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the numerous Atlanta University researchers

whose sociologically negated accomplishments

contributed to the development of the earliest

and most preeminent urban sociological research

institution in the world-

The Atlanta University Sociological Laboratory
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

[T]here are social problems before us demanding careful study, questions awaiting satisfactory answers. We must study, we must investigate, we must attempt to solve; and the utmost that the world can demand is, not lack of human interest and moral conviction, but rather the heart-quality of fairness, and an earnest desire for the truth despite its possible unpleasantness. (Du Bois [1899] 1967:3)

The discipline of sociology is replete with historical data citing theoretical formulations, methodological advancements, and other significant contributions by some of the founders, advocates, and innovators of the discipline. Men such as Auguste Comte, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Karl Marx are canonized classical sociologists that every student of the discipline is required to study because their scholarship, presumably, exemplifies sociological excellence. Now included within many discussions of influential, yet historically overlooked, sociologists and social scientists are women such as Harriet Martineau, Ida B. Wells, Zora Neale Hurston, and Jane Addams and the women of the Hull-House settlement. The ideas of these women and men represent a vast continuum upon which a variety of sociological concepts, theories, methodologies, and investigations have contributed to the relatively young discipline. Many of the individuals who participated in the construction of sociology through their theoretical and empirical research efforts did not do so in a vacuum. Institutions of higher learning were very instrumental in the development and maturation of sociology. Institutions such as Kansas University, Columbia University, University of Nebraska, University of Michigan, and the
University of Chicago are locations where many American social scientists received institutional support and guidance, and were afforded the intellectual freedom to develop sociology into the area of study that we now recognize. These American institutions, through new advancements in sociological theory and methodology, seemingly, replaced Europe as the central locations of innovative sociological developments in the discipline during the late 1800's and early 1900's. One American university rose above the rest because of the tremendous institutional support that was provided for sociological as well as other types of research that resulted in groundbreaking theoretical formulations and methodological techniques.

In 1892 the University of Chicago established the first named sociology department in the United States. Founded through the philanthropic efforts of John D. Rockefeller, the University of Chicago, from its inception, placed an immense importance upon an extensive and ambitious research agenda. Research, as defined by the University of Chicago Committee on Development (1925), is “the employment of human curiosity for the purpose of enlarging the field of human knowledge in the interest of human progress” (1). To that end, the Committee on Development proclaims:

‘Here is to be found intellectual freedom.’ [The University of Chicago] established as its official motto, and has kept it: ‘Let knowledge grow, that life may be enriched.’

By setting up lofty ideals of scholarship, by recognizing research as one of its primary aims, and by encouraging freedom of investigation as a prime condition of success in research, [The University of Chicago] began on a plane to which many other institution has been slowly ascending. (P. 9)
One beneficiary of the ambitious research agenda of the University of Chicago was the newly formed sociology department. Albion Small was chosen to lead this new department through its formative years. University of Chicago officials thought so highly of Small upon his hiring that they declared, "In Sociology, the name of a man like Professor Albion W. Small, Head of that Department of the University, stands for pioneer work in organizing a subject that belongs to the present generation and has made for a broader view of human society" (39). Despite the lavish praise bestowed upon Small, the sociology program at the University of Chicago did not become the school of American sociology until Robert Park, Ernest Watson Burgess, and the second generation\(^1\) of University of Chicago sociologists entered the department and pioneered extensive urban research investigations. Nevertheless, Lester R. Kurtz (1984) suggests that "Although the notion of Chicago as a laboratory for social research is usually associated with Park and Burgess, [urban sociology] was part of the program much earlier" (60).\(^2\) Kurtz's evidence of an earlier urban research program in the sociology department at the University of Chicago consists, singularly, of a general description of the aims of the sociology graduate program in the 1902 university catalog. If the first generation of Chicago sociologists

---

\(^1\) "The second generation [of University of Chicago sociologists] belonged to the Chicago school of Robert Park and Ernest Burgess which endured through the 1920's and into the 1930's" (Smith 1988, p. 3). First generation University of Chicago sociologists consists of those engaged in sociological activity, and affiliated with the university, during the early years of the program. Thus, Albion W. Small, Charles R. Henderson, George E. Vincent, William I. Thomas, as well as, Edward Bemis, Ira Woods Howerton, George H. Mead, Graham Taylor, and Charles Zueblin are included as first generation University of Chicago sociologists.

