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Introduction

This study explores the origins and development of collegiate honors education at one Historically Black College and University (HBCU). The oldest HBCU within the state of Maryland, Morgan State University, located in the city of Baltimore, is the focus of this study. Although honors programs began in the 1920’s, it has only been during the last five decades that public and private higher education institutions of all types have invested in experiences for their high-ability students. Honors programs have become recruitment magnets for their institutions while also raising their academic profiles, justifying campus resources, and funding.¹ The history of higher education from the early through the post-Civil Rights era of the twentieth century reveals simultaneous narratives such as the tension of post-desegregation with Black colleges facing an uncertain future; and the rise and popularity of collegiate honors programs. This history will contribute to tracing seemingly corresponding complex histories in higher education that lead to a relationship that speaks to the development of honors education at HBCUs.

While the extant literature of honors development at historically White public and private institutions of higher education has gradually emerged, our understanding of activity at HBCUs is spotty at best. One connection of these two phenomena—the impact of the desegregation of higher education on HBCUs and the rise of collegiate honors, is the development of honors programs at HBCUs. Examining one mid-Atlantic state institution, Morgan State University, I will illuminate the role and purpose of honors education at a public HBCU through an historical analysis. In the immediate wake of the post-desegregation era and with declining enrollment,

HBCUs had to collectively address future challenges such as clarifying their purpose and mission. Competing with Historically White Institutions (HWIs) for high-achieving African-American students was one of the unanticipated consequences of the Brown v Board of Education, (1954) decision.\(^2\) Often marginalized from higher education literature, this study also broadens the research repository of honors education by documenting the contributions that HBCUs have made to the field of honors education despite a challenging landscape and offers insight to our understanding of serving high-achieving Black collegians.

The broader origins and purpose of honors education in higher education, the historical landscape of Black higher education, including the impact of Brown, and other more contemporary court cases that have weighed in on the desegregation of higher education influence this analysis and will provide the primary background for the literature review.\(^3\) Additionally, an historical overview of Morgan State University in the context of the racially hostile climate of the early 1900s as the Centenary Biblical Institute; the impact of Murray v Maryland and the Cold War era of the mid-1900s as Morgan College; the movement toward university status in the late 1970s; Morgan’s relationship with the state system of higher education throughout all these years, flesh out the context of this study.\(^4\) Morgan State University’s evolution from a White-sponsored missionary institute during Reconstruction to a private liberal arts college, and then a state-owned but with autonomous board-control institution, underlie the site selection offering both a traditional narrative characteristic of the

---

\(^4\) Maryland v Murray 169 Md. 478 (1936).
evolution of HBCUs birthed from strong missionary beginnings, but with a unique strength in a border state to restore and maintain control of its governing power. Further, although Morgan State College is among the top 20 HBCUs in the country, unlike Howard University, it is an under researched institution.5 This study will ultimately demonstrate the magnitude that macroaggressions such as legal segregation and societal racism had on a liberal arts college committed to Black student talent development.

Following in this study of Morgan, the history of its honors education program and its relationship with the state of Maryland unfolds in the next four chapters. In chapter two, I detail the historical origins of collegiate honors education in American higher education, including the involvement of HBCUs in this twentieth century trend of intellectual talent development. The role of a world war and federal funding to higher education, global and domestic politics with regard to both race relations and the advancement of technology as well as the support of independent funding agencies, provide context for understanding the national growth of honors education. In chapter three, I journey through Morgan’s history from the late nineteenth century through the late 1970s when the institution received university status. Beginning with church history that birthed the seminary, I discuss the institution’s growth and attempts to identify a location for its campus among segregated neighborhoods. In this chapter, I also address extensively the Murray case and others that challenged segregation, state funding matters, and, institutional governance. This case and related pre-1935 state machinations of federal funds and the Morrill Act emerged as more important factors than envisioned at the study’s conception. Chapter four begins with an overview of the national climate in Cold War America with regard to Black education and scientific racism. In this chapter I trace the early

evolution of honors activity at Morgan which also affords glimpses into the institution’s educational mission as envisioned by its seventh president, Dr. Martin D. Jenkins. In this chapter the development of honors education begins to unfold. A list of those individuals who have led efforts and have coordinated directly the honors education curriculum and activities at Morgan State University is included. Through oral histories, chapter four introduces individuals who have contributed to the honors experience from the early 1950s through to the late 1980s. The oral histories of participants provide powerful voice, as they speak of the building of an academic community striving for excellence. Morgan’s relationship with the state legislature and its ambition to maintain an independent governing board provides the backdrop for understanding the institution’s growth in the second half of the twentieth century. We learn more of these matters in chapter five, where the oral histories example how state-level decisions impacted the institution. In chapter five, both the professional and personal biographies of participants give this study its breadth through the lives of those who have lived in this institution for multiple decades. Through them and their witness of Morgan, we hear narratives that are counter to the majority. We hear the passion that has enabled individuals to fight despite many legislative and funding defeats. Most evident to the nature of oral histories, we begin to learn how, in their formative years, the experiences of race and racism are woven throughout the personal biographies and have influenced their professional life choices and their allegiance to Morgan. Chapter five also concludes this study with an analysis of the data using critical race theory as a framework for sense making of the reality and role of race in this institution’s history. There are also policy recommendations for reparations that the state legislature as well as the Office of Civil Rights should consider in remedying seven decades of neglect that Morgan has weathered since becoming a public institution. At the end of this chapter is a timeline indicating
some of the particular historical contexts and events in the institution’s history and external forces (higher education studies/commissions, civil rights legislation, and state system reorganizations), for example, that have impacted it. There is a graphic timeline that plots some of these events in the appendices.

As I went deeper into the primary sources and context surrounding honors and Murray, these events and their relationship with Morgan proved pivotal in constructing and analyzing Black higher education within the state of Maryland. In a constructivist fashion, the study thus evolved from a narrower history of honors development to one more richly embedded in the complex history of Maryland’s Black higher education system.

In a broad context this study traces experiences in American history including the freedom of enslaved Blacks, the development of Black colleges, and the influence of Jim Crow and desegregation on Black higher education. These threads are used to construct the historical expansion and tensions of Black higher education within the state of Maryland as narrated through the lives of faculty and administrators at Morgan State University. This study introduces the reader to the founders of Morgan and the challenges the institution faced as it struggled to find its footing in the Jim Crow era of the early twentieth century. In the century’s latter half, the study follows the activism of Morgan’s leaders advocating for the institution to be: fully financially supportive by the state, more racially integrated (post-Brown) with respect to the state actively eschewing institutional program duplication, and with Morgan maintaining governing autonomy.

Perspectives from oral histories and data from archives construct an historical representation of events and an understanding of Black and state-level higher education within
Maryland as well as of Morgan State University. This research updates and extends the sole institutional history published in 1975. Morgan’s institutional history and complicated relationship with the state will unfold in this study. Participant interviews accompany the excavation of documented historical data providing living testimony grounded in their personal backgrounds that have shaped their historical “truths.” Although an historical study, the history I have constructed as a result of analyzing events, people, and their meaning-making utilizes Critical Race Theory, a socially transforming and action oriented framework for examining the influence of racism on social phenomena. This study is thus grounded in the tradition of constructivism as emerging themes threaded the data together into an historical narrative.

Given the racialized context of HBCUs in American society, I found that the tenets of Critical Race Theory (CRT) provided a useful framework for making sense of emerging themes in the primary sources and for understanding the evolution of not only the context that supported the development of honors activities, but the maturation of an institution whose often onerous status marks a rightful place in the history of higher education. CRT frames social phenomena through the lens of race, racism, and challenges the concept of Whiteness as an ideology that permeates and influences American society. It affords researchers interested in race and its intersections with other social identities (women, income, religion, for example) a framework for investigating the racialized contexts of events. Developed in the 1970s, CRT grew out of Critical Legal Studies (CLS) and branched off due to its social activist agenda. CRT holds that “Whiteness” is an intangible tangible—privilege, entitlement, and property—possessed by White people, regardless of their desire to possess it or not.6

---

Chapter I  
Historical Context and Historical Methods

Historiography/ Historical Context

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

...for education among all kinds of men always has had, and always will have, an element of danger and revolution, of dissatisfaction and discontent.-W.E.B. Du Bois, The Souls of Black Folk

Education for enslaved Black Americans was inherently an act of danger and revolt for both the learner and the teacher. For an educated slave was as good as an escaped slave. Liberating both the mind and spirit, education also creates a desire for physical freedom. The word liberal originates from the Latin word, liberalis, which means to liberate or to set free. Liberal education, which W.E.B. Du Bois espoused, is a form of learning that befits a man who is free, liber, and has mastered the methods of logic and languages to chart his own life course affording him the ability to serve as a leader in his community. A man armed with education is a man able to see beyond the darkness of the cave and into the light of his imagined reality. To remain in the cave would cause discontent, for his spirit and his mind know better.

In 1832, a young White man running for a seat in the Illinois general assembly articulated a fortuitous analysis of education in his political announcement. Although at the time of these utterings he had no plan for his idealistic notions, he would sign legislation thirty years later

---

8 In this section, I have chosen to use the word ‘man’ to align with 19th century language. Contemporary standards of writing style guides require adherence to gender neutral language when referring to all people. In this case, reference is to both men and women. However, by using the terminology of the era, for example Freedman’s Bureau, I honor the historical period and give power to the traditional head of the Black community.
9 Theme from Plato’s “Allegory of the Cave,” approx. 360 B.C.E.
establishing a national system of higher education. Foreshadowing the future of the nation he
would one day lead, a twenty-three year old Abraham Lincoln said,

> Upon the subject of education, not presuming to dictate any plan or system respecting it, I
can only say that I view it as the most important subject which we as a people can be
engaged in... For my part, I desire to see the time when education... shall become much
more general than at present, and should be gratified to have it in my power to contribute
something to the advancement of any measure which might have tendency to accelerate
the happy period.  

The “happy period” and measure to which the younger Abe unknowing referred and the older
Lincoln contributed as President of the United States was the 1862 signing of the Morrill Act.
The Act was legislation that allowed for the appropriation of land to U.S. states and territories for
the purpose of establishing at least one collegiate institution for the study of agriculture,

> without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to
teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts... in
order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several
pursuits and professions in life.”

The Morrill Act legislation was sponsored by Vermont Senator Justin S. Morrill. According to
historian Roger Geiger, Morrill was concerned that higher education was too exclusive and not
more accessible to those of the industrial class. The 1862 passage was Morrill’s second attempt

12 Although Morrill was the successful sponsor of the Act and receives credit as the pioneer inventor of the Land
Grants, historian Gary Thomas Lord challenges this assumption, arguing that Alden Partridge, an administrator of
West Point Military Academy, state legislator also from Vermont and the founder of Norwich University (1819) as
well as many other branch institutions modeled after Norwich, actually proposed a plan for a national higher
education system in 1841 that is almost identical to the Morrill proposal. Morrill and Partridge, though not friends,
lived near each other in Vermont and had mutual friends in a variety of social circles. According to Lord, Morrill,
distanced himself from Partridge, giving no credit to him for the plan and claiming to have not thought of the idea
until the late 1850s, although he had very close ties to Norwich—the model of the land grant plan, serving as a
Trustee to the university. See Gary Thomas Lord, “Alden Partridge’s Proposal for a National System of Education:
as he first introduced the Act under President James Buchanan who vetoed it. According to Brunner, Buchanan vetoed the legislation judging that “it was in violation of the traditional policy of the Federal Government which had up to that time left the control of education to the States.” President Abraham Lincoln, however, did sign the legislation that made land grant colleges possible. On matters from education to slavery, it is apparent that the 19th century federalist possessed a more flexible approach to the notions of states’ rights and federal responsibility than did his predecessor. For example, according to historian Paul Finkelman, Buchanan, who was pro-slavery, supported the 1857 Dred Scott U.S. Supreme Court decision that denied Scott his freedom, denounced the citizenship of Blacks whether free or enslaved, and overruled Congress’ authority to restrict slavery as it was a state right. Finkelman wrote that in a newspaper that served as Buchanan’s and the Democratic Party’s “unofficial voice,” a response to the Dred Scott ruling read,

The North and the South have different institutions. Each State is alone responsible for its institutions, and it is morally and constitutionally wrong for the people of one State to assail the institutions of another State.

Lincoln’s ideology of education and Black citizenship differed from Buchanan’s and for the narrative of higher education, Morrill’s proposal prevailed. Under the 1862 Act, each state and territory received 30,000 acres for every Representative and Senator, which was based upon the 1850 United States Census.

---

14 Historians have also noted Buchanan’s interference of the Dred Scott v Sandford case, 60 U.S. 393 (1857). As president-elect, he utilized both his power and social connections to members of the Supreme Court, mainly Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, a native Marylander, to ensure an expedient settlement of the slave issue. Apparently, Buchanan, a segregationist, wanted the national political uproar that this case had spurred settled prior to his taking office. From the legal field, scholars have criticized Judge Taney’s ethical behavior in allowing politics, rather than the U.S. Constitution, to influence the ruling in this case. See, Earl M. Maltz, Dred Scott and the Politics of Slavery, (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007). Also, Dred Scott and the Politics of Slavery—Earl M. Maltz, a discussion hosted by the Kansas City Public Library, June 26, 2013, https://archive.org/details/2013626EarlMaltz.
In 1890, the Second Morrill Act (officially known as the Agricultural College Act of 1890) was passed to provide additional funding for states, especially the southern states with either established segregated institutions or racially exclusive admissions. The Act required educational facilities for Black as well as White residents stating that funds would be made available with a stipulation:

*Provided, That no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such colleges separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provision of this act if the funds received in such State or Territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth.*

The building of Black collegiate institutions began prior to 1890, however the federal legislation did provide well needed funding in the Jim Crow infested southern region of the United States.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the southern United States necessitated out of a culture of segregation and the demand to assiduously address the education needs of the newly freed Black community who had been proscribed in law from learning to read or write. Their White masters understood that with education Blacks would be discontented with their condition of enslavement, and even later, as freed people relegated to the lowest social order. In this regard Frederick Douglass eloquently recalled of his powerful enlightenment,

> The more I read, the more I was led to abhor and detest my enslavers...behold the very discontentment which Master Hugh had predicted would follow my learning to read had already come...It had given me a view of my wretched condition...opened my eyes to the horrible pit...The silver trump of freedom had aroused my soul to eternal wakefulness.

---


Although the journey of Black education from Reconstruction through the development of Black colleges and the desegregation of higher education in the mid-late 1900s will be included herein, it is critical to the reading of HBCUs’ current status to understand that these institutions derived from a place in American history that demands the attention of scholars, educators, higher education administrators, political leaders and community members, and is still relevant to current day concerns. That is to say, the history of these institutions and the status of Black education stems from this era and it continues to unfold.

Section 321 [20. U.S.C. 1060] of the Higher Education Act of 1965 acknowledged the contributions of HBCUs to American society despite the discriminatory and unequal manner in which funding had been distributed to these institutions: “(2) States and Federal Government have discriminated in allocation of land and financial resources to support Black public institutions under the Morrill Act of 1862…(3) and this discriminatory action requires the remedy of enhancement of Black postsecondary institutions to ensure their continuation in fulfilling the Federal mission of equality of educational opportunity.” In section 322 [20. U.S.C.S 1061] the Act goes on to define HBCUs as “any historical Black college or university that was established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, and is, the education of Black Americans.”20 It is this definition of Black postsecondary institutions set by Federal legislation that will be used in this study.

Scholars have observed that although the federal act specifically stated the education of Black Americans, HBCUs have graduated students of diverse ethnic backgrounds.21 In fact, as we will see later, some HBCUs actually have a higher White than Black student enrollment. One

---

extreme example of this is West Virginia’s Bluefield State College at 82% White enrollment according to a June 27, 2014 Time.com article.\textsuperscript{22} This phenomena led to questions about the current purpose of their mission and federal status as a historically Black institution.\textsuperscript{23} For example, in a review of racial shifts in HBCU student populations and the impact of desegregation laws, M. Christopher Brown cites potential challenges such as “eradicating the rich campus culture.”\textsuperscript{24} He notes, for instance, Bluefield State College as having the “highest White student enrollment of the nation’s 103 HBCUs… [at]…92%” during 1994. Brown pointed out that the majority of the faculty and its president were White and the symbols of African American student presence that are evident at most HBCUs, such as Black Greek letter organizations, were absent. Brown comments that it took the institution only four years to “energetic[ally]” comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Bluefield State College is located in West Virginia, a state with a small Black population as compared to those surrounding most HBCUs which may have influenced the university’s racial student profile. Most HBCUs, however, have a majority Black student population, reflecting the demographics of the local community.

In fall 1976, total HBCU enrollment was 222,613 (190,305 or 85.4% of whom were Black students) and twenty years ago in 1991, fall enrollment at all HBCUs was 269,335 (218,366 or 81% Black student enrollment).\textsuperscript{25} In 2011, there were 100 HBCUs, (51 public and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
See also, Marybeth Gasman, et. al. 2007. Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Recent Trends. Academe, 93 no. 1 (2007). Other institutions with majority White enrollment cited by these authors are: West Virginia State University, Shelton State Community College, Lincoln University (Mo.).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
49 private) with a total undergraduate fall 2011 enrollment of 323,616; 81% or 263,414, of these students identified as Black. These data show a steady interest in HBCU attendance, which could signal a continued relevance in educating a significant portion of Black college aspirants.26

Overall, however, the proportion of all Black college students attending HBCUs has fallen in the last 35 years (1976-2011) from 18% to 9%.27 Moreover, Roebuck and Murty pointed out that prior to Brown v Board of Education “over 90 percent of black students were educated at HBCUs.”28 While most of the original federally designated HBCUs are maintaining operations, there has been a significant shift in student enrollment given the (unintended) success of court cases that challenged the separate but equal status quo.29

HBCUs can claim histories of more than a century, and advocates of these institutions have remained as vigilant as much as they may have been with the first significant enrollment decline post Brown and more so after the Higher Education Act of 1965 which charged predominantly White institutions (PWIs) to increase Black student enrollment. Current challenging state funding of the 21st century, an overt societal climate of conservatism particularly against American minorities and immigrants, the rise of the far right Tea Party political movement, along with continued court challenges to college and university policies aimed at recruitment and admission among Blacks and other minority groups, all mark a trend in

27 NCES Digest of Education Statistics, Table 283.

According to Gasman, et.al. (Ibid 2007), there were still 103 HBCUs. As of May 2015, there are 98 four year institutions of which 90 are accredited. White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, U.S. Department of Education. http://www.ed.gov/edblogs/whhbcu/one-hundred-and-five-historically-black-colleges-and-universities/
the environment that serves to threaten the existence and mission of HBCUs. Scholars particularly stress enrollment challenges in the context of smaller institutions’ needs to maintain infrastructure, such as physical plants, and hire a sufficient number of faculty.²⁰ For budgetary reasons, several Southern legislatures have proposed merging their state’s HBCUs with their PWIs in the early 2000s thereby saving on administrative costs and duplication of programs. Albritton explained in 2012,

administrators at public HBCUs face the unique challenge of making sure their programs, and, in some instances, their schools continue to exist in an environment where some state legislatures do not see the need to appropriate funds for institutions that they regard as vestiges of segregation.³¹

Ironically, the current day HBCU which was established because of legal (Plessy v Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896)) state-mandated segregation is now in the antithetical position of having to justify its founding mission in not only a desegregated, but “post-racial” America, as some have seen it since the 2008 election of the country’s first African American president.³² HBCU advocates have thus found themselves pressed up against a contradictory wall.

Advocates have also witnessed a steady flow of legal rulings which have kept higher education administrators at both HBCUs and PWIs on the edge of their seats. The legal cases have generally been of two types: the first set of cases challenged the proper enforcement of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the desegregation of dual systems; the second set essentially argued harm of “reverse discrimination” in admissions practices designed to racially diversify PWI campuses.

³⁰ Albritton, “Educating Our Own.”
³¹ Albritton, “Educating Our Own,” 324.
Adams v Richardson which was filed in 1970 was a result of improper enforcement of a congressional enactment. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI) prohibited discrimination in any agency that received federal funding stating:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) of the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) was charged with ensuring the enforcement and compliance of Title VI. HEW found that ten southern and border-states were maintaining dual systems in higher education. Having established criteria for compliance—the dismantling of a dual system and the desegregation of students, faculty and staff—the ten institutions were sent letters (1969-1970) ordering them to submit desegregation plans. Adams was filed by the NAACP due to HEW’s failure to enforce compliance in states that practiced segregation in its systems of higher education yet continued to receive federal funding. Both the District and the U. S. Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the plaintiff.

In another case in 1975, about twenty years after Brown, Mississippi plaintiffs charged the state with maintaining a dual system of higher education. The case was active through the next two decades until finally landing in the Supreme Court which ruled that Mississippi had not met its desegregation obligations to dismantle all traces of a de jure segregated system. The final 2004 court ruling in United States v Kirk Fordice, 505 U.S. 717 (1992) contributed to a trend of

35 The ten states were: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.
enforcing Title VI yet, this had an unintentional adverse impact on all HBCUs by requiring Mississippi public Black institutions to desegregate and maintain a minimum non-Black enrollment of ten percent.\textsuperscript{37} In their American Association of University Professors (AAUP) committee update report on HBCUs, Gasman et al. discuss the increase of more than 35,000 White students attending HBCUs as of 1995, which was before the \textit{Fordice} final 2004 ruling.\textsuperscript{38} According to NCES, 21,040 White students attended HBCUs in 1976 and 34,908 in 2001.\textsuperscript{39} Additionally, “in 2011, non-Black students made up 19 percent of enrollment at HBCUs, compared with 15 percent in 1976.”\textsuperscript{40} This is evidence that HBCUs were never racially exclusive, and they already had non-segregated campuses prior to \textit{Fordice}. In 2011, non-Black students comprised 60,202 (19%) of the 326,616 total students attending HBCUs.\textsuperscript{41}

Earlier (\textit{Regents of the University of California v Bakke} 438 U.S. 265 [1978]) and more recent court deliberations of affirmative action admission cases \textit{Podberesky v Kirwan} 38F. 3d 147 (4\textsuperscript{th} Cir. 1994); \textit{Hopwood v State of Texas} 78, F. 3d 932 (5\textsuperscript{th} Cir. 1996); \textit{Johnson v Board of Regents of the University of Georgia} 106 F. Supp. 2d 1362 (2001) (2001, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit); \textit{Gratz v Bollinger} 539 U.S. 244 (2003), \textit{Fisher v University of Texas at Austin} 570 U.S. ___ (2013), all strain the good faith efforts of PWIs to add racial diversity to their student bodies, leaving the education of Blacks by both HBCUs and PWIs in the balance. The White student collegiate population has actually fared well with regard to college admission options in the post desegregation era, despite arguments of reverse discrimination. Firstly, unlike Black students in PWIs, this student cohort has always had and continue to have access to


\textsuperscript{38} Gasman, et al., “Historically Black Colleges and Universities: Recent Trends.”

\textsuperscript{39} https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004062.pdf

\textsuperscript{40} http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=667

\textsuperscript{41} NCES Digest of Education Statistics, Table 282.
HBCUs as evidenced in the currently increasing White enrollment numbers at HBCUs.

Secondly, the above and other legal challenges with judgements in favor of White plaintiffs charging reverse discrimination in admissions and scholarships processes, and the fact that White students, overall, tend to have K-12 experiences that better prepare them for college entrance evaluations, affording them a wider pool of post-secondary options, demonstrates that they have not only not suffered from desegregation in higher education as a group, but, in some cases, have arguably gained.

In 1976-77, 88% of HBCU degrees were conferred to Black students decreasing to 85.1% in 1993-94. The significant datum, however, is that of all degrees conferred between 1976-77 and 1993-94 to Black students, those from HBCUs declined from 35.4% to 28% respectively.\(^42\)

In the 2010-11 academic year, four-year HBCUs conferred almost 33,000 Bachelor’s degrees.\(^43\) HBCUs have developed stratagems for surviving the battles of segregation, desegregation, limited funding, and scant resources. It appears that one way HBCUs may have managed to counter the declining enrollment of high achieving Black students lured away to selective White institutions is by developing honors programs to meet the unique academic needs of this population that, which, along with their parents, can be attracted to special offerings for high achieving students.

Black Education/HBCUs and Collegiate Honors Education

No study reflecting on the history of HBCUs can do so without embedding it within U.S. history. It is the nation’s story of slavery, war, politics, economics, and segregation that informs the mission of these institutions. The secession and formation of the Confederate States of


\(^{43}\) NCES Digest of Education Statistics, Table 282.
America led to the American Civil War and at its conclusion, Reconstruction -- a very brief process given the lengthy reign of slavery; the process of nation building, which mostly encompassed rebuilding the South, restoring order, and ensuring the civil rights of the newly freed slave. It is this turbulent historical window that gave birth to the Historically Black Colleges and Universities in existence today.

Now, therefore I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as Commander-in-Chief, of the Army and Navy of the United States in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do...order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana...Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia... and which excepted parts, are for the present, left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power, and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States, and parts of States, are, and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.44

The nation was split over the Confederate states’ bloody defeat of the Union’s victory for abolishing slavery. Abraham Lincoln, the 16th president of the United States, had declared the freedom—the 1863 Emancipation Proclamation of enslaved Blacks—although the executive order was not acknowledged by some Confederate states until two years later. It is at this time of the Reconstruction era where the question of educating the freedmen and for what purpose arose. Prominent people of significant influence and wealth as well as grass-root groups took action, campaigned and debated aggressively what the education of Black people should entail, which in turn, was a philosophical debate regarding the role and claim to American democracy to which

44 Excerpts from The Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863.
this community could expect to aspire.\textsuperscript{45} I maintain this era was a turning point in American education, including higher education, because of its influence on the expansion of primary schooling for all children and the higher education system with the creation of what was termed in the future, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and for what would become the demand on the already existing structure that was American higher education.

The period of Reconstruction was 1865-1877. This window in time of less than two decades, not even a generation, was and remains a powerfully impactful period for understanding the history of Black education in the United States. While a battle ensued in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century over the nature and purpose of education for the newly freed Blacks, at the root of these contested philosophical arguments on all sides was an instinctive acknowledgment of the commanding magnitude of education’s potential to single handedly raise the character, political and socio economic stature, and dogged ingenuity of a person and an entire community. Education aroused a sense of freedom—Freedom of one’s mind, physical self, dignity, and audacity to aspire as high as one’s education and training, opportunity, and effort would afford.

Both the Black churches and northern missionaries, who chartered liberal arts schools and colleges, as well as the southern and northern industrialists, who, later—after the Reconstruction period, preferred an education for Blacks that ensured a continued subservience to the White majority, understood both the benefit and the danger, respectively, of what educating the freedmen foreshadowed. The ability to read and to write meant, conceivably, quite literally the difference between bondage and freedom, and later during this period, the difference between becoming a learned man of letters and the liberal arts or a man who learned to tend to a

field. The latter served respectable agricultural and vocational functions but the former provided an independence from a society not willing to eradicate the lucrative free-labor model that was the southern slave system, nor the caste system that safeguarded the majority’s dominance.46

Education served the political purpose of establishing the social order:

> Although traditional planters continued to favor a repressive system of agricultural labor and to discourage working-class literacy, proponents of southern industrialization increasingly viewed mass schooling as a means to produce efficient and contented labor and as a socialization process to instill in black and white children an acceptance of the southern racial hierarchy.47

Perry provides a critical historical observation of how the power of education for African Americans—enslaved, newly freed, and in contemporary times, is synonymous with not just the notion or spirit of freedom but with its very ability to vastly transform one’s image of himself/herself and his/her stationed place in society.48 In her essay, “Freedom for Literacy and Literacy for Freedom: The African-American Philosophy of Education,” Perry, through the use of several first person narratives, asserts that the value of education in the African American community has historically been viewed as a possession that, when acquired, was an asset inextricably linked to one’s mental, even if not yet physical, freedom. In fact, the narratives demonstrate that the ability to read not only equipped an enslaved African with the tools to escape his disconsolate condition but also piqued in him the sense of rebellion and indignant leadership with which to revolt against an antagonistically demeaning system for both himself and his community. It is this awareness of “literacy for freedom, racial uplift, citizenship, and leadership” 49 that made learning and access to education for those groups not considered worthy

47 Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 27.
49 Perry, et al., Young, Gifted, and Black, 6.
of participating in America’s aristocratic brand of democracy such a formidable battle but, nonetheless, worth the crusade.

When people are denied the opportunity to succeed, they desire it even more so. Although histories vary by community, the theme of Perry’s scholarly counter-narrative holds true for any group that has found itself marginalized hoping to utilize education as a ticket to first class seats in America’s economy of both influence and affluence.

Starting with the 1850 U.S. Census, the racial designation “Mulatto” or “M” appeared along with a separate questionnaire schedule. “There were two questionnaires: one for free inhabitants and one for slaves.”50 While the counting was merely an acknowledgment of their status as property, it would also prove helpful for the South to establish its dominance over all Blacks—free and enslaved which necessitated an established societal racial hierarchy. The exigency of this was all the more imperative with the impending dismantling of the slave system; Most Whites believed that “blacks were naturally inferior to Whites, whether as slaves or as free people, and should therefore be disqualified from full participation in American economic, political, and social life.”51 Not educating Blacks would be the most effective way to ensure their disqualification from full societal participation. Simultaneously, over the course of a few years, the (1) first Morrill Act of 1862 which provided for federal support for state higher education systems, (2) the Civil War and the passing of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, (3) Reconstruction and the Freedmen’s Bureau, (4) the Constitutional Amendments 13th, 14th, and 15th, and (5) the development of colleges specifically committed to the education of Black

50 U.S. Census Bureau. ‘Schedule no. 2 Slave Inhabitants.’ https://www.census.gov/history/www/through_the_decades/index_of_questions/1850_1.html
students, all served as climacteric turning points in the nation’s history and that of higher education in the late 19th century. The question of educating the newly freed person, and where and how and for what purposes spurred a rapid increase in institutions and training schools for Black students. Academies (some collegiate precursors), specifically for educating Blacks developed, expanding the institutional landscape.

The Reconstruction Amendments were legal mandates that were triple threats to the Southern order. The amendments were ratified to restore peace to the South and humanity to Blacks through the abolishment of slavery (13th), equal protection and citizenship (14th), and the right to participate in the governing and leadership with the right to cast a ballot (15th). Educating the new citizen, then, was the next obvious task. The amendments, thus, also impacted the higher educational system. The 1862 Morrill Act, passed during the Civil War, provided federal resources to assist states in providing higher education institutions for residents. However, the Act did not impose federal regulations on states. Excluded from White-only institutions partially funded with Morrill Act I, the federal government, in the second Morrill Act (post Reconstruction) provided southern states with funds to create segregated Black state colleges in 1890. These institutions were separate and unequal in terms of facilities, teaching, and resources in comparison to the traditional White institutions. Rather than integrate their main (White) campuses, this arrangement of unequal dual systems was adopted throughout the southern and border states.

When a man is permanently enslaved, what to do with his time or his life is not in question; his master dictates both his day and his tomorrow. When a man becomes free, the questions of his status and how to integrate him into society emanate. How best does a man function and make his way? The corridor to full citizenship requires: appropriate knowledge
(education), earning a living (work and opportunity), and ideally respecting others and the codes of a civil society (moral character and arguably some religiosity).

This exigency is where the northern missionaries rolled up their sleeves to amend centuries of beastly captivity—for generations of forsaken education, respectable work, and independent personhood. The task was to prepare the freed man for effective citizenship and life “on the outside” of slavery. With no agricultural labor market need for free labor in the North and desiring to right the wrong accorded African Americans, northern missionaries penetrated the South with the task of freeing the mind of the physically freed man with a liberal arts education. As mentioned earlier, this attempt to “reconstruct” the South through education was met with opposition from White southerners and northern industrialists who envisioned a future for the freed slaves that resembled a labor and caste system similar to slavery. Everyone had an idea of what post-bellum education should entail. The ferocious fight of educating the freed slaves and the fate of their future had commenced.52

Prior to Reconstruction and freedom and long before the northern invasion, slaves, sneaking under large oak trees or in secret spaces called “hush harbors,” found opportunities to learn to read which in turn “revealed a world beyond bondage in which the African Americans could imagine themselves free to think…because it most often happened in secret, the very act of learning to read and write subverted the master-slave relationship.”53 Even upon emancipation, they began to teach each other through grassroots, self-taught schooling activities.54 Congress created the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands (Freedmen’s Bureau) in 1865
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52 Tasha Levanga Bradley, “The Race to Educate.”
54 Janet Duitsman Cornelius, Slave Missions and the Black Church in the Antebellum South (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).
to assist the South with its transition from a system of slavery to freedom. Education and the financial support to establish day schools, night schools, industrial schools, institutes, and colleges (Howard Normal and Theological Institute, now Howard University, in 1867) which were open to all races was, what one scholar calls, one of the Bureau’s most effective accomplishment.55

At about the same time in 1868 the northerner Samuel Armstrong founded the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. Hampton and later Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee (1881) Institutes were established to deconstruct Reconstruction gains and contribute to “the relegation of black workers to the lowest forms of labor in southern economy, and the establishment of a general southern racial hierarchy.”56 This program was known as the Hampton-Tuskegee Idea. Scantily contented with the notion of educating Black children, White southerners and northern businessmen, who were quick to dismiss teaching Latin and Greek yet strategic to ensure an industrial education that kept Black youth tied to a low social station, joined Armstrong in his vision or solution, rather, to maintaining a cheap labor force, sustaining the agrarian economy, and settling for strong southern White dominance. Other scholars’ views of the northern philanthropists is that of a more neutral partner, careful to respect the fragile post-Civil War north-south relations. Curti and Nash (1965), writing in the pre-revisionist era, viewed the motivations of philanthropists and northerners as sympathetic. The authors illustrate the favoritism towards White leaders,

The agents selected to administer the Peabody Fund... followed the principle of cooperating with Southern opinion. This meant vocational training [was] promoted...In the early years the General Education Board followed a similar policy of respecting the

feelings of Southern whites. This, its leaders deemed essential for the success of any program of Negro education. 57

The authors go on to explain that the northern industrialists could not advance “a more liberal stance [as it] “would have so aroused the Southern white” so as to undermine greater efforts to provide educational opportunities to the Negro. 58 Curti and Nash’s analysis does have grounding, at least with the General Education Board (GEB) that felt its hands were tied. The GEB dissolved in 1964. In their 1964 Review and Final Report of efforts supporting “Negro Education,” they wrote of the tension of working with White southerners, reporting,

A number of white Southerners held an ingrained conviction that the Negro could not and should not be educated at all…even thirty or forty years after Reconstruction, any attempt at educating the Negroes represented a Yankee plot to impose an alien culture…fearing to wreck its entire Southern program by arousing antagonism, the General Education Board at first moved slowly in developing its program in Negro education. The bulk of its donations in this field in the early days went to schools that emphasized agricultural and industrial training in the pattern of Hampton and Tuskegee institutes…The manual training idea…bore a somewhat harmonious relationship to Southern prejudices: they provided a concept of Negro education the South found easiest to accept. 59

The report recognized criticism the organization later received for supporting the industrial training agenda. In defending the Board’s choices, it commented that for such critics the approach that the Board assumed “should be understood in the light of its educational era…sixty years ago there was no alternative to this approach; there was no public opinion to support any other course. For those who were concerned with the development of Negro leadership through education this was the only route to follow.” 60 In a 1916 survey commissioned by the federal

58 Curti and Nash, Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education.
government with the support of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, Thomas Jesse Jones completed a report entitled *Negro Education*. In it he explained,

> The guiding principle of the General Education Board [GEB] in all its efforts in behalf of Negro education is cooperation, first of all with the [White] public authorities…Its [the Board’s] activities have included improvement of country life through farm demonstration work and boys’ and girls’ clubs in such projects as the cultivation and canning of vegetables.61

This priority to cooperate with and appease the southern Whites left little possibility for an education more sophisticated than canning and farming.

Among many, three major corporate funding sources—The General Education Board, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and the Carnegie Foundation, supported Black education. Monies from these corporations were funneled to education programs such as the homemakers’ club and farm-demonstration movement, “the most important effort [of] the General Education Board.”62 At the level of over $63 million, the General Education Board contributed the most financial support to Black education between the years 1902-1964.63 Smaller but still significant stewards of multiple other funding arms donated appropriations for the training and travel of industrial teachers and courses throughout the South. The Anna T. Jeanes Fund’s sizable $1,000,000 gift supported the “expenses of supervisors and industrial teachers.” Julius Rosenwald, a mid-westerner from Chicago and owner of the Sears Roebuck and Company, contributed to the southern “negro” education movement with his “announcement through Tuskegee Institute that he would give money to assist in the erection of rural school buildings for Negroes.”64 The businessmen residing outside the south certainly had an interest in how Black education would be managed in
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the south. This interest did not likely represent a change in sentiment towards members of the
Black race; it was more conceivably a methodical controlling of a labor force and the
preservation of a bi-structural social and class culture.

Regardless of one’s read of history or the intent of the industrial philanthropists, the
outcome of where corporate money was funneled in these early years is constant. Financial
support from wealthy northern corporations fed the vision for industrial education. Armstrong
was able to underwrite the Hampton-Tuskegee program for industrial training with influential
board members and financial capital of northern philanthropists like George Foster Peabody and
Rockefeller, which secured the industrial program’s position and presented a formidable
opposition to the Black churches and northern missionaries who struggled with meager resources
that propagated liberal education and Black self-leadership. 65

The dismantling of the Reconstruction amendments and the rise of Jim Crow were all
indications of the South exercising states’ rights and its intent to hold tightly on to a social order
of White superiority free from northern interference as negotiated in the 1876 Tilden-Hayes
presidential election that compromised Blacks and their Reconstruction political gains.66
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66 Presidential election between Democrat Samuel J. Tilden and Republican Rutherford B. Hayes. Hayes becomes
19th president with agreement that he would remove remaining federal troops from the south (FL and LA) if the
Republican-controlled state house of representatives would allow electoral commission to take effect, handing
Hayes the presidency. This was a move that sealed the fate and status of Black America and repealed political
Reconstruction gains in the Black community. White segregationists were able to resume White domination. Jim
Crow laws soon set in to keep Blacks in place.
the passage of the Second Morrill Act of 1890, the federal government provided funds to states that used race as a criteria for admission to the White campuses (discrimination based upon race). With this, additional state land grant institutions for African Americans joined the growing private colleges, thus expanding the scope and supposed opportunities within higher education for freed Blacks in the segregated south. Unfortunately, the opportunities for African Americans were less so as these institutions were grossly under resourced. “Although unintentional, the Second Morrill Act of 1890 cemented the prevailing doctrine of segregation; it formalized the manifestation of separate but unequal in higher education.”67

Education is fundamentally political; this is evident in every aspect of its development. The education of Blacks bears proof of its political nature more so than for any other group in the history of higher education in the U.S. From the position of not educating southern Blacks at all to the divisive debates of industrial labor (the Hampton-Tuskegee Idea) education versus liberal education, to wealthy corporations and their accrediting agencies such as the General Education Board’s denial or investment of funding to institutions based upon its own educational ideology, the education of the southern Black has endured the lengthiest chronology of deliberation. This is a debate that expanded from slavery and Reconstruction through decades of desegregation in the mid twentieth century; the underbelly of this conundrum being the “place” of Blacks in White America.

For example, industrial philanthropists supported a position that resisted education as a means to developing Black leadership so as to maintain a caste system. However, when accreditation systems required minimal standards that Hampton-Tuskegee industrial training graduates failed to meet, they looked to use education as a manipulative means of controlling the

---

cultivation of the “right” type of Black leadership, one that would accommodate a subordinated position within a socially stratified society.  

According to Gasman, in 1915, industrial philanthropists conceded that “industrial education could coexist with a more academic curriculum,” and they used their wealth to purchase Black college cooperation and “not jeopardize[ing] their business interests…favor[ing] leaders (typically White men) who upheld southern social norms.” According to Peterkin, “presidents James G. Merrill (1890-1908) and George A. Gates (1909-1912) [of Fisk University] walked the uneasy line between what influential donors like the Slater Fund wanted to see in terms of industrial education and what Fisk trustees expected in terms of curricular development in the liberal arts.” The industrial philanthropists’ approach to Black learning, then, was a political and economic social campaign.

Black colleges and universities, both private and public, came under pressure to meet accreditation standards in the early twentieth century as they were compelled to do away with high school programs, maintaining only collegiate level curricula. Additional challenges were related to insufficient financial resources and endowments, lack of quality teaching and inadequate salaries.71 With philanthropies such as the Ford Foundation providing financing pre-1950s, monetary challenges kept private Black institutions somewhat married to philanthropic wealth, often maintaining a delicate balance between a commitment to a liberal arts ideology (Fisk and Howard universities, for example) and pleasing the sensibilities of wealthy donors.72
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Affiliated with a branch of the Methodist church, Morgan was different in that it did not have to appease affluent benefactors. Morgan adopted liberal arts and professional (teaching) programs very early on in its history and earned accreditation in the earlier part of the twentieth century. These facts and other evidence were consulted to construct an historical narrative of the institution’s history.

**Historical Methods**

Qualitative in nature, historical research is an interpretive, inductive process.\(^7^3\) I relied on evidence from primary sources along with oral histories to construct and analyze the events leading to the development of honors education at Morgan State University within the context of the pre and post-desegregation era of the United States. Sources included archival data culled from university libraries, archives, and personal collections held by faculty and former administrators of honors programs. Furthermore, oral histories were conducted with university administrators and faculty who were or are engaged with collegiate honors education. At the outset of this study, two archival sources in particular were at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Although diverse and varied, HBCUs as an institution share a singular value of educating African-Americans as well as a rich history that dates back to, and for some colleges (Lincoln University, Cheyney University, and Wilberforce University) prior to the Civil War. Despite the history of almost two centennials, educational researchers are challenged to retrieve archival data that comprehensively evidences the years of groundwork, ingenuity, and celebration of institutions that have steadily provided access for African-Americans when it was

not available in predominately White colleges and universities and that boasts many of the nation’s top educated African-American leaders and professionals among its alumni.

A professor of history at an HBCU recently stated that, “HBCUs are not good at documenting their history.” Further, Paris and Gasman have noted, “One problem immediately encountered in researching Black higher education, however, is the diffuse location of archival sources.” Invaluable documents in the form of memos, pictures, audio, founding charters, and presidential papers can be among personal possessions or among the holdings of the very “philanthropic and church organizations that established” the HBCUs. The authors point out that this concern does not hold true across the board for all HBCUs. Given the varied resources and endowments, some have well established archival collections and staffs of professional archivists and others have less impressive resources. In conducting research for this study, the process of undertaking archival research was both exhilarating and frustrating. It became both apparent and necessary, then, to support and complete data found (or absent) in the archives and literature research with oral histories from those whose memories are the sole archive from which I could gather certain data.

This study’s focus narrowed to one institution to allow for a closer examination of the development of events of a “quasi-independent” institution that evolved from an established private institution to one that sits within a larger context of a state public higher education system. The history of Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland is inextricably tied to
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that of the state in which it resides and the state’s system of higher education and relationship with its Black citizens. Peeling away the layers of this interdependent relationship demands a closer investigation of the intricate dynamic.

Retired administrators offer valuable sources of information unavailable elsewhere. Once archived, these and other interviews will become valid documented articles of evidence alongside those data that are in the form of written manuscript. While it is fortunate for researchers to interview those who have made history, this is not often the case. For example, the archives led me to names of former administrators who are no longer alive. Some of these individuals, who actually passed not long ago, would have been key participants for this study. Researchers looking to expand upon this work will be able to consult the interviews I have conducted for this study as a source for future resources, as my “notes, recordings, and transcripts of interviews therefore become valuable sources for other researchers, who no longer have access to the deceased”78

In an attempt to understand the development of Honors education at an HBCU, I interviewed five administrators, faculty, and staff as well and gathered documents from archival repositories from Morgan State University and other higher education institutions. I conducted initial ninety minute interviews and followed up with questions via electronic mail as necessary with participants as themes emerged across interviews. Interviewing former administrators who developed honors programs assisted in understanding the challenges that have created that which is in place at the time of this study. In doing so, I was able to capture documentation that is both

a reflective story, which allowed participants to recall what they did, and a documentation of current accounts of progress for those who were able to speak to the “history” still in the making.

Utilizing oral histories as alternatives to documents was not always an acceptable standard for historical research. Leading American universities in the early 20th century concerned themselves with the mounting rigor and reputation in research and advanced scholarship that rivaled European, especially German, institutions.79 In the beginning of the 20th century, the trend of the apprenticeship model and studying under a practitioner gave way to proprietary schools which soon developed into or became affiliated with universities requiring higher standards for professional and graduate school studies.80 Scholarship itself also looked different in that it was more interdisciplinary, requiring students to pursue a broader course of study. According to Brubacher and Rudy, colleges and universities began to participate in regulation and evaluation processes via state examining authorities, professional associations, and associations of professional schools. Presidents and faculty of the most leading American Ph.D. degree granting institutions, many of whom who had themselves studied at European institutions and possessed an immense admiration and respect for the rigor and advanced studies that characterized those systems, and who were concerned with the quality and reputation of the American system, mobilized to develop undergraduate and institutional criterion for American higher education and research. Indeed, many of the top institutions’ “key positions, both in scholarship and in administration, were held by men whose doctorates from Berlin or Göttingen were their proudest possessions.”81 These leaders also knew their American institutions were not
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on par with European higher education, especially German institutions that were well known for their scholarship and preparing students for advanced studies. “American institutions got little respect from the major universities in Europe. U.S. students were flocked to European universities for graduate degrees and the European view of U.S. academic degrees was less than flattering.”

