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It may be worth its while to examine the role of the two personalities in regard to the Black Movement of the period. The two may have differed with each other's approaches, they, nonetheless, had remarkable perceptions of their missions to achieve equitable justice to their race:

After Frederick Douglass, Mr. Washington was the next great exemplification and revelation of problems of race and labor in America, so significant as to go to the very core of our democracy; and finally, there is to consider Mr. Washington's own personality; the silent, watchful, cautious man, rugged, nervous, popular but unsocial, slow but tireless.1

One must look upon Booker T. Washington's career against the 'Second Reconstitution' beginning late in the eighties and known usually as the rise of the "New South".2 Washington's position was that the Blacks had to achieve economic self-sufficiency before demanding his political rights. Industrial education would buy Southern good will and Northern philanthropy. This was the essence of Booker T. Washington's educational compromise in practice almost a decade before he became


2 Ibid.
nationally known at Atlanta. The position led Washington to take a less "militant" stand on civil rights than did other black leaders, such as those who accused Washington of compromising with the racists on the political position of the Blacks in the South. For Washington gave voice to an important trend in Negro life, one that made him the most popular leader Black Americans ever had. The Washington-controversy was not a debate between representatives of reaction and progress, but over the correct tactics for the emerging Black bourgeoisie.

On September 18, 1895, Booker T. Washington delivered a speech at the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, Georgia, that made him a national figure. He was introduced by former governor Rufus Bullock as a "representative of Negro enterprise and Negro Civilization" His speech allayed any fear his white audience might have had about the ambitions of the Southern Black. Washington emphasized that Blacks wanted responsibilities rather than rights and proposed a programme of accommodation that pleased all White Southerners. Washington exhibited an unusual enthusiasm for learning by doing and for teaching with

Washington himself referred to the economic interest of important capitalists and philanthropists in industrial education and Negro uplift.
concrete objects and the experiences of actual life. The result was that Washington assumed the role of national Negro leader, and his words were considered representative of black thought for a generation.

"There ensued an oligarchy which like all modern governments turned its attention to our economic solution of its political problem.\(^5\) The situation called for the disfranchisement of labourers by labourers. "The South demanded the disfranchisement of the Negro; the Negro demanded political and civil rights and the North demanded peace and security for its investors.\(^6\) Washington's position was that the Blacks had to achieve economic self-sufficiency before demanding his political rights. The position led Washington to take a less "militant" stand on civil rights than did other Black leaders, such as DuBois, who accused Washington of compromising with the racists on the Blacks' political position in the South.

In 1889, Booker T. Washington spoke before the National Education Association at Madison, Wisconsin, and a number of White Southern people present were


\(^5\)DuBois, *n.1*, p.2.

\(^6\)DuBois, *n.1*, p.2.
surprised and interested. They did not have to sit through that uncomfortable quarter of an hour which had usually been their portion when a coloured speaker was stating his case. In 1893 at the meeting of Christian Workers in Atlanta, Georgia, Washington made a still stronger impression upon the South.

Washington declared, "I would set no limits to the attainment of the Negro in arts, in letters or statesmanship.... I plead for industrial education and development for the Negro not because I want to cramp him, but because I want to free him." 7 As early as 1884, he said, "It was this training of the hands that furnished the first basis for anything like united and sympathetic interest and action between the two races at the South and the Whites at the North and those at the South." 8

Washington derived his inspiration directly from Hampton Institute and Samuel Chapman Armstrong. The States Fund had been the chief impetus in advancing the cause of industrial education during the 1880's. He said, "It was this training of the hands that furnished

---


the first basis for anything like united and sympathetic interest and action between the two races at the South and the Whites at the North and those at the South." Washington became great and powerful not because he initiated a trend, but because he expressed it so well.

