

**The Early History of Racially Segregated, Southern Schools of Social Work  
Requesting or Receiving Funds from the Rockefeller Philanthropies  
and the Responses of Social Work Educators to Racial Discrimination**

by John A. Kayser, Ph.D.

Correspondence regarding this report should be directed to John Kayser, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver, 2148 S. High St., Denver, CO, 80208. Phone: 303-871-2915; Email: [jkayser@du.edu](mailto:jkayser@du.edu).

**Introduction**

The following report is an account of the largely untold early history of racially segregated Southern schools of social work prior to the 1964 Civil Right Act, and the responses of faculty to racial discrimination in their host universities. This report covers five schools of social work which sought to obtain or received their initial and/or sustaining funding from the philanthropies established by the Rockefeller family. Those schools were located in New Orleans, Atlanta, Chapel Hill (North Carolina), St. Louis, and Nashville. These philanthropies, along with the Russell Sage Foundation and the American Red Cross, were the major early funders of social work education programs in the United States from the early 1900s to the 1940s. This account is based on material obtained from the following sources at the Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC): the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM); the General Education Board (GEB); the Rockefeller Foundation (RF); and the Russell Sage Foundation (RS). In addition, supplemental information has been drawn from the Social Welfare History Archives (SWHA) at the University of Minnesota as well as published material on the development of social work as a profession and an institutional history of a Southern university.

The research question guiding this investigation is as follows: To what extent did social work educators advance the cause of civil rights and nondiscrimination against racial and ethnic minorities in the United States prior to 1964, when the Civil Rights act desegregated higher education? The history of racial segregation in social work education has received scant attention in the professional literature. Most classic references on the history of social work education (Austin, 1986; Costin, 1983; Hollis and Taylor, 1951; National Association of Social Workers, 1995; 1998) are silent on the topic, even though racial discrimination in the profession was addressed by prominent African-American social work educators during the 1920s and 1930s (Frazier, 1924; Washington, 1935). Even when contemporary social welfare histories focus on racial discrimination as a social problem in America, typically they fail to cover social work's own history of discrimination (Axinn and Levin, 1992; Tratner, 1979). This apparent suppression of knowledge suggests that social work's 66 year history (1898-1964) of establishing and maintaining schools of social work in racially segregated colleges and universities in the North and South constitutes its "legacy of shame" that the profession, which prides itself on its heritage of social justice and societal reform, would rather forget (Kayser & Morrissey, 1998).

Only in recent years has the topic begun to resurface, albeit in a piecemeal fashion (Chandler, 1999; Trolander, 1997). To date, no comprehensive study of the topic has been undertaken and there remains a great paucity of information about the activities of individual social work programs and/or their faculties located at segregated Southern universities and colleges prior when desegregation was mandated by federal law.

#### Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations of the present study. First, the study focuses primarily on schools of social work located in the South and border states, where

segregation in higher education was legalized. The report does not address "de facto" segregated practices in Northern schools of social work.

Second, the information provided is incomplete in that archival information is limited to those schools applying for or obtaining funding from the various philanthropies mentioned above. After initially supporting the establishment of social work programs at Tulane University and Atlanta University during the 1920s, the LSRM then discouraged others schools of social work from applying for funds (Ruml to Throop, March 27, 1928). However, there were several other social work training programs in the South which did not seek funding. Typically, these programs often were housed in or components of other academic departments, such as sociology or business, and only later evolved into their own separate department or school.

In addition, this report also is uneven in that RAC material about some schools is fragmentary, while the records regarding other schools are more extensive. This disparity likely reflects the difference between those schools which were denied funding and those that received funding. Also problematic is the variable span of history covered in the archive materials. In only one school reviewed below (Tulane) is there sufficient material from multiple archive and supplemental sources to cover the entire period from the school's founding to the time desegregation occurred. With other schools, there remains large gaps in the documentation of events. Thus any attempt to understand trends more comprehensively may be considerably off the mark, since so much is, at present, unknown.

A further difficulty is that a number of early schools either did not last very long, or had significant disruptions and interruptions in their development (e.g., changing university affiliations, joining/withdrawing/and then later re-joining accrediting organizations, or changing names over the course of their history). Compounding this difficulty, published and unpublished sources do not always agree about important events the history of social work education, such as the founding dates of particular schools, or

the number of schools initially coming together to form the American Association of Schools of Social Work (AASSW), the first national accrediting body in social work education, which began in 1919.

Finally, archival records reveal only so much about historical events. Typically, they do not provide a clear picture of how central or peripheral were the actions of social work faculty in their responses to racial segregation, or what meaning individual faculty or students may have made out of the struggle for civil rights. That type of appraisal must be deferred until the oral history portion of this investigation is completed, which will focus on capturing the memories, recollections, and experiences of those who witnessed, lived through, and/or subsequently were influenced by these events.

### **Review of Individual Schools**

The account provided below is organized according to the chronological order in which individual schools of social work became established in the South or border states. The earliest date associated with the school's founding is used in determining the sequence by which social work education spread throughout the region.

[Note: White writers in the early part of this century invariably used lower case letters when writing about "negroes" or "the negro" as a collective group. The original language and case designation have been preserved without further correction in the quotes cited below.]

#### **1907: St. Louis Social Work Educational Programs**

Social work educational programs first began in the five largest US cities--New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and St. Louis (Walker, 1928). Its arrival in Missouri occurred within a decade of the founding of the first school of social work (1898). The name and origins of the first St. Louis school are quite confusing. It is variously referred to as the "St. Louis School of Social Economy" (Austin, 1986, Davis and Sale, 1911), the "St. Louis School of Philanthropy" (Davis, McClain, & Riley to

Russell Sage Foundation Trustees, 1907), and the "Missouri School of Social Economy" (Abbott, 1930). According to Austin (1986), it is the fourth school of social work established (after those in New York, Chicago, and Boston).

Apparently, between 1907 and 1924, this early St. Louis school was variously affiliated with the University of Missouri at Columbia, then with Washington University, and then again the University of Missouri. It ceased operations in 1924, when the University of Missouri refused to appropriate money "for the maintenance of any educational project away from its campus at Columbia, Missouri and Washington University was unwilling to reassume its responsibility for it" (Bruno, 1927). Subsequently, separate programs were established at the two universities.

Because Missouri was a very strong "Jim Crow" state, its public and private higher education programs were racially segregated. In his application for RS funding, Bruno (1927) describes St. Louis as "essentially conservative, and nowhere more so than its social work. Up to the time of the organization of the Community Council I think it would not be unjust to have called St. Louis backward with respect to the progress it had made in the mastery of social work technique in comparison with other American communities of similar size and wealth" (p. 4).

Archival records indicate two specific types of responses by social work educators in these St. Louis schools to racial discrimination. In 1907, the St. Louis School of Philanthropy submitted a funding proposal of \$5500.00 to the Russell Sage Foundation to support three research studies into the social welfare condition of people in St. Louis and Missouri. One of the studies proposed to investigate "The Negro in the Problem of Relief," stating: "Valuable studies of the negro have been made by certain individuals and by certain well known institutions, but the subject here proposed has not been considered. Moreover, it is believed by your petitioners to be an increasingly important problem in relief in the cities of the southern and border states, and that the St.

Louis School of Philanthropy is under obvious obligations to promote such a study" (Davis, McClain, & Riley to Russell Sage Foundation Trustees, 1907).

Secondly, in 1926 and again in 1929, Washington University submitted funding proposals for social work education to LSRM (which apparently were not approved). The proposal documents indicates that there were three classes of "colored students" who were not eligible for credit at Washington University, but were registered in extension classes at the University of Chicago. A total of 43 students had registered for these extension classes. One class had run three years, another had run two years, and the third had just begun. (Bruno, 1927; 1929).

Thus, early social work educators in St. Louis programs appeared to recognize the linkage between poverty and race, felt that there was an obligation or social imperative for Southern social workers to study it, and found innovative ways to educate African American social workers when they could not get course credit at their own segregated university.