In order to salvage their reputation and keep their best students on American soil and in American schools, these leaders needed to both set themselves apart from as well as raise the bar of weaker American colleges. Founded in 1900 to address research standards and uniformity, the American Association of Universities (AAU) hoped to prepare its students for graduate work and to establish what would be the common characteristics and ideal standards among serious research institutions. In doing so, they could proudly send strong students to their European colleagues as well as compete with them for top students seeking advanced educational opportunities. Among AAU’s initial members are some of the same premier institutions today: The Catholic University of America, Clark University, Columbia University, Cornell, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Princeton, Stanford, University of California Berkeley, University of Chicago, University of Michigan, University of Pennsylvania, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Yale University. If nothing else, the presidents of these institutions succeeded in garnering European recognition and carving out an identity dedicated to advanced scholarship and research preparation as German schools, which “had long been the Mecca of American scholars,” began to consult AAU for its own graduate admission processes. Even more so, “the prestige of these fourteen schools gave them great leverage over those developing institutions that wished to join this exclusive club,” enabling it to operate as an accrediting body.
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guiding colleges and universities and their respective research methodologies toward its educational values. 84 Having gone to great lengths to mimic European research standards, American scholars would continue to align with standards determined by European scholars including the opinion of oral history as a rigorous research method.

According to Donald Ritchie, the oral accounting of events dates back to civilization and thus,

it seemed reasonable to consult oral as well as written sources until the late nineteenth century, when the German school of scientific history promoted documentary research to the exclusion of other, less “objective” sources. Leopold von Ranke asserted that documents created at the time historical events occurred are the most reliable form of historical evidence; Ranke’s followers helped turn history from a literary form into an academic discipline dependent on the rigorous use of evidence. They trained historians to scrutinize documents in their search for truth and dismissed oral sources as folklore and myth. 85

Following the lead of German scholarship, then, would have been expected as the U.S. would seek to be measured by German standards. As German scholars came to view oral history as an unscientific method of researching the truth in history, American scholars followed suit. 86

This study of Morgan is inclusive of oral history which is a “systematic collection of living people’s testimony about their own experiences.” 87 Oral histories allow us to reclaim data through stories in the absence of or in tandem with written documentation. A shift in U.S. regard of storytelling as researched history did begin to occur. Oral histories as a valid way of documenting history became more prominent in the U.S. after historians began to value the interviews from the 1930s that were commissioned by the Federal Writers’ Project of the Works

86 Ritchie, Doing Oral History.
Progress Administration (WPA). These interviews recorded the histories of the lives of citizens, including those who were former slaves.\(^\text{88}\) History is often understood through manuscripts and official papers of nation leaders and governmental accounts. Notwithstanding critiques of the Slave Narratives and any oral history that should be subjected to critical consideration of the dynamics of the interview and positionality of the interviewer, the oral histories such as those of the WPA permit an accounting and more complete and contextual understanding of history from otherwise “unofficial” sources, especially those from marginalized groups.\(^\text{89}\) The primary intention of Critical Race Theory is to lift the voices of marginalized groups from silence. This framework, then, couples well with the use of oral histories.

Oral history is a sound research method of analysis useful in advancing educational research because the process, when triangulated with written documents and other forms of historical evidence, affords a grounded approach to developing and discovering new knowledge. Educational researchers who utilize qualitative research methods, and oral histories in particular, are careful to socially construct stories as a way of contextualizing oral histories, thereby providing meaningful explanation of a phenomenon. Founded in the field of sociology, grounded theory allows themes and theories to evolve through a continuous process of data collection and analysis.\(^\text{90}\)

---

PBS: http://www.pbs.org/wnet/slavery/resources/wpa.html

\(^\text{89}\) There was concern that the African American former slave participants who were being interviewed by mostly White interviewers self-censored and answered questions as they thought the interviewer might want to hear. “The Limitations of the Slave Narrative Collection: Race and Representativeness.” http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/snhtml/snintro15.html

Archival research for this study was conducted mostly at the Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department at Morgan State University; the Special Collections & University Archives at the University of Maryland Libraries; the Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives of the Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, the home of the religious organization that founded Morgan; and peripherally at the Howard University Archives. I also utilized primary sources from the archives department of the University of Colorado Boulder Libraries. Additionally, I made use of the on-line archives of the Baltimore *Afro-American* newspaper. I found that Paris and Gasman’s assertion concerning archives at HBCUs held true in that with the two well-funded, predominately White public universities, on-line finding aids assisted in an uncomplicated search for documents.91 In contrast, at another HBCU, for example, rather than in the university’s archives, honors program documents were retrieved from a box after a chance encounter in an honors program director’s office which led to the finding of inadequate or fragmented documents. I was aptly warned by the director that due to a relocation of office spaces, “my administrative assistant at the time made the judgment call as to what [documents] to save.”92 At Morgan State University, I also unearthed critical documents by following leads to out-of-state family members of former faculty and staff members. One grandson, serving as a “finding aid,” referred me to his mother who gathered old papers saved in a file box by one of her parents and allowed me access to review them. In these papers were vital documents that were once gaps in the data. Without these papers, I was left questioning either my participants’ recall of an event or the significance of the event itself. By accessing these data, I was able to weave together the tapestry of the interviews. At once, I knew that I knew what I needed to

---

91 Paris and Gasman, “Researching Historically Black Colleges.”
92 Email correspondence with Howard University faculty member. June 24, 2014.
know. These two examples are not indictments of the institutions but do serve as compelling examples of the unnecessary disparity of resources that exist between Black and White institutions and ultimately, in the larger scope of our collective knowledge of the history of higher education, whose historical narrative is worthy of preservation.

The traditional positivist approach to the “scientific” method utilizes methodologies such as hypothesis testing and the researcher supposes an objective, distant approach to analyzing data. Social science researchers are far more explicitly value-laden, often incorporating and bringing multiple lenses to their analyses. The researcher’s personal identity and affiliations or “positionality” is often also addressed. Positionality is the awareness of and conscious attention to one’s intersectional identities, privileges and affiliations and how they shape one’s research and epistemology. For example, I am a Black person native to the city of Baltimore, who grew up within walking distance to Morgan State University. Despite my physical proximity to the university, my knowledge of it, with the exception of the homecoming parade that marched through my neighborhood, and my knowledge of HBCUs in general was sparse. As such, I approached members of this community as an outsider. While my racial identity may have assisted in my access to participants, I was duly warned by one to, “please do us right,” meaning, avoid hurting the image of the institution and reminding me that I was an outsider to whom trust was being cautiously extended. I owe this caution in part to a sense of protection of and commitment to the institution the participants exhibited, a theme that will be discussed later. I also believe that leaders of HBCUs are generally suspicious of outsiders given the negative critiques by researchers who often were not knowledgeable of these institutions and who, in their color-blind approach to research, were likely “not mindful of the enormous role of their own and

---

others’ racialized positionality and cultural ways of knowing.”

Further, most of my interviews were allowed (or communications responded to) only after being introduced by a staff member who granted me a stamp of approval. Being Black alone was not enough as I had to earn the trust of the participants through rapport established in the interviews and strategies such as member checking, a process affording participants review of interview transcripts. That said, I am confident that some of the painful personal elements of the participants’ stories surrounding racism were shared with me due to presumed allegiance to the Black experience. I doubt they would have shared some of these specifics if I belonged to another racial group and they did not have the comfort in assuming I could relate to these experiences, a concern that was a prime critique of White interviewers under harsh Jim Crow conditions of the 1930s WPA Slave Narratives. This level of rapport paved the way to access to subsequent participants. I also bring to this study over twenty years of professional work in collegiate honors education at one of the state’s PWIs. Both my personal and professional backgrounds, while they afforded me insight, access, and an intense investment in this study, also require that I fervently attend to maintaining a scholar’s critical eye to the data and that I recognize that the very topic of this study undoubtedly reflects my political and social context.

Even more than attending to positionality, historians are interpreters, weighing evidence of events in their context to produce an historical explanation of events, places, and people. Using the historians’ methods of analysis, I will analyze events—the development of honors programs at an HBCU, within a broader context—in both the segregation and desegregation

---


eras, to construct an historical narrative. Thus, while not employing a causal approach to
analysis, the study of people—their motives, positions of power, and the era, and the subsequent
sequence of events that eventually become history—do begin to explain how multiple
“variables” are inherently dependent rather than independent, unrelated circumstances.

Historians synthesize data from multiple primary and secondary sources such as print media,
personal letters, official documents, census data, photographs and interviews, in an attempt to
verify and construct historical timelines and narratives, an analytical process that social scientists
refer to as triangulation. Triangulation is a method that allows researchers to check the validity
from more than one source.

For example, how “accurate” is my interpretation of an event supported by evidence of a
news article along with accounts found in a personal correspondence? In the following example,
to ensure a critical review of documents, I, for instance, interrogated primary sources found
among the correspondence of university president Harry Clifton (H.C.) Byrd such as (1) his role
and position of power, (2) biases, his invested interests, (3) with whom he was corresponding
and for what reasons, and (4) what viewpoints are reflected in the correspondence. I also
examined use of language in relation to the language of the era, finally rendering interpretations
of what influences these interrogations had, if any, on leading events.

Writing history requires a critical examination of sources. I made use of personal
correspondence by Harry Clifton (H.C.) Byrd, former president of the University of Maryland as
an example of how I needed to critically examine a primary source. In his letter to Roger Howell,
Byrd expresses his intent to resist the Maryland state court’s decisions requiring him to admit
Donald Gaines Murray.96 Beginning at the top of the document, I took note of the 1935 date in order to also consider what other historical events were unfolding during this time frame. In this particular instance, the University of Maryland is responding to the court ruling ordering Murray’s admittance to its law school. Important to analysis of both the sender and recipient of this correspondence is the critical role and position of power or disempowerment. A telling observation is that this letter is not written on official university letterhead, indicating a personal exchange. The correspondence, dated July 16, 1935, is written to Roger Howell, the dean of the University of Maryland Law School to an address that could be a vacation location—Great Chebeague Island, Maine. The letter reads as if Byrd is consoling the dean on the court ruling and encouraging him to hold off “register[ing] any Negroes.” Other documents, such as catalogues and programs of the law school where Byrd served as keynote speaker may suggest that the two shared a friendship or personal rapport that extended beyond their roles as University of Maryland administrators. Another interpretation is that their influential roles as administrators speaks to a shared cooperation of interests: neither being willing to comply with the ruling to desegregate. As the president of the undergraduate campus as well as the professional schools, Byrd’s resistance was likely due in part to his concern that a desegregated law school would soon lead to desegregating the main undergraduate campus as well.

This particular primary source was retrieved from the Special Collections & University Archives at the University of Maryland Libraries facility, which boasts a well-resourced archive.

96 Pearson v Murray 169 Md. 478,182 A. 590 (1936). (Also known as Murray v Maryland). Donald Murray, a Black man from Baltimore City and recent graduate of Amherst College who sought to extend his education with legal professional school, applied to attend the University of Maryland Law School. He was admitted and the decision was rescinded based upon his race. Murray sued the university system and won. The University of Maryland was ordered to desegregate the law school. Peter Wallenstein, Higher Education and the Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black Southerners, and College Campuses (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008).
While the history of Morgan State University is linked to the larger University of Maryland history—Byrd hoped to establish a law school at Morgan State College (its former name) to thwart the desegregation of the University of Maryland; thus, the latter and its archives are tangential to this study. The archives of Morgan State University were the principal site for primary sources. As stated earlier, the resources of this institution presented a challenge to unearthing data. One challenge throughout this study, and with archival research in general, is deciding how to handle incomplete data. In my research for this study, it was clear to me that it was necessary to consider broadly other source places for data. In doing so, I was faced with the challenge of determining when the data I had was complete or when I needed to consult with other historians to inform my interpretation of the data. The ability to reconcile the dialogue between documents and oral histories, the similarity of challenges among other southern state systems and HBCUs, and matters of desegregation at both the state and national level brought the historical data points of this study to a point of clarity which allowed me to conclude that the data available to me had been exhausted and complete for the purposes of this study.97 Carl Kaestle cites the corroboration of such evidence as the beginning of when “things start falling into place,” for historical claims that can build consensual truths.98

Companion to the determination of exhausted data, historians have also grappled with the notion of truth and what truths—whose narratives best represent past events and how does one feature those claims considering the truths of their own positionality. While the research standard for early twentieth century historians was so-called objectivity, today’s scholars, who represent diverse ethnic, gender, and disciplinary backgrounds, such as women’s history, have shifted the

standard of truth and knowledge toward a more relativistic and dynamic pursuit where there exists "lots of historical truths around." With its attention to matters of race and the intersection of multiple identities, Critical Race Theory supports a rich analysis of contextualized data.

A Case for the Murray Case

The beginning of the Black Civil Rights Movement is often identified as budding in the mid-1950s with the Montgomery bus boycott, sit-ins, and marches. The legal case often associated with the movement is the landmark *Brown v the Board of Education* (1954). In higher education literature, *Missouri ex rel. Gaines v Canada*, 305 U.S. 337 (1938), because it was the first successful U.S. Supreme Court higher education desegregation challenge, is often highlighted. A couple of legal cases post World War II but prior to *Brown* are often discussed as having impacted the desegregation of higher education. These are *Sipuel v Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma*, 332 U.S. 631 (1948) and *Sweatt v Painter* 339 U.S. 629 (1950), both challenges to racially restrictive law school admission policies. Within higher education literature, however, the case involving Donald Murray’s law school challenge is rarely mentioned. For example, the *History of Higher Education Annual*, the only journal specific to the history of higher education, has not provided an analysis of the Murray case and its role in higher education. In their book, *Higher Education for African-Americans before the Civil Rights Era, 1900-1964*, leading higher education historians Roger L. Geiger and Marybeth Gasman wrote that “between 1936 and 1950, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund fought and won several

---


Kaestle, “Standards of Evidence in Historical Research.”

100 Another Supreme Court suit was *McLaurin v Oklahoma State Regents*, 339 U.S. 637 (1950). George McLaurin was admitted to graduate school but experienced segregation within the school as he was forced to sit in the hallway outside the classroom and with segregated access to services and facilities such as the library and dining hall.
cases that made the out-of-state scholarships unconstitutional as a substitute for equal opportunities at home,” but made no direct mention of the 1936 *Murray* challenge. Instead, the authors cited *Missouri ex rel. Gaines v Canada* (1938) and later cases as having shaped desegregation in higher education. In another article that surveyed the “legal and social forces that have had an impact of the development of HBCUs,” Gasman and Hilton do provide a brief overview of *Murray*, but because this article offers a cursory review of legal cases and legislation from the Freedmen’s Bureau in 1865 through the signing of an Executive Order in 2010, a detailed analysis of *Murray* was not included. Generally, the higher education literature has not fully examined the *Murray* challenge, perhaps because, although the first desegregation challenge was successful, it was so at the state versus the U.S. Supreme Court level.

Historian Peter Wallenstein has provided one of the most helpful backgrounds on the individuals involved in the *Murray* case and its ruling in his edited volume, *Higher Education and the Civil Rights Movement*. Wallenstein traces the legal challenges to southern White higher education institutions and those pioneers who were among the first to desegregate these campuses. In his book, *Simple Justice*, social historian Richard Kluger offers an interesting angle of the *Murray* trial providing “court side” details, affording readers a glimpse into the case’s unfolding with testimonial transcripts that exhibit Charles Houston’s (Murray’s lead attorney) competent examination skills. Kluger pointed out that *Murray*’s success was due in large part

to Houston’s astute strategy to selecting the state of Maryland as the test case for its legal challenge, writing “the wisdom of bringing the case in Maryland in the first place was evidence by the state’s decision not to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.”105 After losing both at the District and Appeals Court levels, the state surmised that its chances of a U.S. Supreme Court turnover were slim. It is also possible that the state’s attorneys reasoned that a U.S. Supreme Court ruling would necessitate full desegregation of all its campuses, especially the undergraduate campus and that with the state level ruling, the decision could be contained to the law school only. It is likely that these were their thoughts but it is doubtful that they exercised that level of hindsight. In any event, that Murray was not a U.S. Supreme Court decision with national impact is likely the reason that it is not viewed as a significant case outside the state of Maryland. Although it set precedent elsewhere, even within Maryland, Murray did not alter behavior as the state continued to resist and maintain segregation unless legally challenged, such as in the nursing school desegregation case involving plaintiff Esther McCready.106

Gasman and Hilton’s assessment of Gaines is that it “was a significant development of HBCUs because after Gaines, states could no longer ignore their constitutional obligation to provide in-state graduate higher educational opportunities for Black students.”107 Despite Murray’s limited reach, I maintain that the case is far more significant than credited. It was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)’s first successful challenge in higher education and the legal strategy the lawyers used in Murray—arguing the 14th

106 McCready v Byrd, 195 MD 131(1949).
amendment, that set in motion a formula in the courtroom that would shake up the system of segregation further down the legal road. At a minimum, the benefit of closely examining Murray and the state’s belligerent and desperate response to it, is that it serves a very demonstrative purpose in understanding the Maryland state system of higher education, and, subsequently the environment in which Morgan had to find its way, often fending for itself. This history also informs our understanding of Morgan’s stubborn insistence for providing quality collegiate Black education and ensuring that no talent was wasted. We learn that the development of honors education for high ability students was, in effect, simply an extension and expression of educational access and freedom that Morgan held for all its students. I will discuss later in the study the attempts by the state to avert compliance with the Murray ruling and the state’s blatant disregard of desegregation attempts that followed Murray. Donald Gaines Murray, Esq. helps us to understand Maryland’s political and moral position as a state during the first half of the 1900s and, because of this, unfortunately, we come to recognize that we of the later generation will never fully grasp the personal sacrifice Mr. Murray and other victims who became volunteer soldiers in the courtroom, endured in serving on the front lines, simply for the right of equal education.108

Fortunately, law Professor Leland Ware, does go a long way in locating Murray in its proper context and position in the chronology of the Civil Rights Movement timeline in his article, Setting the Stage for Brown.109 Ware cited that the litigation campaign that the NAACP

---

108 The personal and emotional cost of these plaintiffs during Jim Crow and also their families also serve as significant historical data. Speculation is that Lloyd Gaines was either murdered or committed suicide from the stress of being in the case’s spotlight. Donald Murray received death threats. See, “University of Maryland Applicant Gets Threatening Letter: Note of Warning Sent Murray as Regents Appeal,” Afro-American (1893-1988), Jun 29, 1935. http://search.proquest.com/docview/531036602?accountid=14696.

launched in the 1930s is less remembered than the community demonstrations such as protest marches, assaults on freedom riders and volatile uses of fire hoses. He pointed out, however, that those critical litigation suits were what led to Brown’s success, Murray being the first of these. In 1933, the NAACP produced the Margold Report, named for the NAACP White staff attorney, Nathan Ross Margold.\textsuperscript{110} The report suggested a legal strategy that would challenge southern states’ separate but equal policy and expose the fallacy of equal facilities. When Charles Hamilton Houston, former Dean of Howard University’s law school, became the lead counsel for the organization’s defense team, he adjusted Margold’s (his Harvard Law school classmate) suggestions to include an equalization strategy. According to Ware, Houston’s arguments closely aligned with the \textit{Plessy v Ferguson}, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), separate but equal doctrine. In doing so, Houston, who chose to focus on graduate and professional schools, gambled that southern states would not have the resources to establish equal facilities, and thus would be forced to segregate. Houston anticipated that Murray would go to the Supreme Court. In fact, he seemed hopeful that it would so that it would open up graduate and professional schools across the nation. In charting the NAACP’s success in earlier cases, beginning with Murray, Ware categorically establishes how the most celebrated desegregation case, Brown, would not have been possible, thus substantiating the significance the Murray case should hold for higher education historians. Murray, wrote Ware, “provided a critical boost in the Civil Rights Movement” in that attorneys in other states were eager to file law suits, students were willing to serve as plaintiffs, and the Black community galvanized its voice and audacity to make history by forcing change.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{111} Ware, “Setting the Stage for Brown,” 652.
TIMELINE
Race, Segregation, and the Education of Blacks in the State of Maryland:
Pivotal Historical Events and Dates Influencing HBCUs, Morgan, and the State of Maryland,
1787-1988\textsuperscript{112}

1787  Sharp St. Church is founded by free Blacks who establish the Colored Methodist Society after breaking from the segregated Lovely Lane Meeting House

1797/1807  School to teach Black children established by Daniel Coker (born Isaac Wright), a Black Methodist minister who was born into slavery even though his mother was White. Coker changed his name after being bought from slavery (or purchasing his own freedom).\textsuperscript{113}

1802  The Colored Methodist Society purchases building; 112-116 Sharp Street.

1823  Maryland School of Law founded by David Hoffman—privately operated\textsuperscript{114}

1826  State of MD takes over law school

1833  State discontinues law school classes due to disagreements with Hoffman

1856  Maryland Agriculture College chartered (opened in 1859)

1857  March 6. \textit{Dred Scott v Sandford} 60 U.S. 393 (1857)

1861  Civil War begins

1862  July 2. Morrill Act legislation signed by President Abraham Lincoln; federal funding for the establishment of state Land Grant colleges

1863  January 1. President Lincoln signs Emancipation Proclamation, freeing all slaves

1863  January 1. Reconstruction begins

1864  First conference of Black ministers organized at Sharp Street Church

1865  Civil War ends

1865  April 14. President Abraham Lincoln assassinated by Marylander, John Wilkes Booth

1865  Freedmen’s Bureau (U.S. Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands) is established by Congress

\textsuperscript{112} This list is not meant to be exhaustive. It represents data as detailed in this dissertation. Scholars are invited to add to it in order to extend our collective knowledge on the status of Black education both nationally and within the state of Maryland. Additionally, I urge the development of historical timelines such as this for all the southern and border states that denied Blacks higher educational access.

\textsuperscript{113} Accounts suggest that the school was sponsored by the Colored Methodist Society. The Sharp St. Church written history identified 1797 as the first school to teach Black children to read; a February 19, 1998 \textit{Baltimore Sun} article entitled, “Daniel Coker, Community Leader,” written by Dr. Elmer Palmer, co-founder of the Great Black in Wax Museum located in Baltimore City, identified 1807 as the date in which Coker founded a school. There could have been two different schools as the 1807 date is believed to have resided in the Bethel AME Church. Either narrative illustrates early agency on behalf of Black ministers assuming educational responsibilities for the Black community as well as an open defiance against laws that prohibited such activity.

\textsuperscript{114} Most data regarding the Maryland School of Law 1823-1890 for this timeline was retrieved from: David Skillen Bogden “The First Integration of the University of Maryland School of Law” \textit{Maryland Historical Society Magazine} 84, 1 (spring 1989): 39-49. *Similar to the Honorable Justice Thurgood Marshall who was denied enrollment to the University of Maryland Law School based upon race but was able to later successfully sue the University of Maryland with the \textit{Murray} case, Hawkins was later avenged of his racial mistreatment as a law student as he later “led a successful court fight to overturn a series of residential segregation laws in Baltimore City.” Bogden, “The First Integration,” 1989, 45. Regarding Hawkins, see also Pietila. In addition to his real estate litigation, Pietela writes that Hawkins and DuBois were good friends and credits Hawkins for founding the NAACP legal department. \textit{Not in my Neighborhood}, (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee Publisher, 2010), 16.
1867  Centenary Biblical Institute is established in Baltimore, MD
First classes of Centenary Biblical Institute held at the Sharp Street Memorial
United Methodist Church
1870  Law school reopens and resumes courses
1874  Women admitted to Centenary Biblical Institute’s Normal department
1876  Presidential election between Democrat Samuel J. Tilden and Republican
Rutherford B. Hayes. Hayes becomes 19th president with agreement that he would
remove remaining federal troops from the south (FL and LA) if the Republican
controlled state house of representatives would allow electoral commission to take
effect, handing Hayes the presidency. This was a move that sealed the fate
and status of Black America and repealed political Reconstruction gains in the
Black community. White segregationists were able to resume White domination.
Jim Crow laws soon set in to keep Blacks in place.

1877  March 31. Reconstruction officially ends
1887  Delaware Conference Academy is established
1887  First Blacks admitted to Maryland School of Law: Cummings and Johnson
1889  November. Two more Blacks enroll in law school: John L. Dozier and William
Ashbie Hawkins (Hawkins is graduate of Centenary Biblical Institute)
1889-90  White law students, by majority, protest Black admissions and petition to
have Dozier and Hawkins dismissed
1890  Centenary Biblical Institute renamed Morgan College
1890  September. Law school decides, with support of Regents, to no longer admit
Blacks and expel Dozier and Hawkins who finish their law school education at
Howard University
1890  Baltimore University Law School opens giving protesting segregationists at the
Maryland School of Law a competing alternative and leverage to force Dozier’s
and Hawkins expulsion
1890  U.S. Congress passes Second Morrill Act for the establishment or expansion
of Land Grant colleges for the equal division of funds for “Colored” and White
students/institutions
1890  Delaware Conference Academy name changed to Princess Anne Academy
1891  State of Maryland appropriates one-fifth of Second Morrill Act funds to Morgan
for the support of Princess Anne Academy
1896  *Plessy v Ferguson* 163 U.S. 537 (1896) rules “separate but equal”
1913-17  Morgan faces litigation and hostile challenges from White neighborhood
associations as the president and Board of Trustees sought a location for the
institution
1916  Maryland Agriculture College becomes Maryland State College of Agriculture
with state assuming full control
1917  November 5. *Buchanan v Warley*. 133 Md. 264; 105 A. 157; 1918 Md ; the
Supreme Court rules against residential segregation in Louisville, KY (segregated
real estate sales violated 14th amendment).
1917  Morgan College relocates to the Ivy Mills property, its current location
1918  October 30. *Diggs et al. v Morgan* 133 Md. 264; 105 A. 157; 1918 Md
1919  State purchases Princess Anne Academy; becomes Eastern Branch of the
Maryland Agricultural College
1920  Maryland State College of Agriculture becomes University of Maryland with the president responsible for the main campus as well as all the Baltimore professional schools that merged with the University.

1925  Morgan College receives accreditation from the Middle States Association

1932/33  Regents establish out-of-state scholarships for “Negroes”

1934  Donald Murray files law suit against the University of Maryland

1935  Harry Clifton (Curley) Byrd becomes president of the University of Maryland

1936  January 15. Murray v Pearson 169 Md. 478 (1936). Court orders the University of Maryland to admit Murray to the Law School


1937  Dwight Oliver Wendell Holmes inaugurated as the 6th (and first Black) president of Morgan


1939  Morgan College is purchased by state, becoming Morgan State College but maintains independent Board of Trustees

1947  Higher Education in Maryland Report—“The Marbury Commission Report”

1947  President Truman’s commission report—(Report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education, 1947)

1947  Southern Regional Education Plan established at Southern Governors Conference

1947  WW II veteran Lt. Wilmore B. Leonard is admitted to University of Maryland graduate school (Chemistry department). The institution rescinded the offer, referring to the admission as a “mistake,” due to his race. Leonard was from the Eastern Shore of MD

1948  January 12. Sipuel v Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma 328 U.S. 631 (1948)

1948  Martin D. Jenkins inaugurated as 7th (and second Black) president of Morgan

1948  Princess Anne Academy name changed to Maryland State College, which Martin Jenkins complained got confused with Morgan State College. The confusion may have been a deliberate move on Byrd’s part as he, in response to the 1947 report which called for abandoning Princess Anne Academy, responded by calling for Morgan State [to] be “abandoned, or at least absorbed by Princess Anne and the University.”

1950  April 14. McCready v Byrd 195 MD 131.1949, to integrate the nursing school in Baltimore


1951  Hiram Whittle. University of Maryland concedes to admit Whittle to undergraduate campus (College Park) to avoid litigation but not before offering Whittle enrollment to the Maryland State College (now University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES))

1950  June 30. Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher Education

1953  Byrd steps down as president of the University of Maryland to run for governor


1954  Maryland Blacks and White integrationists exercise political interests ensuring Harry Clifton Byrd’s gubernatorial defeat

---

115 Callcott, The History of the University of Maryland, 1966, 352.
1964  U.S. Civil Rights Act, Title VI; prohibits discrimination on basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving federal funds
1964  Morgan offers first graduate courses
1964  Maryland Advisory Council of Higher Education formed
1965  November 8. U.S. Higher Education Act increased funding to colleges and provided low interest student loans and scholarships and established the National Teachers Corps Act (NTCA)
1966  University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) established, which Morgan administration argued was institutional duplication
1967  Morgan is pulled in under Board of Trustees of State Colleges, losing its governance (St. Mary’s College allowed to remain independent from state governance)
1969  Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools’ (Middle State Association) case study of Morgan State College
Middle States Association names Morgan State College “a model liberal arts college”
1970  University of Maryland President is now only responsible for the main campus at College Park
1970  Maryland State College name changed to University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES)
1975  MD Senate Bill 354 narrowly passes in favor of Morgan receiving university status
1975  Morgan State College is promoted to University status, becoming Morgan State University
1985  State of MD and U.S. Office of Civil Rights enter partnership for desegregation compliance
1988  Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) reorganizes state institutions, attempting to withdraw Morgan’s governing autonomy. Morgan maintains autonomy
Duplication of Morgan’s MBA program at Towson University and the University of Baltimore
Chapter II The History of U.S. Collegiate Honors Education, 1920s-1960s

Frank Aydelotte and the Making of the Honors Movement

Higher education has benefitted financially from the private investment of those with both an interest in and resources to underwrite what they value in American education. Philanthropy cannot be separated from the mission and motives of its donors. Organizations such as the Carnegie Corporation and later the Ford Foundation, for instance, played a significant role in the development of honors education.\textsuperscript{116} In the mid 1920’s Black intellectual Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois was intensely embedded in the life of scholarship, activism, and advocating for the liberal arts education of the “Negro.” The liberal arts education for Blacks that DuBois espoused can be viewed as an honors agenda compared to the agrarian and vocational education promulgated in the South.

In the same nation, but worlds apart, Frank Aydelotte, the seventh (1921-1940) President of Swarthmore College—an institution founded by Quakers and better known for its social activities rather than for its intellectual life prior to his tenure—was initiating his experimental campaign for the advancement of (White) undergraduate scholarship in higher education. Frank Aydelotte, who had experienced the more rigorous academic tradition of European institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge, contended that American higher education had focused its academic expectations and teaching on the average student. The degree-driven, information-fed method of teaching and learning that characterized American higher education fell short of Adyelotte’s ideal of an independent-study model for educating; he preferred an approach that

\textsuperscript{116} For example, the Carnegie Corporation gave a three year grant of $125,000 in 1958 to support the development of the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student. See, Larry Andrews, “The Wisdom of our Elders: Honors Discussions in The Superior Student, 1958-1965,” Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council (fall/winter 2011): 18.
afforded “able” students the freedom away from routine coursework in order for them to engage in self-regulated reading and research, to wrestle individually with big concepts and to pursue knowledge with an inquisitive appetite. The latter was the British tutor method to which Aydelotte dedicated his professional career. His goal was to re-intellectualize and thereby transform higher education for a subset of students who he described as able or superior students and in the process raise the performance expectations of all students and American higher education institutions. The vision for his prototype would be Honors plans or programs on college campuses. Honors programs were the solution and academic home that would provide motivated students with the support and resources for more advanced studies.

The British System

The vision for the American higher education honors plan has roots that extend across the Atlantic to the British educational models of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. This model captivated the former Rhodes Scholar’s attention and was what Aydelotte believed to be the preeminent approach to undergraduate education and scholarship.

Before providing background of the British system, it is important to note that in envisioning “honors” on college campuses, Aydelotte explicitly distinguished his plan for scholarship from a system that praised students for attaining high grade point averages, such as Latin honors awarded at commencement ceremonies or inductions into honor societies. Instead, Aydelotte often rebuffed such practices asserting, as he did in the second edition of *Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities*, “distinctions which are based upon average grades tend to reward intellectual docility and to punish strength of character and keen
intellectual interests.” He felt it was more important for students of superior ability to be challenged and given rigorous examinations that might earn lower averages than to reward students who followed a rigid and basic set of courses and earned higher averages but who had not proven intellectual prowess.

The system that Aydelotte, as well as several other former Rhodes Scholars who became university professors and administrators in American higher educational institutions, adopted was known as the tutorial system. In this system students had no prescribed courses or credit hours; they might attend a couple of lectures consistently, based upon their interests and as advised by their tutor. Rinn described the role of the tutor as “primarily intellectual [in] purpose…to support a student in his academic endeavors and to guide him towards the successful acquisition of knowledge.”118 Academic work (reading and writing) was left to the student under the guidance of the preceptor. Students were entrusted and expected to work out their scholarship independently. In fact they were warned against using up too much of their time by making the mistake of attending too many classes or lectures. They would meet with their tutors one on one or in intimate groups of three to read their work which then led to robust discussions.119 Students were not given term grades. After a period of time, they would sit for their first exam or responsions, which were used to determine their academic ability, as well as sit for intermediate and final exams to earn the BA, receiving either a pass or honors. According to Aydelotte, the acceptable quality level for the honors degree (which would emulate the Oxford

---

119 Rinn, “Major Forerunners.”
model) was far more rigorous than any requirements to date—1944, at any American institution.120

As a result of American exposure to the English education system, either due to Rhodes Scholarship membership or other Oxford and Cambridge University opportunities, these academic customs, including the tutorial system, made their way across to American soil as some, like Aydelotte, became college administrators and/or teachers in American colleges and universities. These leaders espoused, in their opinion, a better way of teaching and learning and also criticized the intellectual decline of higher education in America.

Incubator for Honors: Swarthmore College, 1920s:

Frank Aydelotte was among a small army of foot soldiers who carried the English tutorial system to American institutions and who is credited for what is known as the honors movement. Historian Rinn states, “Although attempts at honors programs had previously been made in the United States, it was Aydelotte’s program at Swarthmore College that started a trend in honors among American colleges and universities.”121 Aydelotte strategically and methodically hatched a plan to “Oxfordize” American higher education through upper division honors programs by using Swarthmore College as the laboratory, his reason for accepting its presidency. In *Transforming Campus Culture*, Wood illustrates Aydelotte’s calculated decision to accept Swarthmore’s presidency offer over those from other institutions.122 Swarthmore provided a small environment of faculty who seemed open to change and a campus faculty eager for new leadership; “when I accepted the presidency of Swarthmore…I did so because I saw here an

---

opportunity to carry out a long-cherished plan for the improvement of undergraduate work in American colleges.”123 While Swarthmore was the test case, the overhauling of undergraduate education by way of honors plans was a national undertaking for Aydelotte. Aydelotte was also successful because he had the faculty on board immediately, he regularly traveled to other campuses “spreading the Honors gospel,” and invited faculty and administrators to Swarthmore to sit in on seminars and speak with Swarthmore Honors students.124 By their own testimony, the faculty were eager to follow Aydelotte’s vision. In a book by the faculty “in his honor” for his retirement, the faculty provide an historical “record of an experiment in higher education” which was the honors study. They wrote that his personable and collaborative spirit,

went far to explain the striking lack of internal opposition at Swarthmore [of the faculty]. He came to the college with the intention of applying to its educational methods something like a revolution, and he launched it shortly after arriving. One would have expected a radical departure from long established methods to produce mutterings and even revolts among those who are asked to readjust themselves. The fact is that the revolution was accepted by the faculty with hardly a dissenting voice, and that at the end of his administration the college was a unit behind him.125

His mission was absolute and advanced expeditiously yet he was patient and methodical in his cause. He ensured that positive word of the Swarthmore experiment was well messaged including coverage in the Journal of Higher Education on a couple of occasions. One example from Wood’s book that evidences Aydelotte’s clever maneuvering, as well as the unquestionable buy-in of the campus, is the marketing he commissioned in order to publicize their efforts. He planned for a well-known author and education reformer in her own right, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, to write a glowing review of the Swarthmore honors experiment featuring the

---

123 Wood, Transforming Campus Culture, 28.
124 Wood, Transforming Campus Culture 52.
125 Faculty, An Adventure in Education: Swarthmore College under Frank Aydelotte (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941): ix-x.
incomparable faculty-student engagement, the student academic prowess, and of the faculty who actually enjoyed both students and teaching.  

Wood’s research into Aydelotte’s personal presidential papers revealed that Fisher also happened to be “a mother of a Swarthmore Honors student, and received a check for one thousand dollars for her article which the College commissioned specifically for the purpose of publishing it and distributing it as a key element of the capital campaign.” The honors plan for American education was intended to engage those students deemed interested in intellectual life, capable of the rigor, responsible, focused to manage the freedom, and motivated to stay on course with the process. Aydelotte’s vision was clear:

To leave the student in freedom, to give him opportunity to develop his own independence and initiative, to provide him with a plan of work and with individual instruction which will prevent too much floundering, and to confront him at the end with a flexible but severe and independent test of the value of his work.

Also, should a student be found unable to stay the course of an honors rigorous path, “the usual penalty for the slacker is to compel him to return to ordinary work.”

Aydelotte and his Swarthmore faculty began planning in 1921-22 for the first honors courses that mimicked the Oxford model of voluntary attendance of classes and examinations

---

Fisher was an influential education advocate, especially for improving rural schooling (http://cdi.uvm.edu/findingaids/collection/fisherdc.ead.xml), and leader of social progressive women’s rights and racial equality movements. A daughter of a university professor and president, she can be presumed to be familiar with the world of higher education. In 1935 she received an honorary degree from Swarthmore College for her writing and “popularize[ing the] Montessori teaching method in U.S. (http://www.swarthmore.edu/past-commencements/past-speakers-and-honorary-degree-recipients). Fisher’s support of Aydelotte’s honors plan where students study independently with as little “classroom interruption” (emphasis mine) as possible coupled very well with her fascination with the Montessori teaching method that advocated self-learning.


129 Aydelotte “Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities,” 17.
with external examiners, but with seminars rather than individual tutoring. “I appointed the appropriate committees and the academic year 1921-22 was spent in planning honors courses.”130 Two courses were launched in fall of 1922 with about a dozen student participants of junior standing. After several faculty committees met to plan new curriculum, “two honors courses were sufficiently agreed upon to make it possible for students to begin the next year—English literature and the social sciences.”131 Soon other colleges began visiting Swarthmore and sitting in on their seminars to learn how to create the same at their institutions. According to Aydelotte, the experiment caught the attention of the General Education Board (GEB) that offered funding for this innovative initiative. Aydelotte wrote,

Dr. Abraham Flexner, with his keen interest in every experiment that promised to improve the quality of American undergraduate education, had become interested in what we were doing and had invited us to make an application for the General Education Board for financial assistance. A representative of the Board came to Swarthmore to inspect honors work at first hand.132

Aydelotte recalled that a GEB representative, without much notice, visited the campus at the end of the term. Instead of observing an honors seminar, the representative instead sat in on an already scheduled meeting with students and faculty. The students were gathered to evaluate their experiences with the new honors format. After listening to a “lively discussion…between students with hardly a word from any member of the faculty,” the GEB visitor “pronounced the meeting the most impressive academic exercise he had ever attended and in due time the much needed financial assistance was forthcoming.”133

130 Aydelotte, Breaking the Academic Lockstep, 32.
131 Aydelotte, Breaking the Academic Lockstep, 33.
132 Aydelotte, Breaking the Academic Lockstep, 34-35.
133 Aydelotte, Breaking the Academic Lockstep, 34-36. John D. Rockefeller founded the General Education Board in 1902. The Board dissolved in 1964 after expending over $300M. The purpose of the Board was the “promotion of education…without distinction of race, sex, or creed.” To Negro higher and secondary education, was given over $32M and in total, including teacher training and salaries, libraries and specific areas such as the natural sciences and humanities, an estimate of $62,675,363 was given, based upon “Summary of Appropriations.” Some of these funds
Swarthmore quickly gained prominence as the leader in honors education, along with the financial support of several philanthropic organizations such as the Carnegie Corporation. Funding in hand, Aydelotte led a research team of Swarthmore professors who visited over 100 campuses, poured through college catalogues to identify and distinguish in type—public or private; research or liberal arts, those campuses that had launched some level of honors plans.\textsuperscript{134} The result, “Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities,” was a 1924 report for the National Research Council, “on honors plans in operation.”\textsuperscript{135} Aydelotte viewed this rapid growth in most of the nation’s accredited colleges as “attempts …to provide special facilities for the best and most ambitious students, freeing them from the regimentation of average standards and giving them opportunities to go forward at a faster pace.”\textsuperscript{136} He also found that while many honors plans began to bud after Swarthmore’s model gained attention, some institutions had opportunities such as honors plans involving either theses, examinations, or the preceptorial system, that were already in the spirit of the model; these were Wesleyan (1873), Michigan (1888), the University of Vermont (1888), and Princeton (1905). Meetings about how to engage “superior” students and the development of honors programs were beginning taking place after interest in Swarthmore’s model. For example, “in 1925 a conference on the subject was held at the State University of Iowa presided over by Dr. Vernon Kellogg of the National Research Council.”\textsuperscript{137}

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item were dispensed through the John F. Slater Fund. See, \textit{General Education Board Review and Final Report 1902-1964}, New York.
\item There is no mention of HBCUs. The reason for the absence could be that there were no honors plans found at these institutions or that Aydelotte and his faculty did not consider or make inquiry of these institutions.
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The programs in the 1924 and the later updated 1925 report were more or less established and some had been abandoned and resumed or formats revised and replaced at later dates. A key point that Aydelotte examined in his 1925 report of these programs is that the concept of honors was fluid enough to meet the particular needs of the institutions and visions of the faculty. For example, he wrote, “there are almost as many different plans for honors based on additional work as there are institutions offering them;” some offered additional work and other institutions suspended regular course requirements.\(^{138}\) Not all campuses had stated honors plans but the manner in which they approached all undergraduate education was in keeping with the movement. Aydelotte insisted that institutions were too ready to reject what he characterized as “the tyranny of the rigid course and hour system” that instead of honors plans for the few able, they devised “freer programs involving more scope for individual initiative [that was] provided for all.”\(^{139}\) Colgate College had an honors plan that ended in 1934 in favor of adopting a total individual approach for all students. Johns Hopkins University, as another example, had “no formal honors plan but much of the work is individual and is done in the spirit of an honors college.”\(^{140}\) The 1925 survey study revealed honors work at several institutions. Table I documents the 93 institutions discussed in Aydelotte’s revised 1925 study.\(^{141}\) As Table I reveals, interest in honors education was widespread. Aydelotte and his colleagues noted that each campus, much like in contemporary times, administered Honors differently. For example, at some institutions, honors work was in addition to students’ regular requirements, or honors work replaced a few of the junior and senior requirements; even still there were campuses with plans

\(^{138}\) Aydelotte, “Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities,” 11.

\(^{139}\) Aydelotte, “Breaking the Academic Lockstep,” 49.

\(^{140}\) Aydelotte, “Breaking the Academic Lockstep,” 49.

\(^{141}\) Aydelotte’s initial 1924, report identified 43 institutions with honors plans (35 honors plans that required extra work and nine institutions whose plans superseded the regular course requirements which afforded students exemption of the junior and/or senior years in lieu of independent work and examinations).
where the honors work superseded all junior and senior year requirements (*). In an ideal setting, Aydelotte advocated for the latter model because it gave students the freedom to fully dedicate to their scholarship and academic passions. Not surprisingly, it should be noted that no HBCU institutions appeared on this list and most are private, liberal arts colleges with very few located in the southern region of the United States.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alfred University</th>
<th>Haverford College</th>
<th>University of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td>Hendrix College</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch College</td>
<td>Hobart College*</td>
<td>University of Buffalo*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard College*</td>
<td>Illinois College</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton College</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowdoin College</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Knox College</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton College*</td>
<td>Lafayette College</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University</td>
<td>Lawrence College</td>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe College</td>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate College*</td>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Puget Sound</td>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td>University of Southern California*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Wooster</td>
<td>Mills College</td>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado College</td>
<td>Mount Holyoke College</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Mount Union College</td>
<td>Ursinus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
<td>Municipal University of Akron</td>
<td>Utah Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse College*</td>
<td>Nebraska Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Vassar College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance College</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Wells College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison University</td>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson College</td>
<td>Occidental College</td>
<td>Whitman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan</td>
<td>Williams College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham College</td>
<td>Pomona College</td>
<td>Wilson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira College*</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Wittenberg College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Radcliffe College*</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville College</td>
<td>Rice Institute*</td>
<td>St. Stephen’s College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell College</td>
<td>Rockford College</td>
<td>Swarthmore College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamline University</td>
<td>Smith College*</td>
<td>Sweet Briar College*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover College</td>
<td>Southwestern Presbyterian University</td>
<td>Temple University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University*</td>
<td>State College of Washington</td>
<td>Union College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Institutions where honors work superseded junior and senior year requirements

An *Adventure in Education* was published in 1941 by the Swarthmore College faculty in tribute to Aydelotte. In 1944, he dedicated his work, *Breaking the Academic Lock Step, The Development of Honors Work in American Colleges and Universities* to them. In it he detailed the honors movement over the last twenty years, referring to it as the “most important educational development of the period between the two world wars.”\(^{142}\) The book was meant to serve as an account of the honors movement and the Swarthmore plan as well as a report to date of growth through the 1930s. Funded again by the Carnegie Corporation and the General Education Board, Aydelotte commissioned Swarthmore faculty to conduct visits to colleges and universities. In highlighting the progress in honors work across the country in higher education, he gave particular attention to the challenges of state colleges. Noting considerable student bodies and state legislatures, he nonetheless applauded the persistent faculty at University of Virginia and Ohio State University for having “taken positions of leadership in the movement.”\(^ {143}\) Despite Aydelotte’s review of public versus private and large versus small size institutional comparisons with regards to the implementation of honors education, no attention nor mention was made of any efforts that might have been active at HBCUs. This omission hints not only to the relevance of this study to higher education literature but also the regard afforded these institutions in the mid-twentieth century era.