In September 1895, Washington emerged as a figure of national reputation and the acknowledged leader of Blacks in America. To the surprise of the world, Washington said what the South wanted to hear and said it with a rare tact. To quote DuBois, Washington, "... touched the keynote not only of the exposition but of the growing American thought on the Negro problem: he reminded his listeners of the great service which the colored people as a working class could do for the South."¹⁰

He denied any interest in social equality when he said: "In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the five fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress." In conclusion he asked for justice and an elimination of sectional differences and racial animosities, which, combined with

¹Ibid., pp.7-8.
¹⁰DuBois, n.1, p.7.
material prosperity would usher in a new era for "our beloved South."\(^{11}\)

In almost all his speeches, Washington called for an interlinking of the total human experience -- mind, body and soul. He believed that this would eventually go in the making of a moral man and a society where all men would be considered equal. His views exemplified a pronounced "Spiritual orientation" which evolved due to his experiences in an oppressive situation. As Charles S. Johnson has suggested. Washington was effectively manipulating the symbols and myths clear to the majority of Americans.\(^{11}\)

In his speeches to the Black audiences, "his concern for his race seems as consistent as his attention to what he considered primary issues.\(^{13}\) The theme of "concerns for race", constituted a "Black perspective" which combined his identification with love


for his people with a spiritual commitment to human well-being.\textsuperscript{14}

Wills Norman Pitts, a famous writer on Washington, after analyzing extensively the latter's speeches, found that Washington stressed the following points:

1) the need of his people for education;

2) industrial education as a means to an end;

3) the value of practicing good will between the races;

4) the South as the best place for Blacks to live; and

5) the duty of both sections in building up the citizenship potential of the race.\textsuperscript{15}

Oliver C. Cox, another writer regarded Washington's speeches as similar to one of Henry G. Grady's which relegated the Black population to racial caste position.\textsuperscript{16} Grady did not want Blacks ever to ask for social equality.

Alfred Young, a well known critic challenges Cox's methodological approach to the question of Washington's perspective. Cox conceived "talented Black men" in slavery as destined to become either "discontented

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{15}Quoted in ibid.

bondsmen with ideas of escape and revolt, or trusted slaves." He concluded, therefore, that Washington's own experiences as a slave seemed to have conditioned his approach to life to the type of personality that he himself had developed. 17

Applying the Marxian analysis, to the lives of individuals who lived under the "peculiar institution," Alfred Young says that Cox failed to understand the dynamics of the slave system. Young argues that Cox has fallen into a trap of using only slave revolts as a measurement of opposition to slavery.

When Washington stated, "In all things that are purely social, we can be as separate as the fingers," he was merely painting the picture of race relations in the South as it was or as he hoped it would be if whites would share his social and religious vision. He asked for "the blotting out of racial prejudice as far as possible in business and civil relations." 18 The perspective that Washington often realized was the necessity of "Black Liberation" before Blacks could integrate into the larger society. Thinking back,

17 Young, n.13.

Washington later wrote, "At Hampton, I found the opportunities...to learn thrift, economy and push. I was surrounded by an atmosphere of business, Christian influences, and the spirit of self-help, that seemed to have awakened every faculty in me." Through a combination of industrial education and economic self-sufficiency, Blacks could consolidate their wealth. To quote Lerone Bennett, Jr., "A man's power depends ultimately on the power of his group." Washington was trying to take advantage of the imposed segregation of Blacks to promote Black hegemony through economic inter-dependence.

When viewed in the context of his time, Washington was a master, "of techniques of manipulating white public opinion." Emphasizing the need for industrial education, he said, "I have had something of an opportunity to study the Negro at first hand." Washington realized the ill effects of slavery but at the same time he said, "...every large slave plantation

---


22 Booker T. Washington, n.19, p.11.
in the South was, in a limited sense, an industrial school." He suggested to the White in the South in his "Atlanta Address" that they should "cast down" their "buckets...and run," their factories. He appealed to people for assistance for his brethren who were three decades removed from slavery -- illiterate, disfranchised, and without an economic base. When he told his Black listeners to "cast down your buckets where you are," he employed the words of a pragmatist. Here was a man who was cognizant of the conditions of his people and thoroughly familiar with the racial prejudices of the South. This he said so that the Blacks could throw off the yoke of economic repression. This was a practical solution necessitated by their slave experience and the prevailing economic circumstances. He explained that he seldom referred to prejudice because it was something to be lived down rather than talked down.

Washington's immediate concern was the question of Black manhood, his identity and the citizenship. In his approach the individual was secondary in transforming the society. Alfred Young commented: "Booker T. Washington's perspective of education was an out-growth

---

Ibid., p.54.