#### **1914: New Orleans Social Work Educational Programs**

In the early 1900s, New Orleans was the largest city in the South (i.e., a population of 350,000), but had no organized child welfare system to address the numerous severe social problems that both white and (especially) black citizens were experiencing, such as high infant mortality rate, poor sanitation, poor housing, inadequate health care, large numbers of dependent or orphaned children, and poverty (Slingerland, 1916). In 1914, under sponsorship of Kingsley Settlement House, a group of Tulane social science faculty offered the first classes in social welfare. Three courses were offered, plus fields trips to study social conditions first hand. It was the first program in the South for the professional training of social workers, and in 1917 it was formally organized as the Southern School of Social Sciences and Public Service (Dyer, 1966). The school was limited financially--it had only contributions from local welfare groups and a small tuition fee charged to students. It became obvious that if social work training

was to survive, it would need a university to take it over. Tulane University was approached to do this, which, by its state charter and the conditions of its founding benefactors, was reserved for the education of white men and (eventually) white women.

In 1921, a \$20,000 grant from the American Red Cross established a formal one-year social work program (American Red Cross, 1920). According to Dyer (1966), Harry Hopkins, then director of the Gulf Division of the Red Cross's field division, lent support to the establishment of the school. The Red Cross was interested in establishing a centralized, regional training program in social work, and Tulane was designated as that central training agency. The program was now known as The School of Social Sciences at Tulane University. It was primarily an undergraduate program combining social sciences studies (e.g., sociology) and social work training. According to Dyer, this was not a full-blown school of social work, but "an emergency social work educational department."

Social work remained a component of the sociology department until 1927, when funding from LSRM (\$93,000) enabled it to become a separate School of Social Work, primarily graduate in nature, with a two-year curriculum qualifying students for the Masters of Arts. Receiving adequate funding support was a constant source of concern in its early years. In 1936, the School received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation which, along with funds received from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (F.E.R.A.) enabled it to continue. During the Depression, it received the largest number of F.E.R.A. scholarships of any school for social work training. Other funding of the Tulane School of Social Work included a 1937 RF grant to train social workers from Latin America (described below), and a 1944-47 GEB grant to expand its curriculum in psychiatric social work. In 1927, the School achieved national accreditation through AASSW, and was a charter member of the current accrediting body of social work education, the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), when it was established in 1952. In 1935, the University established the degree of Master of Social Work.

A persistent theme in rationale for establishing a school of social work at Tulane was the need to have professionally trained *southern* workers. As the 1920 funding proposal for the Red Cross puts it: "Many of the Southern communities are virtually forced to accept Northern and Eastern social service workers, else 'manage to get along' with untrained, poorly equipped and unsatisfactory service" (American Red Cross, 1920). A similar theme was echoed by Eleanor McMMain of the Kingsley House settlement in her 1927 letter to the president of Tulane: "The social agencies in New Orleans feel constantly the need of a source of supply close at home from which to draw their personnel. The adjacent country--indeed we might say the entire far south would welcome such a source of supply near at hand. For many reasons it is better to have southern trained workers in the southern fields" (McMMain to Dinwiddie, 1927).

Several responses to racial segregation are discernible by the social work faculty at Tulane. Relatively early on, Tulane social work students were required to carry both white and black clients as way to increase their competence with clients from various backgrounds. In addition, the school developed specific case studies of African-American individuals and families needing relief or other social services, and also developed its own outline of how to conduct a social study of the African-American family (Sytz, 1936). The outline was developed because the historic "master-servant relationship . . . plays so large a part in the negro-white accommodation which is a difficult relationship when projected into the relief setting. It is the antithesis of the client-worker relationship, and it is as difficult for us to achieve the relationship of caseworker to our negro clients as it is for these clients to participate as do white clients in this relationship" (p. 8). The social study outline was said to be "exceptionally successful . . . [because it] emphasizes the point of view of the client, his attitudes, the way he thinks and feels, his standards, traditions, desires, and relationship with other people" (p. 8). The faculty noted that student attitudes towards the Negro and "poor whites" were changing as result of this type of training: "The words nigger, shiftless,

lazy, no-account put in less and less frequent appearances. The use of an outline for the social study of a negro family has yielded results, both in understanding the individual client, and in outlining more clearly the problems needing attack" (Tulane University School of Social Work and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, 1935, p. 9). In addition, a number of student theses were studies focused on the social problems of the African-American family and community.

Interestingly, despite its segregation policy, Tulane's geographic location attracted students from Mexico, Puerto Rico, and South America. In 1937, the School of Social Work received a RF grant for stipends for Latin American social work students to attend Tulane and receive MSW degrees. It is unclear if the color barrier was not seen as applying to these students, since they came from another country and spoke another language, or if they were simply considered white. Visual inspection of a 1942 black-and-white photograph in the Tulane School of Social Work newsletter (found in the SWHA collection) depicts 10 Latin American students then in attendance. The picture gives the impression that some students had physical features and coloring characteristic of Caucasians, whereas other students had characteristics more consistent with Indian or mixed racial heritage (Tulane University School of Social Work, 1942).

Although RAC archive material does not cover the later history of Tulane School of Social Work, additional SWHA material (Council on Social Work Education, 1963) and a published history of the university (Dyer, 1966) indicate that the social work faculty was actively involved in Tulane's efforts to desegregate. Between 1954 and 1962, the board of trustees at Tulane considered ways to admit African Americans to the university. Various faculty resolutions were passed during this period, particularly by the Graduate School, The Tulane Arts and Sciences Division, and School of Social Work. In 1955-56, the board held a session with all deans to ask advice about this, who gave their unanimous support for desegregation. However, since Tulane was privately established, desegregation would require overturning the provision of wills of Paul Tulane and Mrs.

Josephine Louise Newcomb, its founding benefactors. Eventually, in April 1961, the board voted to admit qualified students regardless of race or color, if it were legally possible to do so. In addition, CSWE played a role in advancing the cause of desegregation during a reaccreditation site visit in 1961 by pressing the issue in a meeting with the president of the University and the dean of the School of Social Work (Council on Social Work Education, 1961; Longennecker to Kahn, 1961).

Subsequently, the School of Social Work received an application from a prospective student who designated her race as Negro. After full consideration by the Admissions Committee, the School informed the applicant that in the opinion of the School, she was fully qualified to begin study for the MSW degree, but due to legal restrictions it could not admit her. Whether intentional or not, this action seemed to invite litigation, which subsequently occurred in October 1961. On December 6, 1962, the federal district court handed down a decision which made it legally possible for Tulane to implement the policy adopted April 1961. On December 12, 1962, the Tulane board implemented its nondiscrimination policy, effective at the beginning of the following academic year in September 1963 (Council on Social Work Education, 1963; Dyer, 1966).

Thus, although Tulane was a segregated university, the social work faculty appeared to have a clear awareness of racism and saw it as negatively affecting the efforts to establish a professional, helping relationship between African-American clients and white social workers. The School had its students assist black clients and developed special teaching materials to help improve the chances of working successfully with black clients. The faculty and dean of the School--as well as the national accrediting body in social work, CSWE--were active participants in Tulane's eight-year struggle to find a way to desegregate.

**1920: Atlanta School of Social Work**

No examination of segregation in social work education is complete without consideration of the unique role of the Atlanta School of Social Work (later, the Atlanta University School of Social Work). Archive documents emphasize somewhat different aspects of the founding of the School. The 1924 Bulletin of the School states that the School "was largely the outgrowth of a feeling which found expression in the National Conference of Social Workers held at New Orleans in the Spring of 1920. There the workers realized the tremendous need for trained colored social workers in the South" (Atlanta School of Social Work, 1924, p. 7). Chandler (1999) states that the "first black school of social work, the Atlanta University School, was not organized until 1921, and then only after black delegates led by Jesse O. Thomas, a black social work leader from Atlanta, protested the segregation of the New Orleans meeting of the National Conference of Social Work and called for the founding of a black school" (p. 110-111).