\(^2\) Examinations of the American Journal of Sociology, the leading journal of American sociology during this period, indicate that first generation University of Chicago sociologists engaged in urban sociological research projects. However, from 1895-1915 first generation University of Chicago sociologists published less than ten articles in the American Journal of Sociology and authored no books focusing on urban sociological issues.
initiated an institutional urban sociology research agenda as Kurtz suggests, why, then, does he not list any of their studies among the twenty-one “most important treatments of urban research at Chicago” (61)? Kurtz’s avowal could only be strengthened by including at least one example of an early urban research study initiated by a first generation University of Chicago scholar in his list of twenty-one. Kurtz’s exclusion of urban research studies conducted by first generation University of Chicago sociologists makes his argument tenuous at best. Although first generation University of Chicago sociologists are noticeably absent from Kurtz’s list, the second generation of University of Chicago sociologists are well represented.

The second generation of University of Chicago sociologists are generally credited for advancing urban research to such a level that the label, “Chicago School of Sociology,” has become an applicable moniker. Kurtz (1984) asserts that “the general outlines of urban research in sociology were first developed by Park and Burgess and their students” (60). Relatedly, Martin Bulmer (1984) alleges that “the Chicago school represented the first successful American program of collective sociological research” (xv). Bulmer, lauding the urban sociological accomplishments of the University of Chicago, further proposes that “what characterized above all the achievement[s] of the Chicago school of sociology was the ability to bring theory and research together in a fruitful way” (xv). When viewed in this manner, the contributions of the second generation of University of Chicago sociologists are, supposedly, some of the earliest and, perhaps, most important to the discipline of sociology—particularly, in the area of urban sociological research. Accordingly, there has been a plethora of historical research
conducted on the urban sociological accomplishments of the Chicago School of Sociology (i.e., Farris 1967; Matthews 1977; Bulmer 1984 and 1985; Smith 1988). After reviewing the urban sociological accomplishments of University of Chicago sociologists, one question remains to be answered and that is "Were any other American scholars engaged in urban research who could warrant the academic adulation bestowed upon the second generation of Chicago sociologists?" The answer to this question may be found in the historical records of one of the oldest sociological laboratories established in the United States-Atlanta University.

Although recognized as one of the first sociology departments established in the United States, the contributions of Atlanta University sociologists and social scientists are, mostly, omitted from classical and contemporary discussions concerning prominent and early scholars who contributed to the discipline of sociology during its formative years in America. This exclusion is astonishing given that Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, one of the preeminent sociologists in the history of the discipline, was the chairperson of the sociology department from 1897-1910 and Atlanta University housed one of the first programs of collective sociological research in the world-the Atlanta University Conference on Negro Problems. Between 1896 and 1924 Atlanta University regularly conducted extensive urban research investigations focusing on the condition of the formerly enslaved African American population of the United States. However, if one were to examine the existing literature, strictly seeking information pertaining to the

---

2 Lester R. Kurtz's *Evaluating Chicago Sociology: A Guide to the Literature, with an Annotated Bibliography* is an invaluable resource that contains a greater listing of the urban research investigations initiated by Chicago sociologists than listed here.
sociological accomplishments of Atlanta University sociologists, they will find a paucity of data. The omission of Atlanta University sociology from extensive investigation and analysis is even more fascinating when one takes into account that some supporters of the Chicago School of Sociology suggest those scholars to have been the first group of academic researchers to systematically and scientifically investigate urban social conditions with theoretical implications (Bulmer 1985). An exhaustive reading of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, a series of published sociological research investigations conducted between 1896-1917, suggests that, possibly, some achievements credited to University of Chicago sociologists (specifically, the creation of America’s first school of sociology) were actually institutionalized at Atlanta University some twenty years earlier.