**Collegiate Honors in Context: Post Second World War**

In his 1944 book, *Breaking the Academic Lock Step*, Aydelotte situates the state of higher education in the context of World War II. Ever concerned for the seemingly basal expectations and absence of a more abstruse system of teaching and learning, Aydelotte makes a case for not

\(^{142}\) Aydelotte, *Breaking the Academic Lock Step*, ix.

\(^{143}\) Aydelotte, *Breaking the Academic Lock Step*, 91.
losing the movement for liberal learning and study, an outcome, he surmised, that would be tantamount to losing a much larger war. Higher education was either in a temporary suspension in response to the war or it was going to allow itself, in the post war era, to be lured away from the fundamental focus of what he opined to be the soul, truth, and purpose of education—freedom of the mind. Uneasy of the potential influence of war on higher education, particularly, honors education, Aydelotte wrote,

As this Preface is written, many plans for honors work have had to be curtailed or suspended because of the war and the absorption of college faculties in the educational programs prescribed by the Army and Navy. The fear is sometimes expressed that accelerated and practical programs have come to stay and the work of the type here described, suspended during the war emergency, may never be resumed.144

Advanced work that is found in honors programs, he argued, do more than increase levels of busy work, but rather provides work that “offer(s) more freedom and responsibility, more scope for the development of intellectual independence and initiative…[thereby creating a more valuable citizen able to adapt and implore problem solving skills without prompting. It is the difference [of] tell[ing] the honors man [or woman] what he must do to get an education [rather than]…what he [or she] must know.”145

Again, Aydelotte worries about the fundamental focus of higher education with the demand of resources placed toward training in the technical fields for war and defense purposes. He pondered what would be the commitment, if any to liberal education:

It is such considerations as these which cause men to fear that this war may mark a turning point in the development of our system of higher education, away from the liberal arts to technical training of experts in the natural and social sciences…the present college generation must sacrifice liberal education in order to learn the technique of war…no one

144 Aydelotte, *Breaking the Academic Lock Step*, xiii.
will complain of the sacrifice if it is only temporary. But regimentation for the sake of security after the war is another matter.146

*Breaking the Academic Lock Step* went to print in spring of 1944, right on the heels of the June 1944 signing of the GI Bill, a legislation that afforded World War II veterans access to higher education, among other benefits, through direct funding to put toward the cost of tuition and other related expenses.

In addition to the distraction of the war on the academy, Aydelotte felt that the diversity with regard to the intellectual prowess of incoming classes threatened higher education. He wrote,

> With this stupendous increase in numbers has come a much wider range of levels of ability. Fifty years ago the limitations set by custom and interest upon entrance to college produced a student group of much more homogenous character. Now our undergraduates are a cross section of the nation. It was only when the number of college students increased so remarkably at the end of the last war [WWI] that the menace to standards began to be widely recognized.”147

Aydelotte was referring to mainly an academic ability cross section as racial diversity, veterans (socio-economic) and even women in *large* numbers on predominately White, male, aristocratic college campuses, was but a foreshadow in the early 1900s. His faculty agreed, observing the impact the influx of new students had on higher education.

Democracy…was never applied to education anywhere in such wholesale fashion as in America after the [F]irst World War…there appeared at the college gates large armies of young men and women who in less prosperous times would not have aspired to college degrees. Our institutions of higher learning were abruptly given a mandate to educate *en masse*.148

146 Aydelotte, *Breaking the Academic Lockstep*, 5.
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Others in elite higher education agreed as the “expansion of enrollments had brought too many students into higher education—substantial numbers who were intellectually unfit for advanced study.”149 World War I preempted the function and academic mission of colleges as “education was determined by the needs of the army…academic standards were virtually abandoned: regular classes were foreshortened and adapted to military purposes, and students had little time for study.”150

Aydelotte noted that a college degree was required for many occupations. The number of students entering colleges and universities increased and with that, the diversity of students’ ability—perhaps what we refer to as college readiness. It is this “ability diversity” that Aydelotte identifies as the weakening of higher education for the “superior student.” Perhaps he would not have envisioned honors plans necessary or even course sequences and credit hours as rigid had college campuses not diversified intellectually and in social class.

Aydelotte and his faculty believed that the level of ability of American students was much more uniform prior to W.W.I. Historian Roger L. Geiger wrote “during the interwar years, American higher education grew into what came to be called mass higher education…[and] contemporaries of the 1920s and 1930s were sensitive to these differences.”151 Aydelotte was responding to the transition from what was primarily “elite higher education [,] ostensibly intended for the students of privileged social backgrounds or extraordinary talent.”152 Colleges and universities were smaller; enrollment was limited by financial considerations and for many careers a college education was not thought to be the best or necessary preparation. Gradually all

---

of this changed. According to Geiger, this difference represented a thinking of higher education reserved for the privileged versus access to the masses who qualified for entry.

Who was going to college and the Second World War were not the only distractions that occupied the attention and resources of higher education. A race to space and the United States coming in second would soon take predominance. This influence, however would serve proponents of honors education well with an increase of resources, especially from philanthropic organizations, and an interest in the academically talented.

(Honors) Higher Education’s Next Challenge: Sputnik and the Cold War Era

The United States was immersed in a domestic battle at all levels in the 1950’s. For one, it was witnessing the ardent upsurge of a community’s refusal to be quieted or settle for the second class citizenship allocated to them; their anger and mobilization toward the flagrant violence pervading their existence and an unequivocal demand for equal rights in every form from bus boycotts in Montgomery, Alabama; the right to vote; to educational access in Topeka, Kansas. The stratagem of the Civil Rights movement eventually gave way to the executive signing of the first Civil Rights Act in September of 1957 (Pub. L. 85-315, 71) by President Eisenhower. In October of 1957 when Black children—who were also academically able and talented students, in Little Rock, Arkansas were fighting for equal access in America’s classrooms, the Soviet Union was launching an international sneak attack; a battle, so to speak,

---

154 It is worth noting that in the discussion of resources, it was White institutions, not HBCUs, generally speaking, that were the primary benefactors. Most public HBCUs had been systematically denied doctorate programs and research laboratories, effectively cutting off opportunities to partake in the burgeoning federal research funds for Cold War scientific and technological innovation. Also, qualified African American scholars, many of whom were educated at northern colleges and universities, had difficult acquiring full time faculty posts during the Cold War America era. See, James Anderson, “Race, Meritocracy, and the American Academy during the Immediate Post-World War II Era,” *History of Education Quarterly* 33 2 (Summer 1993).
in technology and the sciences. The domestic unrest he was facing on the homeland was indeed a national challenge, however Sputnik was a movement for which President Eisenhower was equally unprepared. Russia’s successful October 4, 1957 satellite launch caused the United States embarrassment, moving them to take action to improve and invest resources on every level of U.S. education, including colleges and universities. Almost a year to the date of Russian’s 1957 coup, the 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA) allowed for funding provisions to education in science and technology. The United States was panicked that American scientists, technology, and schooling had fallen secondary to that of the Soviet Union’s talent and educational advancement.156 However, even before 1957 there was sentiment that higher education and education in general was eroding.157 “The Cold War setting created higher expectations among Americans concerning the quality of education in their schools, well before the first Russian sputnik was launched.”158 Joining Aydelotte’s arguably elitist chorus were other people such as Thomas Bonner, an historian and university president, who also publicly asserted their concerns that American education was not teaching at a level to maintain and secure the country’s safety and quality of life. He wrote in 1958 that the nation’s lawmakers and educators had been sufficiently warned; the country was in a dazed lull having ignored,

for several years [the] independent observers [who] have been warning us about what the Soviets were doing in education, especially in science education, but they were crying in the wilderness until October 4, 1957…it is upon education that the fate of our way of life depends. It means that the outcome of the third world war may be decided in the classroom.159

---

Bonner went on to argue that the problem was not that the United States did not have the intellectual talent to compete with Russia but that it was indifferent to intellectual achievement and scholarship. He found that scholars and professors in Germany were given rock star status while in America all prestige went to those who excelled in athletics and entertainment. Bonner wrote, “as a guest professor at a German university… nothing impressed me more than the contrast in status and acceptance of the scholar and the intellectual.”\textsuperscript{160} In addition to this “skewed” American perspective, he explained, everyone was educated at the same level: “we have decided that democracy means the same amount of basic education for all regardless of ability.” Instead, Bonner advocated providing trade education for the less capable so as not to “adjust to meet the needs of those not capable.” Bonner foresaw a time in education when in our colleges [and] universities [and the nation]… will be unashamedly and proudly concerned with the gifted. We will cease grouping them with the handicapped and defective as abnormal or problem children and recognize them as the greatest and most important challenge we have in the classroom. If we continue to make [the gifted]… ashamed of their abilities, as we never have with athletes and showmen…we are doomed as a free people.\textsuperscript{161}

This was Bonner’s plan for a true intellectual and societal democracy. This sentiment was also reflective of the U.S. government and educational leaders’ new goals for U.S. society. For example, U.S. Naval Admiral Hyman Rickover used his status to influence federal level engagement in education, testifying before Congress in 1958 that Russia’s lead with the Sputnik

\textsuperscript{160} Bonner, “Sputniks and the Educational Crisis in America,” 180. Dr. Bonner was a Fulbright lecturer at the University of Mainz in Germany; (http://enquirer.com/editions/2003/09/12/loc_o.bonner.html)

\textsuperscript{161} Bonner, “Sputniks and the Educational Crisis in America,” 184-+232.
launch rested squarely on the shoulders of the difference in the inferiority of American schooling compared to that of Russia’s educational system.162

While the quality of education at all levels became of popular concern to the flabbergasted American public, higher education became the main target for criticism as colleges, and research universities in particular, were where scientists were trained.163 Research universities were also partners with the government, receiving hefty amounts of federal funds and facility resources in efforts to advance in technology and to produce a new generation of scientists. In 1945, according to Douglass, “the federal government was already funding 83 percent of all research in the natural sciences,” most of which was funneled to universities in dollars and in the form of federal laboratories on university campuses. These included, larger sums of money appropriated to the National Science Foundation (NSF) created in 1950, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) passed in 1958, and other federal agencies such as the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Atomic Energy Commission. Douglass went on to explain that while October 1957 was not by far the beginning of federal involvement in higher education research, Sputnik jolted “American lawmakers and the public in their joint resolve to invest in and reposition higher education.”164 It is this repositioning and emphasis on technology rather than the liberal arts that dismayed honors educators who were hoping after the war to refocus higher education on liberal studies. Chaszar notes that the climate of scrutiny on science research and the research university actually focused attention on rigor, academically talented


students, and “encouraged the resurgence of honors programs.” Chaszar references the response at the collegiate level but the effects of the satellite launch also trickled down to the K-12 classroom:

There was no serious action in America’s schools [for the gifted] until Sputnik was launched in 1957…When the educational community finally took action on behalf of the gifted, it did so with alacrity… [in] the late 1950s and early 1960s, there was an upsurge in research activity dealing with the characteristics and education of gifted children.

The White community’s wake up response to the state and level of quality of U.S. education was differently motivated, yet peculiarly similar to Black America’s long critique of U. S. education, having begun a tenacious fight for equality as well as quality in schooling. Black higher education was also seeking equality and to develop talent. HBCUs were not initial recipients of funding from the 1958 National Defense Education Act. As a matter of national state interest, Black institutions were systematically denied consideration in training scientists and for maintaining federal laboratories on their campuses.

In addition to institutional partnerships with the government, college and universities were responding to the campaign of talent development with the resurgence of interest in collegiate honors education. The Cold War era made conditions ripe to pick up after World War II where Aydelotte’s campaign and World Wars I and II had left off.

Joseph W. Cohen, and the Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student 1957-66

The coordinating efforts of Joseph W. Cohen serve to establish him as the forefather of the modern honors program movement in American higher education. Cohen was a philosophy

---

professor at University of Colorado, serving as the institution’s director of the honors program and also as national coordinating officer of collegiate honors education development. While Aydelotte’s efforts are rightly credited for advocating the, albeit elitist, British tutorial system for advanced collegians in American higher education, Cohen’s leadership, in connection with the timely emphasis on gifted development—increased college enrollment, the development of high school initiatives such as the Advanced Placement (AP) program, and a general renewed interest in supporting high achieving students, fashioned most of what we recognize today as American collegiate honors education. Cohen was eager to see students begin their honors experience from the beginning of their college career. Aydelotte’s honors education model developed in the 1920s was an upper division experience with the idea that the first two years of a student’s college career would be spent coming up to speed with remedial work due to high schools’ poor preparation. However, with budding new high school programs like AP and other Cold War emphases in K-12 curricular development, college preparation thirty years later was less of a major concern for collegiate honors educators.¹⁶⁷ Thus, Cohen focused his efforts in developing collegiate honors beginning the freshman year.

During the earlier years of Aydelotte, honors plans were geared toward junior and senior year collegians delving deeply in discipline-based/departmental scholarship; “At the beginning of their junior year, students of approved capacity and independence are allowed to enter a special regimen in which they are freed from the ordinary courses and credits.”¹⁶⁸ The honors

¹⁶⁷ Cohen’s national collegiate honors organization, the ICCS—Inter-University Committee on the Superior Student, founded in 1966, was the forerunner to the current National Collegiate Honors Council or NCHC.
plans of the 1950s forward, however, were attempting to develop honors experiences for the first
two. Cohen distinguished his vision this way:

We won the fight in 1930 [with Colorado faculty for an honors program] first with
juniors and seniors; but, as time passed, the inner logic of experience gradually dictated
the need to fight for the extension of the program…until we were beginning with entering
freshmen.¹⁶⁹

These plans were known as general honors programs, honors experiences offered outside of
individual departmental honors plans. However, Cohen’s vision regarding what constituted
“honors” remained consistent with that of Aydelotte. In the Foreword of the 1966 volume of The
Superior Student in American Higher Education, which he also edited, Cohen shared his
disappointment as a young faculty member in the Philosophy Department at Colorado in the late
1920s, “I was shocked to discover the small amount of knowledge and insight that students
graduating with honors could command [,] despite their high grades and the number of courses
they had taken” thus beginning his commitment to honors education.¹⁷⁰ After receiving final
approval from the faculty, he clarified of the Colorado program that “the award of honors on
grades alone was formally abandoned.”¹⁷¹ In Cohen’s experience, a “good honors program
works to make the talented student specializing in any field a well-rounded, thinking person, not
just a walking catalogue of information.”¹⁷² Cohen was able to use his own institution, the
University of Colorado (Boulder) whose honors program began in 1930, as perhaps not so much

¹⁷⁰ Cohen, foreword, vii.
¹⁷¹ Joseph W. Cohen, “Development of the Honors Movement in the United States,” in The Superior Student in
a test case as Aydelotte had with Swarthmore, but to garner funding and build an honors program to serve as a template for other campuses.

Colorado’s honors program was among a few to survive through and after the Second World War. Cohen wrote that, “[i]t was a striking fact how many of the programs listed by Aydelotte in 1925 were practically nonexistent when I made my own first survey in 1952.” 173 Cohen’s ability to secure Rockefeller Foundation monies to support both Colorado’s honors program and the expansion of the honors movement broadly made all the difference in his ability to mobilize the effort across the nation. The grant also stipulated that the Colorado Honors director would visit colleges and host a June conference in 1957, a meeting that represented “twenty-seven large institutions, both public and private.” 174

With the support of the June meeting behind them and with the backing of the Carnegie Corporation, a second meeting was held later that year in October in order to define action steps from the June proceedings. Among those items, the ICSS was developed at this 1957 meeting to “act as a clearinghouse for information on honors activities across the nation.” 175 Other initiatives were a newsletter, The Superior Student; campus visits; and to plan for more conferences with regional (South in 1958 and Northeast in 1959) scope.

To Cohen’s own accounting, it was the establishment of the ICSS in 1957 that made for a “systematic, coordinated effort…to extend honors programs to the large private and state universities.” 176 ICSS, supported by Carnegie Foundation grant funds, was set up mostly to meet

---

173 Cohen, foreword, x-xi.
the needs of large public universities and colleges. The University of Colorado at Boulder provided the infrastructure and leadership for its headquarters. According to Chaszar, the ICSS’ main mission—through campus visits; writings (the established professional newsletter, *The Superior Student*); outreach to educational associations and agencies; and national and regional conferences, was to reach administrators and faculty, especially, in order to facilitate a broad discussion of honors education and to share resources and support for building and sustaining honors programs, and to serve as a clearinghouse for information. She cited the April 1958 newsletter as declaring: “to stimulate nationwide discussion of the fundamental honors questions.”

Cohen highlighted eight important conferences of note between the years 1958-64. Some were thematic in nature targeting particular populations such as the conferences on Honors and the Preparation of Teachers, University of Wisconsin, April 1962; and on Talented Women and the American College, “Needed Research on Able Women in Honors Programs, Colleges and Society,” Columbia University, May 1964. Cohen’s campus visits were for the purpose of investigating how institutions and faculty could best develop and manage honors programs suitable for their campuses. He also made visits for the purpose of preparing for upcoming regional conferences. According to Chaszar, Cohen visited fourteen Southern universities in the spring of 1958, among them, some Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs): Howard and Southern and later that summer, Fisk and Morehouse. It is interesting to note that during a time of intense

---

philosophical debate regarding the education of the Negro between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois, these particular institutions subscribed to liberal arts education and were also among those referred to colloquially as Black Ivies. After his Southern visits, Cohen reported in the October 1958 newsletter that,

Fisk University is exploring new academic approaches with 25 of its best freshmen. It is also testing out an early admissions experiment in cooperation with six other colleges and universities including Oberlin and Wooster…Morehouse is gathering important data by means of a controlled experiment involving an accelerated program. 24-30 Ford scholars are participating.181

In the May/June 1959 Superior Student newsletter there appeared an article entitled, “Educating the Gifted Negro Student: A problem of Encouragement and Development,” written by President Felton G. Clark and Dean E. C. Harrison of Southern University—an HBCU, about the obstacles with both identifying and encouraging Black student talent.182 The authors referenced the Cold War “international power struggle…and the numerous publications criticizing the nation’s schools for their neglect of the gifted” as reasons and urgency to identify and encourage Black student talent.183 Felton and Harrison pointed out that although the nation was preoccupied with talent development, there was “a noticeable lack of interest in this regard among Negro students.” The authors’ criticism was critical in ensuring that Black institutions and students were included in the talent development campaign, especially with regard to financial support. It would have been detrimental to allow the segregationist climate to disregard Black talent as able to contribute to the Cold War efforts, especially after proving its patriotic valor in the Second World War.184 One concern that Felton and Harrison highlighted was with

183 Clark and Harrison, “Educating the Gifted Negro Student,” 2.
184 See footnote 266 in Chapter III regarding Tuskegee Airman Lt. W. B. Leonard, a WWII veteran’s rejection from the University of Maryland.
the measures in place to identify able students and once identified, providing an environment that would nurture their talents. Finding standardized testing an inadequate indicator, they wrote, “the devices which are being used to identify the talented among the dominant group are less effective in measuring the intellectual potential of Negro youth.”185 Instead, they supported efforts that called upon more integrated strategies for identifying talent such as those of the Southern Project of the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students that “experimented with methods and techniques of searching for talent among Negro high school seniors. During the existence of the project from 1953-1955, 1,732 students in 45 cities were identified as superior through such procedures as counseling, instructor ratings and scholastic aptitude testing.”186 Felton and Harrison acknowledged the lower socio-economic background of some of the identified students and encouraged directing their talent potential by affording them “a challenging and stimulating educational climate [so] they are motivated to strive for high achievement.”187 In this regard, their criticism of Black institutions was that,

Unfortunately, too few of the colleges existing primarily for Negro youth provide the climate that is conducive to the development of able or gifted students…the fact that existing among Negro youth is a significant number of potentially gifted students…Hence, those who are involved in the process of planning educational programs of Negro youth must become more aware of the need for seeking out those with potential and for extending to them stimulating educational opportunities…[and] continue to pursue rather vigorously research and experimentation that will lead to promising “how-to-do-it programs.”188

One of the “how-to-do-it programs” was collegiate honors. On the first page of the May/June 1959 newsletter that preceded the article was an introduction, “The Gifted Negro Student: A

---

185 Clark and Harrison, “Educating the Gifted Negro Student,” 3.
186 Clark and Harrison, “Educating the Gifted Negro Student,” 3.
188 Clark and Harrison, “Educating the Gifted Negro Student,” 4.
Challenge to American Education,” announcing “a conference on the gifted Negro student.” The conference was sponsored by Southern University, the Inter-university Committee on the Superior Students (ICSS) and Southern regional educational associations. The Superior Student editors noted that the conference would address a national concern—“the loss to the nation of a considerable source of undiscovered and hence unrealized Negro intellectual potential serves as one of the foremost challenges to American educational leaders today.” That “educational leaders” was not qualified by the term, “Negro,” emphasizes the national imperative that was the education of this group of students from k-12 to the college level.

Among the other conferences of note between 1958-1964, Cohen highlighted the February 1960 conference hosted by Southern University and A. & M. College in Baton Rouge for institutions predominantly Negro, the Southern University Invitational Conference, a meeting focused on an agenda for the gifted Negro student. Cohen wrote, “I am particularly proud of our first, the Southern conference, which led at once to a conference of predominantly Negro colleges and therefore opened up the whole issue of the culturally deprived and disadvantaged anywhere.” Chazsar explains that the Southern University president, Felton G. Clark, reached out to the Carnegie Corporation for support for a conference who directed him back to the ICSS. ICSS assisted in cosponsoring the conference. At this conference, societal issues that plagued the Black educational experiences such as inferior facilities, resources, not to mention the racial climate that might impede the recognition and/or growth of Black talent were addressed. Earlier, in his 1958 article, “The Development and Present Status of Publicly-Supported Higher

190 "The Gifted Negro Student,” front cover.
191 Cohen, foreword, xiii.
Education for Negroes,” Clark rejected the vocational and agricultural training encouraged by Southern state-funded institutions and espoused by Booker T. Washington’s “advocacy of industrial education which was hailed by white Northerners and Southerners.”

Noting that there were a total of “34 state-supported institutions for Negroes” in 1956-57, he charged Black institutions “to become American institutions…providing an educational climate that stresses competition with standards of excellence.”

Clark did not mention Sputnik directly but did surmise that,

> it was soon realized that America was not utilizing effectively its human resources; the results being a shortage of specialized talent such as engineers, scientists, physicians….Related to the problem was the Negro to whom had been applied the ‘separate but equal doctrine,’ with the consequence being the denial of appropriate opportunities for maximum development of the Negro’s potential.

In other words, Black colleges should have been no different than majority institutions with regard to academic standards and educating Negroes in the tradition of the liberal arts rather than industrial training; to do otherwise would be a waste of Negro talent. As if speaking to an audience broader than HBCU leadership, it appears that Clark saw an opportunity in the Cold War space race to argue for higher levels of Black education. With the recent passage of Brown and the NDEA (National Defense Education Act), Clark was perhaps appealing to the interests of both the nation and its urgent need to develop all talent as well as to the interests of HBCU presidents. Derrick Bell’s concept of Interest-Convergence—the accommodation of two

---

196 In the 1947 report to President Harry S. Truman from the Commission on Higher Education, “Higher Education for American Democracy,” the commissioners warn against denying access: “We are denying the Nation of a vast amount of potential leadership and potential social competence which it sorely needs.” In *The History of Higher Education*, Second Edition, page 765. The Truman Commission also messaged in spirit that the interests of the nation must converge with the interest of the non-majority in order to serve the nation’s best interests.
opposing sides with mutual interests but with competing motivations, was likely Clark’s goal. In the context of desegregation litigation, Bell views the principle operating to the favor of the Black community only when said dismantling meets the interests of the White community; “the interest of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites.”197 Further building upon Bell’s theory of interest-convergence, critical legal scholar Mary L. Dudziak historically traced desegregation cases contextualizing the timing of decisions such as Brown with federal interests regarding foreign policy and global relationships, concluding that it was more the apparent hypocrisy of a nation espousing democracy while maintaining segregation that dismantled Plessy rather than good will. Dudziak argued that these legal events need to be understood in the racialized Cold War context in which they occurred in order to truly benefit from their historical and contemporary meanings, something that scholars have failed to do when ignoring or even miscalculating the role of race in American society:

In the years following World War II, racial discrimination in the United States received increasing attention from other countries…At a time when the U.S. hoped to reshape the postwar world in its own image, the international attention given to racial segregation was troublesome and embarrassing…As a result, historians of Brown seem to write about a different world than do those who consider other aspects of postwar American culture. The failure to contextualize Brown reinforces the sense that the movement against segregation somehow happened in spite of everything else that was going on.198

Attending to the needs of Black talent during a time when the nation needed “all hands on deck,” so to speak, and with an international audience observing the nation’s practice of democracy to its Black citizens, meant there were many converging interests for which Clark’s comments were

opportune. Certainly Dudziak’s revisionist critique of legal historical events reveals the necessity that “understanding the ebb and flow of racial progress and retrenchment requires a careful look at conditions prevailing at different times in history.”

Besides the impending intellectual loss HBCUs would suffer from failing to nurture gifted Negro students, talented Black student enrollment at HBCUs would also soon become a concern. At the 1960 ICSS Southern conference, Black administrators discussed the impression that talented students might have of the HBCU institution. In ‘Final Session: Next Steps,’ Albert N. Whiting, Dean of the College at Morgan State College, pointed out in his paper that

the great single deterrent…by college students on our campuses is the college culture, particularly the informal student culture. Studies of our campus communities would probably show that the dominant values and interest of our students are not intellectual in orientation…In conclusion, [a call] for the establishment of Honors programs in Negro colleges along the lines recommended by the ICSS [was made].

The concern for the collegiate Negro students’ pursuit of the intellectual in general, not just for the high achievers, was perhaps palpable in this most recent post-Brown era. Observed just a few years prior in Howard University professor and author, E. Franklin Frazier’s controversial book, Black Bourgeoisie, he also lamented,

the second and third generation of Negro college students are as listless as the children of peasants…both are less concerned with history or the understanding of the world about them than with their appearance at the next social affair…[and they are unlike] the “children of slaves” who were thirsting for “knowledge” which will enable them to become “men.” But the present generation of Negro college students (who are not the children but the great grand-children of slaves) do not wish to recall their past.

Rather, according to Frazier, they were more interested in material gains.

200 “Final Session: Next Steps” The Superior Student, 2 no. 9 (1960): 15-16.
In 1960, the debate reflected a concern for educating high-achievers. Felton Clark coordinated leaders from a total of thirty-three Black institutions to “explore the most urgent educational problems of superior students from culturally deprived backgrounds… good minds unevenly developed [due to lack of educational resources]” and who were concerned “with remedial (emphasis theirs) work for Honors students.” True to the traditions of HBCUs, the conference ‘Report’ in the *Superior Student* newsletter indicated the contribution that these leaders gave to the larger collegiate honors educators’ community,

It was a contribution of this conference that the broader socio-cultural aspects of Honors programs necessarily received closer scrutiny and came into the foreground…the conference made evident the large role which favorable cultural environment and high levels of expectancy in the… school and the community play in academic achievement.

The ethic of care that distinguishes HBCU institutions and the supportive experiences they afford their students was powerfully present even in their meeting deliberations.

HBCUs had significant engagement with the ICSS and the honors movement. Howard University English professor and honors program director John Lovell, Jr. and Fisk University history professor and honors program director M. J. Lunine, were both in attendance at a

---

Institutional representation at the 1960 conference included (as they were then named) Atlanta University, Clark College, Fisk University, Hampton Institute, Howard University, Louisiana State University, Morgan State College, Morehouse College, Southern University, Stetson University, and Texas Southern University. Historian Horace Mann Bond, then the Dean of the School of Education at Atlanta University and former president of Lincoln University, gave a conference address on the influence of cultural factors on academic performance. Bond was an outspoken critic of intelligence test analyses that concluded African American intelligences’ inferiority.
“general” ICSS conference in Denver in April of 1965. During Cohen’s campus visits to support the development of new and the continued growth of existing honors program from 1956-1963, he was invited to visit and meet with deans and faculty of Howard University (April 14, 1958; March 1, 1961; December 6, 1961), Southern University (April 22, 1958; November 3, 1959), Fisk University (June 17, 1958; September 11-12, 1962), Morehouse and Spelman Colleges (June 21, 1958), and Virginia State and Hampton Institute (September 28, 1960). In a June 16, 1959 correspondence, George Redd, Dean at Fisk University forwarded to Cohen and the ICSS the Fisk’s honors program plans. He wrote, “I have delayed writing to you since the most helpful Louisville Conference because I wanted to give you a complete report…I shall look forward to the increased participation in the services of the Inter-University Committee.”

Redd had attended the first Southern Invitational Conference at the University of Louisville in November of 1958. The conference “for institutions predominantly Negro,” was the Southern University Invitational Conference at Southern University and A.&M. College in February of 1960.

Redd enclosed a report, “Recommendations of the Sub-Committee of the Educational Policy Committee on an Honors Program for Fisk University, June 1959,” describing in full detail the purpose and procedure to developing the honors program. The sub-committee’s report proposed that “it is desirable, as far as practical, to create a climate in which superior students

---

205 ICSS, Fd. 3, Box 22. Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
206 J. W. Cohen’s Visits. Fd. 9, Box 22. Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
207 personal letter, ICSS, Fd. 9, Box 22., Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
will compete more effectively with each other rather than be retarded by the ‘run of the mill’
student.”

The plan indicates not only the University’s commitment but its forward thinking as they
envisioned that by fall 1962, their honors students and program “will have its own food service;
an academic advisor rather than a personnel advisor; its own library…and become a source of
intellectual information for the campus.” Although a formal Honors program had not been
established previously at Fisk, courses with this intent had existed for years. A survey of honors
education on the campus that was attached to the report apprised that,

special offerings for superior students are nothing new at Fisk. For more than twenty
years, Departmental Honors courses have been given in various major fields; and during
the past two years, special Honors sections have been established…what is new…is the
systematic effort to provide the top 5 to 10% of the student body with a four-year
program.

In the 1963-64 ICSS membership brochure, HBCU supporting institutional members
included (as printed): Bennett College (North Carolina), Central State College (Ohio), Clark
College (Georgia), Grambling College (Louisiana), Langston University (Oklahoma), Lincoln
University (Pennsylvania), Savannah State College, Texas Southern University, Tuskegee
Institute (Alabama), Virginia State College, Xavier University (Louisiana). This list only
represents dues paying members; it is likely that many more HBCUs faculty committees were
actively engaged in discussions to develop or had already established honors programs. For

209 “Recommendations of the Sub-Committee of the Educational Policy Committee on an Honors Program for Fisk
University, June 1959” and “Sub-Committee of the Educational Policy Committee on an Honors Program for Fisk
University,” p. 1. (ICSS, Box 2 Fd. 9). Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
210 Theodore S. Currier “The Fisk Honors Program.” Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado
Boulder Libraries.
211 “Fisk University’s General Honors Program” (ICSS, Box2, Fd. 9): 1. Special Collections and Archives,
University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
example, Howard University and Hampton, both with honors programs at the time, do not appear on the list.\textsuperscript{212}

Pertaining to ICSS leadership, Black historian John Hope Franklin was a member of the executive committee for the national organization. He gave the opening address at the conference entitled, “To Educate All the Jeffersonians,” which was published in the April 1960 \textit{Superior Student} newsletter, an issue dedicated to the Southern Conference on the Gifted Negro Student. Franklin’s remarks were of a powerful magnitude that resonates even today as leaders debate on and for Black education,

\ldots the many who sought universal education, or the few who wanted to encourage the superior student, actually had in mind \textit{white} universal education or the encouragement of the superior student \textit{provided} he was white\ldots States more than simultaneously held contradictory notion that universal education should be confined to white people. Perhaps nothing has made a caricature of the current drive to identify and encourage the academically talented more than the concurrently prevailing practice of segregated education and cultural degradation that makes such identification and encouragement extremely difficult\ldots It was the view, supported in law, that Negroes should have equality in ignorance, and that no black person should have an education, whether he be moron or genius\ldots laws were enacted making it a crime for them to learn or be taught\ldots [to] ensure proper subordination.\textsuperscript{213}

Franklin, who later became the nation’s preeminent scholar in American and Black History, continued in his remarks to outline the history of Reconstruction, Jim Crow, and segregation in education. It is worth noting that in further reading of the conference session discussions, the special newsletter also revealed how Fisk, Hampton and other HBCUs were working with local high schools to not only recruit but begin earlier the nurturing of talented

\textsuperscript{212} Institutions are as listed in the brochure. Some institutions have changed their names to reflect their new status offering graduate degrees; for example, Tuskegee Institute which is now Tuskegee University.

\textsuperscript{213} John Hope Franklin, “To Educate All the Jeffersonians,” \textit{The Superior Student}, 3 no. 3 (1960):5. Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
students. In describing efforts of the Hampton Institute to identify talent, Dr. William Robinson reported,

most identification of bright students was too little and too late. To try to correct this, three local high schools [to Hampton] without any programs for their superior students were enlisted in a special effort… [being] given freshman courses in the high school.214

The conference and active discussion of highly talented Black students illustrate Black colleges’ involvement in the late 1950s and early 1960s in a significant and evolving trend in higher education, mostly out of a desire to meet the needs of the Black academically talented student population.

Cohen and his colleagues would continue to travel until 1963 witnessing their efforts of the ICSS transform teaching and learning on campuses across the nation, “As director up to 1963, I took on a good share of these [campus] visits. During this period I made roughly 300 visits and participated in 100 conferences.”215 Cohen’s southern state campus tour was apparently advantageous to his coordinating efforts and the engagement of Black colleges. The HBCUs that were involved in ICSS during these early years were primarily private—Atlanta University (now Clark Atlanta University), Bennett College, Fisk University, Hampton University, Howard University, and Morehouse College, to name a few. Private Black institutions boasted collegiate course work in the liberal arts, often adapted to honors program development. The engagement of these institutions in honors education and the concern for the

214 Panel discussion, “High School Relations and College Honors,” The Superior Student, 3 no. 3 (1960):11. Panelists were Benjamin Hunton (Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Schools, Washington, D.C.); William H. Robinson (Director, Division of Teacher Education, Hampton Institute); Theodore S. Currier (Chairman, Department of History, Fisk University); and Norman D. Kurland (Associate Director, Inter University Committee on the Superior Student). Special Collections and Archives, University of Colorado Boulder Libraries.
higher order intellectual development of students speaks to these private institutions’ autonomy from their states’ higher education systems. This relationship between honors education and liberal education does not appear entirely coincidental. That the private institutions were apt to provide a liberal arts educational focus, thus directing their involvement and concern for meeting the needs of academically talented Black students, is a logical outcome.

There were, however, also state-supported Black institutions that were meeting the needs of their high achieving students. Morgan State University (then Morgan State College), Florida A&M University (then Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes), Grambling State University (then Grambling College, Louisiana) and South Carolina State University (then Colored Normal Industrial Agricultural and Mechanical College of South Carolina) were among some of the public institutions that were deeply engaged with the ICSS and discussions on developing the academically talented youth on their campuses.\(^{216}\)

Two decades after the ICSS Southern conference proved that Black colleges indeed needed to respond to what Webster, Stockard and Henson referred to as the “brain drain” of not just high-achieving but “elite” students from their institutions. In their analysis of enrollment trends of Black elite students--those with high GPAs, class rank, and affluent, well-educated

\(^{216}\) These institutions were a peripheral part of the honors education movement of the late 1950s-60s with early course offerings even though their honors programs/colleges were officially established decades later: FAMU began offering honors education in 1969 but became “a full fledge honors program in 1985” (phone communication with Mr. Samuel Brown, Academic Coordinator, on May 5, 2015); According to websites as of Summer 2015: Grambling State University established its honors program in fall 1990 (http://www.gram.edu/academics/majors/arts-and-sciences/honors-college/); and South Carolina State University was “initially initiated in 1988 and implemented in fall 2010,” (http://www.scsu.edu/academics/honorscollege.aspx).
parents, from 1970-1978, HBCUs were losing ground as this group of bright students were more often choosing White colleges and universities.\textsuperscript{217}

Chapter III  Morgan State University, Jim Crow and (De)Segregation

Historical Overview, 1787-1950

In this chapter, an in-depth historical excavation of Morgan’s complex history under Jim Crow will be revealed as essential grounding to understanding its leadership and the context for the development of honors education among HBCUs. Many HBCUs began with the purpose of training men and women to teach in the Black segregated schools and to train men as ministers to serve the newly freed Black community during Reconstruction. Institutions that began as normal and missionary schools have their roots in the religious congregations that founded them. The commonly known history of Morgan State University is that a group of White ministers and laymen of the United Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore Conference (UMEC) founded the institution in 1867 as the Centenary Biblical Institute. Edward N. Wilson published the History of Morgan State College: A Century of Purpose in Action, 1867-1967.\(^{218}\) In providing justification for establishing an institution for Blacks, Bishop Levi Scott is reported to have stated, “May God prosper the work of our hands and enable us to do something that shall tell favorably and powerfully on the improvement and education of a people long neglected and oppressed”\(^{219}\) While UMEC provided full support and backing for the institution and therefore

\(^{218}\) Edward N. Wilson, The History of Morgan State College: A Century of Purpose in Action, 1867-1967 (New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1975). Many institutional histories commissioned by the administration are written by a member of the staff or faculty who share a deep affection and affinity to the institution. This is the case with Wilson whose relationship as student and employee at Morgan spanned approximately 60 years. His dedication to Morgan is evident in this text and other places such as the school’s Bulletin. The text lacks critical critique but does provide the most thorough presentation of Morgan’s founding to date. Wilson relies heavily on primary church documents from the Baltimore Conference Historical Society housed at the Lovely Lane Church in Baltimore, MD. I was unable to obtain access to the same documents he utilized. It is unclear if they still exist. For this reason, Wilson’s text will serve as a chief source regarding the founding of Morgan and other events of the late 19th/early 20th century that shaped Morgan’s identity. Wilson was a 1921 graduate and forty-two year staff member at Morgan.

rightly deserves credit for its founding, it should be acknowledged that the original idea for the school was first initiated by a group of freed Black ministers.

These Black ministers, of the Colored Methodist Society, established a school for children especially to meet the educational needs of the free Black community. According to souvenir program booklets of the Sharp St. Methodist Church, the Colored Methodist Society was founded in 1787. After acquiring property in 1802 at 112-116 Sharp St. in Baltimore, the name changed to the Sharp St. Methodist Church. Sharp St. and other free Black church congregations within Baltimore City, Washington, DC and other Maryland counties gathered to form the Washington Conference. In fact, Wilson gives credit to this ambitious group of Black leaders for the idea of the Institute who, in 1864, looked to the Methodist Episcopal Church to bring a school to fruition. Wilson wrote,

Even though one may have conceived such an idea, it does not necessarily follow that he is endowed with the required power to implement it…Negroes…planted the idea leading to the founding of the institution now known as Morgan State College. Because they lacked the authority, the resources and the skills necessary to achieve their objective—education for members of their race….they sought the advice and aid of their white friends…the Methodist Episcopal Church. 221

Bishop Levi Scott met with the Black pastors of the Washington Conference at their first conference October 23-November 1, 1864 at the Sharp St. church, of which the meeting minutes pointed out that Levi commented on the coincidence that the conference ended on the same day as “the day on which the dominion of slavery ceases.” It was at the conclusion of this meeting that the establishment of a school to prepare ministers for the newly freed community was settled. The Black pastor of the Sharp St. church, Rev. Benjamin Brown, was recorded in the

---

minutes as stating, “restoring to liberty many of our brethren who have heretofore been in
bondage, to God be the glory and to us the privilege and duty of making this dispensation
available for our moral and intellectual elevation.” 223

Following the conference with the Colored Methodist Society, Methodist Bishop Levi
Scott presented a plan to conference leaders—laymen and ministers, of the church for the
education of the newly freed that might redress the recent history of slavery and help meet the
educational and spiritual needs of the freed slaves. According to Wilson,

Scott invited Thomas Kelso, William Harden, William Daniel, and William B. Hill to a
meeting on Christmas Day, 1866. These five men decided that at least eight additional
men should work with them in undertaking the huge task of establishing a school. Thus,
on January 3, 1867, the second meeting was held with Bishop Scott and his Associate,
Bishop Ames, and the thirteen men …became the Founder and first trustees.224

Accepting the task put forth by the Colored Methodist Society the UMEC men began
efforts to establish an Institute. On December 25, 1866, ministers and laymen of the Baltimore
Conference met to begin laying plans for the school. The Sharp St. Church hosted the first
classes for the Centenary Biblical Institute in 1867 and served as a conduit for the Institute by
recommending students. Male students would study first at the “colored school in Baltimore
which was sponsored by the Association for the Moral and Educational Improvement of the
Colored People,” and then the Sharp St. Church would forward eligible candidates to the
Institute for study for the ministry, thus creating a pipeline to the Institute.225

224 Edward N. Wilson, “The Founders and Our Challenging Heritage (Founders’ Day Address delivered on
Collections & University Archives University of Maryland Libraries. Thomas Kelso (layman and first chair of the
Board of Trustees), Rev. William Harden, William Daniel, Esq. (layman), and William B. Hill (layman). A layman
was not a member of the clergy but was a church leader, often preaching the gospel of the faith and helped to
establish churches.
The Centenary Biblical Institute, or Morgan State University, was thus officially founded in Baltimore, MD by the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1867 for men to pursue the field of theology. In 1874 (for the 1874-75 school year), women were admitted for teacher preparation in the Normal department. Historian Bernard C. Steiner wrote that the Institute had extended its offering in 1879 to include “normal, theological, and college preparatory departments.” Because the Institute was no longer solely a seminary, President Wagner felt the name of the institution should change and recommended the change in a June 13, 1889 report to the Board. On February 12, 1890, President Wagner proposed to the Board to upgrade the Institute to the collegiate level. According to Steiner, the students enrolled in the college preparatory departments requested an affordable in-state option for completing their studies. Steiner explained that the trustees understood the students’ plight and in 1890, petitioned [the state legislature] for a change of corporate name and an enlargement of functions, which petition was granted, and the name was changed to Morgan College, and the school was raised to college grade with all powers granted such institutions.

Wilson documented the minutes of this February 12, 1890 meeting in his book also as reading, “Change the grade of the school from academic to collegiate, thus enabling young men and women to continue their studies at the higher grades.” The school’s status was later confirmed at a June 3, 1890 meeting where it was reported that the “Charter had been amended which changed the name of the institution and granted authority to offer courses of study leading to the awarding of degrees” and gave the institution a name commensurate with its evolving practice and mission. Today, the institution bears the name of its chairman of the Board of Trustees,

---

226 Bernard C. Steiner, History of Education in Maryland, 1894, 205.
227 Wilson, The History of Morgan State College, 1975
228 Steiner, History of Education in Maryland, 1894, 205.
Methodist preacher, Reverend Dr. Lyttleton F. Morgan. Morgan was vice chairman of the Institute from 1876-1886, becoming Chair of the Board officially in February of 1890. Other sources, including Wilson, also commonly cite the generosity of Board chairman Morgan with primarily enabling the promotion of the Institute to a college due to a considerable financial gift to the school. A May 31, 1917 commencement program shows exercises being held at the Sharp St. Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, awarding diplomas to those students completing the college preparatory program and Bachelors of Arts degrees to those who had completed four years of college course study. Included in the commencement exercises were also graduates from Princes Anne Academy. All students had a theme next to their names representing what might have been a final paper requirement for graduation. Morgan continued to strengthen its collegiate program, becoming fully accredited by the Middle States Association in 1925.231

Finding a Home

Beyond the lecture rooms utilized at the Sharp St. Methodist Episcopal Church, various copies of the Morgan State College Bulletin, Steiner’s and Pietila’s accounting of Morgan’s early beginnings, as well as primary documents, reference the first independent location of the Institute at the corner of Fulton and Edmondson Avenue in Baltimore City. Having outgrown this space and also facing financial hardship, the Trustees allowed President Spencer to fundraise. In 1908, due to the institution’s dire funding needs, President John Oakley Spencer traveled to New York to seek financial support from Mr. Andrew Carnegie. Meeting with Mr. Carnegie’s secretary, Mr. James Bertram, who was also interested in Negro education, Spencer was told he only had fifteen minutes to pitch his request. According to his memoirs, Spencer was able to captivate Mr. Bertram’s interest. Wilson reported Spencer’s memoirs as written,

He replied that I could have fifteen minutes. With watch in hand, I rapidly, but clearly outlined the situation at Morgan College. When the fifteen minutes were up, the Secretary requested me to remain. We spent more than an hour discussing the education of the Negro.232

In Spencer’s memoirs, he reported that within two days, Carnegie decided to give $50,000 for a building (to be named in his honor) “provided Morgan College…would raise an additional $50,000 for endowment.”233 It took Morgan about six years to raise the matching funds.