A different version was offered by Joseph Logan of the Red Cross, which in 1921 provided the School with its first grant to hire a full-time field director to coordinate training. His 1924 letter states that the School was established at the request of the Atlanta Associated Charities by Robert C. Dexter, who enlisted the cooperation of several agency heads and Morehouse College "in order to provide some systematic training for colored volunteers, leading to the enlistment and further training, if practical, of professional colored workers" (Logan to Ruml, 1924).

The School was incorporated in 1924, after receiving a three-year grant of \$7,500 from LSRM. An additional five year grant of \$5,000 was given by the LSRM in 1926. After the LSRM was folded into to the Rockefeller Foundation, the GEB continuously funded the School until 1938, giving as much as \$10,000 per year, or between one-quarter and one-third of its annual budget. The School also sought and received money from other philanthropies, including the Russell Sage Foundation, Tracy McGregor Funds, Children's Fund of Michigan, Rosenwald Fund, Phelps-Stokes Fund, Atlanta Community Fund. Through the encouragement of the GEB, the Atlanta School of Social

Work became formally incorporated as a part of Atlanta University in 1938 (Washington to Fosdick, May 4, 1938). After the GEB funding ended, the School attempted to raise an endowment of \$500,000 through a national committee of prominent Black leaders, educators, and entertainers (i.e., Lena Horn, Paul Robeson). This was discontinued after a few years, when Atlanta University became part of the United Negro College Appeal. The second director of the School, Forrester Washington, was an energetic, persistent fund raiser, and the stability of the social work program was due largely to his efforts.

The purpose in founding the School was to focus on the solution to social problems, particularly those affecting Negro life in the South. It was established because other schools of social work were racially segregated (Washington, 1935). According to its 1925 funding appeal to LSRM, "The Negroes, in the last decade stirred to the quick by a new race consciousness, are endeavoring to put on All-Negro social work programs for themselves, and with few exceptions, they are wandering in a maze of futile endeavor, which is leading nowhere and is retarding the growth of real social work. An increasing number of the educated colored people of the South are keenly aware of this condition and are anxious to remedy it" (Hope, Tapley, Lewis, & Dickinson, 1925).

Students enrolled from all over the South and even some international countries, such as South Africa. Its graduates were in high demand by social agencies in both the North and South, and preventing students from being hired away before they had completed the full length of the curriculum often was a considerable challenge. During WW II, enrollment doubled and at its peak, the School had the fourth highest enrollment of any school of social work, irrespective of race.

The Atlanta school was accredited by AASSW in 1928. It had a broad based curriculum focusing on case work, group work, community organization, research, and field work, and maintained a national reputation for high academic standards (Mann to Levy, 1942). Both whites and blacks were on its faculty and Board of Trustees, and its national advisory board included prominent white social work educators from the North

and South, such as Howard Odum, founder of the School of Social Welfare Program at the University of North Carolina; Graham Taylor, founder of the social work school at the University of Chicago; and Walter Pettit, Assistant Director of the New York School of Social Work (Atlanta School of Social Work, 1934). Its first three directors--E. Franklin Frazier, Forrester B. Washington, and Whitney Young, Jr.--were African-Americans educated in northern universities (Peebles-Wilkins, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c). As described in greater detail below, Whitney Young, Jr. played a lead role in getting CSWE to adopt an accreditation standard on non-discrimination.

At the time of the School's establishment, all social service programs in the South were racially segregated (Woodward, 1974). As one observer of the contemporary scene wrote: "The separation between whites and negroes in the field of social welfare is quite complete. The white groups throughout the South are rapidly developing efficient social agencies for white people--few give any attention to negroes" (Murphy to Stubbs, 1924). Washington (1935) notes that: "In the South, particularly, before the Atlanta School of Social Work, there was a marked tendency to employ untrained Negro social workers whereas the same agency would not employ untrained white workers." Prior to the establishment of the Atlanta School, the only means by which Southern black social workers could receive training was by attending short "institutes." Washington (1935) noted that these institutes had been more or less abandoned in the South for white people when they were revived for the social work training of African Americans.

Chandler (1999) indicates that private philanthropies, upon which private social service agencies--and many early schools of social work--were dependent, actively promoted segregation. She notes that "access to philanthropic funds was carefully reserved to white leaders or 'responsible and reliable' African-American individuals and organizations" (p. 110). Chandler notes that E. Franklin Frazier, the first director of the Atlanta School, was one of those "unreliable" persons who was unable to accept the "conditions of racial adjustment." He refused to attend segregated social work meetings,

and he persisted in raising the question of segregation. According to Chandler (citing Frazier, 1957), he eventually was asked to resign his position at the Atlanta School because his ideas of racial adjustment did not conform to the social philosophy of the foundations. Peebles-Wilkins (1995a) indicates that his tenure as director was from 1922 to 1927, and that he resigned because of "the controversy created in the white community by his article in Forum Magazine on racial prejudice" (p. 2586).

While no direct evidence has been found in the RAC collections to indicate that the Rockefeller philanthropies was among those promoting racial segregation, it is clear from Washington's extensive correspondence to various officers of the LSRM and GEB that he was guided by an "up-lift philosophy"--which stressed the role of educated Negroes raising themselves as individuals and their race collectively up through their own efforts, rather than directly combating or challenging white racism and discrimination. It is also clear that there was a significant difference in the amount of grant money and the pattern of its distribution to white and black schools of social work. The Atlanta School received smaller annual amounts (on average, about \$10,000 per year), but was sustained by the various Rockefeller philanthropies over a much longer period of time (1924 to 1938). Indeed, during the 1930s, the GEB pledged matching funds of over \$1,700,000 to Atlanta University (as a whole), of which the School of Social Work was one of the most successful departments in raising funds. In contrast, white schools of social work, such as those at Tulane and Nashville, typically received much larger founding grants up front; however, these tended to be one-time bequests that ended three to five years after the initial award was given, with perhaps a second renewal or sustaining grant occasionally given.

A constant struggle of the Atlanta School was to justify its existence to a variety of different groups who were at times hostile or antagonistic to it, including the black community, white social workers, and white agency heads. Over and over again, the School articulated the rationale that African-American workers--who were professionally

trained in social work and who were skilled and knowledgeable in dealing the social problems experienced by African-American clients--could contribute to the betterment of the black community and race, and were more effective at their mission than white workers could be in working with black clients.

The black community apparently had a wide reaction to the social work profession. On the one hand, Frazier (1924) wrote that "there are some people who think that 'common sense' is the only requisite for successful social work." Many "old-time" pioneer black leaders and heads of social agencies in the North were inclined to hire their relatives and friends, rather than a person formally trained in social work (Washington, 1935). On the other hand, "the relief-administration phase of social work is the most available avenue of employment for college trained Negroes at the present time" (Washington, 1935). This attitude was a mixed blessing, in that the higher, more stable salaries of social workers attracted people not particularly suited for the profession. Some of these people apparently were in it for the money, power, or prestige, motivations that the Atlanta School made a concerted effort to forestall.

A third reaction from some members of the black community was that they would rather work with a white social worker than a black worker (Washington, 1935). "The Negro clients who prefer white workers to Negro workers usually give as reasons for the preference the severity of the colored worker and the fact that they 'don't want their business known by Negro social workers'" (p. 78). Washington argued that: "As long as there exists in this country such pronouncedly differential treatment of the Negro, it is obviously impossible to have a real 'transference,' to borrow a psychoanalytic term, between a white worker and a Negro client" (p. 79).

There was considerable prejudice and opposition to hiring trained African American social workers by white Southern social workers and agency heads. Several factors contributed to this resistance. Washington (1935) notes "social executives did not, in many cases, like educated Negroes of any kind because they had to treat them too

respectfully" (p. 83). There was also a belief by social executives that a white person in any profession was superior to a black person in any profession, and that Negro social workers lacked either "detachment" and/or "sympathy" with their Negro clients, and also received less respect from Negro clients. Another factor was the higher salary white workers could make as supervisors overseeing Negro social workers, rather than working in a "subordinate job in white work with less pay" (p. 79). White social workers were eager to retrain their positions of power and financial security. In addition, white executives of Southern social agencies were not particular about the quality of social work among Negroes as among whites, and further did not intend to spend as much money on Negro clients as on white clients.