Early American sociology is generally viewed through the institutional accomplishments of the Chicago School, now including Jane Addams and the women of the Hull-House settlement, Columbia University, and other predominately white universities. This study is, quite simply, an investigation into the sociological negation of a group of scholars whose contributions to the development of American urban sociology have, largely, gone unnoticed and unappreciated by past and present sociologists. The findings presented in this exposition may contradict and/or debunk commonly held assumptions concerning the origin, methodologies, and theoretical assumptions of urban-based research in the United States. Therefore, this investigation should be viewed as an attempt at uncovering the accomplishments of a group of scholars who have been, heretofore, sociologically negated while adding to the historical sociology literature by
documenting the accomplishments of a small, yet influential, African American institution of higher learning- Atlanta University.

The objectives of this investigation are to uncover some of the sociological accomplishments of Atlanta University scholars and ascertain if Atlanta University housed one of the earliest American schools of sociology. Additionally, explanations for Atlanta University’s negation by many past and contemporary sociologists are explored. These objectives are important because the findings may compel sociologists to redistribute credit concerning various urban sociological discoveries that could result in canonical status for the, seemingly, forgotten Atlanta University researchers.

The outline for this investigation is as follows. Chapter two examines the existing literature concerning the sociological accomplishments of Atlanta University. Chapter three reveals the methods of investigation used for this study. Chapter four details the founding of Atlanta University, the sociology department, and the origin and original plan of the Atlanta University Conferences on Negro Problems. Chapter five contains a detailed examination of every Atlanta University Conference Publication released between 1896-1917. Chapter six contains an application of Martin Bulmer’s model of a school to Atlanta University. Last, chapter seven offers a sociology of knowledge theoretical perspective to answer the question, “How can the sociological negation of the scholarship of Atlanta University sociologists be explained?”
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The existing literature concerning the sociological contributions of Atlanta University is extremely limited (see Atlanta University and W. E. B. Du Bois bibliography). The continuum upon which the existing literature acknowledges Atlanta University research investigations extends from a basic recognition of some sort of research taking place at the university, to general descriptions of certain Atlanta University Conference Publications, to basic summaries of entire series of Atlanta University Conference Studies, and culminates with examinations of the specific contributions of Atlanta University scholars. This research investigation departs from the existing literature through its presentation of the specific methods of research and theories offered for each Atlanta University Conference Publication, 1896-1917.

As indicated above, the continuum upon which Atlanta University scholarship is cited in the literature begins with a basic acknowledgment that research of some sort was

---

1 A wealth of articles acknowledge, but do not sociologically analyze, the Atlanta University Conference Publications. Eight categories have been created to identify the extent to which Atlanta University scholarship is acknowledged. It must be stated that the categories are not arranged in such a manner to prevent some works from being categorized differently. Nevertheless, the common theme in these works is that they mention Atlanta University, but do not investigate the contributions of the Atlanta University sociology department. The first category consists of works that analyze the sociological/social scientific contributions of Atlanta University. The second category concerns works pertaining to W. E. B. Du Bois and his professional relationships with various women scholars/activists. The third category consists of articles that investigate Du Bois' sociological contributions and his exclusion from canonized sociological status. The fourth category deals with Du Bois' intellectual sparrings with Booker T. Washington. The fifth category contains analyses of Du Bois' contributions to various academic disciplines (i.e., Anthropology, Criminal Justice, Economics, English, History, Philosophy, etc.). The sixth category consists of writings concerning Du Bois' communist and Pan Africanist ideology. The seventh category is replete with biographies of Du Bois at various periods in his life. Lastly, the eighth category consists of various works focusing on Du Bois' many theories and concepts (i.e., double consciousness, talented tenth, educational philosophy, etc.).
initiated by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois at the small African American institution. For example, Charles Lemert (1994), in an article discussing the sociological negation of Dr. Du Bois' scholarship, asserts that "he began his first, and longer, tour of duty as a teacher of sociology at Atlanta University during which he conducted the annual Atlanta Conferences (1897-1914) on the sociology of Negro life in America" (385). Relatedly, Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver (1976) proceed toward the opposite end of the continuum by commenting that "[Du Bois'] Atlanta University Studies initiated the technique of measuring social change through continuous resurveys of particular social phenomena; they remain classic statements about conditions for blacks at the turn of the century" (309). Werner J. Lange (1983) further extends the continuum by incorporating Atlanta University Conference Publication data into his argument that W. E. B. Du Bois was the first scholar to scientifically study Afro-Americans. Lange's inclusion of Atlanta University data centers around the fact that:

Du Bois was appointed professor of economics and history at Atlanta University as well as director of the Sociological Laboratory and the Atlanta University Conferences in 1897. Two reports ('Morality Among Negroes in Cities' and 'Social and Physical Conditions of Negroes in Cities,' published in 1896 and 1897, respectively) had appeared prior to his arrival and a few were published after he relinquished his editorship in 1914. Every other number (no.3-no.18) carried the indelible mark of Du Bois. One characteristic feature of that mark, particularly after he wished 'to bring the whole subject matter into a better integrated whole,' was information on Africa. Accordingly, he devoted seven pages of his 1907 report (Economic Cooperation Among Negroes) to 'traces in Africa,' quoting liberally from the works of Ratzel, Schneider, Buechner and Hayford; the same report also contained a section, albeit less detailed than the African one, on the West Indies. (P. 144-145)
These examples are representative of a larger body of literature that simply cites the existence of social science research at Atlanta University. When viewed in this manner, Atlanta University research, although recognized in the literature, is marginalized and, the author suggests, mentioned only as an addendum because of its connection with Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois.

Scholars such as David Levering Lewis and Herbert Aptheker extend the Atlanta University Conference Publications continuum beyond the mere acknowledgment of the existence of research activity. Essentially, they provide summaries of some of the Atlanta University Conference Publications. Levering (1993), referring to the Atlanta University Conference studies in his biography of W. E. B. Du Bois, states that:

Du Bois’ 1902 ‘Negro Artisan’ study was one of his best in terms of methodology. From responses to comprehensive questionnaires sent to 1,300 skilled laborers in the South, he developed a wide-angle socio-economic photograph of labor and race relations at the turn of the century. There were comparative data gathered by collaborating African-American college graduates from thirty-two states, Canada, and Costa Rica, as well as analogous material from a large survey of black labor conducted earlier by the Chattanooga Times, a white newspaper. Wages, working conditions, skill levels, the extent of displacement by white people and the superannuation of certain crafts, and workplace race relations were tabulated and examined with the interspersed testimonials of the artisans themselves. Figures from organized labor revealed whole-sale exclusion of African Americans. Among 1.2 million union members nationally, Du Bois counted less than 40,000 nonwhites. Most were found among the organized workers in the Alabama, West Virginia, and Virginia coal mines, the New Orleans dock workers, and in the Louisiana timber camps. (P. 221-222)

Comparatively, Herbert Aptheker (1973), in an annotated bibliography of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, analyzes, and summarizes the same study.
The study itself commences on page 8; here, again, the scope and method of inquiry are laid out. A schedule of questions concerning biographical data, trade, trade-union connection, wages, relations to whites, education, etc., were answered by 1,300 'Negro skilled workers' mostly in Georgia. In addition, a schedule of questions was placed in the hands of numerous Afro-American college graduates and they sent in returns from 32 states and from Canada, Costa Rica, and Puerto Rico. Questions especially relevant to trade-union practices and status were sent to every trade union affiliated with the AFL and many others. Ninety-seven replied; 11 refused replies. Somewhat similar questions were sent to central labor bodies in every city and town in the nation; 200 representing 30 states replied. (P. 528-529)

The investigations cited here are insightful in that they identify some of the methods and some of the findings of the specific Atlanta University Conference investigation. Unlike this inquiry, they do not identify all of the specific methodological techniques or theoretical propositions offered for each Atlanta University Conference Publication.