The trustees sought a new site for the campus and building as, “it became evident that it would be a great mistake to spend “$50,000 for a building on the very small lot adjacent to the old Morgan College Building, so efforts were made to choose a proper site.”234 Edward Tildon, an architect sent by Carnegie’s secretary to survey the college’s Edmonson and Fulton lot agreed that the site was not suitable for a new building. “The pledges which he [Andrew Carnegie] had made to numerous institutions for various purposes were turned over [to] the Carnegie Corporation” who wanted Morgan to quickly close on a location.235 To do so, a company of mostly all Black men was formed in 1913 to acquire land. They selected a site in Northwest Baltimore, possibly Mount Washington, and oversaw the site, “agreeing to give one-half of the land to Morgan College for the erection of Carnegie Hall, the other half to be used by the company for the development of a first-class residential area.”236 According to Wilson, a temporary site was chosen in 1914 in order to not lose the $50,000 pledge of funds. Journalist Antero Pietila, asserted that “Morgan’s goal was to use half of the forty-three-acre parcel for the

---

232 Wilson, The History of Morgan State College, 1975, 70.
233 Wilson, The History of Morgan State College, 1975, 70.
235 “Address of Dr. John O. Spencer” November 19, 1937, 10-11.
236 Wilson, The History of Morgan College, 1967, 72.
college” and use the rest of the acreage to establish homes.\textsuperscript{237} Having identified property in an upper class White area, Mount Washington, Spencer and the trustees’ greatest problem was not just financing a new campus. Most challenging for them would be locating a space where their Black students would be welcomed.

Spencer and the Board received dozens of negative letters and articles in the local papers protesting any move of the college to the Mount Washington area. Representing a group of business men, Mr. Hayfield wrote on September 3, 1913, “Mt. Washington [is] where Baltimore’s most prominent business men reside…the sentiment of the Citizens of this village is very strong against such a move and will be bitterly resented.”\textsuperscript{238} The emotions were high and the protests ferocious. What follows is a log of the personal and public communications from individuals and organizations. These correspondence demonstrate the intense racialized climate of the pre-WWI-Jim Crow era in which Morgan College sought existence and expansion:

**September 23, 1913**: A personal letter to Rev. Goucher regarding a Resolution passed by 150 citizens representing the Arlington, Park Heights Avenue, Pikesville, Sudbrook and Green Spring Valley areas at a September 22\textsuperscript{nd} meeting to “earnestly protest against the suggested location of Morgan College.” The Resolution was against the owner of the property, Mr. James Ingram, and the Trustees.

**September 23, 1913**: News article (unidentified), “Vigorous Protest Made Park Heights Avenue Residents Aroused Against Negro College.”

**September 26, 1913**, Editorial from \textit{The Sun}: “Time to Call a Halt.”

**September 30, 1913**: letter from the Mt. Washington Improvement Association to Trustee Goucher: “We all appreciate and recognize the value of the work done by this college for the education and elevation of the negro…the location of the negro college and a negro settlement almost in the very heart of this village would not only retard if not prevent further development, but would immeasurably depreciate values throughout this neighborhood.”\textsuperscript{239}

**September 24, 1914**, \textit{The Evening Sun}: “Negro Colony Plans to Adjoin Morgan College.”

\textsuperscript{238} Correspondence to John Goucher from Mr. Hayfield. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.
\textsuperscript{239} Correspondences, articles. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.
The Northwest property was not actualized but instead the company did get the title to an Ivy Mill property. They found an 85-acre lot north of the city’s filtration plant in the county. The space had “graceful hillsides alternating with winding vales, tall maples and lindens mak[ing] this spot a veritable park of picturesqueness.”²⁴⁰ Spencer would have to experiment using slightly different measures than those for the Mt. Washington property once he learned that the “company of colored men” charged to inspect and purchase property for the school had acquired the title to the Ivy Mill property. Although it is not evident how the title was purchased, there was at least one White member of the company. The group could have staged a coup getting him to negotiate the purchase. In any case, after the experience with the Mt. Washington residents, Spencer was likely more careful when visiting in the Ivy Mill area. Spencer visited the property at night “because the people in the neighborhood did not like the complexion of those with whom I associated.” He was also offered money to not consider the property. These are the challenging and “secretive” accounts of Morgan College’s John O. Spencer’s efforts to secure appropriate land for Morgan:

I personally inspected about eighty pieces of property…One offered a contribution of $25,000 to Morgan College if I would bring four or five very black men out to inspect a piece of property…He said, ’I do not expect you to take the property but if my prospective customers see you looking at it, they will hurry up and buy.’²⁴¹

Spencer and members of the company of colored men visited the property when they—the Black men—would least be noticed by the White residents. Spencer wrote,

This property I had first covertly inspected at night and during heavy rainstorms... Quite secretly, an option had been secured. On learning of this, one man offered to me

personally $500 if I would recommend to the Board of Trustees the surrender of this opinion. I showed him the door…These properties when first acquired were in Baltimore County. As soon as it was known that Morgan College was considering the purchase of the land, the most strenuous opposition was developed. I received petitions and threatening letters but the title having been secured there was nothing left for the opposition but to begin legal action.\textsuperscript{242}

Having purchased the Ivy Mills property (current location), White neighbors legally contested a Black college and its students moving in to their neighborhood, creating a tension between the alleged rights of White citizens to a racially exclusive neighborhood and the freedom of Black education, thus reigniting the contested fundamental debate of education and citizenship.\textsuperscript{243} Although the “trustees won every point of the suit,” the court action “so delayed the erection of the building that…Mr. Carnegie’s total gift [was raised] to $95,000” due to the rising costs of building materials and fees absorbed associated with the legal case.\textsuperscript{244} Ivy Mills was not the first site considered for the new location but it was the final one. The college tried other sites (Mt. Washington) before settling in its current location at Cold Spring Lane (formerly Grindon Lane) in 1917, which at the time was a zoned area of Baltimore County.\textsuperscript{245} Journalist Pietela writes:


\textsuperscript{243} Hilary Moss, \textit{Schooling Citizens: The Struggle for African American Education in Antebellum America}. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 130. Moss examined the volatile rise of White opposition to Black education at the same time public education was expanding in the late 19th century.

\textsuperscript{244} Ibid \textit{Bulletin}, April 1936, 14.

\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Buchanan v Warley} 245 U.S. 60 (1917); The Supreme Court rules against residential segregation in Louisville, KY, November 5, 1917.

When Morgan relocated to the area, the neighborhood, like most residential areas, was segregated. I grew up a walk from Morgan State University in the Northwood community. My parents were among the first Black families to desegregate the neighborhood in the late 1960s. They were given a 1931 copy of the Northwood Charter By-laws published by The Greater Northwood Covenant Association, Inc. which contains exclusive language (page 6). These racially restrictive covenants were often within the deeds as a way of legally prohibiting non-White buyers. Reallators profited by “blockbusting” neighborhoods (see Pietela’s \textit{Not in My Neighborhood}). In my parents’ copy of the by-laws, the language was crossed out (not by them) yet still included in the printing of the booklet, perhaps to convey to Black buyers that they were not really welcome. The exclusive language was completely deleted from an on-line version of the same document which, according to my mother who was active in the neighborhood association, did not occur until sometime in the 1980s: (http://static1.squarespace.com/static/51301faa4e4b095f36e7103f4/t/51db7109e4b0222e6013ebaf5/1373335817484/deed-2.pdf) My parents’ original copy reads, “At no time shall the land included in said tract or any part thereon, be occupied by any negro or person of negro extraction. This prohibition, however, is not intended to include the occupancy by a negro domestic servant or other person while employed in or about the premises by the owner or
In 1917 the college settled on a northeast Baltimore parcel, also outside the city’s borders at the time. Morgan was in for a fight there too [after pushback from neighbors in other areas in and around the city that were considered for the new campus location]. Not far from the new site—...were old estates and white villages. Those neighbors were most unhappy. Hoping to derail the project, they first offered to bribe Morgan’s president. He refused. They then filed two lawsuits to prevent Morgan from going ahead with its plans but were defeated in the courts.246

Neighbors surrounding the Ivy Mills property were no different than those in Mt. Washington. A May 2, 1917 Evening Sun news article, “They Object to Negro College ‘In Their Midst,’” shows Lauraville residents lined up in front of Morgan’s Edmondson and Fulton location in protest. More of the same outcry continued in a May 16, 1917 article, “Negro Colony Opposed: Old Town M. & M. Protests against Hillen Road Site,” which was an open letter to a Morgan Trustee. Other articles included (papers unidentified) “Hillen Road Protests Against College Pile Up,” May 7, 1917; and “Talks of Ivy Mill Property: Head of Land Co. Defends Negotiations with Negro College,” May 5, 1917. Neighborhood associations sent letters to both Spencer and Goucher, Trustee chairman, pleading that the college reconsider: the Citizens Improvement Association (May 17, 1917) and the Lauraville Improvement Association (May 30 and June 7, 1917).247 In July 1917 a suit was filed by Russell I. Diggs and his wife, Anna C. Diggs, (Russell I. Diggs et. al. v Morgan College [no citation number in original]) in the Baltimore County Circuit Court. 248 A complaint outlined in the suit stated,

---


247 Correspondences and articles. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.

248 Co-complainants listed on the suit were Samuel W. and Jessie B. Lawder, George H. and Margaret B. Frankton, and William Henry and Johanna C. Beck. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.
said neighborhood has for many years been a residential neighborhood for white persons only and that the homes that have been built there represent the earnings and labor of the owners… [and in becoming aware of the negotiations of the land between the Ivy Land Company and Morgan] and …realizing the irreparable injury that would thereby result, united in most vigorous protests, held public meetings of indignation, sent numerous delegations of remonstrance to the trustees of the respondent and made every reasonable and proper effort to induce said trustees to abandon their said contemplated purchase and their said contemplated illegal plan of colonization and when said trustees, in utter disregard of said promises and remonstrance, consummated said purchase, the protestants even went so far as to offer to buy the property from the said trustees at the price at which they purchased it, which said offer said trustees refused to entertain.249

The appeal for the complainants alleged that the land that Morgan acquired on June 1, 1917 at Hillen Road and Gridiron Lane was in excess of what was needed and that the “defendant has announced that it intends to use a portion of the tract as building lots, to establish thereon a residential negro colony.” The case received a final decision in the Court of Appeals on October 30, 1918. The judgement read,

Whatever view may have been entertained formerly, since the decision in Buchanan v Warley, 245 U.S. 60, 62 L. Ed. 149, 38 S. Ct. 16…it is clear that the improvement of land as a colored residential neighborhood is not of itself a public nuisance. It may or may not become such, according to the way in which after the improvements are made, it is conducted. But to give the Court jurisdiction, since the elements of being a public nuisance and special damage of the plaintiff must co-exist, the judge from whom this appeal was taken was correct in his conclusions.250

The Baltimore Conference was not without support of its brethren. In a June 2, 1917 letter, W. J. Helms, president, E. F. Showell, secretary, and D. H. Hargis (D.S), penned these encouraging words to Rev. Goucher,

Dear Brother, having heard of the purchase of a new site for Morgan College and your efforts to that end, and recognizing the great amount of good such a movement will contribute to that grand old institution, we the Methodist Preacher’s Meeting of the Cambridge District, Delaware Conference hereby register our approval to the whole

249 Diggs v Morgan College, 1917. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md..
250 Russell I. Diggs, Et Al v Morgan College 133 Md. 264; 105 A. 157; 1918 Md. LEXIS 125. Court of Appeals of Maryland.
matter, offer our congratulations to you as the chief agent in its promotion and pledge our hearty support and cooperation in any way designated.  

Two years later in 1919, the trustees also purchased the Morton estate which sat just “adjacent on the south side of the Ivy Mills property.” Spencer’s vision and leadership in this purchase and the import of this new location is not to be underestimated. This legal victory and the relocation was synonymous to a new beginning for the institution. Upon Spencer’s retirement and the celebrations of Morgan’s and the Methodist church’s 70\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of collegiate Black education, and personal tribute to Spencer, a White man, this dramatic New Testament-Christ comparison was recorded expressing the deep regard for his leadership and the Ivy Mills victory, entitled, “Behold the Man!-John Oakley Spencer.”

When Christ was about to be crucified, Pilate brought Him before the crowd and said to them, “Behold the man!” When the crowd saw Him they cried out, “Crucify him, crucify him!” When President John O. Spencer purchased the present site for Morgan College, white people in neighborhood opposed the location of a Negro institution so near them. They paraded Dr. Spencer before the courts of Baltimore and Maryland. They cried, “Behold the man! It is he who plans to bring a group of colored people in our midst. It is he who will make it unsafe for our girls to walk the streets in our community.”

Despite the legal opposition from residential neighbors and racial conflict around their front door, the leadership persevered in securing the Ivy Mill location and their resolve in growing the institution was undeterred.

In a new home site in 1917 and almost thirty years since its name change in 1890 that more accurately depicted the institution’s academic mission, Morgan College continued to function privately under the auspices of the United Methodist Episcopal Church. The state of

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{251}Correspondence to Rev. Goucher, June 2, 1917. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.  
\textsuperscript{252}Ibid \textit{Bulletin}, April 1936, 14.  
\textsuperscript{253}“Behold the Man—John Oakley Spencer” Program for the Seventieth Anniversary Celebration /Program for the Banquet to Dr. John O. Spencer in Appreciation of Thirty-five Years as President of Morgan College May 28, 1937. \textit{The Morgan College Bulletin} Vol III no. 5 (May 1937), 3-4. (Seventieth Anniversary Number 1867-1937). Special Collections & University Archives University of Maryland Libraries.}
Maryland permitted slavery in antebellum times and was not among the states to secede from the Union but, similar to most border states, practiced Jim Crow and was not amenable to mixing the races in educational settings. Therefore, a public land grant option for Black students would be established to segregate Blacks from the all-White main Maryland State College of Agriculture campus, allowing the private Morgan College to receive and disseminate Morrill Act funding on its behalf. Princess Anne Academy, which was originally a junior college branch campus of Morgan College first in 1886 (prior to the 1890 second Morrill Act and under the UMEC Delaware Conference), was placed under state control in 1919 to provide agricultural education as the land grant institution for Negro youth. *Plessy v Ferguson* (1896), which had become the rule of the land twenty-three years prior, declaring separate but equal, made this offering of duplicative programs legal.

**Morgan and the State of Maryland**

Several contextual layers in the scientific community also influenced the educational climate surrounding Morgan during this time. An additional national backdrop to the educational separation of the races upheld by *Plessy* was that of the eugenics movement (the belief of hereditary determinism) which had gained feverish momentum in the early twentieth century. Each of these platforms messaged to Black Marylanders seeking higher education that there was indeed a group of identifiable desirable individuals but they did not belong to that superior group. In fact, they were considered morally, socially, and intellectually ‘unfit.’ Even if Black students were capable of professional studies, the state of Maryland made provisions in 1933 for

---


their advancement out of the home state and away from their families.\textsuperscript{256} Beginning in 1920, all professional programs such as law, medicine, and dentistry, in the city of Baltimore merged under the auspices of the Maryland State College of Agriculture, which was renamed the University of Maryland. Anyone with concerns regarding the various campuses would contact the President of the University of Maryland who headed the undergraduate campus as well as the professional schools. On December 8, 1934, Donald Gaines Murray, a Black Baltimorean and graduate of Amherst College, wrote to the president of the University of Maryland, R.A. Pearson, requesting admission to the Law School.\textsuperscript{257} In an expedient response back to Murray dated December 14, 1934, President Pearson explained:

Under the general laws of this State the University maintains the Princess Anne Academy as a separate institution of higher learning for the education of Negroes. In order to insure equality of opportunity for all citizens of this State, the 1933 legislature passed Chapter 234, creating partial scholarships at Morgan College or institutions outside of the State for Negro students who may desire to take professional courses or other work not given at the Princess Anne Academy.\textsuperscript{258}

Pearson went on to “kindly” offer assistance to Murray in retaining such scholarship funds to go out of state. In a later correspondence to Murray dated March 8, 1935, President Pearson maintained the system’s position, encouraging Murray to attend law school at Howard.

\textsuperscript{256} Peter Wallenstein, \textit{Higher Education and the Civil Rights Movement: White Supremacy, Black Southerners, and College Campuses} (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008), 245. The legislation was passed but monies were not awarded until after Donald G. Murray filed his lawsuit.

\textsuperscript{257} On January 24, 1935 Murray submitted an admission blank (application) for the Law school day program. Although raised in Baltimore, MD, Murray was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and returned to the state for one year of schooling at Lincoln University in Lincoln, Pa (1929-1930) prior to his enrollment in Amherst College, 1930-1934. Data on Murray’s original application form. Office of the President. University of Maryland Records, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries, \textit{Negro Education} files.

\textsuperscript{258} Even though Murray was seeking admission to the School of Law, he had to address his concerns to the president of the main campus. “In 1916, the state took full control of the college and changed its name to the Maryland State College of Agriculture. After the college merged with the Baltimore professional schools in 1920, the name of the institution changed again to the University of Maryland. The president of the College Park campus simultaneously held the position of president of all of the University of Maryland campuses. (http://digital.lib.umd.edu/archivesum/actions.DisplayEADDoc.do?source=/Mdu.ead.univarch.0062.xml). Office of the President. University of Maryland Records, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
University for their “exceptional facilities…in Washington…it has one of the best plants in the country. It’s School of Law is rated as Class ‘A’” and more affordable.259

In 1933, as noted in Pearson’s correspondence, “partial scholarships [were established by the Regents of the University of Maryland] at Morgan College in the state, or at institutions outside the state for negroes qualified to take professional courses not offered for them at Princess Anne Academy [the state’s junior college for Black students] but offered for [W]hite students in the university.”260 Princess Anne Academy did not prove adequate in averting Black students from the all-White institutions as it did not offer professional education and Morgan, although delivering a liberal arts education, was limited in that it did not provide training for law, medicine, or dentistry, for example.

Murray’s legal challenge was only the beginning of several that tested both Pearson’s successor, Harry Clifton (Curley) Byrd, and the state’s tolerance for racial mixing in education. The history of Byrd’s responses to such pressure tells its own narrative. The official University of Maryland presidential digital collections abstract which summarizes accomplishments of Byrd’s administration gives him credit for desegregating the Maryland system. It reads, “In 1935, Maryland became the first southern state university in the twentieth century to accept

---

259 Office of the President. University of Maryland Records, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries, Negro Education files. Although the tuition at Howard University was less than at the University of Maryland, the latter was located on Redwood and Green Streets in Baltimore (Murray lived in Baltimore at 1522 McCullough St.*) and Howard was in D.C. on 420 Fifth Street, N.W. Special Collections and Archives, University of Maryland.

*Address taken from Murray’s application. Pearson had not accounted for the costs of living expenses such as housing, food, and/or transportation or offering funds to cover these additional needs.

The Class ‘A’ category distinction to which Pearson referred is the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The accrediting organization refused HBCUs association membership. Rather than categorize and rate them along with PWIs, SACS designated HBCUs as either Class ‘A’ or ‘B’. See Roger L. Geiger, History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 476.

African-Americans [referring to Murray] and, in 1951, the first to accept African-American undergraduates.” The undergraduate student in 1951 was Hiram T. Whittle. Review of Byrd’s presidential papers, however, provide a more telling historical accounting of the President’s sentiments toward desegregation of the undergraduate campus.\(^{261}\) In fact, it is clear that Hiram T. Whittle, who was a junior mathematics major at Morgan State College desiring to transfer to the engineering program at the main campus, would not have been admitted had it not been for the mounting pressure from the NAACP filed lawsuit. Offering a dissimilar historical accounting of Byrd’s segregationist sentiments than that of the university’s digital abstract, the narrative of the case is presented in a February 3, 1951 article of the Baltimore *Afro-American* newspaper, “Univ. of Md. Board Opens School to All: Admits Its ‘Makeshift Policies’ Have Been Unfair and Illegal,” citing that admission “was approved Wednesday by the university’s board of regents, 18 months after the NAACP filed a court suit on his behalf.” According to the article, the state agreed to sign a “consent decree” after reading the legal signs on the wall and avoiding another public trial. The Board of Regents did offer Whittle “training instead at its Princess Anne school,” before finally conceding “these substitute offers as ‘makeshift policies’.”\(^{262}\) Given this different view of the same event, ascribing Whittle’s admittance to the university as “the first…to accept [sic]” a Black student, as a credit to Byrd’s record, is at best a generous interpretation of the affair.\(^{263}\) It is not likely that without the strong arm of the law, Byrd would have conceded to Murray’s requests for admission.

\(^{261}\) [link](http://digital.lib.umd.edu/archivesum/actions.DisplayEADDoc.do?source=/MdU.ead.univarch.0062.xml)

\(^{262}\) “Univ. of Md. Board Opens School to All: Admits Its ‘Makeshift Policies’ Have Been Unfair and Illegal.” *Baltimore Afro American*, February 3, 1951, 59th Year, No. 52.

\(^{263}\) [link](http://digital.lib.umd.edu/archivesum/actions.DisplayEADDoc.do?source=/MdU.ead.univarch.0062.xml)
Another example of Byrd’s segregationist leanings, which the current University of Maryland presidential digital collections abstract does not mention, occurred prior to Whittle’s enrollment controversy in 1947. There was another student by the name of Wilmore B. Leonard who applied for graduate studies in Chemistry at the University of Maryland. According to a 1947 Afro American article (“Opinion: U. Of Maryland’s ‘Mistake’”), Leonard, a 31 year old fighter veteran was granted admission in error. Gloating over the mistake, the writer opined,

Dr. H. C. (Curley) Byrd, president of the University of Maryland, is wearing a red face these days, and it’s not from sunburn. Somewhere along the line, someone slipped and sent out a card to Wilmore B. Leonard, a 31-year-old former Army captain of Salisbury, MD. Admitting him to the university’s graduate division.264

Historian Amy E. Slaton’s research of the incident in Race, Rigor, and Selectivity in U.S. Engineering indicates that the director of admissions, Edgar F. Long, attempted to get Leonard to return the card but he refused, at which point he was offered an out-of-state scholarship. Slaton wrote that Long,

Actually traveled to Leonard’s home in an effort to force the student to turn over the printed card that granted him provisional admission to College Park. Leonard refused to relinquish the card, at which point Long…told Leonard to keep the card ‘as a souvenir’ and that [his] admission had been ‘a mistake.’265

Although it is likely that Leonard would have been successful had he chosen to sue the university, according to Slaton, Leonard did not pursue the matter legally.266

266 It does not appear that Leonard enrolled in the University of Maryland. Leonard was from Salisbury, Md. and a 1939 graduate of the Hampton Institute. A World War II pilot, he was likely attempting to continue his studies using the G.I. Bill education benefits. According to a Washington Post obituary, Leonard began dental studies at Howard University in 1948. He joined the faculty after earning his degree in 1952, teaching at the Howard University School of Dentistry for 25 years. “W.B. Leonard, Dentist-Professor, Dies” (April 5, 1978). http://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/local/1978/04/05/w-b-leonard-dentist-professor-dies/c74d0620-1231-4f4f-ac99-bc3ab27a2b15/
Byrd’s tenure ended in 1954 leaving this researcher to ponder how his leadership may have responded to Brown. His track record speaks discouraging volumes. In fact, as a member institution of the Southern Regional Education Plan, Maryland manifested bad blood with the Board of Control and the other southern institutions by misusing the agreement of the stated guidelines to ship away its Black students from Maryland.267 The Southern Regional Education Plan, first discussed in 1947, allowed students of the respective schools (some of which were HBCUs) to participate in institutional exchange programs as a means of supplementing educational facilities if their home campus did not offer a particular area of professional study. The program was “not to be used in any way as a substitute to enable the state to circumvent its legal and moral obligation to provide equal educational opportunity to its Negro citizens.”268 In another legal challenge, Byrd offered complainant Esther McCreedy an out-of-state scholarship to a participating Southern Regional Educational Plan institution rather than integrating the nursing school. The Crisis included in its November 1950 issue an explanation and review of the plan that was written by John E. Ivey, Jr., director of Board of Control for Southern Regional Education. In an attempt to refute that the program was contrived to support segregation efforts, Ivey also expressed dismay with Maryland’s stratagem to use the plan for segregation purposes:

the application of Esther McCreedy for admittance to the University of Maryland school of nursing was turned down, admittedly because of race. Without the consent of the Board of Control, the University of Maryland’s Board of Regents’ answer to the court suit that followed was that equal facilities were being provided at Meharry Medical College [a participating institution in the plan]...through the Southern regional program...the Board...after an unsuccessful attempt to persuade the university regents to...

Leonard is on the Tuskegee Airmen Pilot Listing on the Tuskegee University website, http://www.tuskegee.edu/about_us/legacy_of_fame/tuskegee_aires/tuskegee_aires_pilot_listing.aspx According to the October 8, 2010 centennial program for the Bachelor-Benedict Club, Inc., Leonard “was assigned to class 44-H-SE. He earned his wings as a 260th Lieutenant on September 6, 1942, and joined the 99th Squadron.” http://content.yudu.com/Library/A1w34d/BachelorBenedictClub/resources/27.htm Despite service to his country in the name of “democracy,” Ltd. Leonard was denied admission to his state school because of his race, begging the question of education and citizenship for whom.

267 "Report and Recommendations of the Commission to Study the Question of Negro Education,” June 30, 1950, 4.

delete the regional program from their [legal] defense, intervened as a friend of the court [McCready v Byrd, 195 MD 131.1949]...stat[ing]: “The Board’s position is that it shall make regional arrangements to supplement facilities within the States. It is not the purpose of the Board that the regional compact and the contracts at segregation...If this were done, too few members of the present generation of Negro youth would have the opportunity to receive college training. The great leadership potential of these young people would thus be lost, just when American democracy needs it most.269

Ivey’s words echoed the sentiments of the notion of democracy in education that had been recently promoted from the federal level. In 1947, the President’s (Truman) Commission on Higher Education (Higher Education for American Democracy) had this to say about separate but equal,

Segregation lessens the quality of education for the whites as well. To maintain two school systems side by side—duplicating even inadequately the buildings, equipment, and teaching personnel—means that neither can be of the quality that would be possible if all the available resources were devoted to one system, especially not when the States least able to financially support an adequate educational program for their youth are the very ones that are trying to carry a double load.270

It is important to note that during the same post-World War II era as the Truman Commission report, the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education Plan was first discussed at the Southern Governors’ Conference in October of 1947. It was signed by governors in February of 1948 and officially launched in September 1948.271 Maryland governor William Preston Lane, Jr. may have signed the compact in good faith but the University of Maryland system had other plans.

271 John E. Ivey, Jr., “Facts About Regional Education.” Participating states were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.
“Personally, I doubt that the State can take over Morgan College because it is an institution owned and controlled by the Methodist Church, with a Methodist board of trustees.” These were the writings of University of Maryland’s acting president, H.C. Byrd on July 16, 1935. Byrd was strategizing how to block the admission of law school applicant, Donald G. Murray, in the state Supreme Court case and the first successful higher education desegregation case, *Murray v Maryland, 1935* (or *Pearson v Murray, 1936*). However on January 15, 1936, the Maryland Court of Appeals ruled in Murray’s favor. Frantic to set up a Law school at Morgan, Byrd set up a “confidential” meeting for March 9, 1936 at Morgan College with himself, Dr. Spencer, president of Morgan; Dr. T.H. Kiah, principal of Princess Anne Academy; Dean Howell of the University of Maryland Law school and Professor H.F. Cotterman, the head of vocational agriculture. In writing to Howell on February 26, 1936 about the March 9 meeting, Byrd informed Howell that he had already “spoken briefly to the Governor,” indicating that he was moving ‘with all deliberate speed’ on this issue.” Although it was legally determined that Murray would attend the Maryland law school in the fall, the meeting on March 9 likely involved discussions of additional costs to establishing a separate law school. In a March 28, 1936 report from Dean Roger Howell that was requested by President Byrd, Howell outlined the potential costs of establishing a “Class A law school and the probable costs of instituting and maintaining one at Morgan College.” Howell detailed the necessary requirements of the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law School standards, including teaching salaries, equipment, and separate facilities and libraries. For the

---
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latter, Howell suggested in the March 28, 1936 letter that the matter of acquiring a separate facility, which would be costly, could be evaded by having Morgan’s current physical plant provide the space, “it would hardly be necessary for a new school, such as contemplated, to meet the Class A requirements in this respect at once.”275 In yet another suggestion in this letter and attempt to get the law school up and running at minimum costs, he advised that to compensate salaries, “negro teachers should be obtainable for salaries considerably lower than those paid by white schools.” Howell also advised that “as long as no separate law building is maintained,” (although required by the associations), an obtainable budget of $16-18,000.00 would suffice to get started. Even though Thurgood Marshall and, primarily, Charles Hamilton Houston’s legal strategy was to argue for Murray’s admittance because the state could not establish a law school overnight for Murray, Howell and Byrd were giving this their best effort. 276

In another letter to Byrd on December 23, 1936, Howell informs him of a meeting with Morgan Trustee member, Professor McDougle, a White professor from Goucher College in Baltimore. McDougle was meeting with Howell to inquire of Murray’s condition at the law school; Howell’s intentions for the meeting were to continue the discussion of maintaining a separate law school for Blacks. In this meeting, Howell, as reported to Byrd, suggested a state purchase of Morgan or scholarships for professional studies elsewhere. The reported financial projection for a separate law school has far reaching undertones as Howell makes mention of Morgan being taken over by the state, writing

in view of the decision of the Court of Appeals in the Murray case, the obvious alternative to mixed education, was to provide for higher education for negroes at
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a State owned institution—i.e. for the State to take over Morgan College and provide funds for professional training for the negro race there.  

The 1935 Murray decision revealed that the state had “failed to make adequate provision for Negros” in higher education. The state also recognized that although legislative measures of 1933 (Ch. 234 of the Acts of 1933) and Code of 1935 (Article 77, Section 214A) which called for the provision by the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland to allocate scholarship funds, no funds had yet been awarded. Murray forced the hand of the state to allocate funding to Morgan and to pay off its debt to Morgan for the land and purchase of Princess Anne Academy from 1919. According to Callcott, the University of Maryland increased the total $600.00 available for scholarships to $30,000. The legislature also paid out to Morgan “the capital sum of $100,000… for the property at Princess Anne Academy, which belonged to Morgan College and had been used without compensation and maintained by the State”—some twenty years later after the actual 1919 agreement. The University did not want any threats of racial mixing at the professional schools and certainly not at the undergraduate campus. In order to prevent any reason for a request of admission of a Black student to the College Park campus, Callcott wrote that the Regents chose to “evade possible suits to enter the undergraduate schools [and] the legislature appropriated [funds] so that the University could purchase Princess Anne Academy from Morgan College and bring it up to full collegiate standing.” Callcott cited that for reasons of continuing segregation, Byrd ensured the financing education for Blacks in the late 1930s. Byrd, according to Callcott, reasoned that investing financially in Princess Anne was the
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only logical course of action; “if we don’t do something about Princess Anne we’re going to have to accept Negroes at College Park, where our girls are.” Rather than take Byrd’s advice of fully outfitting Princess Anne Academy, the legislature only minimally supported the campus and chose rather, in 1939, to take control of Morgan College as an up-to-standard Black collegiate option.

Due to an Act of the General Assembly—and also because of Murray, the Maryland Commission on Higher Education of Negroes was created. The Commission was charged, among other duties, with administering a total amount of $10,000 in state appropriated funds for scholarships to “Negro students” for the 1935-36 and 1936-37 school years. The scholarships were for Black students “to attend college outside of the State, the main purpose being to give the benefit of college and professional courses to the State, but with the authority to award any of said scholarships to Morgan College, not to exceed $200 each in value.”

The catalyst for these legislative actions were due to the Murray proceedings. The Commission was also charged with responding to the sudden “crisis” that was the Murray decision by facilitating “a study of and further[ing] the interest of Morgan College…and of the interest and needs of higher education for Negroes in Maryland.” In its report, the Commission said as much, writing, “the necessity of a study of the situation at this particular time was demonstrated by an important decision of the highest court of the state which was rendered on January 15, 1936.”
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The lower court ordered that Murray be allowed to begin classes on September 24, 1935, to which an appeal was filed on June 25, 1935. On June 19, 1935, University of Maryland president Raymond A. Pearson, wrote to the Board of Regents with a review of the court decision and recommended that University lawyers get an appeal while the court was still in session. Although in this letter Pearson acknowledged the expertise of the defendant’s legal team, referring to Charles Hamilton Houston as a “Harvard man,” he apparently expected a reversal of the decision as he anticipated blocking Murray’s September access to the law school. In his letter he explained,

The Court of Appeals is now in session but will adjourn tomorrow. If they come back during the summer it may be possible to have this case taken up; otherwise it must wait until the October term. The Attorney General’s office with the approval of Dean Howell, recommends that the case be carried to the Court of Appeals.284

In filing a petition on August 6, 1935 to the Court to advance the case for an immediate appeals hearing, Board of Regents attorney general Herbert R. O’Conor made the case for the urgency of the “crisis” by including two personal letters. One letter (date not provided) was from a parent (Mr. George Quirk) addressed to Byrd concerning the need to withdraw and find a new school for his three daughters if the law school decision also applied to the undergraduate campus:

I have received information…that a recent decision in the Court in Baltimore opens the University of Maryland to negroes this fall...I have three daughters in the University of Maryland, and naturally would not want them there...I cannot understand why this information, if it is true is being withheld from the parents of the student body.285

The second letter was from Byrd himself, writing in his capacity as acting president, to the Court that admitting Murray “has created a situation which may be very disastrous for our
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University.”286 In an apparent attempt to influence the actions of the Court, Byrd relied on race baiting as a tactic to stir up fear, hoping to coerce an outcome to the University’s favor. In washing his hands of any public uprising that might lead to violence, Byrd put the burden of what might be the result of White outrage on the authority of the Court, as he could not be held responsible for what would occur next. He wrote:

Under the law, I am responsible for all discipline in the University, but if the order of the lower court is carried out, and negro [sic] students are admitted to the University, I should not like to be held responsible for what may happen. With five hundred girls on the campus at College Park…the seriousness of the situation…cannot be overestimated.287

In the final ruling, the Court acknowledged the lower $135 cost of attendance compared to Maryland ($203) but went on to explain to the appellants,

But to attend Howard University the petitioner, living in Baltimore, would be under the necessity of paying the expenses of daily travel to and fro, with some expenses while in Washington, or of moving to Washington to live during his law school education, and to pay the incidental expenses of thus living away from home…going to any law school in the nearest jurisdiction, would then, involve him in considerable expense even with the aid of one of the scholarships should he chance to receive one…fall[ing] short of providing for students of the colored race facilities substantially equal to those furnished to the whites in the law school maintained in Baltimore…No separate school for colored students has been decided upon and only an inadequate substitute has been provided [here, the Court may have been referring to Howell’s proposal to establish a law school at Morgan]…We cannot find the remedy to be that of ordering a separate school for negroes…[and] therefore the erection of a separate school is not here an available alternative remedy…The case, as we find it, then, is that the state…must admit.288

The state ruling struck a chord throughout the South as well. On February 4, 1936, Byrd wrote to thirteen White southern university presidents of segregated institutions informing them

---


of the ruling. Byrd wrote his colleagues to warn them that Murray was a “test case” and that more legal challenges are to be expected as the decision “effects every Law school of every state university in the South.” 289 Like brothers protecting a sacred fraternal order, most wrote back in gratitude of Byrd’s “heads up.” Many, such as J.L. Newcomb of University of Virginia, responded that they were already gearing up for such attacks: “I have been having some discussions with the Governor and Attorney General of this State to see if anything can be done to protect the situation in Virginia.” 290

Byrd also received supportive postcards from private citizens—Cyril Hamsill on January 22, 1936 and Anita Sawyer on January 18, 1936, both of Baltimore. 291 Mr. Hamsill wrote that he “hates like poison the idea of Negro Murray attending Maryland-a southern institution.” 292 Forwarding words of encouragement, Anita Sawyer wrote,

I am terribly shocked over negro [sic] Murray case. Most marylanders [sic] feel the same. You have been the main spring in developing the U. of M. & no doubt feel the same. Many of the young men & women of Balto. & other parts of the south will naturally go to another institution to take up law, medicine, etc. because of this. I urge you to keep up the good fight. 293

These sentiments from citizens and the University of Maryland state system speak of the environment in which Morgan College would become a state institution in 1939, pressing for both the right to education and citizenship. It was an environment that was hostile and desperate
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Receiving Byrd’s letter (as listed in an attachment) were the presidents of the University of Kentucky, Virginia, Texas, Tennessee, S. Carolina, N. Carolina (Chapel Hill), Mississippi; Louisiana State University; University of Georgia, Florida (Gainesville), Arkansas, Alabama; Also, the University of Missouri.
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to maintain segregation, without any sincere commitment to Black education. Actually, what these citizens and other segregationists in the state during the *Murray* trial era perhaps did not know or would not want to have known is that prior to 1890, there were at least two Black men who graduated from the University of Maryland Law School and four who attended. Murray was not the very first. According to “The First Integration of the University of Maryland School of Law,” by David Skillen Bogden, a lawyer of national repute, David Hoffman started the law school in 1823. In 1887, two Black students, Harry Sythe Cummings and Charles W. Johnson were enrolled and later graduated within two years rather than three. In the 1889-90 school year two additional Black men, John L. Dozier and William Ashbie Hawkins were admitted. Unfortunately, amidst controversy of White student (and some faculty) protest, Dozier and Hawkins were expelled because of their race. According to a September 15, 1890 article in *The New York Times*, the narrative of the Board’s decision was framed as if they had no other choice but to capitulate to the racist opposition of the White students and thus release Dozier and Hawkins. The article stated,

The Maryland Law School has determined that it will admit no more colored students. Last year two colored students, Cummins and Johnson, the first who ever attended lectures there, were graduated with high honors…two more colored students, W. Ashbie Hawkins and John L. Dozier…have been at the university one year and have been notified by Mr. John P. Poe, on the part of the Regents, that they cannot return. The white students of the Law, Medical, and Dental Departments of the university sent a petition to the Faculty protesting against the admission of any colored students to the Law School…signed by nearly all ninety-nine students…They [Regents] had finally resolved that it would be unwise to endanger the school or jeopardize its interests in any way by any longer allowing colored students to attend the school…A number of [White] students had left the school and others had refused to enter because of the presence of two colored men…that was the chief consideration influencing the action of the Regents. 294

http://query.nytimes.com/mem/archive-free/pdf?res=9C05E4DA103BE533A25756C1A96F9C94619ED7CF
Dozier and Hawkins, with no place to study law in Maryland, must have turned to Morgan College for assistance. Wilson relays in his book the October 3, 1890 meeting minutes of the Trustees in consideration of extending its offerings to include legal studies. The minutes read,

By recent action of the Law Department of the State University of Maryland, it was decided to discontinue colored students in this Department, declaring that it was inexpedient to admit such students to any of the departments of the above named Institution. The law students, thus driven out, and their friends appeal to Morgan College to establish a law school in connection with this Institution, pledging their hearty cooperation and support. It was then moved that the Trustees authorized the establishment of a law school in connection with Morgan College…if such a school…can be established without additional expense to the College.295

The Board did not choose to open a law school, leaving the history of the Murray case to unfold, such as it did. Both completed their studies at Howard University. Hawkins, who was a graduate of the Centenary Biblical Institute (Morgan) became a prominent lawyer in the city of Baltimore known for successfully challenging residential segregation.296 The law school was eventually taken over by the state. Murray was thus the first Black law student to attend the University of Maryland law school in the twentieth century. In 1890, two Black law students who were released from the White law school turned to Morgan for legal studies and in 1936, the state figured Morgan could be the site for Blacks aspiring to study law. About five decades between these incidents, racial segregation was still heavily influencing the educational outcomes of Blacks with Morgan as its rebuttal. It appears that philosopher George Santayana’s famous quote, “those who cannot remember the past are doomed to repeat it,” is apropos here.

Among the recommendations of the 1937 Commission was the transfer of Morgan from a private to a public institution. Outlining the state’s inadequacy of providing undergraduate education for Negroes and the misuse of the Second Morrill Act funding for inadequate Princess Anne Academy, the Commission’s first recommendation was: “The state should establish a public institution of college grade for Negroes, offering undergraduate courses equivalent to those offered by the University of Maryland.” The report called to attention that,

In 1892, the state found itself unable to participate in the distribution of federal funds for the education in agriculture and mechanic arts under the Morrill Act, without making some provision for Negroes…a contract between Morgan College and Maryland Agricultural College…whereby Morgan College undertook to do for the State at Princess Anne similar work on behalf of Negros to that carried on by land grant colleges in the south. 297

The report also pointed out that once Maryland began receiving funds, it kept four-fifths for the main campus and earmarked only one-fifth to Morgan on behalf of Princess Anne. In 1915, the Federal Government objected to this arrangement because Princess Anne, essentially a high school operation, had low scholastic standards, leaving the University of Maryland no choice but to take “administrative control of Princess Anne” in 1919. The Commission went on to describe the state’s neglect of Princess Anne since 1919 thereby justifying, “we recommend the acquisition of Morgan College by the state as a nucleus for further development and believe the interests of the Negro will thus be best served at the least public expense. 298

In fact, according to Table 1 of the report, “Statistics of Land-Grant Colleges Year Ended June 30, 1921,” Maryland appropriated $40,000 in Morrill funds to the main campus but only $10,000 to the institution

“exclusively for colored persons.” Maryland’s appropriations violated the 1890 Morrill Act’s stipulation that “funds received in such State or Territory be equitably divided.”

Regarding the 1919 takeover of Princess Anne Academy by the state, Wilson implied that sponsorship was not an announced collaboration. The state had not all of a sudden become concerned with the education of Black people, however the state figured wisely how to quickly meet federal regulations by profiting from the honest work of the Methodists who were concerned with “Negro education.” Interested in providing schooling on the eastern shore of Maryland for Blacks, and having the support of the Centenary Biblical Institute, the Methodist Episcopal Church-Wilmington purchased property in Princess Anne and on June 9, 1886, the branch school, the Delaware Conference Academy, was approved. Wilson further wrote that in a Board meeting on January 22, 1891, a proposal for “the propriety of quietly changing the name of the Delaware Conference Academy to Princess Anne Academy-the Eastern Branch of the Agricultural College of Maryland” was considered. Significant to this development, especially in 1891 after the Second Morrill Act, is the activity at the University of Maryland, which eventually led to the state’s 1919 control of Princess Anne Academy. According to historian and University of Maryland professor George Callcott, the University of Maryland, then the

299 “Statistics of Land-Grant Colleges Year Ended June 30, 1921,” Bulletin 1922, No. 34 U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Education, 15. Washington, D.C.: Washington Government Printing Office. Table 1 indicates that many other southern and border state Land Grants were also disproportionately appropriating Morrill funds. For example, the most egregious state was Missouri, allocating $46,876 to the White school and $3,125 to the “Colored school.” The most egalitarian states were Florida and South Carolina, each allegedly reporting equally appropriating $25,000 to both their Black and White institutions. Mississippi, allegedly, awarded more to the Black school, $27,269 versus $22,730 to the White institution. Many scholars, such as Horace Mann Bond, documented that southern White-run schools and higher education institutions were not always transparent in their defiance to Plessy and the statutes of the Morrill Land Grant Act. See, Horace Mann Bond, The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934). Also see, Horace Mann Bond, Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel (University of Alabama Press, 1939).
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Maryland Agricultural College, “helped to sponsor the Princess Anne Academy for Negroes” in 1891. In his analysis Callcott also concluded, as did the commissioners of the 1937 Report, that the states’ motives were economically driven writing that “in 1891, after the federal government stipulated that a portion of the land-grant money go to Negro education, the Maryland Agricultural College began making regular appropriations to Princess Anne Academy.” Confirming again the 1937 report regarding disproportionate appropriations of Morrill funds, Callcott wrote,

The trustees, consequently granted about one-fifth of the money to Morgan College of Baltimore, to be spent for its Normal and Industrial Branch at Princess Anne on the Eastern Shore…money flowed into the [University of Maryland] College treasury…in five years the College budget increased 500 percent, from about $10,000 in 1887 to $50,000 in 1892. Looking for ways to spend the money, [President Henry E.] Alvord eliminated tuition entirely, reduced student living expenses to $180 a year, [and] increased faculty from six to twelve.

During this same period in 1891 when President Alvord was eliminating tuition and reducing fees for White students as a result of keeping four-fifths of the Second Morrill Act funds and being flush with excess cash, students at the Princess Anne Academy were “paying their fees and board by working in the institution.” Alvord’s decision-making represents a snub of the original intents of the Act. The Second Morrill Act required “a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act between one college for white students and one institution for

---
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colored students as aforesaid which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and thereupon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act.”

Further, Sec. 2 of the 1890 Act stipulated the Secretary of the Treasury to dispense funds by October 31 of each year in consultation with the Secretary of Education whose job was to monitor appropriate use of the funds. Sec. 4 deputized the Secretary of Education to ensure and communicate to the Secretary of the Treasury compliance of each State and Territory with the Act by October 1 of each year. If the Secretary of Education determined that a State or Territory was not going to receive funds the state or territory could appeal to Congress but the process as detailed in the Act was that the Secretary of Education,

shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory of its appropriation…and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress…If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid it shall be covered into the Treasury. And the Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

The singular depiction of Alvord’s misappropriations and the resulting educational inequity represents the roots of the manifested unequal institutional resources that were still present some fifty plus years later in the early twentieth century (1930s and even later into the 1950s) and offers reasons for the call for justice in education through the legal system, that began primarily with the Murray case. It further illuminates the federal government’s weak enforcement of equitable mandates.