The Atlanta School combated these views by arguing that African-American social workers knew the resources in the black community far better than white social workers ever could, and also knew individual functioning and family life in the black community far better as well. The skills and abilities of these black professionals were soon apparent, as they could handle public relief efforts more efficiently and effectively. In many cases, graduates of the Atlanta School staffed entire "divisions of Negro welfare" in public social services agencies in the South as well as public and private agencies in the North. The School also emphasized the role of research, and many of the studies conducted by students investigated the conditions of black people. For example, studies conducted between 1931 and 1933 focused on disability, hunger, poverty, housing conditions, emergency services, homicide rates, unemployment, health conditions and services, school drop-outs, police brutality, and recreational activities for children. Several studies involved comparisons of social problems and social services received by whites and blacks (Atlanta School of Social Work, 1934).

The School served as an important promoter and disseminator of knowledge, particularly about social work training, to social work organizations in other states. Forrester Washington was invited to address the Alabama State Conference of Social

Work, the Florida State Conference of Social Work, the Southern Sociological Society annual meeting, the Baltimore Urban League, the Social Science Department at Fisk University, and the People's College of Chattanooga, Tennessee (Washington to Fosdick, 1938). Remarkably, in 1940, when a white school of social work was being proposed for establishment at the University of Georgia, Washington was put on the organizing committee "at the earnest request of the Georgia Chapter of the American Association of Social Workers and the head of the proposed curriculum at the University to establish a school of social work . . . of the highest standards" (Atlanta University School of Social Work, 1940).

Although the RAC collection does not cover the later history of the school, SWHA material indicates that the Atlanta School played a key role at the national level in advancing the desegregation of social work education. In October 1958, Whitney Young, Jr., dean of the Atlanta School and a member of CSWE Board of Directors, asked the Council to establish a policy on nondiscrimination (Council on Social Work Education, January 16-18, 1964). Over the next year, the issue was studied and debated, with a major question centering on whether nondiscrimination was a matter of social work ethics (a broader concern), or whether it was an accreditation standards issue (a narrower concern) (Council of Social Work Education, September 27-29, 1959). In 1961, CSWE Board adopted a Policy on Non-Discriminatory Practices governing all its own activities, and by 1962 the Commission on Accreditation had adopted a standard on nondiscrimination for inclusion in the Manual of Accrediting Standards (Council on Social Work Education, September 19, 1962). This standard apparently was not consistently enforced--especially with member schools still legally segregated--and thus in 1965, the Commission on Accreditation adopted a mandatory standard prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, or ethnic origins in all aspects of schools of social work.

Thus, the Atlanta School played a pivot role in combating racism and discrimination in social work and social work education. Initially, its efforts were directed at establishing a school of social work for African Americans, where none had existed before. (An unintended negative impact, however, appeared to result from its emphasis on black social workers working with black clients, since that further reinforced segregation in the delivery of social services). Secondly, the long-term success of the school gave it an influential voice in raising at the national level the fundamental question of whether racial discrimination and exclusionary admission practices were incompatible with social work values and ethics stressing social justice and the individual worth and dignity of all human beings.

**1920: University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill) School of Public Welfare**

According to Bell (1927), prior to 1917, North Carolina lagged far behind the rest of the nation in establishing a public welfare system. There were few existing state institutions, private relief agencies concentrated their efforts in the larger urban centers, and almost nothing was done in the rural areas. Benjamin (1922) notes that at the time, North Carolina was a state in transition. Although there was increased urbanization and industry (tobacco and cotton mills), two-thirds of the state--over 180,000 of the population--still lived in rural areas.

In 1917, "almost overnight" the state legislature enacted a county- and state-wide system of public welfare. This legislation was the result of aggressive work done by the North Carolina State Conference of Social Work. The legislation provided for a State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, an office of the State Commissioner of Public Welfare, and the creation of County Boards of Public Welfare. In 1919, an amendment added the requirement that every county have a county superintendent of public welfare. As Bell (1927) notes, "a tremendous program of social work was thus launched through an entire state with very little educational preparation for its reception in the various counties which were to serve as units of the system." Not only were there few

professionally trained social workers to serve in this new system, but the 57 county superintendents of welfare were by and large untrained in social work.

In 1919, the state enacted an amendment to the original legislation of 1917 mandating that every county have both an unpaid county board of public welfare as well as a paid superintendent of public welfare (Bell, 1927). The effect of this amendment was to create a tremendous need for having trained social workers to fill these county superintendent positions. At this point, William Chase, president of the University of North Carolina (UNC), "came forward and said that if the state was to put on a program of social betterment, it was the duty of the University to develop and train the leadership necessary to carry out such a program" (Johnson to Odum, March 22, 1928). In 1920, the University of North Carolina established the School of Public Welfare. The school was specifically intended for the training of county superintendents and county welfare workers. According to Benjamin (1922), the School of Public Welfare, the State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, and the North Carolina Plan of Public Welfare "are woven into one thong." This state plan apparently served whites only, but subsequently a division for African Americans was developed once funding was received from the LSRM.

Howard Odum, professor of sociology at UNC, was named director of the program. Odum wore many hats simultaneously, also serving as a consultant to the State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, director of the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences at UNC, and founding editor of the Journal of Social Forces, which H. L. Mencken called "the most comprehensive and interesting publication of its kind, and by long odds, in the whole United States." Odum also was a prolific author, publishing numerous sociological studies on the South, collections of Negro songs, textbooks on the study of social problems, and was the series editor for the American Social Science Series for the Henry Holt publishing company. Odum earned his doctoral degree from

Columbia in 1909, with a dissertation was entitled "The Social and Mental Traits of the Negro" (Mencken, 1924).

The North Carolina school was organized on a fourfold basis: (a) "instruction in the social sciences and the magnifying of citizenship in the total ideals of a liberal education; (b) professional training in social work; (c) direct services to communities, assistance to workers in the field, cooperation with county superintendents of public welfare and others, and general projects in community building and welfare; and (d) research, study and publication of results" (Benjamin, 1922). Odum advocated that students develop a strong integration between social science theory, practical training in social work, and social research. Although he clearly valued professional social work, his sociological training emphasized the importance of social science theory and research. However, some state social welfare leaders, such as Mrs. Kate Burr Johnson, the Commissioner of Charities and Public Welfare, were dissatisfied with the amount of practical training in social work methods that students received (Johnson to Odum, March 22, 1928). Another source of dissatisfaction between the state and the university was Odum's emphasis on rural social work, whereas Johnson felt that workers needed to be prepared to also work in the urban centers as well. To her, it seemed that the state and the university had different interests regarding social work training. What the state wanted primarily was help and assistance in serving the county departments of public welfare, whereas the university was primarily interested in the training of students.

Despite these areas of disagreement, both the state and the university were united in their common desire to have Southern social work students trained by Southern faculty in a Southern university. As Kate Burr Johnson notes in her letter to Odum (1928): "I have recently had requests from three splendid persons who want to go into social work to advise them in regard to training. All of them are people whom we would like to keep in North Carolina. They are not enthusiastic about going to the New York School of Social Work or the University of Chicago. They wish to work in this or some other

southern state and they do not feel that the training they would get North would meet their needs." As one student who left the North Carolina program to go to the New York School put it: "I want to see the methods in New York, but I hope to return to my native South [emphasis in the original] to have a part in the big welfare development I believe is coming here. I am used to our rural types and lack of resources, and would like to fit myself to teach case work to some of our Southern girls, so my experience could do somebody some good" (Livermore to Odum, February 25, 1925). Odum himself notes: "In the matter of professors and students things are turned about. In the South we have a large number of northern professors but no northern students. On the other hand the northern universities have great numbers of southern students, while the southern universities have practically no northern students" (Odum to Ruml, December 1, 1924).

Like other Southern schools of social work, North Carolina sought to have a regional influence. The School provided regional training institutes in social work throughout the South. The Journal of Social Forces was the "official organ of the Florida, South Carolina, Alabama, and North Carolina Conference for Social Work" (University of North Carolina, 1925). In 1926, Odum reported to the LSRM staff "pressure is constantly being brought by public officials in Virginia, Alabama, and Georgia, as well as in North Carolina for the training of social workers" (Walker, March 30, 1926).