Alfred Young, n.13, p.233.
of his experience, his environment and his personality." Washington approached education as a "survival mechanism."\textsuperscript{25}

When Washington did not necessarily speak for the attainment of the voting rights for Blacks, it was because he was not confident, "in the people who yesterday were slaves," and now, "citizens" to make laws for "the government of the nation." It is indeed correct to say that, Washington's rhetorical strategy was probably the only kind that would work for Black people.\textsuperscript{4} Speaking at the Afro-American Council in July 1903, he urged patience and optimism:

In the long run it is the race or individual that exercises the most patience, forbearance, and self-control in the midst of trying conditions that wins...the respect of the world .... Let us not forget to lay the greatest stress upon the opportunities open to us, especially here in the South, for constructive growth in labor, in business and education .... An inch of progress is worth more than a yard of complaint.\textsuperscript{7}

Booker T. Washington was very industriously preaching the following thesis to a wider audience:

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{27}E. Davidson Washington, n.8, pp.94-95, 98.
FIRST, he insisted that Negro education had begun at the wrong end, that is, with the college instead of with the industrial school, SECONDLY, that the Negro should not complain at grievances but should face his opportunities. THIRDLY, that the right to vote was of little present importance to the Negro. FOURTHLY, that even in the matter of "Jim-Crow" legislation it was more important that the Negro should be worthy than that he should complain at the injustice.

Washington did not, ordinarily discuss politics, but there were times when he did admit that, "I do not favour the Negro's giving up anything which is fundamental and which has been guaranteed to him by the Constitution .... It is not best for him to relinquish his rights; nor would his doing so be best for the Southern white man." Washington's solution to the question of political rights was suffrage restriction applied to both races -- a notion that had been growing in popularity since about 1890's. In 1899, in referring to the disenfranchisement bill before the Georgia Legislature, he had forcefully declared that its object was to disfranchise the Blacks. Yet three years later he became notorious for his defense of the disfranchisement constitutions: "Every revised constitution throughout the Southern States has put a premium upon intelligence, ownership of property, thrift

---

Footnote: DuBois, n.1, p.10.
and character," he wrote in a general letter to the press.29

It would be wrong to regard Washington as an all-out accommodating leader. By carefully selected ambiguities in language, by mentioning political and civil rights but seldom and then only in tactful and vague terms, he effectively masked the ultimate implications of his philosophy. He never relinquished the rights of Blacks to full liberty to be realized in all respect as their ultimate goal. Gunnar Myrdal correctly assessed, when he said: "It is a political axiom that Negroes can never, in any period, hope to attain more in the short-term power bargain than the most benevolent groups are prepared to give them."30

C. Vann Woodward, the famous historian of Yale University, argued that it was neither Washington's earth-shaking thought nor his personal influence that placed him in the forefront of his race. It was instead, "...the remarkable congeniality between his doctrines


and the dominant forces of his age and society, forces that would have made themselves felt in any case."31 From Woodward's analysis, the worsened race relations would have continued with or without Washington, the United States in general and the South in particular carved out the complete alienation of the Blacks: America was "a White man's Country."32

To achieve equality of his brethren, Washington said, 
"...the Negro must begin at the bottom and lay a sure foundation, and not be lured by any temptation into trying to rise on a false foundation."33 Washington stressed means rather than ends. He was incurably optimistic in his utterances -- as he said, "we owe it not only to ourselves, but to our children, to look always upon the bright side of life."34 The ambiguities in Washington's philosophy were vital to his success. He skilfully manipulated popular symbols and myths like the gospel of wealth and the doctrines of Social Darwinism


32Ibid., pp.32-49.

33Washington, n.29, p.221.

enhanced his effectiveness. Also associated with Washington's middle-class and Social Darwinist philosophy were the ideas of the value of struggle in achieving success, of self-help, and of "taking advantages of disadvantages." As he put it, "No race of people ever got upon its feet without severe and constant struggle, often in the face of the greatest disappointment."

Emphasizing on the same theme, August Meier says, "...inspite of his placatory tone and his outward emphasis upon economic development as the solution to the race problem, Washington was surreptitiously engaged in undermining the American race system by a direct attack upon disfranchisement and segregation." Meier further says, "he was a powerful politician in his own right. The picture that emerges from Washington's own correspondence is distinctly at variance with the ingratiating mask he presented to the world."