Thurgood Marshall, Assistant Special Counsel of the NAACP, challenged President Byrd in a letter dated March 19, 1937, to “either establish[ing] a separate but equal State University

---
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for Negroes; or to admit Negroes to the University of Maryland.”309 Perhaps the state attempted to call Marshall’s bluff. In addition to the appropriations for scholarships and by Commission recommendation, the state did indeed move to bring Morgan under state (Maryland) control.310 Acquiring Morgan afforded the state a public educational institution for Blacks on par with the main campus, filling in where the Academy could not, as well as strategically diverting Black students away from the main campus.

Certainly, the leadership of the Black community was not fooled by the state’s “interest” in providing higher education for Blacks. The politically active Baltimore-based newspaper, the Afro-American, was owned by Morgan College Board of Trustee member Carl Murphy, deeply engaged itself in the desegregation of the state’s higher education system as well as following the Murray case. According to historian Hayward Farrar, the newspaper “complained that Maryland’s interest in Morgan was motivated more by the desire to block the further desegregation of the state university…It exhorted its readers to pressure black and white political leaders to extend the desegregation of the University of Maryland Law School to other branches of the University.”311 The paper also called for all-Black control of Black colleges, “segregation is immoral but if it had to exist, then blacks should control black institutions from top to bottom.”312

Indeed, the church’s ability to maintain steady financial support was decreasing, especially from The Great Depression, yet given the campus’ standing (with its sound
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accreditations), certainly Morgan becoming a public institution was a huge win for the state.  

The transfer of the private Morgan College to the state of Maryland was approved in 1938, changing its name to Morgan State College on November 20, 1939, making it a public college. This transition did not occur without great trepidation on behalf of Morgan’s affiliated church board. It was certainly the dire Great Depression era financial constraints of the church that afforded the state’s checkmate. Judge Soper, member of the Board of Trustees prior to and after the transition, made clear that the private/public purchase was not altogether welcomed as the Board was well aware of the state’s legal need for an institution for Blacks. Soper found that the political schemes of the state then (in 1939) and ten years later were not different. He noted Dr. Byrd’s attempts to govern Morgan State College:

In agitating for control of Morgan College, Dr. Byrd is merely reviving a plan which was carefully considered and rejected at the time that the old Morgan College was purchased by the state… the Legislature passed the Act of 1939, Ch. 331, and appointed a Commission to consider the purchase of the institution. The Commission consisted of John E. Semms, B. Howell Griswold, Thomas W. Pangborn, A.W.W. Woodcock and Dr. Byrd himself. The result was that the property was purchased and transferred to the State, and a Board of nine trustees was appointed by the Act. The price paid was about one-fourth of the value which represented about the amount of the capital expenditures furnished by the Methodist Church. It should be made perfectly clear that the transfer was made because the state had no college for Negroes, and it was faced with decisions of the courts requiring it to admit Negroes to white schools, or furnish an equivalent. Princess Anne was admittedly below grade, and Morgan was the obvious answer. This state was obliged to acquire it. Some of us on the Board of Trustees were heartily in favor of a sale, because the Methodist Church was unable to furnish the money…but there were many, including the presiding white Bishop of the area, who opposed the transfer strenuously. And it was only after a long, hard fight, as I can personally testify that the interest of the race prevailed over the prestige of the church.  

---

The Methodist church was proud that it had established the only four-year college in the state dedicated to the liberal arts education for Blacks, and by doing so could make claim to most of the Black professional class in Maryland through its alumni. The Board realized that the alternative to not selling Morgan to the state would place the institution in jeopardy of closing. The Church was increasingly unable to financially support Morgan and if it were to close, so would options for a true collegiate-level education for Blacks within the state. The Board had to place the priority of maintaining collegiate Black education within the state over its ownership of the institution. As a group committed to eradicating the consequences of slavery and Jim Crow through education and as leaders who also witnessed the state’s destructive disregard to Princess Anne, they were rightfully concerned that what they had built for seventy-two years would be destroyed.

During the discussions of and later negotiations over Morgan’s purchase by the state, John O. Spencer was coming to a close of his 35 year (1902-1937) tenure as president of Morgan College due to chronic illness. Perhaps the Board had listened to the petitions of the Afro-American regarding Black leadership at Black institutions. In an attempt to hire Morgan’s next president and first “colored layman,” the board elected on June 22, 1937 (inaugurated November 19, 1937) African American president, Dwight O. W. Holmes who was Dean of the Graduate School of Howard University. Holmes’ election, however, seems to have involved more of a consideration regarding his dedication to the faith and Christian education rather than a consideration of his race. On June 30, 1937, President Spencer wrote to Rev. Charles W. Baldwin regarding Holmes’ candidacy, debriefing him of a Friday, June 25, 1937 meeting that he and his assistant, Mr. James H. Carter who was Black, had with Holmes.315 Although the

315 Correspondence from Spencer to Rev. Baldwin, June 30, 1937. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md.
Board had voted unanimously to pursue Holmes for the presidency, Spencer was requested to “confer with him, especially in the matter of the religious activities of Morgan College.”

Spencer reluctantly accepted the request with the agreement that if Holmes was judged religiously unacceptable, “the election would not stand.” Holmes persuasively assuaged any concerns regarding his philosophy of the moral and religious development of young men and women. According to Spencer’s letter, Holmes “expressed his willingness and desire to attend daily chapel as often as possible.” Endorsing the unanimous election to stand in favor of Holmes’ candidacy, Spencer concluded,

> While Dr. Holmes is not of the evangelistic type, I believe that he will have a profound and helpful influence upon our young people in the Christian way of life. Based upon this interview and the vote of the Board, we offered him the presidency at a salary of sixty-six hundred dollars for the full calendar year, with rent free use of the cottage on the grounds.

The board expressed pleasure appointing a “Methodist layman and an experienced scholar in higher education.”

Holmes’ inauguration was November 19, 1937, at which Byrd provided Holmes with a welcome to the state. In his address, Byrd spoke to Holmes (and to guests) in a manner as if he

---

James H. Carter was Spencer’s trusted assistant. Spencer invited Carter to the meeting because he highly regarded Carter’s judgement. According to the Morgan State College Athletic Hall of Fame web site, Carter attended Morgan College (1912-1916) and was Salutatorian of the senior class commencement exercises. He was an accomplished track athlete and was employed at the College from after graduation until his death in 1959. Carter was a critical decision maker in the purchase of the Ivy Mill property as he was among those visiting the site with Spencer. Carter’s father, a Lutheran minister lived on and maintained a church for the employees who resided on the Old Ivy Mills property before it had closed (it was a Quarry business) and was sold. Carter was born and raised on this property. Carter’s opinion regarding the purchase of the property is presumed to have carried influence.


---
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had not recently fought against desegregation or that the recent *Murray* case had somehow altered his views of a Jim Crow educational system. As we will see later, Holmes was not at all fooled by Byrd’s words of peace and equality as he would have to continue the arduous push back on both Byrd and the state in order to protect Morgan’s best interests. Likely spoken with a “straight face,” Byrd delivered these words,

> Education is the only wealth which is lasting and of which one can never be dispossessed …no one can take from an educated man his perspective of life, nor destroy that mental equipment…In administering the processes of education, one is constantly confronted with the difficult problem of determining fundamental value. The college of today fully…recognizes that no system can remain static and still meet the needs of each new era, in which unexpected barriers rise to challenge each succeeding generation… The political doctrine of the equality of man is…that not who you are but what you are should be the proper basis for the appraisement of the potential values of individuals…But we do know that the brilliant conception of…equal rights of citizenship…was the turning point in the political, economic and social history of the world and had done most to lead mankind towards its ultimate objective of peace.

Proponents of Black education who were in the audience likely questioned if Byrd had thought to apply this philosophy of equity in his administering of the Princess Anne Academy. One statement from Byrd that in historical hindsight certainly was true was the contentious position in which Holmes would find himself with the state, when he said: “Doctor Holmes, it is impossible for us to exaggerate the magnitude of the task that you accept in coming to this state.”

Inaugurated during the 70th anniversary of the College’s founding, Holmes, in his address, reminded the audience that they were just seventy years from slavery and that Morgan and other Black colleges represented an “epic struggle to attain, through the medium of education, the full stature of American citizenship…made all the harder because of the reluctance of the dominant group…to believe in either the possibility or advisability of educating

---

this people.” 322 What Holmes expressed that was significant about his inauguration was not so much that he was Black—citing that, “many colleges prior to this time have been placed in charge of Negroes after long periods of administration by white men,” but, that it had occurred, he said, “with no pressure from the Negro citizenry…it means that the Negro college presidents as a group…is no longer considered a risk but a matter of course.” 323 Even though the Afro-American had called for Black leadership, Holmes was likely referring to the much more hostile confrontations in the mid-1920s on the campuses of Fisk, Lincoln, and Howard Universities from students and alumni who, frustrated with the authoritarian and racist behavior of their White leadership, pushed for the appointments of Black presidents. 324 With regard to “the place and function of Morgan College,” Holmes espoused taking “a realistic approach in dealing with…the educational administration where the race question is involved,” which meant recognizing that Black colleges, especially state Black colleges, “had to be built from public funds voted [on] by legislatures composed of Southern white men.” 325 The job of the Negro president, then, was to carefully transform the funding allocation motivations of the legislature: “slowly wean [them] away from a reluctant vote of a few dollars to keep the Negroes quiet to an enthusiastic and sometimes competitive eagerness to make their State college for Negroes the

---
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best in the land.” Knowing that the state purchase of Morgan was likely imminent, Holmes’ comments were for that half of the audience with whom he would soon need to convince of the benefit of supporting Black higher education and a Black president. To this, the clergy—over 100 present, of both races and several denominations, who were gathered that day, echoed in their comments from the chairman representing the ministers:

The clergy and colored race of Baltimore and vicinity, irrespective of religious denomination, most heartily welcome the new era of intellectual and moral development among the race, foreshadowed in recent changes in the administrative affairs of Morgan College, our only institution of collegiate grade for our people whereby, for the first time in the history of the state, an eminent educator of the colored race in the person of Doctor Dwight Oliver Wendell Holmes, has been elected.  

Dr. Holmes was president when Morgan came under state control in 1939. He managed the process and steered the College in continued growth as the first Black president until his retirement in June 1948 when he continued his duties to the institution as President Emeritus. After the end of his tenure in 1948 he later served on the state’s 1950 “Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher Education.” The 1950 Commission made its report and recommendation to Governor Lane, the Legislative Council and the General Assembly of Maryland. However prior to this committee’s report, another report of the Maryland Commission on Higher Education, “A Survey of Higher Education in the State of Maryland,” was submitted to Maryland Governor Herbert Romulus O’Conor, the former Attorney General for the Murray case.  
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1947 Survey was the catalyst and “major source of reference” for the 1950 report.\textsuperscript{329} A professor of Education at Howard University, Dr. Martin Jenkins, contributed as consultant and member of the 1947 survey staff to the Marbury Report by specifically investigating the status of Negro Higher Education within the state of Maryland. It is in this survey that a scathing evaluation of the University of Maryland’s neglect of the Princess Anne campus materialized. Callcott reported that the commission “recommended that Princess Anne be abandoned and that the state’s efforts be concentrated at Morgan State.”\textsuperscript{330} This so fueled Byrd’s rage, and perhaps his competitor’s ego—Byrd was a star collegiate athlete, that he responded with the weight of his full influence. Callcott reported,

Byrd was furious. Immediately he made Negro education his “first priority.” He changed the name of Princess Anne Academy to Maryland State College in 1948 and quadrupled the state’s investment in the institution before the legislature quite realized what was happening. To attract students to the [Maryland State] college full-page advertisements appeared in Negro newspapers as far away as Philadelphia. Then, assuming full initiative, Byrd turned the tables on the commission reports by demanding that Morgan State be abandoned, or at least absorbed, by Princess Anne and the University.\textsuperscript{331}

Nevertheless, the 1947 report was leveraged by Dr. Holmes as well as the Morgan State College Board of Trustees to maintain its own governance and resist Morgan coming under the governing auspices of the University of Maryland. In fact, the 1950 Commission recommended “an overall board for all state supported higher education” to which Holmes dissented.\textsuperscript{332} Dr. Holmes submitted a minority report to the recommendations outlined in the final 1950 report rejecting a suggestion that an advisory commission be appointed to serve as the “policy-making body…that it ultimately lead to an overall board for all state-supported higher education and

\textsuperscript{329} Report and Recommendations of the Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher Education (June 30, 1950), xi. https://archive.org/details/reportrecommenda00mary
\textsuperscript{330} Callcott, The History of the University of Maryland, 1966, 352.
\textsuperscript{331} Callcott, The History of the University of Maryland, 1966, 352.
\textsuperscript{332} Ibid., 1950 Commission Report, v.
with full administrative authority.” Holmes asserted a strong stand against such moves noting Jenkins’ unfavorable survey status results of the Maryland State College at Princess Anne as detailed in the 1947 report and advocated unequivocally for Morgan’s self-government.

Morgan’s various names reflect an institutional expansion of mission. Figure I also reflects the institution’s changes in governance from 1867 to present day.

Figure I: Table of Institutional Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Type and Governing Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centenary Biblical Institute</td>
<td>1867-1890</td>
<td>Privately affiliated with UMEC*, independent Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan College</td>
<td>1890-1939</td>
<td>Privately affiliated with UMEC, independent Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State College</td>
<td>1939-1967</td>
<td>Public; independent Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State College</td>
<td>1967-1975</td>
<td>Public; Board of Trustees of the State Colleges. Morgan does not maintain independent governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>1975-present</td>
<td>Public; independent Morgan State University Board of Regents. Morgan returns to independent governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Conference Academy</td>
<td>1886-1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess Anne Academy—the Eastern Branch of the Agricultural College of Maryland**</td>
<td>1891-1919</td>
<td>Princess Anne Academy was a branch of Morgan until purchased by the state in 1919, needing to comply with the Second Morrill Act of 1890, which required states to provide equal educational opportunities for Black students in agriculture and the mechanic arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Branch of the Maryland Agricultural College (1919)</td>
<td>1919-1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland State College (1948)</td>
<td>1948-1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland Eastern Shore (1970)</td>
<td>1970-present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* United Methodist Episcopal Church-Baltimore Conference

**United Methodist Episcopal Church-Delaware Conference. Founded as a preparatory secondary school for the Centenary Biblical Institute.

---

Staying the Course: Public Autonomy

For he will be like a tree planted by the water, That extends its roots by a stream. And will not fear when the heat comes; But its leaves will be green, And it will not be anxious in a year of drought Nor cease to yield fruit. Jeremiah 17:8\textsuperscript{334}

There is a Christian hymn taken from this scripture with the lyrics, “I shall not be moved; just like a tree planted by the water, I shall not be moved.”\textsuperscript{335} As if hearkened to remain true to the calls from its Christian Methodist Episcopal traditions, the leaders of Morgan have remained doggedly steadfast, though financially tossed about, in maintaining its independence. Morgan State College, since it became a public institution has unapologetically asserted its right to governing autonomy, not quite fully giving itself over to the state. Morgan has historically resisted University of Maryland management of its institution. It has led with and carved out for itself this unique position since becoming a public institution in 1939. In strong dissent of the Commission’s 1950 recommendations, Holmes replies:

My objection to this recommendation is that it seems designed to accomplish in a roundabout way what the administration of the University of Maryland has been trying unsuccessfully to do ever since Morgan became a State institution, namely, to take over the management of Morgan State College; a procedure that would be an undeserved insult to Morgan’s Board and one that would be deeply resented by the Negro people.

In addition to how the Black community would respond to such action, Holmes defended the record of Morgan’s Board in its steady guide of the institution, stating,

Nothing whatever has developed in the discussion of the Commission to suggest that the Board of Trustees of Morgan State College has failed, in any manner, in performing its duty. From a weak independent institution in 1938 the Board of Trustees with limited funds has transformed it in 12 years into a college with real academic standing in spite of the distractions accompanying the dislocations and hinderances \textit{[sic]} of six years of war. That Board has been making a continuous study of the problems of the higher education of Negroes in Maryland and has been rather successfully solving them so far as possible with limited appropriations.

\textsuperscript{334} Holy Bible, New American Standard Bible.
\textsuperscript{335} Song written by John T. Benson, Sr.
Holmes redirected the committee’s obvious hypocrisy by asking why they would recommend a University of Maryland takeover of Morgan when they had surmised within the same said report that the University had utterly failed the Princess Anne campus. He also argued that Morgan would fail to be a priority, even with good intentions, simply because the College Park campus, with its size and function, justifiably demanded the full attention of a Board. Continuing, he wrote,

"Why then," the Commission has been asked, "should this Board of Trustees be dismissed and the management of Morgan State College turned over to another board whose main responsibility must of necessity be the University of Maryland whose management alone should take the energies of any Board?" Since it is obvious that the proposed board would necessarily be under the domination of the President of the University of Maryland whose main interests would be absorbed there, "Why should the Morgan Board be liquidated?" To this question, asked frequently to members of this Commission, the reply has always been vaguely stated that it would be in the best interests of Morgan State College without giving any specific reasons why that should be so. The sad record, on the other hand, of the administration of Princess Anne under the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland, until stung by the scathing criticisms of the report of the Marbury Commission, is fresh in the minds of every person in Maryland interested in the education of the Negro. The Negro people especially deplore any attempt to see the destinies of Morgan entrusted to that same care.336

Holmes’ beseeching insistence reflected his belief that the University of Maryland governing board’s practices and policies would not benefit the interests of Morgan due largely in part to the individual members who would serve on said board and the priorities they would collectively advance337 and also based upon the indisputable documented ill management of Princess Anne.338

Although Holmes was in dissent of the above recommendation, the full commission was in agreement with Holmes’ assessment of the University of Maryland’s management of Princess Anne as stated in Recommendation #5:

that no further capital outlay for the construction of new buildings or for additions to present buildings be expended for Maryland State College at Princess Anne. That the question of the ultimate disposition of that institution for educational or other state or local purposes be charged to the responsibility of an advisory committee on higher education in Maryland…and furthermore, that the College be separated from the University of Maryland at the earliest possible time.339

The commission went on to refer to Maryland State College at Princess Anne as an “unwanted step child,” writing that it “deplores the expenditure of public funds for an institution which has not and cannot effectively serve the best interest of Negro students in Maryland…[finding] the facilities…woefully inadequate for the needs of a land grant college.”340 In a discussion of possible solutions, the Commission suggested abandoning Princess Anne and transferring all work to Morgan or “that the administration of the institution be transferred to the control of the Board of Trustees of Morgan State College.”341 In the end, the recommendation was to halt all physical expansion of the campus and to further study the future operation of the institution.342

The Commission maintained a schedule of meetings to collect data for the report.

Concerning Morgan State College, they met with President Jenkins in October of 1949 and Judge Soper, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, in December of 1949 along with other Trustees. On October 17, 1949 president of Morgan State College, Martin Jenkins prepared an “Abstract of Remarks of the President Before [sic] the Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher

Education” which was approved in compliance with Senate Resolution April 1, 1949.\textsuperscript{343} In the interest of Negro education for the state, Jenkins argued for Morgan “to be designated the land grant college for Negroes,” stating that Princess Anne “does not carry accreditation above the state level…[and] that the Middle States Association apparently does not regard Princess Anne as an integral part of the University of Maryland.”\textsuperscript{344} With regard to governing control, Jenkins continued with his thoughts on why Morgan should maintain autonomy, which was,

the administration of Negro colleges by Negroes is a universal pattern throughout the South; because the University of Maryland has neglected higher education of Negroes in its assigned areas; and because such administration and control will help Negroes keep their self-respect with the segregated framework.

Judge Morris A. Soper, chairman of the Board of Trustees for Morgan State College and a White man with demonstrated commitment to Morgan and the education of the Black community, wrote a thirty page opinion, “Statement of Judge Morris A. Soper to Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher Education in Maryland, December 6, 1949” in preparation of his meeting with the Commission. He advocated Morgan’s right to continued self-governance and also pointed to the hypocrisy of Thomas G. Pullen, State Superintendent of Schools, (state teachers colleges were under the State Board of Education) and H.C. Byrd. Taking the two to task, Soper charged that neither Pullen or Byrd wanted any authority between them and their direct access to the governor, yet they thought Morgan should capitulate to such a plan by falling under the authority of University of Maryland and allowing it to represent their interests at the state level,

\textsuperscript{343} Morgan State College Board of Trustees Minutes 1948-49. Beulah M. Davis Special Collection Department, Morgan State University.

\textsuperscript{344} Morgan State College Board of Trustees Minutes, 1948-49. “Abstract of Remarks of the President Before the Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher Education” (1949), 3. Beulah M. Davis Special Collection Department, Morgan State University.
The attitude of these educators [Pullen and Byrd] is therefore plain—no supervision at all for the white man, only the Negro must comply with the demand for economy, and his needs should not be submitted to the appraisal of an impartial official, but to the scrutiny and control of white officials who are his competitors for public funds….all of their demands must go through him [referring to Byrd] and he will decide how much to ask for College Park and how much to ask for Morgan.\textsuperscript{345}

Soper also noted in his statement that two years prior in July of 1947, Byrd recommended to the Legislature that there be a Negro advisory board for Morgan and Princess Anne but they would not be granted decision-making power. And in response to Byrd’s suggestion that all political tension would be resolved if Morgan would come under University of Maryland control, Soper, in classic DuBoisian fashion, rebutted that “the right of the Negro to equal education opportunities will never cease to be a political question of prime importance.”\textsuperscript{346} Indeed the very question of the place, purpose, and commitment to Negro education presented “an element of danger and revolution” to those opposed to it.\textsuperscript{347}

**Govern Thyself Accordingly**

It is in this Cold War/nascent civil rights context of: (1) a pervasive separate and largely unequal climate; (2) an examination of the purpose and value of higher education at the national and state levels; and (3) a heightened interest in talent development, that Morgan State College—a tree planted by troubled waters—drew a definitive line in the sand, to sustain itself as a self-governing, public, liberal arts college that would not be moved. In doing so, it anchored its efforts in fostering an environment that would nurture the instruction of honors students.

\textsuperscript{345} Morgan State College Board of Trustee Minutes, 1948-49. “Statement of Judge Morris A. Soper to Commission to Study the Question of Negro Higher Education in Maryland, December 6, 1949,” 7. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.

\textsuperscript{346} Ibid., “Soper to Commission,” 9.

\textsuperscript{347} Ibid., W.E.B. DuBois 1903. See page 2.
Nevertheless, collegiate institutions are heavily influenced by state and national level external factors as well as those internal forces and values that shape their histories.\textsuperscript{348} Proper governance structures ensure that processes of internal decision making and communication are inclusive of and represent the expertise of entities from the curriculum (faculty) to the budget (administrators), for the best interests of the institution. If institutions are functioning soundly internally, they are best able to respond uniformly to outside pressures that threaten the institution. The American Association of University Professors’ “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” provides institutions of higher education with a guideline of operating principles. In the preamble it explains that while the Statement is “not intended [to]… serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components [trustee members, administrators, faculty and students] of an academic institution, it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures.”\textsuperscript{349} The Statement does not provide specific principles for external challenges to institutions:

Although there are multiple constituencies and increasingly more complex agencies invested in and supporting higher education than during the nineteenth century when many were founded, the statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example… state legislatures, state commissions.\textsuperscript{350}

For example, under the #3 Governing Board section, the statement does outline the role of trustee members, “when ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the


governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution."351 We see this advocating behavior in both Morgan Trustee Chairman Sopers’ response to the consideration of Morgan’s loss of autonomy as well as that of Holmes’ Commission minority report. Although Holmes was not an official voting board member at the time of his 1950 dissent, as President Emeritus and most recent outgoing chief academic officer, he regularly attended Board of Trustee meetings post his tenure as president.352

Institutions from corporations to colleges have a culture that embody and reflect outwardly their values. Scholar of university organizational behavior, Tierney, proposed organizational culture as a way to frame and understand governing and decision-making processes in higher education. Examining universities as “cultural entities” whose decisions are influenced by culture, what is Morgan’s organizational culture as revealed through interviews and institutional documents? More precisely, Tierney asks, what are the external forces “such as demographic, economic, and political conditions” and internal forces that are rooted in the organization’s very history from which values have derived, passed on by community members and leaders and sustained over time? I maintain that for HBCUs, the two overlap as their demographic, economic, and political conditions are their histories. The most salient external forces imposed on Morgan’s history—its very establishment—are racism, segregation, strained (or competing) relationships with the state legislation in which it sits, and the legislature’s

352 Morgan State College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes 1950-53. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
varying levels of support. From this context, the values that Tierney speaks of as identified in
Morgan’s circumstances are: (1) striving and demanding excellence from students and faculty at
all costs; (2) and with this, managing an acute balance of accommodating learning needs while
expecting achievement for students at all ability levels; (3) independent agency with regard to
guardianship; (4) a sense of protectiveness of the institution; (5) a spirit of not giving up and
going on with business as if well resourced; and (6) general mistrust of the state and belief that
the state has single-handedly thwarted the institution’s progress due to racism.353

The latter informs the complex and contentious climate in which HBCUs, such as Morgan, are forced to navigate and in which its leaders make decisions. Often characterized as dictators, as if a leadership style exclusive to these presidents, Minor warns against assessing the governance of HBCUs as well as its leaders without taking into consideration the racialized climate and the fact that race relations permeate the relationship between public HBCUs and the state systems that fund them. In a 2005 study, one HBCU faculty member said of a state legislature that “everything we do is looked at differently by the board of trustees. They see us and…white institutions in the state completely differently.”354 In this study of Morgan, the value of independent governance was a source of pride, the mantel on which Morgan hung its hat. Referring to his 1988 decision to maintain autonomy, former Morgan State University president, Earl S. Richardson proudly recalled,

If anyone were to ask me, what was the single most important decision I ever made, it was to remain outside of the system, by far. When I did it everybody said you are a fool but—(in consultation with the [Morgan] Board of Regents [we considered] what were the advantages and disadvantages, etc.). We did not want people to say you want to be treated differently because you are Black so we approached St. Mary’s College to join us. So, St. Mary’s came together with me and we convinced Senator Clarence Blount and then Lt. Governor who had been president of the Senate,

353 Tierney, “Organizational Culture in Higher Education.”
354 James Minor, “Faculty Governance at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.” Academe. 91, 3 (2005): 35.
As president, Richardson felt that the “climb to excellence,” required resources that the institution would not acquire as quickly if it had not maintained independent governance. Reasoning that Morgan would be forced to compete with other in-system institutions, Richardson determined Morgan would be better served if its interests were not subject to a “pecking order” with the other schools, thus allowing it to freely advocate for those resources—contemporary facilities and high-demand academic offerings—that attract honors students.

The administration was not as successful twenty years prior when it was unable to successfully hold on to its autonomy. The institution strongly believed that when its board was dissolved in 1967 and placed under the Board of Trustee of State Colleges of Maryland, “the protection of Morgan’s interest and welfare was significantly diminished…It was then that Morgan State College became substantially neglected.” The Morgan administration appears proud of its Middle States Accreditation that dates back to 1925 and the “model liberal arts” designation it received in the mid-1970s. Consider what this accredited status might have meant for a “Negro” institution in the early 20th century or any institution wanting the recognition of its colleagues.

The process of quality assurance began in the early 1900s with Abraham Flexner’s review of medical schools which led to the establishment of standards, the closure of many medical schools and a clear distinction of the model institution and program. AAU (Association

---

355 Earl S. Richardson interview by Traci Dula May 20, 2015. St. Mary’s College to which Richardson referred is a liberal arts school in Maryland that also maintains independent governance.
of American Universities), along with philanthropy (i.e. Carnegie, Rockefeller) that also invested in standardizing higher education and the professions through commissioned studies and oversight boards, led to a type of rank and file reform that birthed order into the chaos that was higher education, weeded out for good the degree mills and set apart the elite institutions as the ideal to which other American colleges would aspire. Also, philanthropists, most notably the Carnegie Foundation, began to provide grant money to advance the scholarship and best practices of the professions. Through its Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CAFT) there was a push for formalizing education curricula and preparation as well as the development of standards and review processes, which only added to the growing body of professional graduate school programs. A case in point is the conclusive study and report by Abraham Flexner entitled *Medical Education in the United States and Canada* that helped to cement standardization efforts that had been ongoing with German-trained American doctors. The study was supported and published by CAFT in 1910. Flexner’s sweeping review of medical school standards and facilities across the nation not only brought standards to the medical profession—and caused the closure of several programs after the release of the report due to low evaluative ratings and scathing accounts of facilities, but also raised the bar across many professions with regard to both standards of program certification and acceptance to study a profession.

Middle States Association was established in 1887 but began accrediting in 1919 after its Commission on Institutions of Higher Education was introduced. No Black college, not even Howard University, appeared on the original 1921 list of accredited institutions. A few years

---

357 “Highlights from the Commission’s First 90 Years.” 90th anniversary 1919-2009 Middle States Commission on Higher Education. www.msche.org
later, Morgan was “one of the first negro institutions” to receive this peer review acknowledgement.\textsuperscript{358}

In the heyday of active desegregation in Maryland in the late sixties—(1967), Morgan, which had proven itself as a reputable “Negro” institution, was placed under the same governing structure as the state’s teachers colleges that were transitioning to comprehensive four year institutions—some of which were only accredited at the state level. An executive administrator who first came to Morgan as a faculty member in 1959 and has been there since, had this to say of the 1967 decision:

\textit{We lost independence in the late 1960s, when the teacher’s colleges became state colleges and they put us under the board and Jenkins tried [to challenge the decision] and they lumped us with them as if we were similar. We fought it and St. Mary’s managed to stay out during that time. When they did the reorganization later in 1988, and they decided [again that] they were going to stick us under the system, we fought that. We got it [autonomy] back because we became a university. When we celebrated our centennial in ’67, we had been in Time Magazine, or one of those magazines. We were up for a centennial accreditation visit by Middle States but they decided they weren’t going to do the normal centennial process. We were going to be a case study because we had been designated in one of those national magazines—Time or Newsweek, where we had been listed as one of the outstanding liberal arts colleges and all these blue ribbon panels and commission studies that we were in and most of them talked about how our faculty eclipsed [University of Maryland] College Park faculty even though we didn’t have the pay scale—we had a peanuts pay scale but they said our faculty...and that [recognition] was due in part to Jenkins, yes.}\textsuperscript{359}

Why, then, given Morgan’s evident reputation as an able institution, were they moved under the state governing system? In 1964, according to Vergial Webb, “during the beginning of the post-civil rights era, state support for historically Black colleges was withheld because of the


\textsuperscript{359} Dr. Betty Matthews [pseud.] interview with Traci Dula June 8, 2015.

As noted on the Morgan State University Alumni Association website page, “1969 Morgan is selected as a model liberal arts program by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and is ranked by a Newsweek poll among the top ten African-American colleges and universities.”

false notion that integration had abolished the need for such institutions.”\textsuperscript{360} One explanation could be that the general notion of race and intelligence continued to permeate throughout the sixties and influenced the general regard of Black colleges. Also, it is likely that mainstream U.S. was not familiar with HBCUs and their success, only the picture that was painted of them as being led by poor fiscal managers with unreasonable leadership styles. An influential article published in 1967 by two leading White researchers (Christopher Jencks and David Riesman) in higher education seemed to represent this ignorance.

Jencks and Riesman, writing in the highly reputed \textit{Harvard Education Review}, published “The American Negro College,” which served to discredit these institutions more.\textsuperscript{361} The article was rippled with insults and racially derogatory statements to both the institutions and the Black community they served. Jencks and Riesman, referring to DuBois as a ‘militant’ [\textit{sic}] and, expressing sympathy to the white northern industrialists, stated that “we would argue that the Northern whites who backed private colleges for Negroes were moved by genuinely philanthropic motives.” Crediting, but awfully imitating Frazier’s \textit{Black Bourgeoisie}, the authors cited HBCUs’ downfall as a failed sense of self-contempt to live up to the standards of White institutions; they claimed “that the Negro college of the 1950’s was usually an ill-financed, ill-staffed caricature of white higher education.” Jencks and Reisman failed to contextualize this condition with any explanation of state underfunding. The article was irresponsible as it represented the authors’ imperious critique as if factual on topics from “the authoritarian atmosphere…with intervening trustees… [and] the faculty tyrannized by the president” to the sexual experiences of Black female undergraduates. The “research” article was subjective and

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
The journal’s reputation and the authors’ standing in the academic community—an attentive audience. In its final analysis, the authors harshly concluded that HBCUs were “disaster areas.” Although the eugenics movement had ebbed by the late 1960s, there was still an acceptance of the racial-genetic intelligence narrative with Blacks assumed inferior.

Understanding the times in which the state apprehended Morgan’s governance in 1967 and reorganized it among a group of teacher colleges in transition that were not peer to Morgan’s prominence as a liberal arts institution, we might ask, were members of the State Council influenced by Jencks and Reisman’s dreadfully ill-informed ‘critique’? Perhaps the Council found the critique of Black colleges as “disaster areas” a convenient and opportune justification for Morgan’s new governance structure. It is fair to note that the authors included Morgan among a list of better functioning Black colleges conceding that it offered “relatively good academic credentials.”

With the transition of the Maryland teacher colleges and a new state board, The Advisory Council for Higher Education in Maryland was established in 1964. It was this body which recommended that Morgan and the newly transitioned institutions (Bowie and Coppin, both HBCUs; Frostburg, Salisbury, and Towson), move under the state system, the Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Maryland, in 1967. With regard to institutional company, Webb points out that two of the five institutions had just received regional accreditation, compared to Morgan’s

---


then forty plus years of Middle States accreditation.\textsuperscript{364} Morgan’s prowess as an institution was firmly anchored in the academic community, its teaching reputation sound. According to Klein’s 1928 \textit{Bulletin} of the U. S. Bureau of Education, not only had the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States granted accreditation in 1925 (“it being the first negro institution to be credited by this association”), so did the state of Maryland. The “Maryland State Department of Education has rated the institution as a class A standard college since 1910” as well as the departments of education in other states.\textsuperscript{365} The value Morgan had to the state of Maryland was no secret. At the time of the 1928 Survey the state provided appropriations to Morgan’s (at this time still a private institution) educational department due to its outstanding regard in preparing and certifying Black teachers. It may have been for good reason that the state would have interest in pulling Morgan under its fold, even if its leaders did not agree. Morgan’s reputation for training teachers went back as far as the 1920s. As one is perceived to be the company one keeps, perhaps the thinking of grouping Morgan with the teachers colleges was a strategy to pull up the latter, if only by association, to the level of the former. It is important to note that St. Mary’s College of Maryland, also a liberal arts but not an HBCU, was allowed to retain its independent governance in 1967. In fact, it has always maintained autonomy.

Holmes wrote his minority report in 1950 as a member of the Commission forewarning that in the hands of the state, Morgan would experience funding neglect similar to Princess Anne. Not twenty years later, his fear of state governance control would come to bear. Some argued that this move led to the institution’s neglect and stunted its progress over a course of more than a decade. During this time, the state system was in continued incompliance of the

\textsuperscript{364} Webb, \textit{Fair Morgan}.
Health Education and Welfare (HEW) Office of Civil Rights (OCR) regulations of maintaining a dual system. In an interview with the former honors director and Dean Emeritus, Dr. Burnie Hollis shared,

Morgan had an independent board of trustees up until 1967. But what you may not have heard is that when Morgan came under the state system, it was told point blank, the other colleges and universities are teachers colleges. You are an established liberal arts institution. You must stop now your progress until they catch up. We were so far ahead of them that the others had to catch up so they [the state of Maryland] stop funding Morgan so that the others could catch up and that’s where the whole problem began. That’s when Morgan began to lose ground.366

Hollis’ analysis is supported in Vergial Smith Webb’s *Fair Morgan*. He stated that Morgan,

suffered from lack of equal educational opportunity through the years…Morgan’s growth and development were impeded by inequities in the state system of higher education: when funding and support were withheld, while finances were awarded instead to state teachers colleges during their transition…; and when Morgan’s Board of Trustees was dissolved….a change which led to Morgan’s neglect for a decade.367

Not wanting to experience this sense of institutional recession that was felt in the late 1960’s, Earl S. Richardson, former president of Morgan, said of his late 1980’s decision,

It is the cause for the posture of Morgan in 1988 when the state said we want to now incorporate all of the 4-year campuses under the University of Maryland system governance and Morgan looked out at its vision, the continued recruitment of quality students and said, “ah, these are the things we need and we need them fast because of the deprivation and neglect historically;” we don’t have a minute to waste and if we go in to a multi-campus system it is by its very nature a compromise because every policy that is promulgated in that system is not geared at any one campus but is a compromise of the interest of all of those in it. So you compromise from the very beginning.

Here Richardson’s choice to forgo the state governing system involved averting “the middle man” between Morgan and the governor and legislature when petitioning budgetary requests.
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366 Dr. Burney Hollis, interview by Traci Dula, June 15, 2015.
Albert Whiting noted in his book, *Guardians of the Flame*, that “in publicly supported schools…efforts to eke out even minimal funding from reluctant state sources unconvinced of the need for so much as a semblance of quality education for “Negroes” was a great psychic drain exacerbated by the need for dissembling tactics and strategies.” Only an independent board with a single advocating interest, according to Richardson, would have the uncompromising gall to force the institution’s agenda with an unapologetic, pressing sense of urgency. The audacity of Richardson’s position illustrates his knowledge and acceptance of the dynamic of racism at play at the state level. The acceptance was not a resignation to a subordinated, powerless status but was a brazen point of departure that one can take to allow themselves agency to survive in a racialized climate. Legal scholar Derrick Bell explains that the means to escape and to challenge the grit of racism is to concede to its ubiquitous nature in order to effectively “delegitimate it [so] we can accurately pinpoint it.” With this capacity to critically trace the racist roots of many southern state higher education policy decisions, Richardson had the clarity that Bell described as an ability to “go forth and serve, knowing that our failure to act will not change conditions and may very well worsen them.” By not capitulating to the state’s requests (read, demands), Richardson took the Underground Railroad route to ensure that Morgan State continued to ride the freedom rails.

Of private HBCUs, historian Joy Ann Williamson writes that “missionary philanthropists set up private HBCUs with the same assumption: financial and political autonomy from the state and the right to develop curricula, campus policies and other matters without the fear of state
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370 Bell, *Faces at the Bottom of the Well*, 198.
Once a private institution, it was agreed that Morgan would maintain its own Board of Trustees upon transitioning to a public college in 1939. “The Board of Regents of the proposed Morgan State College/University shall consist of nine members… provided, that of the nine members, a reasonable number shall be selected from the present membership of the Board of Trustees of Morgan College; and, provided further, that a substantial number shall be members of the Negro race.”

The state-supported institution with an independent board lasted for twenty-eight years before being co-opted by the state in 1967. Instead of becoming a university as they were striving to do, Morgan officials felt the institution was being pulled backward or stunted when it fell under the state’s Board of Trustees. A former vice president for academic affairs at Morgan recalled events in Jenkins’ leadership that began to prepare the way for university status such as expanding the institution’s mission beyond the Black student demographic. She also spoke of those actions at the state level that led to Morgan’s 1967 takeover. She stated,

> After our case study with Middle States they said we were ready [to become a university], Jenkins asked for university status and their answer to that was to build UMBC (University of Maryland Baltimore County, a branch campus of the University of Maryland, located about 25 minutes from Morgan) in our back yard. UB (University of Baltimore, located in the downtown area of the city) was the Baltimore College of Commerce and they made it a university. Many of the schools, when they made some comprehensive, a lot of little other schools went out of business. Instead of making us a university and developing us, they just built another White school in our back yard. Made them a university. We’ll be a 150 years old in 2017 and they [UMBC] will be 50. They agreed [with Jenkins] that the Baltimore area needed a university but not Morgan. Instead of developing us to a level where we could serve the needs of the city, the urban area, they just built UMBC.
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372 Wilson, The History of Morgan State College, 94.

373 Dr. Betty Matthews [pseud.] interview with Traci Dula June 8, 2015.
Jenkins was forward-thinking and ambitious. He and the Board crafted a plan to expand the institution’s services and mission to include serving a significant number of White students by serving the city-wide area. Their plan attracted regional attention. The April 1964 edition of the monthly *Southern School News* covered the bold plan in the story, “Morgan Launches 10-Point Program to Enroll Whites.”\(^{374}\) According to the article, Morgan’s Board adopted the program to “stimulate white student interest,” feeling that if the main White campus was desegregating, so should Morgan. Two of the mentioned thrusts to meet the goal of integration were to “emphasize the financial aid available without regard to race [and] enlist the support of public and private school systems in promoting the college among white high school students.”\(^{375}\)

In a special supplement to the *Afro American* newspaper celebrating the College’s centennial anniversary, President Martin D. Jenkins highlighted his vision in a June 3, 1967 article, “The Years Ahead: Progress Through Purpose,” writing, “The College will lose its identity as a predominantly colored institution [and] move toward university status by organizing divisions of education, business administration, urban affairs and health services.”\(^{376}\) In fact, Jenkins, on January 14, 1969, submitted a recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges following the Middle States visit to be a “racially integrated, urban oriented university.”

> It is recommend that Morgan State College be developed as a…university under the continued control for the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges…and that this recommendation be presented to the Maryland Council for Higher Education for review and approval…all thoughtful people recognize and are appalled by the enormous problem of rejuvenating Baltimore…this institution can and should make a significant contribution to this development…enable[ing] this institution to enlarge its services to the entire State [sic]…Morgan is convinced that implementation of this recommendation will
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375 Ibid, “Morgan Launches 10-Program to Enroll Whites.”
provide increased opportunities for higher education for the citizens of Baltimore and other areas of the State.\(^{377}\)

Although Governor Marvin Mandel did refer this recommendation as requested of Jenkins, the Council agreed to support to “expand [Morgan’s] urban thrust but disapproved the university status.” In a final attempt in his role as president in a report to the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges, Jenkins urged reconsideration of university status for Morgan, citing his initial request “for a racially integrated, urban oriented university the most important proposal of my twenty-two years as President [sic].”\(^{378}\)

This state policy decision, when analyzed from a critical race perspective, suggests that the state exercised its Whiteness as a form of property right; that is, it enacted its privilege and power to exclude Morgan from the right of growth and competition. Extending critical race tenets from a legal to an educational realm, DeCuir-Gunby and Dixson explain:

> the notion of the permanence of racism suggests that racist hierarchical structures govern all political, economic, and social domains. Such structures allocate the privileging of Whites and the subsequent Othering of people of color in all arenas, including education.\(^{379}\)

Furthermore, critical race theory allows us to locate this policy decision not just as Whiteness as property but also as the accepted and preferred norm. Instead of expanding Morgan to meet the needs of the metropolitan Baltimore area beyond just the Black community, the state legislature “normalized” the state’s educational agenda to its political archetype that only White institutions were deemed fit to educate White people. The messaged norm was the assumption that White


people would not want to attend a Black, or at least a traditionally Black institution, and so the only reasonable course of action for meeting the local educational needs was to duplicate another four year institution—that would be acceptable for Whites. The establishment of UMBC, then, can be viewed as the “normativity of whiteness” response to Jenkins’ proposal for an urban university.