Odum tried unsuccessfully to get separate funding for the School of Public Welfare from the LSRM. In 1925 and 1927, he developed funding proposals for social work. The 1925 proposal focused on developing a southern regional center for social work training (University of North Carolina, 1925), and the 1927 proposal called for training in "undifferentiated social work" by which he apparently meant generic, rather than specialized, social work training that would be taught at both the undergraduate and graduate level (University of North Carolina School of Public Welfare, 1927).

Neither of these proposals were funded. Sydnor Walker and others at the LSRM questioned the practicality of the proposals and also why salaries charged to the School of Public Welfare were for persons dividing their time among the School, the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, and undergraduate instruction (Walker, March 16, 1927). Also, Walker discovered that several of the University of North Carolina faculty who were listed as participating in the School had never been approached by Odum about his plans (Walker, November 7-11, 1927). Odum's funding requests for the school appear based, in part, primarily on his interest in recruiting and retaining a strong social science faculty, including faculty who would conduct research at the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, which he also directed (Odum to Ruml, June 22, 1927).

Indeed, he was more successful in getting the interest and support of Beardsley Ruml, director of LSRM, for this project (Odum to Ruml, March 26, 1925). Between 1924-25, Odum organized a seven-state auto trip with himself, Ruml, President Chase, and Professor Outhwaite to visit several universities in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia in order to keep the Memorial staff "constantly informed about the actual conditions and situations in the South . . .as well as learning a great deal from other individuals and localities" (University of North Carolina, 1925).

An added difficulty was that Odum was unable to work out satisfactory negotiations about the School of Social Welfare with William Chase, president of the University (Walker, March 30, 1926). This may have been compounded by Chase's extended absence from campus when he interviewed for the presidency at the University of Oregon, while also being encouraged by Ruml to become the head of the Social Science Research Council.

As a result of these difficulties, the School of Social Welfare remained quite small and undeveloped. In 1927, Sydnor Walker reported that "There are about seven persons in the School of Public Welfare taking the professional course this year. Not all of these

are college graduates, and the work is evidently not on a graduate level" (Walker, November 7-11, 1927). Also, the LSRM staff was aware of the dissatisfaction expressed by Kate Burr Johnson, the Commissioner of the State Board of Charities and Public Welfare, regarding the training which the social work students were receiving (Walker, September 21, 1928). In 1928, Odum characterized his efforts to get separate funding for the School as "failing here so signally" (Odum to Walker, March 17, 1928).

Although UNC was segregated, the School of Social Welfare played a key role in developing social welfare services for African Americans in the state. From 1924-1927, Odum obtained a \$10,000 per year grant from LSRM to fund a "Four Counties Demonstration Project," designed to show the efficiency of a county welfare system administered by professionally trained social workers. As part of this demonstration project, one person was hired to develop "Negro social welfare services." As Kate Burr Johnson (Johnson to Ruml, February 18, 1927) notes: "The work that has been done for Negroes under the direction of Lieutenant Oxley has met with the heartiest approval throughout the state and we have gotten splendid cooperation both from local and state officials." It is clear that this was a major development in public social services. In 1923, the year prior to the grant, only one "colored" welfare case was opened, whereas in the next two years, 113 and 47 "colored" cases were opened (University of North Carolina-State Board of Charities, 1927-1928).

An LSRM memorandum summarizes the importance of Oxley's work: "The great success of the work initiated by Lieut. Oxley is indicated by the demand for its extension. Lieut. Oxley is quite a genius according to Mrs. Johnson for presenting his demands to the Legislature. We have been much gratified that the Legislature has consented to the establishment of a Home for units of juvenile negro girls who are delinquent. Mrs. Johnson feels that there are many things which could be done under a state program, but that nothing is more necessary than to extend the negro work at this time" (Walker, March 7, 1927). Eventually a Division of Negro Welfare was established, through a

\$27,000 LSRM grant. The division's "general aim is to develop a program for negro social service corresponding or at least correlating to some extent with the whole state plan" (Bell, 1927).

The purpose of the Division of Negro Welfare was four fold: (a) intelligent study of Negro life with its social problems; (b) community organization in the counties having a Negro population to carry out a constructive program; (c) developing leadership among Negroes to assume responsibility in both local and state-wide programs; and (d) providing an opportunity for training for volunteer and paid workers in annual Institutes (North Carolina State Board of Charities, 1927). In addition, faculty from the Institute for Research into the Social Sciences conducted several sociological studies on Negro social problems, as well as attended or presented their work at professional conferences focusing on Negro life. As mentioned earlier, Odum also served on the national advisory board of the Atlanta School of Social Work.

In 1927, in connection with the Four County Demonstration Project, Miss Mitchell, a graduate of the School of Public Welfare and employed by the State Department of Charities and Public Welfare, assisted four black social work students at the Bishop Tuttle School for Colored Girls on the St. Augustine College campus at Raleigh. Miss Mitchell assisted in giving instruction, field work and case work. The Bishop Tuttle School was said to have a capacity to teach twenty girls in social work and was anxious to accommodate more than the four that they had (Walker, March 7, 1927).

Thus, despite the North Carolina school's small size, its faculty--particularly Howard Odum--played a major role in developing social welfare services for African-American clients in the state. Although both the School and the newly developed Negro welfare division operated on a segregated basis, given the established racial attitudes and practices of the time, Odum's work seems very advanced. His prolific sociological scholarship was devoted primarily to studying the social conditions and problems of the

South, through which he helped establish specialized welfare services for the black community where none had existed before.

### **1942: Nashville School of Social Work**

The Nashville School of Social Work was established through a GEB grant in 1942. Its relevance for this study is two-fold. First, it was explicitly conceptualized as a white school. Secondly, despite being a segregated institution, it was responsive to the requests from African-American social workers in the Nashville area who wanted advanced social work training provided by the School.

The establishment of social work training in Nashville had a long and arduous beginning. According to Pederson (1943a). "In 1910 and again in 1925, Mr. Francis McLean, of the Russell Sage Foundation, made a study regarding the need for a family welfare society in Nashville, and made mention of the need for a school of social work." Over the next several years, this idea was considered by several of the universities and colleges in the area. In 1916, the Peabody College faculty minutes carried an item related to the need for a school of social work in Nashville (Pederson, 1943a). In 1925, LSRM gave \$125,000 over five years to Vanderbilt to strengthen the social sciences, and establishing a school of social work was extensively discussed at that time (General Education Board, 1942). In 1926, the LSRM approved a proposal to spend up to \$2 million to strengthen the social sciences and to establish a school of social work for Negroes at Fisk University in Nashville (General Education Board, 1942).

[NOTE: The Encyclopedia of Social Work (National Association of Social Workers , 1995, p. 2636), states that the first social work training program for black workers was started by Dr. George Edmund Hanes at Fisk in 1910. Evidently, however, a fully developed social work training program did not become established there, or if it did, it was one not affiliated with AASSW, since there is no mention of it in the listing of schools of social work in the Social York Year Book series, which the Russell Sage Foundation began publishing biannually in 1930.]

"In 1928, the directors of the Spelman Foundation [sic] became interested enough in the establishment of such a school to send Dr. Walter Pettit, director of the New York School of Social Work, to Nashville to study the need for such a school." (Pederson, 1943a). However, nothing further was done until 1934-35 when the Federal Emergency Relief Administration selected Vanderbilt University as one of the schools to incorporate in its curriculum an emergency training program for social workers. This school was conducted for the period of one year, and was under the direction of Dr. E. T. Krueger, Head of the Department of Sociology at Vanderbilt (Pederson, 1943a).