The ambiguities that have been talked about in Washington's philosophy were vital to his success. Blacks who supported him looked to his tactfully worded

---


expressions on ultimate goals, the conservative Southerners were attracted by his seeming acceptance of disenfranchisement and segregation and by his flattery. The Industrialists and Philanthropists appreciated his "petty bourgeois outlook." He expressed a Social Darwinism of competition between individuals and races of uplifting backward races, that was congenial to his age. He conveniently put Negro equality off into a hazy future that did not disturb the "practical" and prejudiced men of his generation.

Washington's practical intuitive mind did not deal in abstract analysis of forces. As a wise creative reformer, he did not merely denounce evil from without, he deliberately set himself to develop in the new generation loyalty to new values. The sum of all Washington's functional achievement was the man himself. To the end of his days he remained "racy to the soil." At times he espoused a high degree of racial solidarity and economic nationalism. On one occasion he declared: "We are a nation within a nation." While Blacks should be the last to draw the colour line, at the same time they should see to it that, "in every wise and
legitimate way our people are taught to patronize racial enterprise."

It is difficult to evaluate as to what extent Washington directly influenced Black thought. The Blacks accepted him partly because of the prestige and power he held among whites, and partly because his views -- except for his conciliatory phraseology -- were dominant in the Black community throughout the South. Basil Mathews, a famous writer on Washington said that he had no doubt about the influence that Washington held during his time while saying:

> It seems certain that no leader since Booker T. Washington has had, or is ever likely to have, the all-embracing authority that he exercised in his prime...in producing and practising a consistent policy.

Harvard-educated, W.E.B. DuBois calls for higher education for the "talented tenth." The N.A.A.C.P. flourished because it concentrated on "uplift and provided with liberal amounts of cash from Northern White gentlemen. DuBois, while criticizing Washington argued:

> While it is a great truth to say that the Negro must strive and strive mightily to help

---

37 Detroit Leader, September 8, 1911, University of Massachusetts, Amherst Library.

himself, it is equally true that unless his striving be not simply seconded, but rather aroused and encouraged by the initiative of the richer and wiser environing group, he cannot hope for great success."

While discussing about the differences between these militants and Washington's conservatives, one would agree with Eugene D. Genovese that these differences concerned emphases, tactics, and public stance much more than ideological fundamentals.

Harold Cruse elevates Booker T. Washington into an ideological fore-runner of the "bourgeois democratic revolution." He even sees Washington as the originator of the concept of Black capitalism. The author in his book, cites books and chapters from the collected works of Marx, Lenin and Stalin and argues the need to recognize the revolutionary character of the "bourgeoisie-democratic" phase of the Black revolution. 'Black Power' is not revolutionary, but a movement of rebellion in practice and ideology and reformist in progress. Hence, the revolution has to be led, especially by the intellectuals. Cruse is fully


41 Ibid., p.233.
convinced that the revolution is necessary for the transformation of the white society. One would agree with Genovese when he says, "...We find the formation of a tradition of recalcitrance, but not revolution, action but not politics, dim awareness of oppression but not cumulative, ideological growth." He further goes on, "What was missing was that sense of group consciousness, collective responsibility and joint political effort which is the essence of a revolutionary tradition."

William Toll, in his book, The Resurgence of Race, addresses the question of attitudes toward minority groups in an emerging industrial economy. The author broadens the familiar contrast between the ideas of Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois. He says that important Black figures as Charles W. Chestnutt, Alexander Crummell, Timothy Thomas Fortune, Archibald Grimke, James Weldon Johnson and William Monroe Trotter, wrestled with the same basic questions about the way blacks were to deal with their role in American Society. Booker T. Washington looked to a future that de-emphasized Blacks -- DuBois saw pride in ethnicity as essential to black progress.