After the loss of independent governance in the late 1960s which may have seemed like “a year of drought,” 1975 might have been Morgan’s year of jubilee and vindication—“but its leaves will be green.”380 By a very close 71-37 vote, 71 being the minimum number of ‘yea’ votes needed to pass according to an April 8, 1975 Baltimore Afro American newspaper article, “Passage of Morgan U bill thrills black legislators,” the house passed Senate Bill 354 designating Morgan as a university. Senator Clarence Mitchell (D) stated that “Morgan should have been a university in 1965 when Morgan’s accreditation was higher than the University of Maryland’s. It’s only racism and lack of adequate numbers of black legislators that caused it to be placed under the Board of Trustees of State Colleges.”381 Another politician was quoted in the same article as observing, “the real practical value of the bill, said Lena K. Lee, (D-38,) lies not only in the fact that Morgan gains university status, but it’s also significant that Morgan will now have its own board.”382 The passage of Senate Bill 354 most likely came at the right time for the state even if at a close margin considering that compliance officers from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW)—an arm of the Office of Civil Rights, were visiting state colleges that same week in April 1975. Reason for the visit was to “determine the extent of
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381 “Passage of Morgan U bill thrills black legislators,” Afro American, 83rd Year, no. 67, April 8, 1975, front page. Mitchell was deputy majority whip 1975-78 and served Baltimore City senate legislative districts 10, 38, and 39 1967-1989.
desegregation” and to review the state’s failure to enact desegregation plans and “the lack of action by the governor and the legislature to designate and fund Morgan as ‘a racially integrated urban university with doctoral programs’ ... [and] failure to eliminate the racial duality among public post secondary [sic] institutions,” among other concerns of compliance.383

The successful vote was followed by days of anticipation as it awaited a final gubernatorial signature. The agenda for the April 15, 1975 Executive Council reads as though Interim President Thomas Fraser was preparing for the next phase with this item for discussion: “What Can The College Do to Advance the Concept of University Status at this Point in Time?” Without the full minutes of that meeting in the archives, the deliberations on this item are unclear. It is likely that the administrative team was preparing the next immediate and long-term future steps of its new status. What is clear, however, is a confirmation letter received by the president’s office on April 21, 1975 from Comptroller of the Treasury Louis L. Goldstein in a April 18, 1975 correspondence to Fraser that read,

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have sent to Governor Marvin Mandel dated April 18, 1975, with reference to Senate Bill 354 establishing Morgan State College as a University. It is a pleasure to cooperate.384

The attached letter to Mandel read as a plea that hints to the Governor’s hesitancy to sign Senate Bill 354. Having attended a Martin D. Jenkins building dedication on the campus, Goldstein wrote to the Governor that he extended the Governor’s greetings (to Morgan’s administrators) on his behalf and that while there,

Most of the talk on campus was in reference to your signing Senate Bill 354 which was sponsored by thirty-two senators in the 1975 session of the General Assembly. I had an opportunity to speak to students, faculty, members of the staff, and supporters from all parts of Maryland and the country and they all favor you signing this important

384 Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
legislation. I concur in their recommendations and recommend that you sign Senate Bill 354.\textsuperscript{385}

Mandel may have been holding off signing Bill 354 due to financial obligations that would arise. Morgan’s potential university status with an independent board threatened the financial security of the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges of the State of Maryland (the “State Colleges Board”). In a detailed four page correspondence dated April 18, 1975 to Dr. Edmund C. Mester, who was the executive director of the State Colleges Board, law firm Smith, Somerville & Case, warned of the serious security bond default that would incur as well as any future ability to secure bonds if Mandel were to sign Bill 354. The State Colleges Board purchased revenue bonds by pooling resources of each state college. Morgan’s removal from under the control of the Board would weaken the consolidated funds, causing it to default its Trust Agreement with The Equitable Trust Company of Maryland. These bonds, “The Consolidated Student Union Facilities of the Board of Trustees,” were issued in 1969 and 1971 for the “purpose of defraying costs of construction and equipping for student union buildings” at first Towson State College (1969, Series A Bonds) and then at Frostburg and Morgan State Colleges (1971, Series B Bonds). Per the agreement, each state college under the Board’s control was to impose student union fees (Section 701) to their students to generate payment revenue. Concerned for the financial and legal outcomes of Bill 354 if signed, the law firm advised Mester,

\begin{quote}
In our opinion, transfer of Morgan State College to a separate governing Board would raise serious issues with respect to the impairment of the security for the Consolidated Student Unions Revenue Bonds of the Board of Trustees… should Senate Bill 354 be signed by the Governor of Maryland, there would be a potential abrogation of the fiscal system…this would delete one entire State college and its student body from the aforementioned fiscal system and thus would seriously impair and diminish the sources of
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{385} Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
An independent board, if Senate Bill 354 were signed, would have no financial obligation to this agreement. The firm cautioned of a potential legal challenge to either a default on the agreement or the legality of the Senate Bill 354 given this prior Trust Agreement, the latter serving as a justifiable loop hole for not signing the Bill. Approving Morgan’s university status, wrote the firm, would also hurt credit resources as this move would set a precedent for withdrawal of other campuses from the Board’s control. Additionally, they went on to point out the unfairness to the institutions who had already pledged resources to the pool and had not yet received the benefit of the agreement.

At a May 13, 1975 meeting, the Morgan Executive Council discussed a stern correspondence sent from African American Senator Clarence Blount to the Governor that threatened the political support and trust of the Black community if he failed to sign Senate Bill 354. There was a question of the Bill’s constitutionality, a concern on which the Governor may have been consulting with the Attorney General. Senator Blount, a member of the Black Caucus political group that led the push on the issue and the favorable vote in the General Assembly, reminded Mandel that the Caucus “agreed to support any corrective legislation which was necessary to clean up defects in the bill.” Clarifying the Caucus’ line in the sand on this matter and throwing their now heavily political weight of the 1970s, he continued,

If the Attorney General should declare it constitutionally defective, and you fail to sign it, all the angels and gods in heaven will never convince the Black community of the state that this was not a ruse on your part. The damage to your image in the Black community
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386 Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
387 Letter form Clarence Blount to Governor Mandel, May 9, 1975. Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University. Dated May 9, 1975; a copy received to Interim President Fraser on May 12.
388 Letter form Clarence Blount to Governor Mandel, May 9, 1975. Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
would be irrevocable…The Black community and the Black Caucus worked for this bill. It is important to us that we be the instrument for the transition of Morgan into a University. It will not have the same meaning to Blacks if at some future date some other group dictates or imposes this change. You have placed those of us in the Black community who support you in an impossible position because you have failed to appoint Blacks to the highest policy making positions. You would be finally politically castrating us if you failed to sign Senate Bill 354.389

Clarence Blount and the Black Caucus was able to influence this decision due to the political power that Blacks were able to mount in the 1970s. As Senator Mitchell’s *Afro American* quote implied, Morgan very well would have acquired university status after the 1965 Middle States case study recommendations had the African American political presence in the legislature been in 1965 what it was in 1975. Senator Mitchel’s comments powerfully punctuated the significance of Black education and its connection to and interdependence with citizenship.

Six days later on May 15, 1975, Governor Marvin Mandel signed Senate Bill 354, effective July 1, 1975. In a statement issued on May 16, 1975, Interim President Thomas Fraser credited Martin Jenkins for first envisioning Morgan State University, “signing Senate Bill 354 yesterday (May 15) in a brief ceremony in Annapolis brought success to a conceptualization first proposed by Morgan’s President Emeritus, Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, in 1969.”390 Fraser, Jenkins, and newly appointed (June 1, 1975) Morgan State president, Dr. Andrew Billingsley, were all present at the signing. Billingsley called for a “University Day” assembly on July 3, 1975 to celebrate the university’s new status that involved a convocation and reception and drew state
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389 Letter from Clarence Blount to Governor Mandel, May 9, 1975. Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.

390 Morgan State College Minutes of the President’s Executive Council 1974-1975. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
and Baltimore city level dignitaries from Governor Mandel and Baltimore Mayor Donald Schaefer to the Black Caucus, the General Assembly, and Methodist ministers. The event was open to the public and university community. In a June 16, 1975 memorandum, Billingsley requested of his vice presidents, directors, and supervisors “that all employees be excused from duty, where possible, in order to attend the assembly.” With this final formal occasion behind, Morgan officially transitioned over to university status.

The political and financial landscapes of this decision were likely wrought with ample competing interests from various constituents. Through all of the upheaval over concern of independent and state level governance over the decades, reluctant state support, and other external forces that challenged progress, Morgan’s leadership focused enough internally to develop the type of educational programs that aligned with its mission. Challenges from residential segregation, serving as the state’s scapegoat for the Second Morrill Act and later the law school, and underfunding and support through the mid to latter half of the twentieth century in Cold War America, Morgan had to assume for itself the role it would play in Black higher education. Would it go forward, challenged to meet new heights or would it succumb to the political forces that sought to unnerve it? The resolve and mindset of this institution’s leadership would set the stage for the development of honors education and catering to the best and the brightest among its student population.
Chapter IV  We’ve Come This Far By Faith: Honors Education

Charting Maryland’s segregated higher educational system, its resistance to desegregation and substandard support afforded to Black education across the twentieth century helps to situate not only the racialized climate of this era but also the development of honors education at Morgan. The push back from the state and White (segregationist) Baltimore illustrate that there were very few expectations for education beyond that which was federally prescribed or with regard to the potential and role of the Black community to the larger commonwealth. Black educators, along with allies from other communities, were contesting (from 1863 through the mid twentieth century) to ensure minimum higher educational access promised by the 14\textsuperscript{th} Amendment that was equal to that with the White community. Also, refocusing higher education to attend to and nurture high achieving students had become a campaign which began between the two world wars and continued in the 1950s Cold War. Did Aydelotte and his faculty ever reach out to HBCUs as they advocated for honors education or were these institutions simply dismissed as not possessing the raw material—talented students? Perhaps the very notion that there were Blacks of superior academic talent was a preposterous position for one to take. Yet, in the 1930s there were researchers who were responding to that very assumption. Consider, for example, the writings of Charles H. Thompson who was a professor and Dean at Howard University and founder of the \textit{Journal of Negro Education}. Louis Ray wrote that one of Thompson’s goals for Howard was “to focus on educating gifted students of color.”\footnote{Louis Ray, “Revisiting Charles H. Thompson’s Proposal for Educating Gifted African American Students, 1933-1961,” \textit{The Journal of Negro Education}, 81, 3 (2012), 190.} In 1935, and as editor of the \textit{Journal}, Thompson provided the editorial comment,
“Investing in Negro Brains,” insisting “that the range of intelligence among Negroes runs just as high as it does among other racial groups.”393 Noting the poor educational opportunities and facilities that bring to mind the conditions similar to those allowed to persist at the Princess Anne Academy, Thompson wrote that it was no wonder that a student may not achieve to potential “in view of the depressing effect of poor environment and poor school facilities upon the I.Q.”

Thompson did not call for the development of honors programs but he did go on to inquire about the identification and harnessing of Black academic talent, writing,

what efforts are being made to discover them and to develop their talents for the benefit of the race and the nation? These questions assume considerable importance when it is considered that the Negro as a race and the nation as a whole are handicapped because of natural resources of superior human ability remain buried undeveloped, and unused. …it is evident that something much more systematic must be done about it… [are] we making the best of our higher educational facilities…some rather comprehensive machinery has to be devised by which we may discover the members of this “very superior” Negro group…many of these bright young people are lost, either because of lack of encouragement or lack of funds to go on with their training—and their superior brains are of little avail without training.394

As for some HBCUs, including Morgan, they were pushing that very agenda despite the segregated environment that made the training of “superior Negroes” work only befitting the most adamant combination of educator and civil rights advocate.

**Morgan and Jenkins: The Early Years**

The United States in the mid-1940s seemed to be redefining itself on several fronts. Domestically, the country sought to provide a better transition among its veterans through the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 or the G.I. Bill. The G.I. Bill, among other benefits, provided educational benefits affording access to higher education, although full Black
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participation was limited due to racist southern state practices in higher education. President Truman passed Executive Order No. 9981 on July 26, 1948 outlawing segregation in the U. S. armed services. The Carnegie Corporation commissioned Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal to write, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy* (1944) which had a powerful impact on the public mind regarding the negative impact of racism and the nation’s stated democratic ideals. Other glimpses of slow change toward integration domestically included the first Black major league baseball player, Jackie Robinson, and the Supreme Court ruling against state enforcement of racially restrictive residential covenants. Globally, following the 1945 end of World War II, the United States was engaged in a cold war of mistrust and nuclear missile development with the Soviet Union. Having fought against the Germans, it could be asserted that American leadership did not support German Aryan supremacy, or at least the annihilation of Jews. Despite the “Double V for Victory” campaign Blacks waged during the Second World War—V for victory against fascism and V for victory against domestic racism, the lingering impact of the American eugenics movement and its influence cannot be understated. It was still active post the second war and this influence weighed heavily on America’s own struggles with race, the U. S. version of White supremacy, and notions of Black worthiness and intellectual fitness.

While the United States’ interest in science, engineering and language development among its citizenry and the expansion of human capital by way of college access through the G.I. Bill, the 1950 establishment of the National Science Foundation, and K-12 curricular


396 *Shelley v Kraemer* 334 U.S. 1(1948).
development programs, scientific racism (the eugenics movement) continued to perpetuate the idea of intellectual inferiority of some and the superiority of others. Furthermore, education at all levels was at this time still largely segregated by race and unequally and inadequately resourced for Black Americans. With much hanging in the nation’s political balance, Morgan was in a leadership transition of its second Black president looking toward the promise of a new decade.

April 22, 1948, 3:30 p.m.
Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Morgan State College
The Report of the Committee on Nomination of President was called for Mr. Wagner made a verbal report and announced the name of Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, faculty member of Howard University, as a unanimous choice of the Committee. The following action was taken, “Resolved: That Dr. Martin D. Jenkins be and is elected President of Morgan State College to take effect July 1, 1948.”

Dr. Martin Jenkins was inaugurated as the seventh president in 1948, as second African American president, and, as Holmes, was also recruited from Howard University. Jenkins was
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397 Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes, Morgan State College, April 22, 1948. The minutes reflected that after the unanimous vote of Jenkins’ appointment, the Board Chair reported of another candidate’s decline of the position, “Chairman Soper reported that Dr. Charles Wesley, previously elected by the Board, had upon his own request been formally released from his obligation.” The notes imply that Charles Harris Wesley had accepted the presidency position, perhaps even signed a contract, since he was granted release. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.

Wesley, a historian and scholar was president of Wilberforce University in Ohio 1942-1947. In 1947, he began his 14 year tenure as president of the College of Education and Industrial Arts also in Wilberforce, Ohio. The College of Education and Industrial Arts was once a two-year curriculum program housed within the liberal arts Wilberforce University which later split off after expanding to a four-curriculum offering. This new, independent institution was renamed Central State College in 1951 and later, in 1965, was renamed Central State University. Wesley was also an ordained minister in the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) church with which Wilberforce was affiliated and had been co-founded along with the Cincinnati Methodist Episcopal Church. Wesley who was a proven seasoned higher education administrator (from both Howard University and Wilberforce) a noted educator, scholar (with masters and doctoral degrees from both Yale and Harvard respectively), author, and an ordained Methodist minister (Morgan was founded by United Methodist clergy), was a desirable candidate and deemed a philosophical fit for the institution. Recall that Holmes, the first African American president at Morgan was admired because in addition to his higher education experience, was a “Methodist layman;” Wesley was a trained minister in the Methodist tradition.

Wesley received his doctorate of divinity degree from Wilberforce. That along with serving as its president for five years, perhaps led his institutional allegiance to shoulder the challenge of birthing the newly formed independent Normal and Industrial Arts school through its fledgling beginnings. Morgan State College later acknowledged Wesley’s commitment to teaching and education with an honorary degree in pedagogy (Ped.D.) in 1961 (see page 189 of Wilson’s The History of Morgan State College: A Century of Purpose in Action, 1867-1967).
professor of Education and Dean of Howard’s Graduate School. Jenkins received a doctoral degree from Northwestern University under the mentorship of Dr. Paul Witty, a psychologist and pioneer in gifted education research. Jenkins began to expand the field of intelligence research by carving out a unique line of scholarship on highly intellectually (IQ 160+) gifted Negro children, developing studies that provided a counter narrative to the dominant acceptance of race (Black) intellectual inferiority. This acceptance of Black inferiority stemmed from a narrative promulgated from a platform of White privilege yet spoken of as if inherently true. Solórzano and Yosso refer to these narratives as stories that are ‘majoritarian’ because they “generate from a legacy of racial privilege…which seems ‘natural.’” By intentionally seeking out and studying gifted Black children, Jenkins confronted the dominant, seemingly “objective” ideology while asserting a contrasting story and thereby critically questioning the neutrality of a racialized framework for understanding intelligence. One such majoritarian storyteller and researcher that Jenkins (and Witty) challenged with their studies was well-known Stanford University educational psychologist and eugenicist, Lewis Madison Terman. Although Terman had not found Black children who scored in the ranges of genius or near genius using the Stanford-Binet I.Q. test, Witty and Jenkins did produce such results, reporting,

In the studies reported to date, Negro children usually have been found distinctly inferior to white children in test-intelligence, and few Negro children have been cited who earn scores in the ‘genius’ or ‘near-genius’ category. Although L. M. Terman reported 15 children of IQ 180 or above and L. S. Hollingworth wrote of 17 children who tested at or

---


400 Selden, Inheriting Shame, 23. Terman was an advisory committee member of the American Eugenics Society. He was also credited with authoring the modern intelligence testing movement in the early 20th century, including the Stanford-Binet IQ test which he revised in 1916 and (co-authoring) the Army Alpha Beta tests.
above IQ 180, there has not appeared…a published account of a Negro child testing at these extraordinary levels…nevertheless, the writers of this paper have found the Stanford-Binet test useful in examining capable Negro children, and in identifying those of unusual ability.401

As the oral histories of participants will later reveal, much of Morgan’s contemporary rise as a premier institution moving toward university status, at least in recent memory, can be traced back to the beginning of Jenkins’ tenure. In fact, this study could simultaneously follow the leadership of Jenkins’ influence as president of Morgan as much as it attempts to trace the origins and development of its honors education activities.402 Morgan professor and historian Webb’s analysis of Jenkins’ tenure states: “Morgan initially acquired its reputation because of the ingenuous [sic], administrative works of Dr. Martin D. Jenkins…President Jenkins led Morgan to perhaps its highest point of excellence, and laid the foundation for building and maintaining academic and scholarly achievement at the college.”403 It may be that one may not have happened, as it were, without the other.

Similar to Adyelotte, Jenkins appears to have arrived to his presidency from the beginning with an agenda to raise the academic profile of his institution and was able to quickly gain the unquestionable support of the faculty. Dr. Burney Hollis, a former Dean and director of honors activities recalled,

At the time Martin Jenkins had tried to make Morgan a first rate university. In fact, he succeeded in getting us declared a model liberal arts institution by the Middle States Association. Martin Jenkins was such a strong president. If he said you must have an honors program, you must have an honors program. If he said a university has got to have brilliant students and you’ve got to track those students; that’s what you did.404

402 Such is often the case with inductive research due to its flexible and emerging nature.
403 Webb, Fair Morgan, 5.
404 Dr. Burney Hollis, interview by Traci Dula, June 15, 2015.
Envisioning a more rigorous academic culture for Swarthmore, Aydelotte promised in his 1921 Inaugural address to set an ideal of “the discovery and training of the best minds for leadership in an industrial democracy” and vowing to no more “[allow] the capacity of the average to prevent us from bringing the best up to the standards they could reach.” While Aydelotte’s slightly competitive vision conveys a divisive favoritism towards the top students, Jenkins’ comments in his December 17, 1948 Inauguration address strike a somewhat similar, yet more egalitarian, chord. With the notion of capitalizing on the talents of those of high ability, but perceptively noting, however, that gifted Black students had not been afforded the resources to nurture their prowess as had their White counterparts. He urged,

> It is apparent that the intellectual resources of the Negro people have not been developed to the same extent as have those of the general population. This constitutes a type of erosion of the human resources which our state can ill-afford. It is our responsibility at Morgan State College to conserve these resources and this we propose to do.

In one of his research studies from 1943 on gifted Negro children, Jenkins pointed out that these students were not rare enigmas of their race; there were many out there but unfortunately, he concluded,

> We may discover extreme deviates in psychometric intelligence in our schools unrecognized and denied the type of education experiences which are necessary for their best development…these cases bring into sharp focus the limitations which our society places on the development of the highly gifted Negro. These children are nurtured in a culture in which racial inferiority of the Negro is a basic assumption.

---

405 Faculty, *An Adventure in Education*, 26-27.
Another critical work, because it was among the first to challenge conventional wisdom regarding intelligence testing and race, was an earlier study co-authored with his advisor and mentor, Dr. Paul Witty. The study, “The Case of B: A Gifted Negro Girl” revealed,

The fact that we can find a Negro child whose IQ falls in the very highest range indicates that Negro blood is not always the limiting specter so universally proclaimed…this case is of significance further in that it demonstrates that we may discover…in any school population, unrecognized and denied the types of educational experiences which are necessary for their best development, as well as for the best interest of the social order.408

Later, just before his tenure at Morgan began while still at Howard University, Jenkins co-authored a study that investigated the characteristics of high and average ability Negro collegians. Study results confirmed what other studies at the time found, that high income parental occupations coupled with exceptionally, well- resourced elementary and secondary level schools which “are much more likely to reveal superior ability at the college level.” The opposite was true for “the unselected Negro college population, which comes from homes of low educational level, from poor schools etc.” The authors did caution mindfulness toward environmental factors in considering that, in their opinion, most Black students attending HBCUs in 1947 were actually from low parent occupation-income homes and subpar schooling, concluding that while individual intellectual capacity “sets the limits of development…environmental factors [also] determine the level of development within these limits” for scholastic achievement. Additionally, for any collegian, environment has a vacillation effect on both psychometric intelligence and achievement.409

His informed understandings through research may have influenced Jenkins’ Inaugural address, which judiciously emphasized the characteristics of the institution’s student population and the college’s fundamental responsibility to “adapt its program to the needs of that population.” He went on to explain,

If we are to make our best contribution to these students, we must have a clear understanding of what we intend to do for them, and how we intend to accomplish this aim. We intend…to…produc[e] students who are liberally educated…We shall approach this task well aware of the difficulties which confront us. Like Negro students everywhere, the students who come to Morgan State College reveal in their knowledge, their attitudes, and their behavior, the restrictions their environment has placed upon them. Although there are numerous exceptions, they come from homes which are poor in the material things and in which the tradition of a liberal education is absent. They experience, in their daily living, social attitudes of contempt and lack of respect which inevitably lead to the feelings of frustration and inferiority. These things we are bound to consider in our educational program and procedures. We realize that our demand for accomplishment must be tempered by sympathetic understanding of the handicaps their experiences have imposed upon our students.

Again, Jenkins suggested in his approach to first acknowledge the societal challenges the student population would bring to them such as lacking social and cultural capital and familiarity with the material and intellectual world usually present in the lives of those with a liberal arts education. Jenkins cites the psychological damage of racism on their students and insists that these considerations need to be tended to in an educational program in order to also accomplish in fullness the task of cultivating liberally educated graduates who would succeed despite a hostile, racialized society.

For example, there is a photo in a 1967 *Afro American* newspaper supplement of Dr. Ruth Brett with a honors student holding a 1960-61 ICSS brochure, indicating engagement, even if not membership, in the organization. The photo capture reads,

In 1960, Robert Bell, a Dunbar High School graduate, came to Morgan State College as a freshman. Dr. Ruth Brett, coordinator of Student Personnel Services, recognized him as a superior student. Young Bell became one of the outstanding Morgan students and later
elected Student Government President (AFRO featured him as BMOC—Big Man on Campus, September, 1965). Bell was graduated with highest honors from Morgan in June, 1966. Today he is completing his first year at the Harvard University Law School, on $2,146 scholarships.410

The Southern University Invitational Conference was held in February of 1960. It could be that Brett attended this conference with the dean, Nathaniel Whiting, or that she or the institution became involved with ICSS after this significant 1960 conference. Although archival data has not yet revealed specifically paid institutional membership in ICSS, Jenkins and his staff were certainly responding to the movement for the superior student. “As president…Jenkins set early goals of increasing the number of Black faculty, establishing an advanced level of scholarship in courses. And initiating new programs for students.”411 It appears that his scholarship in gifted education informed his academic vision as president at Morgan. Jenkins introduced a curriculum that involved testing and academic counseling that would allow students to work at a level that was best suited for their college preparedness. “Jenkins also introduced under his administration, a book-of-the-month for all students to read and a departmental honors scholars program.”412 He also “oversaw twelve new chapters of academic honor societies that were established to encourage and recognize student academic accomplishment.”413

Although passionate about nurturing high ability students, Jenkins was as adamant regarding the academic achievement of students at all levels of abilities. This seems to be the one difference between him and Aydelotte and where the two may have parted philosophically. The environment of rigor and high expectations, given each student’s aptitude level, would be

410 “Developing the Whole Person,” Morgan State College 100th Anniversary Edition, Afro-American newspaper, June 3, 1967, 16. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md. Within the article, Counseling Center services were described this way: “Special services are provided for underachievers and honor-students, transfer students and overseas students.”
411 Davis, “Dr. Martin Jenkins,” 137.
412 Wilson, The History of Morgan State College, 126.
413 Wilson, The History of Morgan State College, 101-103.
cultivated. The new tracked curriculum tested students into either program A, B, or C. Curriculum ‘A’ was for “students who need[ed] additional work in the tools of learning in order to insure better subsequent success in college.” Curriculum ‘B’ was for students who were deemed college ready, “those students who demonstrate a high level of ability;” and Curriculum ‘C’ was “the honors program open to selected students above the freshman year who have demonstrated unusual ability.” These modifications to the academic curricula speak to a rational flow of Jenkins' scholarly educational research interests in the “high achieving Negro.” It is also worth noting the inversed scheme of Jenkins’ proposed curriculum and how he thought to reverse the order of the tracks thereby avoiding any psychological stigma on students who fell in to the group that needed remediation. As for the Curriculum C program, I have likened it to his study of the case of a Negro girl solely identified as ‘B.’ Jenkins, in developing a plan for the high ability collegiate students was, in effect, making a case for ‘C,’ that is Curriculum C students (see Appendix B) and set the institution on a new trajectory. As a scholar, Jenkins’ research sought to prove the existence of high ability Black students and the urgent need to nurture their talent. Curriculum C was designed to develop and enrich the academic experiences of high ability students at Morgan. Similar to ‘B,’ the Curriculum C students represented the very cohort of young people that Martin worried were not adequately identified and developed.

Jenkins arrived to Morgan in 1948 as president. The launch of the A, B, and C curriculum was October 1957. Edward Wilson, who served as Registrar prior to and through Jenkin’s tenure, credited the three-track curriculum and the beginning of an Introduction to College, a two-week program for freshman and the hiring of student personnel professionals to provide freshman

---

counseling, to Jenkins’ leadership. There is some document evidence to also suggest the willing deliberations from the faculty. Jenkins asked the faculty to arrive to campus earlier than they normally would to prepare and address matters related to instruction. A Faculty Institute was established (and continues to this day) and in a Morgan State College (MSC) Bulletin it was reported that, “In September, 1949 faculty members for the first time reported for three days earlier than usual in order to give group consideration to a number of internal educational problems.”415 One of those 1949 faculty institute topics discussed was “What to Do about Superior Students.” Although these meetings began in 1949, with planning possibly extending through the early 1950s, first mention of the Three Track program in print was in the October 1957 MSC Bulletin. Jenkins viewed the new Three-Track program as one mechanism to serve students but also as a way to remain relevant, progressive and perhaps a magnet for high achieving Black students. In a later March 1964 publication of Southern School News, Jenkins was reported as stating that, post-Brown, “some of America’s most esteemed academic centers are now actively recruiting colored students… [making] specific reference to Princeton University which has inaugurated a new program to attract a larger Negro enrollment.” Also in this article Jenkins revealed how Morgan, with its program seven years in operation by 1964, was “experimenting with a ‘track plan’” as one way that he was ensuring that Morgan was not among the institutions to “stand still, for if it does so, it goes backward.” In addition to earnestly desiring to nurture talented students, Jenkins may have also foreshadowed how Brown and

---

desegregation would impact HBCU’s thus the programmatic and academic emphasis on the gifted student.416

The October 1957 announcement for the Three-Track program read that the “new admission regulations for freshmen” would be effective beginning September 1957. The announcement read as follows,

Morgan State College is deeply concerned about the academic success of all students who enter. To this end the freshman curriculum has been revised in order to take into account the various levels of ability, previous training and experience. The revised curriculum is designed to give every student a fair chance to be successful in his or her college work.

That the program description emphasized the success of “every” student, illustrates Jenkins’ (and the faculty’s) commitment to all students, not just the academic stars. This philosophical approach indicates that there may have been a conscious disbursement in resources across ability levels and an intention to meet the needs of one set of students without compromising the needs of another. The announcement went on to explain how the program would unfold and how students would be assigned:

Upon entrance all freshmen are given a battery of tests. Performance on these tests determines the program to be pursued by the freshmen. The revised Freshman Curriculum is set up as a three-track program. These tracks are designated as Freshman Curriculum A, Freshman Curriculum B, and the Honors Curriculum.

The program was fluid, affording students movement as well as accountability. For example, “a student may transfer from the ‘A’ program to the ‘B’ [however] any student in this [B] curriculum whose work is appreciably below average at the first semester will be transferred to

416 “Morgan Trustees to Seek More White Students,” Southern School News, March 1964, 4. This article also addressed the Morgan leadership’s desire to expand its mission by enrolling more White students. If White institutions were enrolling and attracting more Black students, Morgan could attract White students. Either way, Jenkins felt that the diversity made for a better institution.
the ‘A’ program the second semester.”\textsuperscript{417} Another Bulletin addressed more specifically what data were gleaned from the student tests, stating,

“these tests are used for the purpose of placing student in Freshman Curriculum “A”, “B”, or “C” (see Differentiated Curricula for Freshman.) The tests also provide information concerning student’s ability, special aptitudes, interest, achievement and general adjustment. This information serves as a basis for counseling and becomes a part of the student’s cumulative record.”\textsuperscript{418}

The testing, freshman orientation, and the coordination of curriculum program activities were directed under Dr. Ruth Brett. Dr. Brett was hired by Dr. Jenkins in 1956 as associate professor and director of the Lower Division “for a newly created position…primarily responsible for the adjustment of freshman and sophomore students.”\textsuperscript{419}

According to both her individual annual reports and a Counseling Center brochure, Dr. Ruth Brett had direct coordination of the Curriculum C (honors students) with the support of a faculty committee until the early 1970s. In addition to academic opportunities and support to these students and the selected faculty who worked closely with them, Brett held small group counseling sessions with honors students. Significant to note is that in a 1958-59 summary of the Counseling Center program, Brett recommends, under a section entitled “Work With Superior

\textsuperscript{417} Morgan State College Bulletin, xxiv, 1 (October 1957). Special Collections and Archives University of Maryland Libraries.  
\textsuperscript{418} Morgan State College Bulletin, (April 1960). Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.  
\textsuperscript{419} Dr. Brett had an extensive career in higher education prior to her 1956 arrival to Morgan. She taught at Spelman College, Dillard University; was Dean of Women at Dillard; Dean of Students at Bennett College and Fisk University and was director of the Student Center at the University of Munich (Germany). While at Morgan, she was very active in the College Student Personnel field, served on commissions and as consultant for the American Council on Education, and elected to the National Board of the YWCA. She maintained an active speaking circuit at local churches, campus events, and professional conferences. Dr. Ruth Brett Quarles was included on several “Who’s Who” lists. A high ability student herself, Brett was valedictorian of her high school and graduated with highest honors from Shaw University. She was the wife of noted historian Dr. Benjamin Quarles who was a history professor and department head also at Morgan State College. She retired from the University in 1980, ending a 24 year career there.
Students Beyond Freshman Level,” proposing a four-year honors program. It would take twenty-two years before her vision came to fruition in the fall semester of 1980 following her spring retirement. In an April 1964 booklet entitled “Functions of the Office of the Coordinator of Student Personnel Services: The Counseling Program,” Brett outlines services to parents: “Letters are also sent to parents for specified groups of students who have completed two semesters including students eligible for the Honors Program, C Curriculum students.” Brett also coordinated across campus for the ‘Introduction to College Week,’ working with colleagues and faculty to administer placement tests, and discussions with faculty, in groups of 10 students, about the meaning of those tests and curricula assignments. Specifically for faculty, she ensured that they received “a list of students eligible for Honors Program and others with high potential.” Although Brett worked directly with the Curriculum C students and the honors faculty committee, the Counseling Center staff provided support of faculty counselors for “B” program students for their first two semesters, group orientation course for “A” program students for their first semester. As early as the June 1, 1964 (97th Session) Commencement Exercises program, there is mention of two “graduates in Honors Program,” which was separate from those recognized for Latin honors. The list became longer every year, evidence of steady engagement of honors program activity during the 1960s.

Dean Emeritus Burney Hollis alumnus of 1968 was an honors/Curriculum C student. After proving that he was a motivated student capable of more rigorous work, he moved from Curriculum B to Curriculum C. He recounted,

420 Dr. Brett’s personal papers approximately 1958-1969. Access was granted by family members. Many documents in this collection included newspapers clippings, staff annual reports, Brett’s resume, awards, photos, and student and Counseling Center guide books. I am indebted to the Quarles family. Other than the institutional memory of retired/retiring staff members, documentation specifically of the Curriculum C or three-track program and its activities is not readily available at the University.
I started in Curriculum B but by the end of my freshman year I was in Curriculum C. I had to prove that to myself as well as to them and I won’t gloat about it but I did graduate as salutatorian of the class so I did lift myself up and did what I needed to do. Once I saw what Morgan could do for its students—and Morgan did a lot for its students, I’m a country boy. I worked in the fields of the Eastern Shore of Maryland… Dr. Matthews was in C curriculum and that was the honors program, per se. Students in the C curriculum had special teachers, special sections of classes that they went to. So, they got the very best at the university and that was at the lower division, freshman and sophomore year. At the upper division there was the departmental honors scholarship, honors scholars in each department. Dr. [Matthews], if I remember correctly, was the one in Chemistry. They were on full scholarship and they had to write an honors thesis. In 1967-68, I was the one in English. And we had to write an honors thesis, appear before an honors committee and defend the thesis.421

Jenkins’ Three-Track program is such a perceived hallmark of excellence on the campus that many are unaware of honors education activity prior to 1957. Dr. Hollis was incorrect about Dr. Matthews’ honors experiences. Dr. Matthews was an honors student in what she described as an honors program, however she was not in Curriculum C as the three-track program was not in place during her 1950-54 undergraduate years. She was, however, a recipient of Jenkins’ academic department scholarship initiatives, one of three scholarships she received as an upperclassman. As described in the December 1953 issue of The Morgan State Bulletin, the honors scholarships were “upon recommendation of department heads [for] junior and senior students who have maintained high scholastic records and show potential ability.”422 Dr. Matthews recalled,

Dr. Jenkins started his honors scholarship award and so then each department could nominate a student and you went through grueling testing and interviewing and I mean a whole screening process and 12 of the students would get these full scholarships and it was a scholarship with room and board. This was the Morgan State College honors scholarship and it covered me for senior year so I lived on campus for senior year too. And so I had not completed the problem that I was working on as the Ellis award winner (a Jenkins research scholarship that Matthews was awarded her junior year that also included room and board) and I was going to be continuing my research during my senior year. I continued the project my senior year and the research was published in

421 Dr. Burney Hollis, interview by Traci Dula, June 15, 2015.
422 The Morgan College Bulletin vol XIX no.6 (December 1953), 25. Special Collections & University Archives University of Maryland Libraries.
one of the journals of the American chemical societies and so I graduated with an article—it did not come out until November of that year after I graduated.\textsuperscript{423}

The scholarship awards illustrate that even though the Three-Track program had not yet launched, Jenkins along with his administration and faculty were creating opportunities to encourage and retain academically strong students as well as promote faculty mentoring of student independent research. Dr. Matthews’ publication in a research journal as an undergraduate indicates a substantial activity of rigor and a development of talent in the early 1950s.

Establishing exactly when Honors education activity began at Morgan prior to Jenkins’ scholarship and curriculum initiatives is a dubious task. Some have given credit to the Jenkins’ Curriculum C initiative and, therefore, the beginning of honors education on the campus; there is Dr. Matthews’ knowledge and experience of an early 1950s version of honors education, which clearly was in existence prior to Jenkins, but with a (currently) unknown beginning; and still, as will be discussed later, there is yet another model identified as beginning in 1980. Dean Burney Hollis presented it as an evolution of several phases: (1) The 1950-60s Track C program which included lower division coursework and upper division departmental honors scholars which led to the honors thesis; (2) The 1970-80s more formal honors program with honors seminars, a

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{423} Betty Matthews [pseud.], interview by Traci Dula, June 8, 2015. According to the \textit{Morgan College Bulletin}, Matthews received $545.00 for the Elis award vol xix no. 4, (June 1953): 49, Special Collections & University Archives University of Maryland Libraries. Matthews also received the Chemistry department’s George T. Stansbury Chemistry Award for “outstanding work of a creative nature in chemistry (The \textit{Morgan College Bulletin}, vol xx no. 2 (February 1954), Special Collections & University Archives University of Maryland Libraries. George Stansbury is the older brother to Clayton Stansbury, former director of Honors. Because of her publication in analytical chemistry, Matthews was inducted in to Sigma Psi, the research arm of Beta Kappa Chi, as a first semester graduate student at Iowa State, a distinction usually awarded to third year graduate students. As the only Black and only female student in her masters Chemistry program at Iowa, Matthews was isolated from her peers but was proud to state, “But I survived. Little Morgan prepared me even though we didn’t have all of the instrumentation that most universities had because we have been historically underfunded by the state of Maryland.” She recalls that her White male class mates would acquire study materials that they did not share with her “because they didn’t even talk to me or look at me, but still I survived. Yea, oh goodness.”
\end{flushright}
short-lived honors publication of faculty work, departmental honors scholars and eventually a student honors scholarship as part of the in-coming student admission package; and (3) 1990s-present, present being June 2015, which was the University Honors Program with both upper and lower division course work, orientations, scholarship, faculty, etc. Honors education on the campus did indeed evolve in phases however, given the data collection, I would adjust Dr. Hollis’ timeline by separating the 1980s from the 1970s. The program that began in 1980 under Dr. Clayton Stansbury was different in that “the Honors Program” was now a part of the university structure with an appointed full-time director, whereas, in the 1970s, the director was a faculty member with part-time “honors” administrative duties and prior to that (the 1950s-the establishment of Curriculum C) the Dean of the College seemed to coordinate honors activities.

Of her early 1950s era experience of honors, Dr. Matthews recalled in her interview the following:

_I came to Morgan in 1950 after I graduated from high school and it was not arranged the way it is nowadays where when students are admitted to the college they are admitted in to the honors program. It was not that way when I came. You came in and you went through all the placement tests that you had to go through and then in October you got a letter from the Dean of the College telling you that you were included in the honors program based on the evaluation of the placement exams...There was an honors program here even though there wasn’t the A,B, and C designation at that time...When I was an undergraduate, the dean of the college, Dean George C. Grant was the chief academic officer and he was the director of the honors program...we had some honors sections of courses in the freshman and sophomore years...and then after that students in the honors program were expected to do some kind of major project or something related to their discipline. Mine was my research that I did during my junior year. Whether I had that Ellis award or not, I would have done that research because I was in honors. [Honors] was campus-wide and we had Alpha Kappa Mu because Black folks couldn’t get in to Phi Beta Kappa. Alpha Kappa Mu was the top ranking honor society on Black campuses and so we had Alpha Kappa Mu as the top honor society and there was some special academic-specific honor societies._

---

424 Dr. Hollis was interviewed June 15, 2015. By July 2015, the University Honors Program was designated the Honors College and named after a longstanding professor and administrator, Dr. Clara I. Adams.
Matthews’ mention of honor societies, even those that were denied, exemplifies agency on behalf of HBCUs to not only provide special opportunities but also celebrate its talented students and doing so on their own terms even when segregated from the White societies.⁴²⁵ That Black honors/high achieving students were categorically restricted from the racially exclusive societies is one way the consequences of segregation structurally hampered Black institutional and individual honors development.

As an undergraduate student in the 1960s, Dr. Hollis participated in the three track program. Hollis recalled defending his senior honors thesis before a committee, on which there were no faculty from his department. He stated,

_Every department was not represented. In fact, on the committee that reviewed me, there was no English professor. I was being interviewed by people in biology._

Despite the disciplinary mismatch, faculty across the campus were responsible for working with students, even out of their own academic departments. Hollis’ recollection of his experience reflects the legacy of care and excellence under which he studied and the accountability for learning that the faculty assumed for students regardless of their academic area. This structure of faculty involvement across the campus and disciplines also speaks perhaps to Jenkins’ expressed expectation of faculty involvement with high-ability students. Hollis continued saying,

---

⁴²⁵ That HBCUs established societies from which their students and institutions were restricted is not uncommon. As outsiders are by nature humanly prone to do, these organizations exercised agency in creating their own organizations for their students. Similarly, Jewish students who found themselves ostracized from social Greek life, formed their own communities out of need to support and validate one another as well as form organizations in response to their exclusion. Clubs such as the Menorah Society founded at Harvard in 1906 and Zeta Beta Tau (1898) originated to allow students to fellowship in their cultural and religious identities as well as discuss critical historical and contemporary community concerns and promote Jewish pride. Likewise, also in 1906, Black male students, who were restricted from White social activities at Cornell University, founded the first Black fraternity, Alpha Phi Alpha. See Harold S. Wechsler, “An Academic Gresham’s Law: Group Repulsion as a Theme in American Higher Education,” in _The History of Higher Education, 2nd Ed._ (Needham Heights: Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing, 1997).
The worse one was the one in biology but at that time, every teacher was responsible for excellence in writing. So the one in biology was very good. In fact, the only fault with my thesis was a typographical error on page 68 and it was the biology professor who pointed it out. She made such a big deal about it. She said it can’t be a thesis, it cannot be perfect with that mistake. Now that was before we had computers so I had to go back and retype. It was rigid. It was very rigid. When I stepped in as director of the honors program in ’73, I think I made it more formal and structured than it had been before... If you are going to be an honors student you should be better than everybody else and you should be expected to do a little more than everybody else as well. And so I structured the program around honors seminars that they had not had before, placed greater emphasis upon the honors thesis and the defense of it and pushed the students and the honors faculty to become involved in scholarship and research.

Of his later role as faculty director of Honors (1973-77), the program seemed to have taken a structural shift in the early 1970s. Dr. Hollis explained,

*The first director of the Honors program was appointed in 1971 or 1972 [with] Dr. Idel W. E. Taylor. Let me put it in context: For a long time there was no established formal honors program but there was a program and that’s when Dr. Matthews was here. It just didn’t have an official title. It was more informal because it was handled by an honors committee. There was no director; there was no formal program and formal title. It was handled by the honors committee. And the honors committee [elected by the faculty] was one before whom you had to defend your honors thesis once it was written... All committees were elected by the faculty.*

Although Hollis’ undergraduate and faculty experiences in honors overlapped the years under which Morgan had lost autonomy, the attention to honors students seemed to maintain institutional commitment. Another enhancement that Hollis created during his tenure as faculty director was Spring Honors Day. According to the May 17, 1976 article in the student newspaper, *The Spokesman*, syndicated journalist Carl T. Rowan served as keynote speaker of an event that highlighted “a full week of recognition for the university’s scholastically advanced students.”

---

426 Dr. Burney Hollis, interview by Traci Dula, June 15, 2015.
427 “Carl Rowan Addresses Honors Gathering at Morgan,” *Spokesman* vol. xxiv no. 8 (1976). Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
In fact we developed a journal out of our efforts in that direction…This is a combination of faculty and students’ work. Most of the articles in here are written by faculty but there was a departmental honors scholar in English and he put one of his poems in there. And its honors news and stuff like that. In a previous issue it was a profile of every departmental honors scholar but no, students never got to the point of really publishing in that journal and it was short lived because I left the honors program and went back to finish my doctorate…I was part time faculty and part time administrator, half and half. I taught two classes and I had release time of half a load to administer the honors program. And I do believe for the first time they gave me a secretary as well; I don’t think anybody had a secretary before me so we actually had an office, a three office suite in fact with me and a secretary, and a study room for the students.

Under Hollis’ more formal coordination, there is in the 107th session commencement book a list of students who completed senior theses and who were listed under the Departmental Honors Scholars category. Also, under his leadership is a May 1976 Morgan State University Honors Review, a semi-annual publication by the University Honors Program. By the end of the 1970s, honors at Morgan would move from a part time faculty director to a unit that was part of the administrative structure with a full-time dedicated director rather than a committee leading its direction. Dr. Clayton Stansbury was the first director of the new model, shaping and providing leadership and structure for almost two decades, 1980-1996. Dr. Andrew Billingsley was president of Morgan when Stansbury made first mention of an honors program. It may have been a matter of timing, coincidence, trust or all three when Billingsley approved the new unit,

I resigned as being vice president for student affairs and I told them I wanted to establish an honors program. We didn’t have one as such, we had splinters, I’d say, of an honors program but I took over and we had an established honors program…I directed from 1980-1996 the first coordinated effort…Now one thing I can tell you, a number of those so-called white honor societies were not here on campus so I got five honor societies—because I was working with freshman I was able to get two freshman honor societies: Phi Eta Sigma and Alpha Lambda Delta.

428 May 19, 1974 commencement program. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
429 Dr. Clayton Stansbury interview by Traci Dula June 4, 2015.
Dr. Glenn Phillips, a faculty member who worked alongside Dr. Stansbury to launch the honors program reported that the faculty, while not verbalizing a structured program,

were articulating that we needed to attract more high achieving students...Morgan had for decades attracted a number of outstanding African American students but during this period, the percentage of outstanding students had declined and there were a number of students who could have come here but they were going to other schools because they were being offered scholarships and so on. We needed to have our own.430

Dr. Phillips gave a precise articulation of the unintended outcome of desegregating higher education. The high achieving students that Morgan had previously attracted were likely prior to and just after Brown. When White institutions began actively attracting this population, the reaction was inevitably felt in the HBCU classroom. The investment in honors education, therefore, was integral to drawing these students back to the institution.

On a one-year assignment from teaching, Phillips was a self-described “foot soldier” in the process of establishing the honors program. In order to help administer the honors program, Phillips surveyed other institutions, mostly Ivy League schools, to understand how they organized their honors programs and with Dr. Stansbury, the two developed program proposals and a structure. Phillips recalled viewing the investment of the institution’s new unit as equally important to the university’s administration and that it was an initiative that, top down, people wanted to see put in place. He recalled,

It was the first year and it was quite interesting because they weren’t quite sure of what they wanted to do although they had a broad idea about honors. There are different kinds of honors programs. So the first major assignment I had was to research other honors programs. What I did, and there was no internet then, I had to simply write to different schools that had honors programs. We had to determine what schools had honors programs and so what we did was we earmarked some Ivy League schools and then some schools the size of Morgan and asked them for copies of their programs, their catalogs to see how they did it and what their goals and objectives were.