"In 1939, at the request of the presidents of Scarritt College, Vanderbilt University, and Peabody College, Miss Marian Hathway, Executive Secretary of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, came to Nashville to make a study of the need for such a school in the state and region, and to survey the resources which were available and which would be needed for such an undertaking. As a result of this visit, Miss Hathway recommended to the administrators of the three schools and to the American Association of Schools of Social Work the establishment of a school of social work in Nashville" (Pederson, 1943a). The Hathway study was funded by the LSRM. She noted that earlier efforts to establish a school of social work had failed because of both the lack of funding and because of the lack of cooperation between the existing colleges in the area. The proposed school was seen as the joint venture of the three educational institutions, each of which already had established departments in education and other human service disciplines. "Scarritt College for Christian Workers is controlled by the Methodist church, and prepares young men and women, not for the ministry, but for missionary work and social work in the churches. The George Peabody Teachers College is preeminent throughout the whole South as a leader in teacher training. In recent years, it has tended to concentrate its efforts upon a graduate program for teachers and school administrators. . .The Vanderbilt University professional schools serve the whole South, with heavy representation from the South Central region. . .the

endowed schools of Medicine and Nursing are located in Nashville because of its central location with reference to the latter area" (Mann et al., 1939 or later).

From the beginning, the Nashville social work program overtly was conceptualized as a white school serving the southern region. In its earliest accreditation documents, the School provided a geographic regional analysis examining the five other white social work programs in the South: Tulane University, College of William and Mary (Virginia); University of Louisville, University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), and the one training program for African American social workers at Atlanta University (Mann et al., 1939). A primary rationale for establishing the program was that the other established white schools of social work were geographically distant from Nashville and the Tennessee area. Although the GEB was most reluctant to fund another school of social work, it eventually was persuaded to fund the Nashville program, because of the need for trained social workers in the South to deal with relief efforts stemming from the Depression and also because of social problems connected to the start of WW II. In May 1942, the GEB made a \$40,000 grant given over five years for the establishment of such a school, based on the understanding that the Nashville school would be free standing, but that the three institutions--Vanderbilt, Scarritt, and Peabody-- would jointly contribute and support the program. The grant award stated that any deficits in the School's operating cost were to be born by Vanderbilt, and that if deficits occurred after three years, Vanderbilt could take it over. Thus, Vanderbilt became the fiscal agent for the School.

The Nashville school was housed in a building owned by Scarritt College, located across the street from the Vanderbilt campus. The school opened on Sept. 22, 1942. It had enrolled forth-two students (twenty full time, and twenty-two part-time). Students were encouraged to take courses from the three sponsoring institutions, and students from those institutions could enroll for classes in the social work school (Pederson, 1943a).

Because the School ran deficits of \$6,000 during its first three years, the GEB gave a supplemental grant of \$10,000 for three years, starting in 1945.

Like other southern schools, the Nashville social work school sought to have a regional influence. In 1948, the School organized and developed a Regional Conference on the Education of Social Workers, funded by a small grant from the GEB. The conference drew social workers, agency administrators, faculty members, and government leaders in public welfare throughout the South. Its students primarily were from the South.

After WW II, Vanderbilt sought to drop its support of the Nashville social work program because it was running annual deficits of up to \$25,000. In addition, a trustee of Vanderbilt strongly objected to funding an educational program not named Vanderbilt. Eventually, Vanderbilt asked the GEB to be released from its obligation to continue to fund the deficits of the Nashville School. At that point, the University of Tennessee (a public, state university) agreed--perhaps reluctantly--to take over the school (Branscon to Calkins, December 31, 1948). At least until 1960, the program remained located in Nashville. By 1971, it had moved to the University of Tennessee at Knoxville campus, but apparently maintained branches at Nashville and Memphis.

Although the Nashville school was racially segregated--indeed, Tennessee had a state law prohibiting the education of whites and blacks in the same institution--it was very responsive to the requests of African-American social workers who wanted further training. Shortly after the school opened in 1942, ten African-American social workers petitioned the Nashville School of Social Work to offer extension courses at Fisk University, a black college. A number of these workers had received training in approved schools of social work and were eager to take additional work. The Executive Committee of the Nashville School agreed to offer one course each quarter at Fisk, which were taught by the regular faculty members of the Nashville School (Pederson, 1942).

Dr. Charles S. Johnson of the Nashville School faculty and Dr. Thomas Jones, president of Fisk, were said to the principals involved in this endeavor (Pederson, 1943b).

The School's activities in providing training to African Americans were prominently featured in a remarkable dinner meeting held in Nashville in January 1943 with the heads of several Negro and white institutions to "consider their common interests in the area" (Mann, 1943). The dinner was attended by two members of the GEB (Albert Mann and Fred McCuistion); Dr. John Cuninggim, president of Scarritt College; S. C. Garrison, president of Peabody College; Thomas E. Jones, president of Fisk University; Edward Turner, president of Meharry Medical College; Lora Pederson, director of the Nashville School of Social Work; John Van Sickle, director of the Vanderbilt University Institute of Research and Training in the Social Sciences; and other community leaders. (It is unclear if O. C. Carmichael, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, attended.) Following the meeting, McCuistion asked several of the speakers to provide a written summary of their remarks, which Albert Mann, Director of Southern Education for the GEB, then distributed. The thrust of those remarks was on the high degree of inter-racial cooperation already achieved among the institutions, such as had been established between the Nashville School of Social Work and Fisk University (Pederson, 1943b). Van Sickle (to McQuistion, 1943) states: "arrangements have already been successfully concluded whereby the School can give its full offerings to the Fisk students and its certificates."

It seems apparent that this meeting was an unusual and (for some) an uncomfortable event. While there was clear excitement about the spirit of interracial cooperation that had been achieved, it also was clear that both black and white educational leaders felt they were walking a fine line. Van Sickle's summary of the meeting (1943) indicates that President Cuninggim of Scarritt College had remarked that "the war, by raising the race issue to the national and international level, provides an opportunity to advance the solution of the problem in the South. His assertion [is] that if

Vanderbilt, Peabody, and Scarritt can move forward cautiously and in complete harmony, they could carry the entire South with them as a courageous declaration of faith. His actions in inviting the Negro members of the Work Conference on Rural Life to the luncheon which Scarritt offered to the group would indeed lead some of his supporters to change their wills, if it became generally known. He admitted that he was perhaps too far out in front."

According to Van Sickle, Thomas Jones, president of Fisk, also said he had the same misgivings, and called for moderation in seeking racial accommodation: "a little rocking won't do any harm, but there must be no upsetting of the boat." Jones indicated that the three institutions may soon have to face pooling of their intellectual resources for the training of Negro officers for administrative service in occupied territories. He indicated that the armed forces were considering establishing a training center for Negro officers located at Fisk. Van Sickle (to McQuiston, 1943) refers to his forthcoming book "in which I set forth what seems to me to be the most promising line of attack in the racial issue what may be summed in the phrase 'equitable segregation.'"

The degree of vulnerability felt by these leaders may have interfered with the inter-racial cooperation which just had begun. In an early December interview with Albert Mann, GEB Director of Southern Education, Lora Pederson states that there was "local concern owing to a confused mental condition which Dr. Cuninggim has developed. He appears to be deliberately stirring some antagonism to President Stuntz [the new president of Scarritt] and to be creating difficulties. He is expressing genuine concern about any admission of Negroes to Scarritt campus. While he had offered the building in which the School of Social Work is housed as Scarritt's financial contribution to the joint program, he actually charged for it. President Stuntz has since removed the rental charge" (Mann, 1944).

### **Conclusion**

As the archive and supplemental material examined above indicates, each of the schools of social work established in the Southern colleges and universities operated on a segregated basis--for whites only--with the exception of the Atlanta program, which was dedicated as the school for Negro social workers. As public welfare programs began to be established in the South, there was a great demand for professionally trained social workers, and an equally strong demand that Southern students be trained in southern educational institutions. Most, if not all, of the Southern schools sought to have a regional influence beyond their immediate locality or state. They recruited mainly southern students, and provided a variety of outreach training and workshops to social workers throughout the region.

