Centennial Exposition display further reflect pride in the campus.

This pride is also seen in the choices of location for class photographs most of which were taken out of doors with one of the major buildings providing the background. Between 1876 and 1886, Virginia Hall is the predominant choice as backdrop for class pictures as it was the dominant feature of the campus as well as the center for many campus activities. After 1886 the Memorial Chapel is the most frequently chosen background, again reflecting its position at the center of the campus and pride in its beautiful architecture. The senior class picture of 1892 was the only one taken on the piazza of
the Mansion House and probably reflected the desire of the students to have Armstrong appear in their photograph as he had in those of preceding classes. Armstrong was, by this time, weakened by his heart disease as well as an earlier stroke and was less able to move around the grounds. The buildings, which Armstrong had planned to engender self respect in Hampton's students, were, as he had hoped, a source of pride.

The campus became a focus for fond memories and affection for those associated with the school. Strong ties were forged between students and their Alma Mater as Armstrong had intended. Many of them, in letters to teachers and friends remaining at Hampton, spoke of it fondly as "home" and voiced the hope that the school intended to prosper.

Writing in 1894, Alice Bacon, who first visited the campus in 1870-71 at the age of twelve when her sister Rebecca was a teacher there, described the impression Hampton made on her and others who lived and studied there: "She sat down under a little tree close to the water's edge and saw the rippling, gleaming blue of the creek widen out into the white-capped waters of the Roads. And as she sat under that tree, and felt the soft breeze lift her hair, and heard the cheerful, busy hum of life about her, and saw the beauty of sky and sea in front of her, the charm of Hampton entered her heart and has dwelt there ever since". (9) Although Hampton grew and changed over the years, "the picture of our little
Hampton has remained unfaded and there is something in its spirit, its purpose and its charm, that must remain for all time in the mind that it has once entered". (10)

It might be expected that, after Armstrong's death in 1893, his plan and vision for the campus would have been lost or altered. In 1901 the Board of Trustees commissioned a firm of architects, Manning Brothers of Boston, to draw up a plan for the future development of the Hampton campus, which could be realized gradually as the need for new buildings arose. Manning's suggestions were somewhat radical. They involved the removal of several buildings including Wigwam and the Stone Memorial Building in order to clear out the center of the grounds and make a large, somewhat rectangular lawn with the buildings ranged around it. This would shift the focus of the campus away from the waterfront toward the Gatewood Corner entrance to the school grounds. (11) The plan was described as "too elaborate in design, too inconvenient, and too expensive to maintain". (12) But even more importantly, it was a radical departure from the campus plan of Armstrong to which the new principal and the Board of Trustees remained committed. They rejected both of the plans submitted by Manning brothers. In their rejection of the Manning plan, the second principal and the Board of Trustees indicated that they were familiar with Armstrong's campus plan and had no desire to change it. A second firm of architects provided a plan in 1908 which did not disturb the plan Armstrong had established.
The historic value of Armstrong's campus plan and the place of the Hampton school in the history of the nation were recognized when several of the early buildings were designated as National Historic Landmarks by the Virginia Historical Commission and the National Registry of Historic Places. The buildings so designated include the Mansion House, Virginia Hall, Wigwam, Academic Hall and the Memorial Chapel.

**RECLAIMING THE TRADITION:** In the 1950s and 1960s Hampton departed from the more traditional architecture of the older buildings and erected a series of more utilitarian, modern buildings. The change was so marked that the point where the old and new campuses come together not only lacks harmony, but also jars the senses. It is only in the recent years that Hampton has again begun to pay homage to its architectural traditions by employing architects who graduated from Hampton and who express through their designs respect for its history.

Wilder Hall, a boys' dormitory erected in 1990, was the first of the school's new buildings to express this tradition. Located on the waterfront next to Academic Hall on the former site of the Science Building, it became part of Armstrong's first line of buildings, an important part of the old campus. The architectural style is post modern Gothic which blends well with the surrounding original buildings. It features an irregular roofline with peaks and pinnacles similar to Virginia Hall. The entrance which faces the river has a peaked roof with a central rose window which is startlingly similar.
to the entrance of Virginia Hall. It is built of red brick with decorative bands of black marking the tops and sills of the windows and extending around the building as is Virginia Hall. Armstrong would have approved.

The original Whipple Barn burned in 1904 and was replaced by another barn of the same design but minus the bell tower. In recent years it had been used only for storage. When the need arose for a separate student services building to relieve overcrowding in the Administration Building, it was decided to place this building on the site facing Tyler street to the left of the main entrance to the campus which was occupied by the barn. Rather than raze this historic structure as was done to other historic barns and replace it with a new and modern building, it was decided to remodel Whipple Barn and adapt it to its new role. The remodeling of the structure left intact the two story, L shaped design of the original building. The inside was gutted and redesigned to include a large atrium with a gallery running along two sides and accommodations for the necessary offices and service areas. Another wing, of the same color brick was added to the side opposite the short arm of the ell. The building is attractive, preserves an important link with Hampton's roots, and provides a bright, spacious interior where all student services are now housed under one roof.

The most recent building to be completed is the Harvey library, an ultramodern building located on the new campus.
But even this most futuristic building has features which link it to Hampton's historic architecture. The exterior is decorated with the familiar bands of black brick which are found in so many of the older buildings. Inside the atrium entrance hang two matching murals painted by John Biggers, a prominent artist and graduate of the school. In these murals he has included the symbolism of the most imposing of the original buildings. Academic Hall again represents education of the mind, the opportunity for learning so coveted by the ex slaves. Virginia Hall represents Hampton's early focus on the education of young women and the importance of coeducation in the uplift of the Negro. Huntington Industrial Works, long since converted to a dormitory, still stands for the importance of technical education, the training of the hand. And Memorial Chapel reflects the importance of the building of sound Christian character and the place of religion at the heart of the Hampton enterprise. Through these newest campus buildings, Hampton is indeed reclaiming her proud tradition.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Hampton's campus and archives offered a rich source of information about one of a unique group of educational institutions, those founded to educate freed slaves. Study of these schools and their contributions to the progress of the Negro is especially important at this time when many are questioning the place of these institutions in a modern, integrated society. Further study of the "Black Iveys" as a group and their unique contributions to American
education is needed in order to understand their role in modern society. Just as the "Seven Sisters" set the tone for the early education of women, these schools set the tone for the early education of Blacks and continue to exert a strong influence on the course of education for Blacks today.
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