430 Dr. Glen Phillips interview by Traci Dula May 27, 2015.
Not having the luxury of the internet at his fingertips certainly must have made the task far more labor intensive and complicated. The coordinators had a particular view of what were Morgan’s peer institutions. They mostly made inquiries to private Ivy League schools, rather than other public universities, likely because of their shared liberal arts missions or desirable high standards. Once information on several programs had been obtained, the next task was to decide what aspects best fit the needs, goals, and existing curriculum at Morgan. Phillips continued,

and then we sat down, and said that we were going in different directions...Some schools had a special academic department only dealing with honors others had one, kind of infused through the whole system. So we needed to decide on what [to do]... I was part of giving input to Dr. Stansbury...my role was simply to do the research to see what other schools that had honors programs did and to help map out a program that would be unique to Morgan, that would fit in to Morgan's curriculum. I submitted everything to the director and... kind of mapped out what we thought would be something that is workable, something that could be implemented immediately because it was not something that was our plan five years down the road. They wanted it hitting right now, you know what I mean?

This urgency likely reflected an agenda to propel Morgan forward quickly and to attract the students that Phillips’ said the faculty wanted to see back in the classroom. A trifold brochure that lists Stansbury as director has included in it a brief history of the honors program on the campus,

The University Honors Program is and has been since 1974 the broad umbrella under which all honors-related activities fall. It includes (1) a General Honors Program, (2) Departmental Honors course, (3) a network of honor societies, (4) Curricular and extra-curricular honors activities, and (5) Scholarship Programs.431

---

431 The brochure may have been printed between 1980 and 1984 because Stansbury became director in 1980 and Dr. Matthews is listed on the brochure as the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. Her tenure as Dean ran from 1975-1985. Beginning in 1985 she served as Chief Academic Officer (1985-2005). “But in my role as chief academic officer, the honors program actually came under my purview.” Matthews in her June 8, 2015 interview with Traci Dula.
Honors activity may have had its origins in Curriculum C (or earlier) but the 1974 structure developed under Hollis and the dedicated full time unit begun in 1980 may compete for the official founding date, depending upon whom you ask. This is because the latter was the first time honors education was a designated unit with a dedicated full time director, signaling a new beginning. Whether it is the more informal honors program with a small “p” or the more formal 1980 version with a capital “P,” as enunciated by Hollis, the spirit of honors education and excellence was present on campus in many forms. In my informal conversations with staff and former students, the general understanding has been that honors at Morgan first began in 1980 under Dr. Clayton Stansbury. According to my assessment of the data—both archival and oral histories, however, the first structured honors program was the launching of the September 1957 Three-Track Curriculum.

An administrator described “honors”—the expectation of deep, serious study and application of knowledge, excelling at all costs, as a value that is ingrained in the institution’s history. According to this administrator, Dr. Earl Richardson, it is not a program, per se, as it is more what the institution’s legacy in its totality has embodied. President Emeritus Dr. Earl S. Richardson frames honors at Morgan in the context of his view of the “mystique” that he believes is the HBCU culture, a unique ability to cultivate an honors mindset across the campus while carefully tending to the needs of students at any point on the academic ability scale. During the interview, he explained,

> Morgan was always an institution of great excellence and gave high priority to recruiting some of our best and brightest students ... during that period [of segregated higher education] no matter where you came from no matter whether you were among the best and the brightest or at the margins meaning needing some academic support, it was always Morgan’s objective to take you where you were and carry you where you ought to

---

432 Many members of the Morgan campus community, unaware of earlier versions, identify 1980 as the first honors program. Few are aware of the Three Track program.
be and Morgan is known for that, has been for that for many, many years... And that really perhaps more so today than then, than the earlier years is part of the mystique of historically black colleges. It is part of the uniqueness of them that they don't just try to become selective and focus only on the best and the brightest. We have too much man power, too much talent to be wasted on such a model of selectivity. That there are many of our students, Black or White that given the opportunity to rise to the occasion and it so happens that many of us who staff and teach at these institutions are living examples of that mantra; are living examples of persons who did not always have the best education coming out of the schools but who were able to rise to the occasion because of the environment in which we were in.

In describing his own HBCU undergraduate experience and the meaning of “honors,” Richardson continued to describe the culture of high expectations at HBCUs as honors even though there may have not have been an established program. He reflected,

So honors program? No. We did not have an honors program. I graduated from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (then, Maryland State College) [in 1965]. As I said, it was a microcosm of all of our Black schools. We didn’t have an honors program but you know what? Honors convocation, honors recognition, honors this and honors that, a virtual honors program! Every Black institution has an Honors convocation. In that bulletin they are talking about all the honors students and you are this based upon GPA). There is this aura that you ought to be forever striving to be an honors person, the graduate...I would say as I said before, honors for us was a way of life on our campuses (the historically black colleges and universities campuses) because it was always recognized, celebrated, and promoted; promoted through scholarship money; promoted through convocations and big speakers and dinners around it. It was always—and you were big man on campus, smart guy. And it didn’t mean that you were recruited as an honors student.

The big man on campus, BMOC, which Richardson references is a term that has evolved. In Richardson’s vernacular use of the term, it refers to the student who achieves academically and receives official campus accolades as a result. In a 1967 Afro American newspaper supplement, the term is used to describe a Morgan honors student who graduated with highest honors and
went on to Harvard University with a scholarship. In the contemporary vernacular—at least in some circles, the term carries connotations of a less studious college man, one who knows where to find the best parties. It is the former understanding of the term that Richardson used to describe the campus culture that encourages students to amass an honors disposition toward their studies. He continued,

\[\text{[It is] the environment that says that if you are willing to put in the effort, then you can be as good as anyone else. And that again is part of the uniqueness, part of the ambiance, part of the culture of the historically Black college that makes it different; that makes it work; that makes it effective.}\]

Distinguishing the mystique of what Richardson thinks make HBCUs unique, here he positions, within this same context, the purpose of contemporary honors programs in helping these institutions sustain themselves in a competitive, desegregated environment:

\[\text{And so, that then goes to the honors program. The honors program yes, serves its purpose in attracting the best and the brightest but the best and the brightest does not erase a community or a university make. It must be heterogeneous in its make up to reach the ideal of the academy...}\]

Acknowledging the challenges of maintaining an honors program and the accompanying resources, along with attracting honors level students, Richardson nonetheless touts again that “mystique” that he claims is something White institutions are not able to do for their students, at least the Black student population. He adds,

\[\text{Now, again all of the things that make it so difficult that are easier at White institutions on this note is that they have more money, they have more programs, they have facilities and all that, so it’s more difficult for HBIs. But there is one thing that is difficult to replicate and that is a kind of nurturing that is provided even when you don’t recognize it immediately. There is something about not having to prove yourself— that being at ease, being able to just blossom in the sunlight of the spring. There you find that doesn’t mean}\]

---


that you long for an enclave, a black enclave, no. But it means that whatever this composition is, that philosophically that institution understands who I am; what my challenges are, where I need to go, and what I need to get me there. And it works toward that even when I am fighting it. That’s the magic of HBCU’s.

Although the resources of White institutions generally outweigh those at HBCUs, Richardson is sure that the latter provides students with an institutional comfort that generally parleys into academic confidence and competence that lead to success. The collective reputation of HBCU’s ability to meet the needs of a wide range of academic readiness levels is statistically high, especially with remedial coursework for those students whose potential had not actualized during high school. 435 It is in this context that Morgan established and strengthened honors offerings as the initiatives would go far to capture the attention of high achievers as recruitment gems as well as fortify an on-campus community of achievement among all students.

**Formal Honors Development at Morgan State University**

Honors offerings on most campuses evolve over time, usually beginning in faculty meetings with fledgling departmental honors programs, in academic areas such as English or history or departments of arts and sciences. They usually begin with a small number of pilot course offerings, eventually expanding to a college/university-wide entity that is interdisciplinary, accommodating students in all majors, and with a prominent role—whether it wishes to or not, in attracting the institution’s top academic students with luring financial scholarships. Similarly, Morgan advanced through many phases before establishing a designated unit.

---

The ninth institutional president, Dr. Andrew Billingsley arrived at Morgan in 1975 just as the decision was being made to upgrade the institution to university status. Five years later, the 1980 University Honors Program was launched under his tenure. It is, however his predecessor, Dr. Earl S. Richardson, who is credited with raising the profile of the program with the establishment of full-ride scholarships for incoming students and appointing a university task force to address the curriculum structure of the campus wide program and what Honors would represent on the campus. According to Stansbury, Dr. Billingsley in his role as president taught an honors seminar, however generating significant student financial support in the way of scholarships was a Richardson initiative,

Students received a little something but nothing like those two scholarships. One was called Honors scholars. Honors scholars received a full scholarship (this started in 1987) and they had special rooms, they received everything. I could get them into the bookstore ahead of the other students to get their books.

Stansbury felt that the institutional investment in the program began with Richardson’s 1984 tenure as president.

We really got started it in 1984 when Dr. Richardson was the president. I think it was in 1987 when he then named it the curriculum-based honors program. The students took the same courses as all of the other students but had courses that were enriched with specially selected teachers. Those courses were more difficult than the regular courses. When you come from high school, you had to have a high SAT—I don’t recall the SAT, and you had to have an honors average. And from 1988 until I retired, we brought in about 300 students each year.

Dr. Phillips echoed the perception of Richardson’s commitment to the honors program. After Stansbury’s 1996 retirement, Richardson assigned his executive assistant, Dr. Rich, to the honors director position to ensure its continued operation. Phillips recalled that this assignment further messaged institutional support of Honors. He recalled,

Then the campus realized how serious Dr. Richardson was taking it [the honors program] when he actually moved the guy who was his assistant in to the honors program to be
director after Dr. Stansbury retired which meant it was a priority. Dr. Richardson really pushed it a lot. Dr. Billingsley kind of started it but it really didn’t take off. Dr. Richardson wanted to improve the quality of the school because this school was designated as the urban institution in Maryland and there was a big argument during that period about duplication of educational resources. What Dr. Richardson was intending on doing was taking the word urban seriously because a lot of people took urban as meaning Black but he was going for more than Black. He was saying, if you are going to be urban it means the whole of Baltimore not just Black Baltimore. So he was willing to push and comparing here and what was going on at [the University of Maryland,] College Park and what’s going on at that other school in Baltimore UMBC that it [had designated itself] an “honors university” so he was up against [a challenge]… Dr. Richardson had more reasons to push the honors program than Dr. Billingsley. Dr. Billingsley, did it for a good reasons but then it was pressing for Dr. Richardson to actually continue honors and improve upon it.

Phillips’ comments here are critical given that during this time in the late 1980s when Richardson was enhancing the honors curriculum, sharpening its focus and developing scholarship offerings for high achieving students, the state was reorganizing its governance structure in 1988 and was seeking to pull Morgan back under state control. Phillips’ mention of UMBC likely refers to two concerns: the Administration’s ongoing resentment of the establishment of UMBC in 1966 which ultimately aborted the institution’s vision as the urban institution serving the educational needs of the greater Baltimore area; and, that UMBC had developed clever marketing in branding itself “a honors university in Maryland,” in 1995. This marketing tactic messaged that the other public state institutions—at least those in the immediate competing market, were inferior. Sustaining a well-developed honors program at Morgan, then, became a matter of primary urgency.

An Honors Program Task Force chaired by the head of the Philosophy Department, Dr. Otto Begus, submitted its final report on December 12, 1986.436 The report was approved June

18, 1987, effective the fall 1987 school year. As indicated in the report, the Task Force received from Richardson a “specific mandate to develop a curriculum based Honors Program.”437 In doing so, the Task Force first restated the institution’s commitment to its full student body by positioning the expected role of honors education,

The Task Force understands that an Honors Program should not weaken or replace the proven commitment to the University to students of all levels of preparedness. All students must be challenged to grow. It is in this upward movement where the Honors Program finds its proper place: not to segregate an elite, but serve as a spear-head, an avant-garde.

According to Dr. Stansbury, the success and profile of the honors program appeared as a priority not only in the president’s office but among their Board of Regents and constituents within the community as the program’s reputation began to expand. He stated,

Oh it had to be approved. All that we did. I had a person from the vice president of academic services office who was my supervisor. I sent it to my supervisor and the supervisor, I guess, would send it to the vice president and so forth. The honors program in 1987, criteria that I received came from the assistant to the president for Dr. Richardson. And they would send me the (honors admission) criteria every year and then I would send him a letter stating this is the information that you said we would abide by (SAT or ACT scores and high school average for honors).

Stansbury recalled the Board of Regents were very supportive of the Honors program’s growth. Additionally, its popularity grew as Stansbury recalls receiving interests from state representatives who hoped to have their students participate in the program.

Twenty-three years after the 1957 introduction of the Three Track program and about 22 years after Dr. Brett’s first 1958-59 recommendation for a four-year honors program, the 1980s honors program at Morgan, which came to be anchored in the curriculum and to offer full-ride scholarships, was in a solid position to help drive the institution forward.

Morgan Honors Directors Timeline

Coordinators and/or “Directors”* of honors education, the Track C Curriculum and/or the University Honors Program

Dr. George C. Grant, Dean of Arts and Sciences, 1936 acting; 1937-59

Dr. Albert N. Whiting, Dean of the College, 1959-1966/67

Dr. Idel W. E. Taylor 1971-72

Mr. Burney Hollis 1973-1977

Dr. Lucious Outlaw 1977-1979

University Honors Program (UHP)

Dr. Clayton Stansbury 1980-1996
Dr. Stanley T. Rich 1996-2003*
Dr. Don C. Brunson 2003-2009**

UHP and Honors College as of July 2015

Dr. Darryl Peterkin January 2010-Present

The Dean of the College/College of Arts and Sciences/College of Liberal Arts coordinated honors activities; there was also a faculty Honors Committee

“C” Curriculum activities were coordinated through the Counseling Center along with a faculty Honors Committee

The 1970s honors activities were coordinated with a part-time faculty director

Beginning in the fall of 1980 the University Honors Program was made part of the administrative structure and had a dedicated full time director

*Dr. Rich is listed in the 2001-2003 Catalog which was published multiple years out. He passed away, however, December 31, 2001.

**Dr. Brunson was appointed director January 11, 2002. Brunson is listed as such in the 2003-2006/2006-2009 Catalogs
Chapter V ‘Prospering Because That’s Its History’: Analysis of Themes

In a competing college search environment for high achieving students with similar offers from other institutions, an honors program and scholarships are often not enough. These students and their families, then, are able to compare amenities from research facilities to resident halls as the college admission ball is in their court and they are able to write their ticket to just about any school in the nation, let alone the state. This is especially true for high achieving Black collegians who are highly recruited by PWIs, wishing to diversify their student populations. One challenge that has emerged in the data, and is believed by study participants to have had a disenabling effect on the honors program at Morgan State University, preventing it from actualizing its recruitment potential and institutional growth in general, is the perceived neglect and lack of funding support from the state of Maryland. This and other themes will be discussed in this chapter.

Analysis of Themes

Emerging Themes A: State Support and Autonomy

State support and institutional autonomy were the two most salient themes that emerged throughout this study both in interviews and in documents. The two are tightly interconnected as Morgan has battled for independence and pushed for institutional prominence and recognition as a state supported academy of higher learning. The interdependent relationship of Morgan State University and the state of Maryland is a history that, even in the 21st century, continues to unravel a tale—one of a tense legal accounting of unresolved matters of race and equity in higher education. Some of what Morgan administrators had to say about state support and institutional growth or stagnation reveals the challenges of becoming a competitive institution—actualized or
perceived—as a destination for the nation’s most high achieving collegians. Examples of these two threads in the data follows.

In the Board of Trustees minutes, Jenkins is confident of the state’s compliance with the *Brown* decision. In a June 17, 1954 report entitled, “Problems Incident to Integration: A Statement Submitted to the Board of Trustees by Martin D. Jenkins, President,” regarding the May supreme court decision, he discusses both potential challenges and opportunities for the institution.\(^{438}\) Chiefly, Jenkins wanted the Board to plan for how the decision might impact “the status of the college in the State system of higher education [as ‘the largest institution in the State devoted primarily to the higher education of Negro youth’], including the question of an independent Board of Trustees.”\(^{439}\) He also asked the Board to consider policy regarding admissions and scholarships as he expected an influx of White student applicants; “there are many specific objectives based on the racial homogeneity of our student body…I believe…we should immediately take the position that we are serving the entire population of the state. Specific reference to the term Negro (or colored) in our objectives should now be eliminated.” While he expected that the attention of their activities would presumably continue to focus on Black students, he asked the Board to consider how their recruitment and scholarship policies might be effected. On the last page of this eight-page document, he concluded with a section entitled, “The Basic View” voicing,

> It is assumed that the State of Maryland is going to comply fully with the terms of the Supreme Court decisions. It is possible and desirable that this be done while at the same time retaining the identity of Morgan State College as a unit of the State system of higher

\(^{438}\) Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, June 17, 1954. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.

\(^{439}\) Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, June 17, 1954. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
education. The Trustees, faculty and staff of the college should work within the framework of this basic view.\footnote{As Dr. Matthews’ earlier quote indicates, Jenkins’ optimism never considered that the state would go to the lengths of establishing another institution, UMBC, to meet the local educational needs of Whites. Dr. Betty Matthews [pseud.] interview with Traci Dula June 8, 2015.}

As an Adams state that continuously failed to dismantle its dual system, Jenkins’ optimistic expectations fell short.\footnote{Adams v Richardson, 356 F. Supp. 92 (1973). NAACP filed suit against the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for failure to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. HEW was forced to re-enact its duty to ensure that higher educational state systems dismantled segregation with the review of desegregation plans for each state.} As a result, insufficient monetary funding and a paucity of recognition (such as the establishment of the University of Maryland Baltimore County, UMBC, in 1966) served to sabotage the expanded White student population that Jenkins presumed would become Morgan’s growth market in serving the Baltimore metropolitan area. This is what Hollis observed about the impact of desegregation on the institution’s history:

\textit{Desegregation might have been the worst thing to happen to HBCUs... At one time when we were segregated, we had to do our very best to make sure that our students were twice as well prepared as other students in order to get half as much and we knew that and therefore we really, really educated them. Now, because they have the option of going elsewhere and some people think we’re living in a post racial America—I’ve never fallen for that notion... it is easier for them to compete to get in to White institutions. The White institutions in the minds of Americans have better reputations and consequently we’re losing that battle. We are not attracting the brightest and the best because the doors are open elsewhere. That’s one of the side effects of desegregation. What bothers me most is that there is a question now about the validity of the existence of HBCUs. And I ask myself constantly, why? There is no question about the legitimacy of women’s colleges or Jewish colleges or anything like that. Why HBCUs? Any institution that is able to attract a clientele is a legitimate institution, it seems to me but there is something racial in picking on HBCUs in saying that they are outmoded. They are not. There are people who still want to go to HBCUs because of the culture that is here. They ought to have that opportunity and they ought to be able to find at an HBCU an honors program and a curriculum that are second to none. The solution to the problem is very simple to me; you fund HBCUs in the same manner in which you fund any other institution. They are all institutions of learning. There is a lot of prejudice in the whole thing.}

He is not alone in his judgment. Interesting to this point, however, is, as the seventies began to evidence the results of desegregation, HBCU leaders echoed Hollis’ concern regarding
integration. In his book *Guardians of the Flame*, a former HBCU president observed that the top academic group of students were among the first to exercise their broader college options, reflecting that,

> The climate was changing as the process of desegregation expanded and accelerated…but more and more African American students were taking advantage of the new and broader opportunities for higher education experiences in majority group institutions. Consequently, there was a disproportionate shifting of students from the traditional minority schools. It started first with the top echelon group and then filtered gradually to the mid-level groups.\(^{442}\)

As the acting president strategizing an honors program opportunity to raise the overall student profile, Richardson understood not only the influence of a program to attract and provide rigorous academic opportunities for the most advanced students but also the critical priority of ensuring that the most demanding academic offerings along with innovative facilities and technologies meet the expectations of such a population. He explains,

> And so the honors program has been that magnet for attracting those students and we have had it in different versions each generation we’ve tried to perfect; each generation we’ve tried to make it more effective. I must say to you that I am persuaded that our institutions [HBCUs] have always been able to attract talented students even when the SAT score and the GPA did not compare with some of those at the more selective universities. It was clear that the talent was there if only it could be tapped and developed and we focused on that. Now what did that mean for Morgan? It meant when I came that I had to continue that but not only continue it but take it to the next level and so we had to talk about what is attractive; what then is the magnet for them, for students and it turns out that beyond all those intangible qualities that we talked about, it is what we do to students, how we make them feel psychologically and how we move them socially. It turns out that they are not much different than any other student. They are looking for attractive programs and they are looking for beautiful and modern facilities; they are looking for financial assistance, you see? And then they are looking for people who may look like them but may not look like them but think like them; can share their experiences and then be [a] support as they move through the educational process.

Richardson goes on to lay out the requirements and challenges in attracting high ability students who are looking for scholarships and expecting modern facilities and resources. He recalls the efforts made in the late 1980s and 1990s to build honors but also explains enduring concerns still relevant at the time of his interview:

And so we went about trying to address those issues that then attracted our most talented students whether we categorize them as honors or non-honors. It just so happens that honors students represent a seller’s market. They hold the cards. They get to dictate what you have to have to get me. And they prioritize those factors in their choosing you. Money is not enough. It is a great incentive, a great incentive, and it has played a major role in attracting Black students to Black colleges, notwithstanding their not having the broad range of programs, the beautiful facilities and some of the other amenities.

But so many institutions are offering money now that... money doesn’t have—it’s necessary, it’s essential, you’re not going to get them without it—but it is not the final decision. They want to know what programs do you have; do you have the program I’m looking for? Do you have engineering; do you have civil engineering, electrical engineering; do you have business? Do you have cybersecurity; do you have all of the things that are going to improve my life in the future, okay. So programs become critical. Secondly, what is my quality of life there? Do you have beautiful classrooms where I am going to study? Do you have modern residence halls/housing where I am going to live? Do you have attractive and comprehensive student services that are going to support me as I move through; do you have beautiful recreation and cultural facilities and outlets? I want to know what my quality of life is going to be.

Richardson continues below, identifying one of the most challenging obstacles that HBCUs have had to face which has been maintaining recruitment leverage on a student body that now has options and keeping pace in a post-Brown era:

Therein lies the dilemma for Black schools in recruiting an essential segment of the student body because remember I said that the ideal of the academy is one that is heterogeneous, has a mix of different social economic backgrounds from different academic preparation. That heterogeneity is important to the student body. And so, when we are looking at that student body, to what extent then is your institution able to continue to attracting those...You no longer have the monopoly that you had in the pre-Brown era; Then it makes it essential that you have those things in the post-Brown era. That then becomes the vision, part of the vision for our historically Black colleges particularly those that are progressive and moving toward the 21st century.
In order to meet the expectations of high-achieving students and to move forward as a 21st century institution that excels in leading research and creating knowledge, Richardson expressed that what has held back honors development is what has also not propelled the university’s potential:

As a public university the state has deliberately undermined its success by not funding the things that make it attractive to the best and the brightest. Morgan has been aggressive in it and that is why its leaders become so frustrated and decide that we are going to move on but we are going to make this happen one way or another.

In fact I was just reading last evening the state’s reaction to Martin Jenkin’s [1964] proposal and the way they decided to dispose of it [Richardson assuming an imaginary mimicked voice and paraphrasing the state’s response]:

‘Well, no, Jenkins has a point there. Baltimore needs badly an urban university, but it would be a mistake just to create that at Morgan. We should instead create a metropolitan university of Baltimore by bringing in all of the campuses of Towson, Coppin, and maybe even Bowie. And they should do it not in the UMD system but under a separate board that would govern only this entity.’ [end mimicking]

I suspect that will rise again as a result of the proceedings in this law suit. Rise again but also meet with great opposition. But they have always wanted and so rather, Morgan had a history of moving very rapidly. Under my administration [1984-2010] it moved from being a liberal arts university, which had already been envisioned before I even got here, to a major research university. Without however, the infrastructure. The state said yes, you can be it—we petitioned, yes you are the public urban university. But it never provided the infrastructure or undermined at every turn the efforts of Morgan to develop a program inventory consistent with its designation as an urban university.

Well, then, when Morgan--using its political forces, was able to force the issue on engineering and on some of the other high demand areas [such as] architecture, then the state said yes we will acknowledge it but we will not fund it and support it in the way that we do the White schools; as a matter of fact, we are going to duplicate much of what you do at the White schools. It was really an extension of the Byrd philosophy. Curly Byrd. Byrd’s philosophy was you better fund those Negro schools otherwise those Black boys are going to be up here with our White girls. It was another version of that! That same role is being played by the University of Maryland here in aborting every effort that Morgan makes towards being the university it ascribes to be inclusive of honors programs for honors students.

---

Richardson examples the impact of college choice factors when talented students are considering options and how state appropriations have left them lacking in competition resources.

You see, a student that prepared to go into engineering, whether he be Black or White, if he has two programs to choose from; one is fully outfitted, has all of the allied disciplines around it, has money just being pumped in, faculty and research and all of the other things that make it attractive to partnerships with business and make it attractive to corporates for fundraising. Where do you think they are going?

So, we can’t talk about honors students without talking about those factors that are part of the attraction and recruitment of them and where the issue lies in terms of the road that they are able to play and have the potential of playing in educating students, particularly Black students. That’s the importance of this and Morgan’s honors program now is challenged. We do good; but it is challenged by the absence of the failure of the state to provide the kind of infrastructure that makes it competitive in its attraction of students regardless of its academic background. i.e., the Coalition law suit against the state of Maryland for its mistreatment, unfair treatment of historically Black colleges. That is the essence of it. That but for the actions of the state, this university would have prospered because that’s its history.444

Matthews echoed these sentiments regarding state funding, recalling a few instances that examples her concerns with state support from earlier years between the late 1950s through the early 1970s. According to Dr. Matthews, President Jenkins secured money from the Ford Foundation to underwrite the entire three-track A, B, and C freshman program for ten years with an agreement that the state would continue support once the grant money ran out. Activities for the grant money also included an eight-week summer program for Curriculum A students. The state did not continue with support, including the summer program. After ten years, the freshman program ended in the late 1960’s.445 Data from the personal papers of Dr. Brett indicate the success Morgan had with this Ford Foundation funded program.

444 “That but for the actions of the state, this university would have prospered because that’s its history.” This powerful quote by Richardson captured the overall findings of this study, thus it is used in part as the title of the study and this chapter.

445 The three-track program began in 1957. Estimates are that it ran through to about 1969 or 1970.
Dr. Brett’s May 23, 1960 annual report (for 1959-60 school year) boasts of her pleasure in supporting high ability students, writing “in counseling, I find counseling in small groups with Curriculum “C” and Promethean Kappa Tau [an honors society] members increasingly effective.” In her 1961 through 1966 reports, Brett made mention of her involvement with the Honors Coordinating Committee and spending a portion of her administrative time with the support of and planning for Curriculum “C” students. In the 1964 report, she made the suggestion to “have honors students sit in reserved seats at opening Convocation in Fall 1964…[and to] provide a special retreat before registration in September (with President and Dean as hosts) for students eligible for the Honors Program.” These reports evidence the thriving activity for track “C” honors students. The Freshman Guide and Work Books published by the Counseling Center for years 1970-71 and 1972-73 also refers to the track curriculum. Dr. Matthews recalls that the later publication may have been already printed (with regard to any reference to the three track program) because “I am pretty certain that the program ended with the funding which was late 1960s or no later than the 1970-71 academic year.” Matthews’ recall may be

---

446 Brett advised the Promethean Kappa Tau for all of her Morgan tenure. As described in the Counseling Center’s 1970-71 Freshman Guide and Work Book, “The purpose…is to motivate new freshmen of above-average ability to become scholars and to develop those personal habits and qualities which enable them to help promote a campus climate that nourishes the academic life.” The society was open to any freshman who achieved a certain academic GPA threshold, however, ‘A’ Curriculum students needed both a 3.0 GPA and to move successfully to the ‘B’ Curriculum program while maintaining the 3.0. ‘B’ students required maintaining a 3.0 both semesters. ‘C’ Curriculum students needed a specific set of courses and more credit hours each semester. Student could not “have earned no grade less than a ‘C’ in English.”

The following was retrieved from the Morgan State University website: The Promethean Kappa Tau Freshman Honor Society was founded at Morgan State University (then Morgan State College) in 1957 by the late Dr. George C. Grant, who served as Dean of the College. The Society was named by Dr. Sandye J. McIntyre, late Distinguished Professor of Foreign Languages. Dr. Ruth Brett Quarles, late Director of the Counseling Center, served as the advisor to the Society during its first twenty-three years of existence. In recognition of the outstanding service and contributions of Dean Grant and Dr. Brett, Dr. Clayton Stansbury, emeritus Director of the University Honors Program, renamed the Society to include the names of Dean Grant and Dr. Brett: the Grant-Brett Promethean Kappa Tau Freshman Honor Society. However, it is better known to its members as PKT.


447 Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
correct. While a projected ten year plan for the Counseling Center for the period 1967-77 continued to mention services provided to Honors students, there is no specific reference to the three track program. Even more, according to Brett’s 1972-1973 annual report she expresses concerns under ‘Major Problem Areas at Morgan State College,’ that “the problem which seems to me most overwhelming is the fact that Morgan admits students…without having a program which adequately meets individual needs on the Freshman level.” To this problem she suggested the coordination of faculty working with students and a summer orientation program. These concerns may very well be indicative to the dissolved three track program and its advising activities that acclimated students to the college environment and supported them throughout their first year. She repeated this concern in her 1974-75 report the following year urging that a new summer orientation program be implemented the following fall, “we must begin in 1976.”

Outside of an honors program, per se, Morgan had established an undergraduate leadership political science program of honors level that had gained prominence again with Ford Foundation grant money only to have it terminated due to the lack of state support. Continuing to provide yet another example of how she felt the state aborted a special program by not providing funding, Matthews spoke of it in this way:

We started the summer program again later and we started that during my administration as vice president. I talked about the A, B, and C program and the program for that group that was our A curriculum people. We were bringing them in about 20% of our entering class. I mentioned the summer program because The Ford Foundation supported that program for 10 years on the understanding that the state would take it over after that. When the Ford Foundation money ran out, the state [failed to continue it]. I don’t know why they did that a second time as well. We had a political science institute, an outstanding program. Around that time, most of the Blacks with Ph.D.s in political science had come through our program and went directly in to Ph.D. programs upon graduation. We brought students in for a semester. In fact, we had a few students who did a whole year at Morgan who were brought in with money that Ford gave
us to bring some students because they were so enamored with the program and students from other colleges got to spend at least one semester here or one year; some of the better students they allowed to stay for one year but that program was funded by the Ford Foundation for ten years and on the years of a presidential election we would have these campaign convention sessions; we would have all the things set up. We would have students from NY who were the NY group, like a congressional simulation. It was set up in the gymnasium. We had Robert Kennedy to come as the guest speaker. The program was outstanding and most of the students were given scholarships all out of this Ford Foundation money. The program got high marks. The Ford Foundation used to be good to Dr. Jenkins and so we had gotten money to do the A, B, and C program and then the Ford Foundation came in and funded this political science institute. And, the state did the same thing on that. They [Ford Foundation] wanted it to be continued under the state but they did the same thing. When the program monies ran out, the programs died.448

An article write up of the political program, “The Institute for Political Education,” in the June 3, 1967 Afro American newspaper supplement described that the purpose of the program was “aimed at developing…an awareness and knowledge of practical politics…[teaching students to] use politics and government for the betterment of their communities.” Launched in 1959, the program, as outlined in the article also,

Consists of lectures, seminars, informal discussions, workshops, field trips, field projects, internships, both in Washington and Baltimore City…[it] sponsors mock elections, town meetings and other mass activities involving the entire undergraduate student body. With the help of the Ford Foundation, the college is able to provide some twenty undergraduate scholarships each year…[and to] students from five (5) other colleges each year.449

Photographs accompanying the article show (1) students participating in an annual conference for high school social science teachers, (2) a 1964 mock national convention with 1,300 student participants and (3) a May 1966 lecture with Julian Bond. At the time Bond was in a legal

448 Dr. Betty Matthews [pseud.] interview with Traci Dula June 8, 2015.
449 “Institute for Political Education,” Morgan State College 100th Anniversary Edition, Afro-American newspaper, June 3, 1967, 16. Morgan University Files, Higher Education Records, Baltimore-Washington Conference Archives, Lovely Lane United Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md. In 1967, Morgan’s Institute for Political Education was directed by political science assistant director Dr. Augustus A. Adair and was founded by Dr. G. James Fleming, professor of political science.

Confirming Matthews’ assessment of Morgan’s pride in these activities, a report from Jenkins serves to provide additional documentation of her reflections. Jenkins’ final ‘Annual Report of the President, 1969-1970: Outstanding Aspects of the Morgan State College Program’\footnote{President Martin D. Jenkins. \textit{Morgan State College Annual Report of the President for the year 1969-1970} (submitted August 1970). Special Collections and Archives, University of Maryland Libraries.} to the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges highlighted these signature programs as well as other successes in his 22 year tenure such as the 1968 Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools Case Study which was directed by Dr. James Frost of State University of New York. Pulling excerpts from the Case Study report, Jenkins’ shared these glowing evaluations,

> The compensatory education program of Morgan State College drew most attention... Members of the Case Study were impressed by the large numbers of talented humans who have been discovered and educated by the process...[and] spoke of their resolve to improve the efforts of their own institutions in working with disadvantaged youth... The visitors were impressed by the willingness of the faculty to give attention to individual students.

Based on the overall “superb Report provided by the college prior to the meeting in Baltimore” and the visit itself, the committee endorsed Morgan serving the higher education needs of the Baltimore area stating,

> Morgan State derives is greatest strength from the spirit of public service...a year has not yet passed since Morgan State was ‘folded in’ under the jurisdiction of the single State Board of Trustees...but there is no doubt whatsoever...that this institution means to serve \textbf{ALL} the people of Maryland—black and white alike, and especially those in the Greater Baltimore area.
Jenkins explained later in the report in a section entitled “Requests of Foundation and Federal Agencies,” that “normally, institutions individuals seeking grants from foundation or Federal agencies submit proposals…the Ford Foundation…have, in recognition of program strengths, requested the college to submit proposals.” In his appendix of grants and awards from the Ford Foundation, neither the Three-Track program nor the Institute for Political Education are listed. It is possible that these programs received Ford Foundation support without submitted proposals. Jenkins did not make mention of a ten year limit of Ford funds or of the fact that the state was expected to continue these programs but the Annual Report, however, was submitted to the very entity—the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges, that would have made the decision on whether or not to support or discontinue these programs. Perhaps Jenkins thought it politically unwise to mention the funding oversights.

Jenkins described the Freshman Three-Track Program as one of 60 different conscious components that comprised Morgan’s “evolving” yet nationally recognized Compensatory Education Program designed to,

Take students who, in general, are far below American norms in academic aptitude and achievement, who have grown up in a segregated social structure, isolated from the mainstream of American life, and bring them in four short years to a point where they can compete in all areas of life with other American College graduates.

Developed to “take into account various levels of ability,” Jenkins described the Freshman Three-Tracker Program as one designed to “maximize [students] chances for success in his

---


453 Although the he Rockefeller Archives digital collection listings do not show a grant proposal for the Three Track Program, this does not mean it does not exist; many archives do not have all items listed. The full collection must be examined in person for accuracy of holdings. [http://dimes.rockarch.org/xtf/search](http://dimes.rockarch.org/xtf/search)

college career.” If a student who is in the group requiring remediation earned a 2.5 GPA or better at the end of the first semester [they] could move up to the next level. Jenkins’ program, although contemporary critics might argue as tracking, was designed to support and move students along rather than trap them in a basal program of instruction. Considering the institution’s mission as a liberal arts program and its goal to “bring our graduates, despite initial handicaps, up to a level which will enable them to compete without apology with other American college graduates,” no well-informed observer could soundly judge the goals of the Three-Track program as a tracking system designed simply to segregate by talent and to only invest resources in its most gifted students.455

Jenkins also highlighted as an outstanding program the Institute for Political Education that Matthew’s mentioned in her interview. He reported that it was “founded in 1959 and funded by the Ford Foundation.” It was designed to develop “citizen-politicians” and in addition to lectures and seminars, the program included a ‘laboratory’ [that] provided a voting machine, political maps, tape recorders, television and radio—all used for creating political awareness, political intelligences and expertness in real political situations.456

In addition to the special Ford Foundation programs that were not continued, Matthews reflected on the state’s challenge to comply with OCR desegregation guidelines.

No, Maryland is not in compliance. Well we are waiting on this Coalition case. Judge (Catherine) Blake ruled that the state did not comply and she said as much. She said that she could have brought them up on some additional charges because they did not comply with the Supreme Court ruling about the duplication of programs. And even while the 2000-2005 desegregation agreement that we had, they duplicated three of our programs during the time that that thing was in effect. That last agreement that we had 2000-2005,

well during that period they duplicated three of our programs (electrical engineering, MBA, and public health). 457

Referring to a current legal challenge that an outside party has against the state regarding its support of Maryland state public HBCUs and the duplication of programs (Coalition for Excellence and Equity in Higher Education v Maryland Higher Education CCB-06-2773 2013), Matthews clarified that while Morgan State University is not a plaintiff, state actions allowing the duplication of a MBA program already at Morgan is what compelled the suit.

*It was not our suit, it was the Coalition’s. But yes, that was the straw that broke the camel’s back. When we had the case study for Middle States during our centennial that group came in and we were under the microscope for two weeks. They had about 40 or so higher education authorities from all around the country and they came in and looked at everything under every rock, overturned every stone, and they said we were ready to move to the next level. Middle States said that the state ought to give us the resources to do so and they came through with some strong recommendations of what the state should do but they didn’t do any of that stuff. So then they said to us we were ready to offer graduate programs and the business program was one of the approved programs ’68 and started in ’69.* 458

Morgan was the first and only public MBA program in the Baltimore surrounding area in 1969. 459 The Baltimore College of Commerce (now University of Baltimore) was a private upper division institution located in downtown Baltimore when it acquired its MBA program in 1973. Because Morgan was the only public option in the metropolitan area, its White student enrollment was around 30% for the MBA program, according to Matthews. (In his 1969-1970 report to the Board of Trustees of State Colleges, Jenkins reported an overall White graduate

---

457 *Coalition for Excellence and Equity in Higher Education v Maryland Higher Commission* 1:06-cv-02773-CCB 382 (2013). Matthews also refers to the 2000-2005 Partnership Agreement between the state of Maryland and OCR to dismantle segregation in Maryland higher education.

458 The Middle States Case Study took place in the spring of the year, March 17-20, 1968, according to March 23, 1967 Morgan State College Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.

459 The University of Maryland, located about one hour south of Morgan, granted its first MBA degrees to five students in 1947 who came to the school in 1946 from University of Texas with their graduate advisor, Dr. John Frederick. Frederick joined the faculty in 1946. [http://www.rhsmith.umd.edu/about-us/history](http://www.rhsmith.umd.edu/about-us/history).
Once The Baltimore College of Commerce was made public and moved under the Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Maryland along with Morgan and the other teacher colleges that had transitioned as four year institutions, the new University of Baltimore became an affordable competitor to Morgan’s MBA program with the latter institution’s White student enrollment dropping to well under ten percent. A few years after the merge, the institutions placed under the Board of Trustee of State Colleges of Maryland were tasked with selecting undergraduate programs in order to avoid program duplication. Morgan chose to maintain its well established undergraduate business and graduate MBA programs. According to Matthews, this was the agreement. The leadership of Towson University, one of the newly transitioned teacher’s colleges located just outside the city, about 20 minutes from Morgan’s campus, was first allowed to duplicate an undergraduate business administration degree. Later, they were allowed to offer marketing and management degrees. The then vice president of academic affairs of Towson approached Dr. Matthews to share Morgan’s MBA program as a joint offering with the stipulation that Morgan’s faculty and students travel to the Towson campus for the courses. After choosing not to inconvenience her students and faculty and declining the offer, Towson was able to petition and gain approval from the legislature for a joint MBA program with University of Baltimore, thereby duplicating Morgan’s program. Because University of Baltimore was an upper division program that was just beginning to develop a lower level division and admitting freshman students, its president, Robert Bogomolny was concerned that Towson would take over even their MBA program. Matthew explained Bogomolny’s concern:

And Towson claimed that it was in need of another program. And UB did not want to share a program because they figured if Towson got into the mix with them that they [UB] would get kind of knocked off and so [Robert Bogomolny] told Dr. Richardson that he wasn’t in favor of it but he had to do it; he was in the system so he had to do what the system wanted him to do because Towson wanted that program and that’s when we exploded. The state decided that Towson, UB, and Morgan should sit down and negotiate a joint program and I said H-, no! This is our program. We were the first public MBA program in the state of Maryland and we ain’t giving up our program. We are not putting their names on our program! And that’s duplication; there is no need for such a program. At that time, MBA enrollments were going down but we have never had the resources that we needed to do the job.

The Towson/UB MBA proposal received full review. On March 15, 2005 Calvin W. Burnett—a Black man and former president of HBCU Coppin State University, Secretary of Higher Education for the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC)—informed Dr. Robert L. Caret (Towson University president) and Dr. Robert L. Bogomolny (University of Baltimore president) of the approval of the joint MBA program. He wrote that “in light of steady growth in the number of both undergraduate and graduate enrollments in business, there should be no negative impacts on other MBA programs.” He also went on to claim that Morgan had seen “a small reduction from 2003-2004” in enrollment, implying that perhaps the joint institutional programs could bring that up. He also cited the 2004 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education which “encourages the higher education community to ‘promote efficiencies and increase cost-effectiveness through fostering collaboration among institutions.’ The proposed Joint Program is directly responsive to this goal.” Among his reasons for justifying the approval he cited (there were eleven in total): (1) a state need for the joint program; (2) there was “no discernable harm to the MBA programs existing at an HBI”; (3) Morgan declined Towson’s joint program offer; and (4) Towson has the available faculty. That Towson had faculty not being used to their potential is a questionable state interest. However, the first concern

---

highlighted on this list regarding need is also questionable. Publications from *Business Week* to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* all reported a national decline in MBA programs. In a Thursday, April 14, 2005 on-line issue, the *Chronicle* reported “some programs are cutting their enrollments…the dip in applications is a result of higher tuition, stagnant starting salaries for MBA graduates, and lower demand for those graduates by companies.” In a May 17, 2005 *Baltimore Sun* newspaper article, Burnett was quoted as saying that not having a master’s program “has hindered Towson University from attracting and retaining faculty of the highest quality…I don’t see how that could negatively impact on Morgan. Would they lose one? Would they go 17 instead of 19…the real question here is whether this program is in violation of civil rights laws…the answer…is no.”

I feel all of the things of ours that had been duplicated [over the years], I want them all yanked. All of them. Electrical Engineering…I have an agreement in my desk drawer. When the state did a review of engineering education within the state—because only 1 or 2% of black students were earning a Bachelor’s degree in engineering in the state including Navy, the report talked about what they should be doing at the University of Maryland but there was a minority report by Clarence Mitchell and it said that engineering education in Baltimore City should be here and there was a new chancellor (John S. Toll) and he didn’t feel that we should have an engineering program. He felt that all of the HBCUs should have pre-engineering programs. That year he went around to all the legislative meetings during the summer. This decision had been made at the June meeting and with the minority report that Mitchell had put in, the group decided that engineering should be put here in the Baltimore area. And so then Toll got that overturned. After the board approved this in June, then they came back in September to say they were reconsidering that vote and they would have a hearing on it and they would

---


464 Initially, the Blue Ribbon Panel recommended that all engineering education take place at College Park with a satellite program at UMBC. Mitchell’s minority report convinced the Panel to recommend engineering education in Baltimore at Morgan State University.

465 Toll was president of University of Maryland 1978-89 which included five system institutions.
make a new decision. And with the new decision there was a piece of an engineering program at UMBC and a piece here. Now UMBC was operating under College Park's program but they wanted their own. First, they didn't have enough money to enhance the program at College Park and to build a new program here. But now, all of a sudden they have money they can enhance the program at College Park and build a piece of a school at UMBC and a piece of a school here. And then they were told that they could not have in the agreement we were supposed to have two programs and [that we should] operate cooperatively. This was the early '80s when we were talking about engineering. Our engineering program began in 1985, the first year I was vice president for academic affairs (I was dean of the graduate program 1975-85).