All of the schools, both white and black, took some type of action to address the social problems of African-American clients. The faculty at individual white schools developed a variety of responses, such as: (a) having faculty or student research projects examine African-American social problems and conditions; (b) requiring white students to work with African-American clients directly; (c) developing special teaching materials on how to work with African American clients and families; (d) offering social work courses at black universities and colleges, or arranging to have black social workers receive course credit at northern white universities; and (e) establishing separate "divisions of Negro Welfare" to meet the needs of the previously unserved African-American community. Working within an "up-lift" philosophy, the Atlanta school for black social workers was devoted exclusively to addressing the social problems of African Americans, and to developed high quality, competent, social work professionals. In many respects, the impact of the Atlanta School appears to have extended beyond the South in that its graduates were highly sought after by Northern as well as Southern social agencies.

The tenor of these actions, however, is one of *accommodation* to the racial attitudes and practices of the times, rather than *confrontation*. As far as can be

determined from the available data at hand, the emphasis of social work educators appears primarily to have focused on improving social work education and social welfare services in their respective communities and states, rather than fighting for desegregation or racial justice. Some educators apparently seemed more in support of (or at least were not disturbed by) the prospect of "equitable segregation." Overt protest against segregated practices in higher education or the social welfare field rarely appears in individual schools of social work or, for that matter, in the social work profession itself (Golden, 1965; Kindelsperger, 1964). However, it is wise to remember how much is unknown. Other than the Tulane School of Social Work, we presently lack information about the actions of other Southern social work schools during the 1940s-60s regarding their efforts to affect change in the segregated policies of their universities.

At the national level, the social work education accrediting bodies, AASSW and its successor organization, CSWE, also accommodated racial segregation. Not only did these organizations have member schools practicing segregation during the 43 year period (1919-1962) from the time of their respective foundings until racial segregation and discrimination became prohibited, often the leadership of these organizations was supplied by faculty and academic administrators from segregated Southern schools of social work (Wisner to Mann, January 7, 1938). Only in the mid to late 1950s did the issue receive attention both at individual schools, such as Tulane, as well as by CSWE, which had succeeded AASSW as the national social work education accrediting organization.

Interestingly, only a few instances were found giving evidence of cooperation or collaboration among geographically distant white schools of social work. It is clear that individual white schools kept apprised of the developments at the other Southern white schools, but also felt threatened when new schools of social work were proposed for the region (Wisner to Walker, January 7, 1935). However, there is more abundant evidence

that inter-racial cooperation among black and white social work educators existed at the local level in certain communities.

The Rockefeller family philanthropies played a major role in the establishment of social work education, and were a major funder--sometimes enthusiastically, other times reluctantly--of both white and black social work educational programs in the South. These training programs often were created out of sense of national and state urgency. At the national level, social work programs were developed to respond to the needs of veterans returning home after World War I and II, to deal with devastating impact of the Great Depression, and to administer federal relief efforts. At the local level, social work training often arose when states began to create organized social welfare services for its citizens and realized they had no trained personnel to staff them.

Through their sustained interest in and financial support of the individual schools, the Rockefeller philanthropies demonstrated their belief that the social work profession offered something unique and important in meeting these difficult social problems. In addition, through long-term support of the Atlanta School of Social Work, the Rockefeller philanthropies demonstrated an enduring faith that cadres of professionally trained African-American social workers were not only an asset to black communities and individual clients, but also that they were important to the development of the social work profession itself. Eventually this faith was rewarded when, through the work of Whitney Young Jr. and other social work educators, CSWE passed its first policy--two years before it became a federal mandate--requiring schools to desegregate.

Although beyond the scope of the present study to study in depth, it is clear that the legacy of segregation in social work education continued long after the enactment of the Civil Rights law (Longres, 1972). Many individual schools struggled in recruiting and retaining ethnic minority students and faculty, and in effectively teaching multicultural competence to all students, irrespective of their particular cultural or ethnic background. Despite recent national trends in the 1990s indicating that ethnic minorities

constitute between 20 and 33% of the undergraduate and graduate social work student population and 24% of the undergraduate and graduate social work faculty population (Lennon, 1997), the primary professional organization in the United States, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), has remained "overwhelmingly white" (Gibelman and Schervish, 1997).

Clearly, the profession has a long way to go in achieving racial equality within its own ranks. It is hoped that understanding its own hidden history of racial segregation will be one small step on the road towards achieving the just and equitable society--and profession--envisioned by social work values, ethics, and ideals.

### **References**

- Abbott, E. (1930). Education for Social Work. Social Work Year Book 1929. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Atlanta School of Social Work (1924, June). Bulletin of the Atlanta School of Social Work. General Education Board Archives, Folder 613, Box 70, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Atlanta School of Social Work (1934). Emergency grant application to the General Education Board, General Education Board Archives, Folder 618, Box 70, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Atlanta University School of Social Work (1940). Some of the highlights in the accomplishments of the School during the past year. General Education Board Archives, Folder 616, Box 70. Rockefeller Archive Center.
- American Red Cross (July 14, 1920). Establishing and financing social science instruction and social service training in Tulane University. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 739, Box 70 Series 3, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.

- Austin, D. (1986). A history of social work education. School of Social Work, University of Texas at Austin.
- Axinn, J., & Levin, H. (1992). Social welfare: A history of the American response to need (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Bell, M. (1927). A brief study of social work in rural North Carolina. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 661, Box 62, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Benjamin, P. (September 15, 1922). The North Carolina plan. The Survey. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, Folder 787, Box 75, Rockefeller Archives Center.
- Branscon, H. to Calkins, R. (December 31, 1948). Letter. General Education Board Archives, Folder 4846, Box 456, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Bruno, F. (1927). A statement prepared for the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation, in connection with the request of the Washington University for assistance from the Foundation to establish the Training Course for Social Work at Washington University upon an adequate and permanent basis. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 814, Box 78, Series 3, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Bruno, F. (1929). A statement prepared for the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation, in connection with the request of the Washington University for assistance from the Foundation to establish the Training Course for Social Work at Washington University upon an adequate and permanent basis. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 814, Box 78, Series 3, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Chandler, S. (1999). "Prising open that old prejudiced door: African-Americans, poverty, and social work in the early twentieth century. In G. Lowe and P. Reid (eds.) The

- professionalization of poverty: Social work and the poor in the twentieth century (pp. 105-119). NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Costin, L. (1983). Edith Abbott and the Chicago influence on social work education. Social Service Review, 57(1), 94-111.
- Council on Social Work Education, (September 27-29, 1959). Minutes of the Commission on Accreditation (CSWE document 9-12-39M). Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 2, Box 3, Folder title: "Accreditation Commission Minutes, Agenda, Action, 1957-1959," University of Minnesota.
- Council on Social Work Education (1961). Meeting minutes of the Commission on Accreditation. Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 29, Box 143, University of Minnesota.
- Council on Social Work Education, (September 19, 1962). Memorandum to the Board of Directors from the Commission on Accreditation. Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 2, Box 1a, "Accreditation Commission Correspondence, 1962," University of Minnesota.
- Council on Social Work Education (1963). Tulane University admits first Negroes. Social work educator, 9(2), 3. Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 40, Box 62-65, University of Minnesota.
- Council on Social Work Education (January 16-18, 1964). Excerpt from the meeting of the Commission on Accreditation. Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 2, Box 4-5, Folder title: "Accreditation Policy, Procedures, Discussion," University of Minnesota.
- Davis, C. M., McClain, W. H., and Riley, F. J., to Russell Sage Foundation Trustees (1907, September 30). Letter. Russell Sage Foundation Archives, Folder 232, Box 30, Series 4B1.3, Record Group IV, Rockefeller Archive Center.