William Toll says Washington treated the black freedmen like underdeveloped peasantry in need of economic rehabilitation. The other point of view expounded by Alexander Crummell, George Washington Williams, and DuBois, emphasized ethnic revitalization. This theory became more dominant in the 1920s. Toll indicates that this change in orientation was made possible by a shift of influence from one elite, to another, from the politicians and educators who were powerful after the civil war to the novelists, sociologists, and propagandists, who achieved influence about the time of World War-I. Toll shows that their concern for improvement of the Black masses was genuine, but he questions their solutions. They stressed a gradual change toward social rehabilitation in the hope that the freedmen could adopt to the modern economy. Toll says, that even Washington began to recognize the need for a resurgence of race. Toll contends that disputes between Washington, DuBois and others boil down to a question of stressing economics of race. His discussions make it appear that Blacks had to choose between two extremes: submergence in a capitalistic society with almost no attention to ethnicity or assertion of ethnicity coupled with an attack on the

exploitative ways of American economic institutions. He claims the debates among Black elites involved a struggle, "to salvage their sanity in a culture predisposed to destroy their identity. Some blacks were not simply seeking "humane integration into white society," he observes: they recognized the need for "a moral alternative to 'White Society.'"\(^4\)

To counter what he called Washington's "accommodationism," DuBois said he was "in conscience bound to ask of this nation three things: 1) The right to vote; 2) Civic equality; 3) The education of youth according to ability."\(^5\) These conflicts were more concerned with certain racial principles involved in such goals as "civil rights," "racial equality," "higher education", "voting rights," "gradualism," "accommodationism," "political power," "back to Africa," "separatism," "integration" etc. etc. These ideologies cannot be understood in their proper contexts unless one at the same time comprehends the basic economic realities and motivations behind them. "Ideologies make men, it is economics that feeds, clothes, and shelters them."\(^6\)

Time has proven that the issues first raised by

\(^4\)Genovese, n. 42, pp. 6-7.

\(^5\)Toll, n. 108, p. 52.

\(^6\)Cruse, n. 40 p. 282.
Washington and DuBois are still very much with us. Neither the "civil rights" of DuBois, nor the "economics" of Washington, has won a full measure of acceptance, and the "education" problem on another level is more a bone of civil contention among the races than ever before.

DuBois and the radicals blamed Washington for not believing in the efficacy of their programme for racial equality in 1900. Although, DuBois had to admit; indirectly, that Booker T. Washington had not been all wrong about civil rights agitation in 1900, BuBois still refused to give Washington his due credit. He declared in 1940: "We must lay on the soul of this man a heavy responsibility for the consummation of Negro disfranchisement...." Which is to imply either that Washington did not care to see Blacks exercising the vote. Thus DuBois believed:

There faces the American Negro therefore an intimate and subtle problem combining into one object two difficult sets of facts: His present racial segregation which will persist for several decades; and his attempt by carefully planned and intelligent action to fit himself into the new economic organization which the world faces.

At the same time, in discussing himself and

\[7\] W.E.B. DuBois, n.45, p.243

\[8\] DuBois, Dusk of Dawn (New York, 1940) p.197.
Booker T. Washington and the conflict of programme that had occurred between them, DuBois admitted: "I was not against Washington's ideas." Reiterating the same theme DuBois further said, "[our] two theories of Negro progress were not absolutely contradictory."

Fundamental to all issues growing out of the original clash between Washington and DuBois is the central fact that has still not been resolved in Black thinking. It is impossible to separate civil rights from the economics of the problem of Black existence in America. And by civil rights and economics we do not simply mean the question of jobs and discrimination in employment. The question goes much deeper. This was brought home to DuBois more profoundly by several years after his conflict with Washington when the Garvey movement came into being. Though Washington minimized the importance of franchise and civil rights, actually, he was deeply involved in politics to prevent discrimination of different forms. In 1903 and 1904 he personally "Spent at least four thousands dollars in cash, out of my own pocket...in advancing the rights of the black man." His political involvement went even

---

49 Ibid. p.196
50 Ibid. p.196
51 Ibid.
deeper. He might say that he disliked the atmosphere at
Washington because it was impossible to build up a race
whose leaders were spending most of their time and
energy in trying to get into or stay in office, but
under Roosevelt he became the arbiter of Black
appointments to federal office, and later claimed that
Washington had approved of his policy of appointing
fewer but better qualified Negroes.