In December 1984, Morgan State University and the University of Maryland entered into a Memorandum of Understanding. It was signed by both Richardson and John S. Toll, president of University of Maryland Central Administration. On June 19, 2002, Karen R. Johnson, Secretary of Higher Education for the Maryland Higher Education Commission informed Freeman A. Hrabowski, president of the University of Maryland Baltimore County, that his institution was approved to offer graduate degrees in computer engineering. Although the letter stated that UMBC’s program was “not broadly similar to nor unnecessarily duplicative of…the existing Master of Engineering and Doctor of Engineering program at Morgan State University,” Matthews felt this was not the case and that computer engineering was very similar to electrical engineering. She thought that to suggest that there was enough distinction between the two areas of emphases to warrant establishing a program at UMBC was insulting.466

Moreover, prior to the 2002 and 2005 MHEC program decisions, the state system was warned over thirty years earlier by Regional Civil Rights Director, Dr. Eloise Severinson, of the department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), that it “does not yet meet the requirements of Title VI.” In response to the state’s October 1, 1969 desegregation plan’s failure to document active dismantling of duplicated programs, Dr. Severinson offered suggestions in

466 Both the MOU and the letter from Secretary Johnston to Dr. Hrabowski were retrieved from files of Dr. Beatrice Matthews [pseud] Morgan State University.
how it might meet HEW standards. She enclosed with her letter, “A Suggested Course of Action for Achieving the Elimination of Racial Identifiability in the Maryland System of Higher Education.” Keeping in mind that in 1969, Morgan was at this time under the Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Maryland, her suggestions included:

1. “Morgan State College should offer curricula which are not available at these [greater Baltimore area] institutions. Business administration…and other undergraduate curricula should be offered by only one state college in this particular geographic area. A transfer of this nature would be made gradually over a period of years…for example, only Morgan State College would offer business administration to entering students.”

2. “Expansion of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County Division (UMBC) must be carried out in a manner which will further the desegregation of the state’s institutions of higher education in the greater Baltimore area. Duplicating curricula presently available at Morgan State and Copping State [an HBCU located on the West side of the city] Colleges would appear to decrease the possibilities of desegregation …the plan must demonstrate how expansion of UMBC will further desegregation.

Despite the negligence observed by the Office of Civil Rights, the system exhibited insufficient will in efforts to dismantle the state system and its duplication of programs which directly incurs funding burdens and scarce resources for smaller institutions, and most often HBCUs.

UMBC opened its doors on September 19, 1966. A year later Morgan was moved under state control. In Dr. Severinson’s response to the state plan, she also indicated support of a proposal to merge the Baltimore campuses, writing, “we understand that a proposal to merge the state institutions of higher education in the greater Baltimore area into a single University is currently under consideration.” If this was indeed the case, it is reasonable to suspect that the move to establish UMBC and a merger of all Baltimore campuses in to one Baltimore area university is another possible rationale behind moving Morgan into the state system with the

---

467 The date stamp of the Maryland plan was actually September 29, 1969. The letter was addressed to the Honorable Blair Lee, Secretary of State of Maryland, Annapolis, Maryland 21401. Dr. Eloise Severinson represented Region III, office address 220 Seventh Street, NE, Charlottesville, Virginia 2290. Negro Education files, Special Collections and Archives, University of Maryland Libraries.
other institutions. In fact, UMBC was conceived in part from concerns that “one-third of the student enrollment at College Park resided in the Baltimore area...by 1958, the Board of Regents went on record supporting the development of a campus in the Baltimore area.”\textsuperscript{468} Do note that this decision was made four years post \textit{Brown}. With a student enrollment that almost doubled between the fall of 1954-1962, College Park President Wilson Homer Elkins addressed the Board of Regents with three options: “build a campus in the Baltimore area; extend the building program at College Park; or raise admissions standards.” A decade post Hiram Whittle’s admission to College Park, neither Elkins nor the Board of Regents of Maryland chose to invest those same UMBC funds by simply expanding the 100 year old Morgan State College.\textsuperscript{469}

Burney Hollis commented in his interview generally on the funding concerns of all HBCUs across the board and how that impacts this category of institutions, stating

\begin{quote}
\textit{Currently we are at a disadvantage mainly because White institutions can offer more money and better facilities and what sensible student would not opt for that? Black institutions are underfunded; they always have been. They probably always will be. And so it is difficult for us to recruit the best and the brightest anymore. They have no reason, other than the tradition of the university to choose us as opposed to an institution whom society considers to have a better reputation. I mean people used to say, what school do you attend? And the answer would be How-\textit{vard}, but that was Howard, mispronounced because we thought that society placed greater value on Harvard University. Having taught at Ivies and abroad, I would rank HBCUs up against any of them. It’s just that they have the reputation.}
\end{quote}

Richardson concluded his interview with this thought:

\begin{quote}
\textit{but for the deliberate actions of the state, our institution would probably be among the best at attracting students, talented students that would be considered honors.}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{469} That St. Mary’s College was not located in or near the Baltimore area (it was located two hours away on the state’s western shore) is likely the other reason why the college was able was able to maintain its governance in 1967. The institution’s location protected it from interests of the state system. See ‘Staying the Course’ section of this dissertation.
Emerging Themes B: *Fair Morgan*—Institutional and Student Commitment

Two other interwoven primary themes the study reveals are an impassioned sense of institutional commitment and dedication to students as it relates to the benefits of an honors program. This section discusses how participants drew upon their undergraduate experiences as a way of bringing meaning to their professional work and career choices. Sharing powerful examples of particular events, they offer insights into their choices on behalf of students, the institution, HBCUs, and their own lives. The positionality of their personal undergraduate stories, extended tenure—some have spent their entire or mostly their entire professional careers at Morgan—and their value of HBCUs influences their unwavering commitment to the institution and its legacy. This influence has informed their career choices and the manner in which they approach their work and commitment to their students. These are their stories as spoken in their interviews.

Dr. Beatrice Matthew’s relationship with Morgan began in 1950 as an undergraduate Chemistry honors student. She returned in 1959, flattered that she would be selected to replace her mentor and research advisor in the role of professor in the Chemistry department. March 26 and April 23, 1959 Board of Trustee Minutes (President’s Recommendations) show that Dr. Clyde R. Dillard, professor would be resigning effective August 31, 1959 and that Dr. Matthews (pseudonym) would begin as assistant professor, effective September 1. Just twenty-six years old, Matthews had not applied for the position. Dr. Dillard had personally contacted her to inquire of her interest.

---

470 *Fair Morgan* is the title of the institution’s alma mater. Lyrics to the first stanza: “Fair Morgan, we love thee, so tried and so true, Our hearts at they name thrill with pride; We owe thee allegiance, we pledge the our faith, A faith which shall ever abide.” http://www.morgan.edu/academic_affairs/university_convocation/the_alma_mater.html

471 Board of Trustee Meeting Minutes, April 23, 1959. Beulah M. Davis Special Collections Department, Morgan State University.
It blew me away. It was a dream job. I never gave any thought to the remote possibility that I could be a faculty member at a college. I was in awe of the fact that they would ask me to join the faculty.

As a female Chemistry student in the 1950s, Matthews “never had a woman teacher for chemistry my whole career—undergraduate, graduate, and doctorate” but she felt that Morgan, even with its meager resources, prepared her well to compete beyond the Bachelor’s which is what likely formed her confidence in this institution’s ability to prepare its students. She recalls having faculty mentors who were able to personally facilitate her academic success:

Dr. Spaulding was friendly with people at Goucher [College] and [Johns] Hopkins [University] so different instruments that my research experiments required that we did not have the instrumentation for, they would allow me to go to [to their campuses] and do those things there. So I have to say, my preparation here at little Morgan was excellent.

Once Dr. Matthews became a seasoned professor and administrator, and with desegregation opening opportunities, she could have very easily parlayed her talent as a woman with STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) degrees in to a career beyond Morgan.

So many people say, why would you stay, you could have gone anywhere in physical chemistry but I said I wasn’t interested in going anywhere. I had a good education here and I wanted students that came here to have the quality of education that I had and so my goal has always been to provide the opportunities for these kids to get the best education that they can get. I wanted my students to have the best academic experience that they could possibly have.

Feeling that she had the best example possible in Jenkins, Matthews modeled her priorities after his which were to get the best for your students by getting the best faculty possible. Saying that Jenkins went after the best she recalled how, even though she had completed the necessary academic requirements, she found herself in class with noted historian Benjamin Quarles:

My general education requirements were completed but Jenkins was talking to students about this man that he had hired who came in my junior year. He also brought this other person who was going to be teaching a humanities course. I audited that course and one
of Quarles’ courses. He brought the top people and then he had to fight the legislature to be able to pay these people because you couldn’t pay them on the scale that we had. I learned from him and when I became an administrator, especially when I became vice president for academic affairs, I wanted the best when it came to faculty. I brought in some of the best people and they brought in their ‘A’ game every day…and our kids deserved that.

In admiration, Matthews said that Jenkins would use every opportunity such as conferences or national meetings to look for scholarly talent. Describing Jenkins as one who,

scoured the country. If he saw a bright spot he went after them and he was unrelenting. And when they came, they stayed. I used to have people telling me at Johns Hopkins—a couple of presidents over there, would say, ‘you don’t know how many times we have tried to get Quarles and I said in response, ‘Quarles is not coming. Don’t waste your time. It is not about the money and it’s not about your name. He likes what he is doing’.

Dr. Glenn Phillips, who is a professor of history, agreed with Matthews saying that:

Jenkins did this because you can’t just have high achieving students, you have to have highly qualified teachers. Jenkins was committed to bringing in people with doctorates…there were a number of universities that tried to encourage Dr. Quarles to leave Morgan but he stayed because he brought recognition to scholarship so that [people would know that] Black teachers on Black campuses are not simply teachers in the classroom but they do research as well.

Matthews also recalled Jenkins inviting speakers to campus such as economist Homer Favor, who, she said “was one of the few Black economist at the time,” and John Hope Franklin. These experiences left an indelible mark on her that have influenced her work today.

Likewise, Dr. Burney Hollis, a 1968 Morgan graduate, was advised by his Mississippi native advisor at the University of Pennsylvania not to begin his career at an HBCU. In his interview Hollis shared,

He was a good man from Mississippi who said ‘this will sound like prejudice to you but if you go back to a Black school they are going to use you until they use you up.’ I said, nah, no, Black power, so I came back.
What explained Hollis’ enthusiasm and commitment to Morgan when he too had other career options? Similar to Matthews’ experience, he had this testimony regarding how Morgan influenced his education:

*It was the dean who persuaded me to become director of Honors. I was returning from graduate school and was just interested in my alma mater.*

*Although I came to Morgan as class valedictorian, it was a shock factor when I realized that I was not as good as some other students here who had gone to urban high schools. I am from the rural area of Cambridge, MD… I worked in the fields of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. But I saw some of the most educated people I had ever encountered in my life at Morgan and that was an inspiration and I wanted to become a part of it.*

Still visibly excited about his undergraduate experience, Hollis continued,

*I had Benjamin Quarles, the historian.*\(^472\) I never took a class under him and I never knew who he was except that he spoke to me every day. I couldn’t imagine that a giant scholar like him would speak and he didn’t have a clue as to who I was but he spoke to me all the time.

*In the English department, I had Nick Aaron Ford, one of the pioneer Black literary scholars who wrote the first study of the African American novel; I had Waters E. Turpin who was a novelist but never mentioned to any of his students that he was a novelist so we never read his books while I was a student here. It was not until I went to graduate school that I discovered him and I wrote my dissertation on him, the first on Turpin.*

*I had Ulysses Lee who was probably the most brilliant professors I had ever encountered in my life. He was one of the editors of the Negro Caravan, the first major anthology of African American literature. And the list goes on. I was really surrounded by good people and I decided I wanted to be a part of that. A part of that tradition to come back and carry on because they were beginning to retire and somebody had to replace them so I came back to replace them.*

These oral histories reflect as much about what they did receive from attending an HBCU as it does about what they were denied as Black citizens. Matthews, Hollis and Stansbury were all former students who graduated with levels of honorary academic distinction. An experience that

\(^{472}\) Dr. Benjamin Quarles was a noted historian and also head of the History department at Morgan State College. His major books included, *The Negro in the American Revolution* (1961), *Lincoln and the Negro* (1962), and *Black Abolitionists* (1969).
pained Dr. Clayton Stansbury was the inability of the campus to receive permission to inaugurate chapters of honor societies that were closed to non-White students. As director of the University Honors Program, this particular circumstance in his experience became a driving force in his work with students to ensure them access to honorary societies and recognition of their accomplishments. It was also important to Stansbury that Honors students networked with other collegiate honors students beyond the campus and attended national conferences. This thread of Stansbury’s story began when he was a psychology undergraduate student at Morgan:

Now there’s something that really made me angry. In 1953 I was a student in psychology and we wanted to have Psi Chi, that’s the national honors society in psychology, but we could not get Psi Chi. The national office was in Washington, D.C. and Dr. Roger K. Williams, the chairman of the psychology department, drove some of his students there. We went to the office there and I still know the name of the lady who turned us down. I remember her face from 1953. And she said no, we didn’t have enough Ph.D.s on the staff. I made Psi Chi as a graduate student at Howard University. I think that made me a little bitter about Honors so I wanted to get everything for my students that I couldn’t get.

Stansbury said that he knew well even as a young person the reason for the denial, although he did not understand why they then did allow access to Blacks as graduate students. Recognition of achievement was important to him. In addition to honorary societies, Stansbury explains,

I thought I could do something to help these students better prepare for graduate school and for some of those so-called better jobs. When I became director of the honors program, I came up with the honors stole and the honors tassels. Before, you didn’t get anything to wear for graduation. You’d be surprise how hard students work just to get this…I started this in 1984.

He also made sure that each student receiving Latin honors took home a trophy from the Honors Convocation ceremony or he would provide student hometown write-ups on student accomplishments for church announcements. Stansbury felt that he broadened students’ experiences in little things that, for kids who had never been far out of the city or the state, gave them soft skills, or capital, that would serve them later. He recalled receiving a call from a
nervous student who was on his way to a national society convention and did not understand how
to navigate the airport. He had never been on a plane and when he needed to change planes after
a stopover, he could not locate his luggage. He was unaware that his luggage traveled separately
and would arrive at the final destination.

Getting students to conferences was a testament to Stansbury’s commitment to his honors
students. At the time, Morgan did not provide funding for student travel, or at least Stansbury
was unable to secure the funds. After being denied the option to share his professional travel
budget with students, Stansbury found another option:

*I used to go out to a truck to buy lunch…the truck sold hotdogs…and other goodies. I
said that’s what I am going to do. I’m gonna sell hotdogs. And outside of my office in the
Jenkins building, I sold hotdogs, chips, and soda. My wife let me use her three crock pots.
We would buy the hotdogs and everything we needed. She’d get up early in the morning
(before going to work as a teacher) and she would cut up onions. She got the relish,
mustard, and ketchup. I sold our hotdogs for five or ten cents cheaper than that truck out
there…we gave away free cookies and pickles and that’s how I made the money to send
students to conventions. I didn’t tell the administration that I was doing this. I didn’t tell
anybody. And for six years, I sent students to the conventions, on an airplane. See, my
students weren’t having the experiences that White students were having.*

Stansbury’s efforts are similar to the self-help method that the Black community has modeled
since Emancipation. It is this same agency that Paul Finkelman described among Black women
in late 1800s who championed for the relief of their people as they “raised funds through bake
sales, fairs, and other community activities.” Finkelman refers to such activity as Black
Philanthropy rather than self-help, emphasizing the community’s contribution despite its lack of
wealth unlike the Rockefellers, Carnegies or other large-scale donors in the nineteenth-early
twentieth centuries. According to Finkelman, the Black community raised over $1 million dollars

---

473 Paul Finkelman, Encyclopedia of African American History 1896 to the Present: From the Age of Segregation to the Twenty-First Century, volume 1 (Oxford University Press, 2009), 80-81. See also, V.P. Franklin and Carter Julian Savage, Cultural Capital and Black Education: African American Communities and the Funding of Black Schooling, 1865 to the Present (Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 2004).
which the Freedmen’s Bureau used along with federal money and sums from other philanthropic societies “to establish over four thousand schools in the South.” Like these ancestors, Stansbury made a way in the tradition of his community.

Describing himself as a living example, having attended Maryland State College, now the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES), Dr. Earl S. Richardson also understands the influence of his personal history. His identity as a son of farmers—the youngest of fourteen children but the first to attend college—and Black person who came of age during segregation, serve as culminating forces that helps him to make meaning of the role of Morgan in the state of Maryland and his position as its zealous defender. Although Richardson attended high school with children of UMES faculty at the college which sat adjacent to his high school, he never really gave much thought to the school or attending college until his parents asked him what he was going to do with his life now that he had graduated high school. Certain that he did not see farming in his future, he replied that he wanted to go to school. His parents borrowed money against the house to send him. With their support and two weeks after the fall semester had already convened, Richardson showed up for class.

*I went in a ‘C’ student not because I necessarily was a ‘C’ student but I did not put the premium on education when I was in high school. I just didn’t put a premium on being the best. [There was] no family history in it [attending college]. I went in a ‘C’ student and graduated second in my class. That’s what historically Black colleges mean! You see why I am so passionate about them?*

*I am a living example. I never dreamed that I would become a president of a major university; that I would ever be in the presence of presidents of the country, and the presence of presidents like [Bill] Clinton, [Nelson] Mandela, [Thabo]Mbeki, no, no, no… just a simple person. Ordinary person of no means. Only good parents who said, ‘you can do this too.’*

---

475 Richardson has in his office pictures of himself with these leaders and well as other notable figures.
And having no other options, was lucky enough to have gone to a historically Black college who reinforced for me it is not where you come from its where you are going. And if you are willing, if you have the determination to succeed, you can.

That’s the story. So nobody can tell me different. I am a living witness and I communicate to every student who had the opportunity to come by my desk, “Listen, you can do this, you can do this.” And to me, one of the most important roles that a president can have after all of the big things, the macro things, it is to say to students: “you can do this now stop the foolishness; you can do this; and don’t relent.” And you know what? They are doing it. But who takes the time at these other universities? They are now trying to replicate that culture; that discipline, at the White institutions.

There is an intersection of contradiction in the lives of these participants. Segregation, which denied them access to White campuses, also afforded them experiences that seem to transform and influence their collective world views. Their younger selves chose to make their careers specifically in a Black college, primarily because this space took them in, taught and nurtured them when the alternatives did not. Post Brown desegregated America is a period that is supposed to be different from their childhood, however they have journeyed through their careers very much challenging a segregated system of higher education. For those who have not retired, the years ahead look very similar to the decades that have gone by. Nonetheless, these stories provided an extraordinary backdrop for understanding how these leaders and education reformers have helped to cultivate an aura, continue a legacy, and yes even develop a program of honors education for their high ability students. The difference, as Morgan does it—and what other institutions of all types can learn—is that they celebrate and develop high ability students while also nurturing success and achievement among students who are most academically challenged. As Dr. Richardson wisely clarified, the best and the brightest does not erase a community or a university make. It must be heterogeneous in its make up to reach the ideal of the academy.
Chapter VI Conclusion

This study examined the origins and development of honors education and the impact of both segregation and desegregation at Morgan State University. Utilizing written documentation and oral histories, the origins and development of honors education dates back to as early as 1950. Morgan State faculty were clearly among the forerunners of this nation’s history of collegiate honors education in the mid twentieth century. Morgan State University should be included in the pages of those accounts of future scholars investigating the phenomenon of gifted education within higher education. After a history of at least sixty-five years of developing (mostly) African American high ability students, the future of these activities appears stable. As such, in July the University Honors Program was upgraded to the Honors College. On May 6, 2015, Morgan State University President David Wilson sent a letter to a faculty member and executive administrator with a career at the university almost as long as the Honors program itself—at least as far back as I was able to document. The letter read,

I am pleased to inform you that the Morgan State University Board of Regents, at its meeting on May 5, 2015, voted to elevate the Honors Program at Morgan to an Honors College, and name it the “Clara I. Adams Honors College.”

University naming opportunities often come with sizable monetary donations and much campus political handling on the part of the benefitting institution’s development officers managing multi-level, million dollar campaigns. In this case, with the autonomy of an independent board, this institution was able to honor one of their own, not because of her financial gifts, but
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476 One participant indicated that some formal honors education activities existed even prior to her 1950-1954 undergraduate tenure.
477 Copy of letter was retrieved from Dr. Adams.
because of her almost six decade career commitment as professor and administrator to the University and her “record of academic excellence, and strong advocacy, to ensure that Morgan State University is positioned to always uphold academic excellence as its primary mission.”

At the naming ceremony on September 30, 2015, Dr. Adams had this to say about her experiences with Morgan and, consequently, the state:

More than five decades ago, when I came to Morgan, I came fully aware of the great opportunities that Martin D. Jenkins had presented to me. And hopeful that I could do for my students what the teachers I had had done for me... And in those days of a segregated school system in Baltimore, we had second hand books, broken down second hand equipment and second hand, even in some cases, buildings. But one thing we did not have is secondhand teachers. The teachers we had were awesome and as I thought about it, I don’t remember them making a lot about the second hand books or the second hand equipment; they were about the business of teaching us...And then when I got to Morgan, it was more of the same. The faculty was outstanding. We never had all of the resources that the other schools had but what we did not get in resources, they made up for and so for that, I’ve been very lucky.

And so when I was deciding about my game plan for being an assistant professor... at Morgan, I thought about what my teachers had done. They did not dwell on what they didn’t have; they didn’t dwell on the resources that they should have had but never got. They dwelled on preparing us and they made every effort to give us every advantage they could and did it par excellent. And so that was going to be my game plan. Don’t worry about what we don’t have. Don’t worry about what the state hasn’t given us but should have given us.

When I graduated from Morgan, my graduation was about two and a half weeks after the Brown v the Board of Education decision had come down in 1954. And when I was coming to work at Morgan in 1959, I figured that’s been five years already since Brown came down so surely by now things are going to be getting better and will continue to get better.

Well, that wasn’t the case... I found that it was business as usual in higher education and the Brown decision didn’t resonate with the higher education segment in about ten states in this country, Maryland being one of them.

And the 1964 higher education act was a reminder for them; they still didn’t take heed. In 1969, they were sued by the Office of Civil Rights for not having dismantled their segregated higher education system. But it’s been 60 or more years since Brown came

---

479 Formal letter from Dr. David Wilson, President of Morgan State University to Dr. Clara I. Adams, Special Assistant to the President, May 6, 2015. A copy of the letter was given to me by Dr. Adams upon my request after learning of the promotion of the University Honors Program to the Honors College.
down and 46 years since the Office of Civil Rights sued the *Adams* states for not doing what they were supposed to do and they are still working at it

So, we still have the students. We can’t complain about what we don’t have. We have to take care of our students and we’ve got to give them the best educational experience they should have.

Why has Morgan survived and even thrived when other HBCUs have not? What is in its legacy from the 1800s that has lasted into the twenty-first century? An independent board with the commitment of bloodhounds to the institution helps. So does sound leadership. However, the true answers may be perhaps in Adams’ final sentence of her remarks—“we have to take care of our students and we’ve got to give them the best educational experience they should have.” That is, students and excellence first despite any and all conditions. Having a very clear vision of what needs to be done and doing it with all faith and due diligence, without apology, excuse, or trepidation to external forces. Perhaps, it was also that prayer of Bishop Levi Scott asking God “to prosper the work of our hands.”

The use of Critical Race Theory in educational research expands the use of oral histories and lived experiences as valid data sources. It also affords a critical lens in which to analyze events that, on the surface, appear neutral. Even in circumstances of blatant racialized contexts, Critical Race Theory as a paradigm provides the language and analytical tools to explain these phenomena that would otherwise often leave its victims voiceless, powerless, and without an effective course of action.

Although racism should be continuously fought on all fronts with all necessary legal means, it will not be eradicated. This is not just a realist ideology for critiquing how structural/political resources are allocated. For instance, one might consider the 2013 law suit, *Coalition for Excellence and Equity in Higher Education v Maryland Higher Commission* and
Judge Catherine Blake’s opinion. This case and Maryland’s decades-long inability to comply and OCR’s refusal to impose real penalties beyond the strong arm of a threat provides a tangible example of a realistic worldview of American society. Other examples already mentioned in the narratives of the study are the establishment of UMBC in 1966, the failure to continue special programs with state funds when grant money ceased, and the governor’s hesitancy in signing Senate Bill 354 in 1975; or how a legislative vote could be reversed a few months later denying the HBCU the structural resources necessary to compete by providing educational offerings in a demanding discipline.480

The three tenets of Critical Race Theory that were most salient to me as a researcher and therefore provided lens of analysis for this study were: counter storytelling, interest convergence/material determinism and racial realism/permanence. The belief that racism is a permanent, ingrained characteristic of American society is neither a hopeless nor a non-patriotic concept. However, it is a position that acknowledges the extent to which racism’s consequences are a debilitating evil force that challenges and abates the humanity of others. Counter storytelling is a creative weapon by which scholars, through imaginative and often fantasy narratives, contest and expose the structural barricades that impede access and equality. For example, the dominant group uses debilitating force to message the intellectual inferiority of the subordinate group. Doing so ensures the subordinates’ acceptance of a narrative that tells of their inability to produce the type of talent to contribute significantly to the needs of a workforce or community. Counter storytelling allows the teller within a subordinate group to reclaim what had been stolen; to rewrite and retell what had been believed and to challenge assumptions in an intriguing and imaginative manner that allows the reader to suspend initial political rhetoric or

480 Referring to the Three-Track and Institute for Political Education that were funded by the Ford Foundation. The Three-Track program began in September 1957 and the Institute in 1959.
judgment. It also empowers and gives legitimacy to individual and collective voices dampened by the discourse of the privileged.

While I chose not to develop a counter story in the traditional sense of critical race theory for the purpose of this study, I have substituted the oral histories of the participants as stories that run counter to the majoritarian narrative. I have found ample heroism in the tenacity of their oral histories and their actions. However, future scholarly work that incorporates this tenet as a way to imagine this nation without the leaders, doctors, and innovators that were birthed through HBCUs had these institutions not existed, and the loss to industries, the economy, and other significant arenas would be well worth the examination. Similar to what Derrick Bell imagined in his fabled predictions of racism in America, how would the nation be less off if state systems bartered our HBCUs and all their alumni to space aliens? How would the lives of members of the majority who are aloof to or ignorant of HBCUs change? How would state systems pick up the slack in educating its Black citizens or would they?

Counter narratives lead to counter policies and strategies for action. They have the power to frame the perspective from which we choose to operate. They influence the value system that dictates resources and priorities and ultimately, a belief system: a belief system that employs a value that in all educational contexts, all communities possess talents and potential; gifts and backgrounds that, when rigorously cultivated, will multiply America’s strength base. For example, most Americas do not wish to lose world power nor the valuable resources it affords. No nation would desire to be vulnerable to another. From military and national security to technology; the arts; world sports competitions; the economy; energy and the efficient cultivation of natural resources; and educational achievements, Americans want to be on top. In referring to

---

the inequities of the American K-12 educational system, former Newark, New Jersey mayor Cory Booker once said of the democratization of education that “you cannot have a superior democracy with an inferior education system.” If for no other reason beyond national self-interest, there needs to be a shift towards supporting higher education institutions that specifically nurture and have as their mission the educational advancements of racially diverse communities.

While time and democratization, with the assistant of changing laws, has served to transform individual hearts, beliefs, and relationships, the primary effective means for social change and policy is to target the personal, economic, and socio structural interests of the dominant (White) community. This notion of interest convergence is apparent in the way Black Maryland political leaders aligned their political interests with those of Governor Mandel in the signing of Senate Bill 354. These strategists, seeing the racial climate for what it was at the time, knew that in order to have their interests (Morgan becoming a University then, not sometime later), had to be accommodated by Mandel’s interest in maintaining the political endorsement of the Black community. Mandel likely supported Morgan’s promotion, but with the politically racialized landscape and the competing interests of other constituencies, his full backing was left to question. Consider also the CRT tenet that argues that Whiteness is a form of property. If White property rights do in fact include the right to exclude, one can reasonably contend that the state of Maryland has, at given moments in history, exercised its right to exclude MSU from fair competition. With the establishment of UMBC, did the state system’s leadership, through the understanding of their world view, believe that HBCUs were not supposed to be on the same level as White institutions; that they were not to be entrusted with the large scale responsibility to

482 Cory Booker, Mayor, City of Newark, September 24, 2010.
educate people outside of the Black community? Critical Race Theory requires us to ask, how did their membership of the dominant group influence their worldview and therefore legislative decision making?

By definition of their existence, HBCUs are marginalized institutions whose narratives are most often not controlled by them, particularly those in the public sector. This study sought to reclaim and contribute to a growing discourse on HBCUs and their resilience in general, and of Morgan State University and its critique of a southern state system of higher education, in particular. This study allowed participants to reflect upon the decades of successes—including the role of honors education, and challenges while documenting through oral histories the precarious relationship with the state that, aside from public law suits, is often a bell not rung or heard outside either the campus or the Black community. By documenting both the personal and institutional stories of the participants we understand the stories of pre-desegregation collegians as well as the historical institutional narrative that runs counter to the majority story lines, especially those of University of Maryland system leaders, who, for one example, is documented as having desegregated the state’s system of higher education when he was actually a staunch segregationist. Further, through the examination of primary documents, we learn of the hostile manner in which Morgan settled in its current location, withstanding the most brazen example in the institution’s history of Whiteness quite literally as property. Despite these circumstances, the critical task of providing a liberal arts education and meeting the needs of high-ability students carried forward as if it had been well resourced with state support throughout the twentieth century.

In this study, I have utilized the power of oral histories to capture the voice of color. According to Delgado and Stefancic, voice of color is the unique perspective that people of color
have about race and racism due to their individual and communal experiences with members of and structures controlled by the majority. According to this tenet, White people, who have very different societal experiences lack this first-hand knowledge. Minorities are able to utilize their lived histories to recognize, and more so feel, the micro-aggressive realities of racism, something unfamiliar to most members of the majority. For example, members of the minority versus the majority communities hold distinct feelings of trust with regard to interactions with the police and the judicial system in large part because the former has been historically brutalized by the system and the latter, protected. My position as a Black mother of two sons, that a White mother may not experience, is fear of any police run-ins whenever they are out of the house. Another example of how giving voice to people of color is critical in our individual views of the world and impacts policy and decision making is this personal family illustration:

I recall when President Obama, the first Black candidate to win a major political party nomination, was running for his first presidential term. His wife, Michelle Obama, was criticized by political right wing talk show host Bill O’Reilly and other conservatives for her “non-patriotic” feelings toward America when she stated, “for the first time in my adult life I am proud of my country because it feels like hope is finally making a comeback.” To this statement, Cindy McCain, the White wife of the White republican nominee John McCain, responded “I’m proud of my country. I don’t know about you, if you heard those words earlier. I’m very proud of my country…”

Why do I recall this so well and why should it matter? It is because my sister’s response to the entire scenario gives confirmation to the notion of voice of color when she said out loud to the TV after hearing Mrs. McCain’s rebuff, “well, I guess you do love your country. I would too if I were White, blonde, wealthy and everything in this country catered to me just because I was a White, blonde Barbie doll. What’s there not to love?”

What my sister exposed was that as members of the dominant group, O’Reilly and McCain lack the direct negative experiences of race and racism to understand the experiences that shaped

Michelle Obama’s perspective of race and what it means to be a person of color in the United States. O’Reilly and McCain’s privileged perspective also missed the target that critique of one’s country is not always a matter of non-patriotism as it is more often rooted in a place of hope that our nation can be and should be better, offering opportunity to all citizens. How either of these two conservatives could even suggest that a man and his American-born, supportive wife seeking to serve the people by holding the highest office in the nation are anything but patriotic is just privileged stupidity. I do not say this to be pugnacious but to point out the damaging scripts that develop when members of the dominant group control the narrative, abducting the voices of the subordinate group. The perspective that the participants of this study had regarding the role of Morgan State University within the state of Maryland is rooted in their unique experiences as the “Other,” which offers valid and valuable knowledge to our extended understanding of HBCUs within the context of higher education as well as the professionals who dedicate their professional lives to these institutions.

The critique of liberalism—a philosophy and approach to social transformation that endorses gradual change and that arguably appears to maintain social status quo—is also evident in the data in that former presidents opposed forfeiting institutional autonomy. Most evident is former president Earl S. Richardson who resisted the type of incremental, “in all deliberate speed,” change that he believed would have resulted, had he chosen to join the state system’s governing body. He wanted his institution on a faster track and perhaps in his critique of the liberal manner in which state business had been conducted as well as the realities of race, he chose differently for the institution.

In agreeing that racism is permanent yet conceding to the positive changes that have come with legal wins, the primary effective means for social change and policy is to target the
personal, economic and socio-structural interests of the dominant (White) community. The White property rights of the state prevented Morgan’s growth by historically not always providing what was required and necessary to fully compete. Gloria Ladson-Billings boldly asserted that, “adopting and adapting CRT as a framework for educational equity means that we will have to expose racism in education and propose radical solutions for addressing it. We will have to take bold and sometimes unpopular positions.”484 MSU has been “othered” in the normalizing and building of a state higher education system. Racism, as seen in this study, has been exposed. As such CRT requires radical recommendations for reparations. Based upon the data revealed in this study, this researcher recommends dismantling the privilege of White property that supported the racialized policy decisions and the forgoing results, starting with,

1. The state moving to have Towson State University relinquish any and all duplicated programs originally assigned to Morgan State University. As suggested in 1970 by OCR, such a process can occur in phases until undergraduates seeking a particular program of study are funneled in to the one institution offering that degree.

2. The state assigns UMBC as a satellite campus of Morgan State University—MSU, Baltimore County campus. With the establishment of UMBC, the state missed the best opportunity to comply with Title VI in not dismantling a segregated system but also in defining Morgan’s mission on the basis of terms that extend beyond race. The expansion of its role would have raised the prestige of the institution, classification, and academic program offerings.485

Also, it is highly recommended that the state move to bring to full exposure to the stories—the almost 150 years of narratives, hidden in the walls of the campus, with a contemporary archives and special collections facility. We will never have the full historical understanding of the Maryland system of higher education without all stories voiced and materials digitized from the various viewpoints and backgrounds that represent them. That Morgan State University, the

oldest and most prominent HBCU research university in the state does not boast archival resources and facilities comparable to those that can be found at the main campus is a gross oversight. By not having such state of the art resources, we hinder potential researchers from studying the state’s various stories. In our failure to know and make sense of the past, we likewise position ourselves to carry these practices in to our imagination of what equitable higher education across the state should entail. The state’s higher education history is inextricably linked to that of Morgan’s and vice versa. Since 1919 when it purchased the Princess Anne Academy from Morgan College and going forward, the relationship, for better or worse, has been inescapable.

Given exploration of honors activities and development at an HBCU this historical analysis has revealed the contributions that this collection of institutions has made to the development of honors in higher education. This study is significant in bridging a gap in the collegiate honors, HBCU, and higher education literature, an area of research that is lacking. For example, in one recent study, “College and University Honors Program in the Southern United States,” the authors fail to make any mention of Black institutions despite the research being conducted in the region of the nation where most HBCUs are located. This color-blind oversight indicates how HBCUs are categorically absent from mainstream research consideration of most higher education scholars unless the topic is specifically on Black education. While Black institutions may have been among the participants in the study, it is uncertain to the reader. I maintain that given the particular history of the southern region of the United States, it is neglectful and incomplete to any findings to not highlight the distinct characteristics of Black institutions even if they appear on the surface to be conducting similar work as their White
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486 Dena Owens and Jon Travis, “College and University Honors Programs in the Southern United States,” Focus on Colleges, Universities, and Schools 7, 1 (2013).
counterparts. The reason for this is that any past contributions or current practices of initiatives being carried out at an HBCU versus that of a White institution will most often occur within a more onerous context given both the unique historical and contemporary challenges of these institutions. This necessitates even a brief acknowledgement when attempting to understand current trends in higher education, especially within the American South.

This study has also revealed the nimbleness and flexibility of these institutions to aggressively pursue excellence for their most able students yet also produce excellence in their less or least able students, a characteristic for which HBCUs have been lauded. Finally, what we can come to understand about HBCUs’ historical strategies in best meeting the needs of high achieving Black collegians, how institutions of higher education need to respond to and identify these students, as well as the contributions from institutions who have for over a century done so better than any category of higher learning institutions, will better equip both scholars and educators in achieving the best outcomes with regard to projecting the future of Black education.

Honors education at Morgan State University is one aspect of this institution’s story. Honors education at this institution or HBCUs in general should not be underestimated or disregarded. Knowing more about it and its legacy at other HBCUs, expands our understanding of the landscape of these unique institutions. I maintain by the data of this study that while HBCUs have employed honors education in their undergraduate curriculum to the similar extent as PWIs (as it is my professional background, I would argue in some cases, even more), it is in the end (1) the spirit of honoring the role of education in Black and American society; (2) honoring the advancement of a collective through one, *E pluribus unum*; and (3) honoring all students such that they think, study, and learn at a level of superiority, regardless of their
beginnings, how these institutions have found and continue their escape from the immutable nature of race, segregation and the oft time corrosive illusion that is desegregation.
Appendix

Appendix A

Second Morrill Act of 1890, Chap. 841

FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS. Sess. I. Chs. 839-841. 1890.

infectious or contagious diseases, he may, by proclamation, suspend the importation of all or any class of animals for a limited time, and may change, modify, revoke, or renew such proclamation, as the public good may require; and during the time of such suspension the importation of any such animals shall be unlawful.

Sec. 10. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause careful inspection to be made by a suitable officer of all imported animals described in this act, to ascertain whether such animals are infected with contagious diseases or have been exposed to infection so as to be dangerous to other animals, which shall then either be placed in quarantine or dealt with according to the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and all food, litter, manure, clothing, utensils, and other appliances that have been so related to such animals on board ship as to be judged liable to convey infection shall be dealt with according to the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and the Secretary of Agriculture may cause inspection to be made of all animals described in this act intended for exportation, and provide for the disinfection of all vessels engaged in the transportation thereof, and of all barges or other vessels used in the conveyance of such animals intended for export to the ocean steamer or other vessels, and of all attendants and their clothing, and of all head-ropes and other appliances used in such exportation, by such orders and regulations as he may prescribe; and if, upon such inspection, any such animals shall be adjudged, under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, to be infected or to have been exposed to infection so as to be dangerous to other animals, they shall not be allowed to be placed upon any vessel for exportation; the expense of all the inspection and disinfection provided for in this section to be borne by the owners of the vessels on which such animals are exported.

Approved, August 30, 1890.

CHAP. 840.—An act to establish a fog-signal at or near the Cuckolds Island, at the entrance to Boothbay Harbor, otherwise known as Townsend Harbor, Maine.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to establish a fog-signal at or near Cuckolds Island, at the entrance of Boothbay Harbor, otherwise known as Townsend Harbor, Maine, at a cost not exceeding twenty-five thousand dollars, including the cost of the site.

Approved, August 30, 1890.

CHAP. 841.—An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be, and hereby is, annually appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, arising from the sales of public lands, to be paid as hereafter provided, to each State and Territory for the more complete endowment and maintenance of colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts now established, or which may be hereafter established, in accordance with an act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two.

STAT 1—VOL XXVI—47
Appropriation for year ending June 30, 1890.
Increasing annual appropriation for ten years.
Annual appropriation thereafter.
Expenditure limited.

Provided.

No distinction of race, etc., in any one college.
Separate colleges for white and colored students.
Division of funds in certain cases.
Vol. 25, pp. 802-506.

Legislative reposition and report of equitable, etc., division.

Compliance with law.
Time, manner, etc., of annual payments to State or Territorial treasurer, etc.
Payments to treasurers of colleges or other institutions.
Annual financial reports to Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior.

Money-grants subject to legislative ascent.
Provided.
Certain installments due, to be paid on ascent of Governor, etc.

Diminution of fund to be made up by State, etc.

the sum of fifteen thousand dollars for the year ending June thirtieth, eighteen hundred and ninety, and an annual increase of the amount of such appropriation thereafter for ten years by an additional sum of one thousand dollars over the preceding year, and the annual amount to be paid thereafter to each State and Territory shall be twenty-five thousand dollars to be applied only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural and economic science, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life, and to the facilities for such instruction: Provided, That no money shall be paid out under this act to any State or Territory for the support and maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students, but the establishment and maintenance of such colleges separately for white and colored students shall be held to be a compliance with the provisions of this act if the funds received in such State or Territory be equitably divided as hereinafter set forth: Provided, That in any State in which there has been one college established in pursuance of the act of July second, eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and also in which an educational institution of like character has been established, or may be hereafter established, and is now aided by such State from its own revenue, for the education of colored students in agriculture and the mechanic arts, however named or styled, or whether or not it has received money heretofore under the act to which this act is an amendment, the legislature of such State may propose and report to the Secretary of the Interior a just and equitable division of the fund to be received under this act between one college for white students and one institution for colored students established as aforesaid, which shall be divided into two parts and paid accordingly, and upon such institution for colored students shall be entitled to the benefits of this act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the act of eighteen hundred and sixty-two, and the fulfillment of the foregoing provisions shall be taken as a compliance with the provisions in reference to separate colleges for white and colored students.

Sec. 2. That the sums hereby appropriated to the States and Territories for the further endowment and support of colleges shall be annually paid on or before the thirty-first day of July of each year, by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the warrant of the Secretary of the Interior, out of the Treasury of the United States, to the State or Territorial treasurer, or to such officer as shall be designated by the laws of such State or Territory to receive the same, who shall, upon the order of the trustees of the college, or the institution for colored students, immediately pay over said sums to the treasurers of the respective colleges or other institutions entitled to receive the same, and such treasurers shall be required to report to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior, on or before the first day of September of each year, a detailed statement of the amount so received and of its disbursement. The grants of moneys authorized by this act are made subject to the legislative ascent of the several States and Territories to the purpose of said grants: Provided, That payments of such installments of the appropriation herein made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of legislature meeting next after the passage of this act shall be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 3. That if any portion of the moneys received by the designated officer of the State or Territory for the further and more complete endowment, support, and maintenance of colleges, or of institutions for colored students, as provided in this act, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, or be misapplied,
it shall be replaced by the State or Territory to which it belongs, and until so replaced, no subsequent appropriation shall be apportioned or paid to such State or Territory; and no portion of said moneys shall be applied, directly or indirectly, under any pretense whatever, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings. An annual report by the president of each of said colleges shall be made to the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to the Secretary of the Interior, regarding the condition and progress of each college, including statistical information in relation to its receipts and expenditures, its library, the number of its students and professors, and also as to any improvements and experiments made under the direction of any experiment stations attached to said colleges, with their cost and results, and such other industrial and economical statistics as may be regarded as useful, one copy of which shall be transmitted by mail free to all other colleges further endowed under this act.

Sec. 4. That on or before the first day of July in each year, after the passage of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury as to each State and Territory whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriation for colleges, or of institutions for colored students, under this act, and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive. If the Secretary of the Interior shall withhold a certificate from any State or Territory of its appropriation the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President, and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress, in order that the State or Territory may, if it should so desire, appeal to Congress from the determination of the Secretary of the Interior. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid it shall be covered into the Treasury. And the Secretary of the Interior is hereby charged with the proper administration of this law.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Interior shall annually report to Congress the disbursements which have been made in all the States and Territories, and also whether the appropriation of any State or Territory has been withheld, and if so, the reasons therefor.

Sec. 6. Congress may at any time amend, suspend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act.

Approved, August 30, 1890.

CHAP. 854.—An act granting the use of certain lands to the town of New Haven, Connecticut, for a public park.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby granted to the town of New Haven, in the State of Connecticut, the right to occupy, improve, and control, for the purposes of a public park, for the use and benefit of citizens of the United States and for no other purposes whatever, the tract of land owned by the United States which is situated on the east shore of New Haven Harbor, containing thirty acres, more or less, known as the Fort Hale tract, and partly occupied by an abandoned earth-work of that name, said tract being bounded northerly by the north side of the roadway leading to said tract, easterly by lands owned by various private parties, and southerly and westerly by New Haven Harbor, upon the following conditions and provisions:

First. That before beginning any use or improvement of said land the said town shall present to the Secretary of War detailed plans of such improvement and shall have received his approval thereof.

[Further provisions and conditions follow]
A CASE FOR CURRICULUM C*:  
A PUBLIC HBCU PURSUES EXCELLENCE, INDEPENDENCE IN A SOUTHERN DUAL SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Morgan State University and the State of Maryland

Dr. Jenkins’ 1939 co-authored study that challenged Eugenicist thinking was, The Case for B: A Negro Gifted Girl. Jenkins expanded his passion for gifted education with Curriculum C honors education and activities at Morgan State College (now University).

*Since 1969 Maryland has yet to fully comply with OCR desegregation standards. As of 2015, the state system is in partnership with the U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Civil Rights, reviewing the status of educational opportunities for African Americans. In a 2013 decision in favor of the Coalition for Excellence and Equity in Higher Education, Judge Catherine Blake ruled the state still maintains a dual system of higher education.
Institutional Presidents

INSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENTS

J. Emory Round, D.D.
1869 - 1882 (Centenary Biblical Institute)

W. Maslin Frysinger, D.D.
1882 - 1888 (Centenary Biblical Institute)

John J. Wagner, D.D.
1888 - 1901 (Morgan College)

Charles Edmond Young, D.D.
Acting President, 1901 - 1902 (Morgan College)

John O. Spencer, Ph.D. LL.D.
1902 - 1937 (Morgan College)

Dwight O.W. Holmes, Ph.D. LL.D.
1937 - 1948 (Morgan State College)

Martin D. Jenkins, Ph.D. LL.D.
1948 - 1970 (Morgan State College)

King Vergil Cheek, J.D.
1971 - 1974 (Morgan State College)

Andrew Billingsley, Ph.D.
1975 - 1984

Earl S. Richardson, Ed.D.
November 1984 - June 2010
Interim President, February 1984 - October 1984

David Wilson, Ed.D.
July 2010 – Present

Source: http://www.morgan.edu/office_of_the_president/presidential_history.html
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