- Davis, C., & Sale, S. (October 30, 1911). Letter. Russell Sage Foundation Archives, Folder 220, Box 29, Series 4B1, Record Group I, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Dyer, J. (1966). Tulane: The biography of a university, 1834-1965. NY: Harper and Row.
- Frazier, E. F. (1924, December). Education of colored social workers in the South. N.A.T.C.S. Bulletin. Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Folder 6, Box 1, Series 212, Record Group 1.1, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- General Education Board (May 15, 1942). Meeting memo. General Education Board Archives, Folder 4844, Box 456, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Gibleman, M., & Schervish, P. (1997). Who we are: A second look. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- Golden, J. (1965). Desegregation of social agencies in the South. Social Work, 58-67.
- Hope, Tapley, Lewis, & Dickinson (January 23, 1925). Letter. General Education Board Archives, Folder 613, Box 70, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Hollis, E., & Taylor, A. (1951). Social work education in the United States. NY: Columbia University Press
- Johnson, K. to Ruml, B. (February 18, 1927). Letter. Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. Folder 787, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Johnson, K. to Odum, H. (March 22, 1928). Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. Folder 787, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Kayser, J., & Morrissey, C. (1998). Historically significant memories in social work. Two perspectives on oral history research and the helping professions. Reflections: Narratives of Professional Helping, 4(4), 61-66.
- Kindelsperger, K. (1964). To be (or not to be) equal. Social Work Education (newsletter of the Council on Social Work Education (vol. 12, pp. 2, 7. Social Welfare

- History Archives. Record Group 40, Box 62-65, Folder title: "Social Work Education 1964, V. 12," University of Minnesota.
- Lennon, T. (1999). Statistics on social work education in the United States: 1998. Alexandria, VA: Council on Social Work Education.
- Livermore, M. to Odum, H. (February 25, 1925). Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 776, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Logan to Ruml (April 9, 1924). Letter. Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Folder 6, Box 1, Project Series 212, Record Group 1.1, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Longenecker to Kahn, (April 19, 1961). Letter. Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 29, Box 142, University of Minnesota.
- Longres, J. (1972). The impact of racism on social work education. Journal of Education for Social Work, 8(1), 31-41.
- Mann, A. to Levy (April 8, 1942). Letter. General Education Board Archives, Folder 616, Box 70. Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Mann, A. (March 1, 1943). Inter-Office correspondence. General Education Board Archives, Folder 4849. Box 456, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Mann, A. (December 4, 1944). Interview with Miss Laura [sic] L. Pederson, Director, Nashville School of Social Work, General Education Board Archives, Folder 4845, Box 452, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Mann, D., Broarley, H., Stoves, M., Lyle, R., Jones, W., Savage, P., & Krueger, E. (1939 or later). The Nashville University Center. Social Welfare History Archives, Records Group 29, Box 136, University of Minnesota.
- McMain to Dinwiddie (May 9, 1927). Laura Spelman Rockefeller Archives, Folder 739, Box 70, Series 3, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.

- Mencken, H. L. (December, 7, 1924). "The South rebels again." (news column clipping from the St. Paul Pioneer Press). Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives. Folder 788, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Murphy to Stubbs (February 19, 1924). Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Folder 6, Box 1, Series 212, Record Group 1.1 Projects. Rockefeller Archive Center.
- National Association of Social Workers (1995). Significant dates in social welfare history. Encyclopedia of social work (19th ed., vol. 3). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Association of Social Workers (1998). Milestones in the development of social work: 1900-1950s. www.NASW.org.: Author.
- North Carolina State Board of Charities (1927). Plan for continuing and expanding the public welfare program for Negroes in North Carolina. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives. Folder 787, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Odum, H. to Ruml, B. (December 1, 1924). Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 787, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Odum, H. to Ruml, B. (March 25, 1925). Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 776, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Odum, H. to Ruml, B. (June 22, 1927). Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 785, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Odum, H. to Walker, S. (March 17, 1928) Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 785, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.

- Pederson, L. (November 11, 1942). Report to the Executive Committee of the Nashville School of Social Work. General Education Board Archives, Folder 4847, Box 456, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Pederson, L (1943a). Annual Report: Nashville School of Social Work. Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 29, Box 136, Folder title "University of Tennessee documents." University of Minnesota.
- Pederson, L. (1943b). Summary of remarks made by Miss Lora Lee Pederson of the Nashville School of Social Work. General Education Board Archives, Folder 4849, Box 456, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Peebles-Wilkins, W. (1995a). Frazier, Edward Franklin (1894-1962) [Biographical entry]. In National Association of Social Workers' Encyclopedia of Social Work (19th edition, p. 2586). Washington, DC: Author.
- Peebles-Wilkins, W. (1995b). Washington, Forrester Blanchar (1887-1963). [Biographical entry]. In National Association of Social Workers' Encyclopedia of Social Work (19th edition, p. 2616). Washington, DC: Author.
- Peebles-Wilkins, W. (1995c). Young, Whitney Moore, Jr. (1921-1971)[Biographical entry]. In National Association of Social Workers' Encyclopedia of Social Work (19th edition, p. 2618). Washington, DC: Author.
- Ruml, B. to Throop, G. (March 27, 1928). Letter. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 819, Box 78, Series 3, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Slingerland, W. (1916). A constructive program of organized child welfare work for New Orleans and Louisiana. Russell Sage Foundation Archives, microfische, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Sytz. F. (1936). New frontiers in professional development for social work. General Education Board Archives, Folder 950, box 486, Series 6. Rockefeller Archive Center.

- Trolander, J. (1997). Fighting racism and sexism. *The Council on Social Work Education, Social Service Review*, 110-135
- Trattner, W. (1979). From poor law to welfare state: A history of social welfare in America (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Tulane University School of Social Work and Federal Emergency Relief Administration (1935). Educational Audit. Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Folder 37, Box 4, Series 221, Record Group 1.1 Projects, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Tulane University School of Social Work (1942). Photograph appearing in the article 'Inter-American Cooperation in Social Work.' Footnotes, Vol. 5(2). Social Welfare History Archives, Record Group 29, Box 143, University of Minnesota.
- University of North Carolina (1925). Preliminary memorandum: The University of North Carolina, A southern regional center for social research and social work: A tentative report and suggestion, Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 781, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- University of North Carolina School of Public Welfare (1927). A program for the further development of training for undifferentiated social work and for the development of public welfare instruction and administration: Available resources, personnel, and administration. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 785, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- University of North Carolina-State Board of Charities, (1927-1928). A preliminary report of county demonstration project. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 787, Box 75, Series III. Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Van Sickle to McCuiston, (February 16, 1943). Letter. General Education Board Archives, Folder 4849, Box 456, Rockefeller Archive Center.

- Walker, S. (March 30, 1926). Memorandum of interview with Howard Odum. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 785, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Walker, S. (March 7, 1927). Memorandum of interview with Mrs. Johnson, Miss Mitchell, Lieut. Oxley. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 787, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Walker, S. (March 16, 1927). Memorandum of interview with Howard Odum. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 785, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Walker, S. (November 7-11, 1927). Memorandum of interview with Howard Odum. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 785, Box 74, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Walker, S. (September 21, 1928). Memorandum of interview with Kate Burr Johnson.. Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Archives, Folder 787, Box 75, Series III, Subseries 6, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Walker, S. (1928). Social work and the training of social workers. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Washington, F. (1935). The need and education of Negro social workers. Journal of Negro Education (reprint). General Education Board Archives, Folder 618, Box 70, Rockefeller Archive Center
- Washington, F. to Fosdick (May 4, 1938). Letter. General Education Board Archives, Folder 615, Box 70, Rockefeller Archive Center.
- Wisner, E. to Mann, A. (January 7, 1938). Letter. General Education Board, Record Group 3, Series 6, Subseries Tulane University School of Social Work, 1938-1943, Folder 950, Box 486, Rockefeller Archive Center.

Wisner, E. to Walker, S. (January 7, 1935). Letter. Rockefeller Foundation Archives,  
Record Group 1.1 Projects, Series: Louisiana, Subseries: Tulane University  
School of Social Work, 1934-35, Folder 37, Box 4, Rockefeller Archive Center

Woodward, C. V. (1974). The strange career of Jim Crow (3rd ed.). NY: Oxford  
University Press.

The Rockefeller Foundation was the principle source for funding public opinion and psychological warfare research between the late 1930s and the end of World War Two. With limited government and corporate interest or support of propaganda-related studies, most of the money for such research came from this powerful organization that recognized the importance of ascertaining and steering public opinion in the immediate prewar years. Rockefeller philanthropic attention toward public opinion was twofold: 1) to review and establish the psychological environment in the United States for anticipated