By 1901 Washington was at the height of his fame,
and received the presidential seal of approval when
Theodore Roosevelt invited him to dinner at the White
House. The episode angered Southern Whites, but even
Washington's black critics conceded that it had enhanced
his reputation. Henry M. Turner informed Washington: "You
are about to be the great representative and hero of the
Negro race, notwithstanding you have been very
conservative." Yet although he had the ear of
presidents and philanthropists, Washington was unable to
halt, let alone improve, the deteriorating racial
situation of the Progressive era.

"Ibid.

"Roosevelt to Booker T. Washington, Sept. 14.,
Dec. 12, 1901 the Booket T. Washington papers, University
of Massachusetts library, Amherst.

"Harlan, Booker T. Washington: The Wizard of
In 1896, the Supreme Court's decision in Plessy v. Ferguson appeared to give judicial sanction to the 'Separate but equal' doctrine already endorsed by Washington. Again, while he helped to deliver the black vote to the Republicans in state and national elections, Washington appeared powerless when Theodore Roosevelt, in a blatantly racist act, summarily dismissed three companies of black troops in Brownsville, Texas, after they had resisted a white mob. The Brownsville affair "highlighted Washington's lack of one essential attribute for the leader of an oppressed minority—the capacity for righteous public anger against injustice." Similarly, Taft's policy of removing Southern black office holders indicated the very real limits to Washington's political influence.

Thus, although Washington held to full citizenship rights and integration as his objective, he masked this goal beneath an approach that satisfied influential elements that were either indifferent or hostile to its fulfilment. He was not the first to conceive a constructive, even militant emphasis upon self-help, racial cooperation and economic development with a conciliatory, ingratiating, and accommodating approach to the White South. But his name is the one most

---

55 Ibid. 323.
indissolubly linked with this combination. Washington apparently really believed that in the face of an economic and moral development that assimilated Blacks to American middle-class standards, prejudice would diminish and the barriers of discrimination world crumble. He emphasized duties rather than rights; the Black's faults rather than his grievances; his opportunities rather than his difficulties. He stressed means rather than ends. He was optimistic rather than pessimistic. He stressed economics above politics, industrial above liberal education, self help above dependence on the national government. He taught that rural life was superior to urban life. He professed a deep love for the South and a profound faith in the goodness of the Southern Whites-atleast of the "better class". He appealed more to the self-interest of the whites - their economic and moral good-than to this sense of justice. He skilfully manipulated popular symbols and myths like the gospel of wealth and the doctrines of Social Darwinism. Terms like "Social equality," "Civil relations," "Constitutional rights," "Christian Character," "industrial education." and "justice" were capable of a wide variety of interpretations. The Supreme Court for example, did not appear to think that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments prohibited segregation and the use of various
subterfuges that effected disfranchisement. Washington shrewdly used these ambiguities, and they were an important source both of his popularity and of the acrimonious discussion over his policy that occupied Blacks for many years.

His Differences with Booker T. Washington:

Till recent years, it was a commonly accepted fact that Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois were at logger-heads with each other. There is no doubt that they had differences of opinion and they had put across their ideological skirmishes occasionally. In evaluating these two Black leaders in a historical sense, it is necessary to have an objective assessment of their philosophies. The research conducted into the life and times of these leaders suggests that their ideas were not basically contradictory. They were rather complementary to each other's approaches. DuBois himself wrote:

It was no controversy of my seeking; quite the contrary. I was, in my imagination, a scientist and neither a leader nor an agitator; I had nothing but the greatest admiration for Mr. Washington and Tuskegee..."

At the time when Booker T. Washington delivered his Atlanta Address in 1895, many colored papers condemned the proposition of compromise with the Southern Whitemen. DuBois, wrote to the New York Age that the Southern Blacks could cooperate with the White South if the latter opened the doors of economic opportunity to them.\textsuperscript{57} The Whites, at this time were pressing for disenfranchisement and segregation laws. They agreed with Washington's speech since it suited their investments. The Atlanta Exposition came at a time when the contact between the races was strictly on an employer-employee relationship. The Blacks supported his speech since they hoped for economic betterment and Whites supported the idea, for it would bring their support in the social and political spheres.

The differences between these two leaders related to the respective background that they both had and the character that each of these men possessed. DuBois was born in New England, and entered a world of abolished slavery. In his childhood, he was brought up in the company of Whites. It was only at the age of twenty-six, after his return from Europe to America, that he

experienced heightened racial tensions. Lynching of Blacks was at its peak. Washington's early life was very much unlike that of DuBois.

DuBois had lived for years with Washington and the Tuskegee theory of education. It has been commonly believed that Washington's autobiography made him see the deeper cultural meanings of the Tuskegee message. He openly criticized the author in his July 1901 review of *Up From Slavery*. He saw the main weakness of Washington's leadership to be his opposition to liberal culture. His *Souls of Black Folk*, contained several searchingly critical essays on Washington. He accused him of preaching a, "...gospel of work and money to such an extent as apparently almost completely to overshadow the higher aims of life". DuBois said that Washington's 'Atlanta Address' made him the leader of his people, not by their own choice, but because of the manner in which he was acclaimed by the whites in the North and in the South.

Washington rose from a slave cabin, received an honorary degree from Harvard, and received gala receptions from the Southerners. But, DuBois was, both, a pioneering advocate of Black capitalism, and later one

---

of the country's most prominent Black Marxists. He relied on a boundless faith in humanity, the efficiency of work and thrift, and the virtue of humility. These ideas were basic to DuBois' own thinking. At first DuBois agreed with Washington's gradualist strategy. DuBois did not deny the importance of pacifying the South, but he refused to pay Washington's price which he interpreted as degradation and virtual slavery. Elliott Rudwick remarked:

For DuBois, the black's only effective way to open the doors of opportunity was to adopt tactics of militant protest and agitation; by employing this style of propaganda, he made a key contribution to the evolution of black protest in the twentieth century and to the civil rights movement.

The obvious sense of pride which DuBois had is shown in almost all of his writings. DuBois declared that social justice could not be achieved by flattering the race elements of the whites. What was needed was a clamorous protest against oppression.

Washington's concern, on the other hand, over the growing polarization was based on his fear that a more aggressive policy would alienate white support of Negro

---

institutions and seriously curtail the flow of money and the acceleration of educational and organizational efforts. One of the biographers of Washington pointed out:

It has been said that he did more than any other man to overcome the prejudices against the members of his race, and to establish a neighbourly feeling -- a sort of fellowship between the negroes and the white people in the South.

DuBois asked for three things: the right to vote, civic equality, and the education of youth according to their ability. DuBois did not approve of Washington's apologetic tone for injustice. The struggle between the two could not reach the layman. Since DuBois represented the intellectuals of the day, his voice could not be heard by the common man.

Except for a common dedication to the cause of race advancement, the personalities of the two men differed as widely as their ideas. Washington was a practical realist, and interested in attaining tangible goals. DuBois was a romantic -- he would fight for principles even if his life was endangered. DuBois had a poetic temperament, whereas Washington was simple and prosaic. Washington was first and last an American but DuBois was

first and last a Negro. To DuBois, Washington's faith in man and God was somewhat naïve. DuBois felt unhappy on Washington's strong reliance on the attitude of the Blacks cooperation with the White South. He could not agree that there was a solidarity of interest between the Southern Negro and the Southern White man which made the race problem one to be served from within. The Black man's cooperation and support to the white men, according to DuBois, was too high a price to pay. DuBois felt that the White man was an enemy rather than a friend.

Washington preferred South for his race, while DuBois could see no future in the South. Instead, he contradicted Washington's counsel, and urged the Black people to go to North for freedom and advancement.

Since both were educators, their divergence in regard to educational philosophy became the focal point of their most widely publicized disagreement. DuBois criticized Washington's philosophy of education from the viewpoint of its format and its basic thrust. On the other hand, Washington's views exemplified a pronounced "spiritual orientation". His perspective of education was an outgrowth of his experience of his environment and his personality.
Even those who admired DuBois' intellectual and literary abilities usually endorsed Washington's constructive approach with its emphasis on gradualism and duties and responsibilities. They deplored DuBois' bitter and militant approach. It would be speculative to argue that criticism to Washington's ideology stemmed from mere envy. There is no doubt that Washington dominated the scene completely. It was this denunciation that his opponents resented. They feared the ascendancy of the "Tuskegee Machine", which would provide Washington a power over Negro affairs.