The examples cited above demonstrate how the Atlanta University Conference Publications continuum extends from the simple recognition of Atlanta University research to more detailed presentations of the basic methods and findings of the conferences. To date, only Elliott Rudwick and Shaun L. Gabbidon, by placing the sociological/social scientific investigations of Atlanta University at the center of their research inquiries, have extended the continuum to its farthest end.

In "W. E. B. Du Bois and the Atlanta University Studies on the Negro," Elliott Rudwick (1957) reviews the Atlanta University Conference Publications and concludes that, "The Atlanta Studies were of uneven quality in planning, structure, methods, and content; and in order to demonstrate this disparity, one set of monographs which were poorly done will be contrasted with another group which, in the present writer's
judgement, represents sounder research" (468). Rudwick selected Some Efforts of Negroes for Their Own Social Betterment (1898 and 1909) and Economic Cooperation Among Negro Americans (1907) to represent poor examples of research conducted by Atlanta University investigators. The Negro Artisan (1902 and 1912) embody monographs that, according to Rudwick, possess quality structure, sound methodology, and outstanding content. Rudwick's critique of both sets of monographs is outlined below.

In his critique of the 1898 publication, Some Efforts of Negroes for Their Own Social Advancement, Rudwick identifies five structural, methodological, and theoretical issues that make this monograph problematic. First, Rudwick suggests that the sampling procedure utilized by Atlanta University researchers was questionable. Rudwick (1957) states that "[Du Bois] was not seriously troubled by the problem of sampling procedures, either in the selection of his type of cities or in the data to be located within them" (469). Secondly, although Rudwick applauds the inclusion of educated Atlanta community researchers, he criticizes Du Bois because "he gave very few instructions, beyond telling them to submit limited descriptions of some of the benevolent organizations within their own communities" (469). Thirdly, "[Du Bois] provided no method for checking the reliability or validity of the material sent to him" (469). This issue is of particular concern to Rudwick since Dr. Du Bois' early Atlanta University Conference studies often relied upon researchers to research themselves and their communities. Fourthly, "One also finds an absence of controls in reporting the smaller benevolent societies, and after reading one superficial list after another, there is a tendency to ask, so what?" (470). Lastly, each
Atlanta University Conference Publication ends with a set of resolutions designed to actively address the findings presented at each year’s meeting. Rudwick insists that the “resolutions do not seem to have grown out of the inductive material presented, and most of them are only exhortations which do not suggest any specific techniques to accomplish the ends sought” (470). Rudwick’s overall analysis of the 1898 study is summarized by his assertion that “Du Bois succeeded in amassing an encyclopedic array of facts (often with little connection to each other)” (470). The 1907 Atlanta University Conference Publication receives a similar critique from Rudwick.

Rudwick identifies three deficiencies in the 1907 Atlanta University Conference Publication- *Economic Cooperation Among Negro Americans*. First, Rudwick is critical of this monograph because Dr. Du Bois did not utilize, comparatively, data collected in the 1898 study. Since *Some Efforts of Negroes for Their Own Social Advancement* and *Economic Cooperation Among Negro Americans* both addressed economic issues and its effect on the “Negro” population, Rudwick argues that the 1907 study would have been strengthened by including previously collected data and utilizing it comparatively. Secondly, and relatedly, the 1898 investigation furnished data concerning a specific business, the Coleman Manufacturing Company, such as the working conditions faced by its African American owner and employees. When Atlanta University researchers returned to conduct their 1907 study nine years later, they discovered that “the founder died, and a white company bought the mill and is running it with white help. Here [is] an excellent opportunity for a case study of the failure of race enterprise” (470). Rudwick suggests that a case study, which included data collected during the years in which there was an
African American mill owner and the years immediately after the white mill owner took over, would have greatly strengthened Du Bois' project. Lastly, Rudwick, as in his analysis of the previous monograph, suggests that the resolutions of the 1907 study were "not developed out of the data presented in the monograph" (470).

The 1909 monograph, Some Efforts of Negroes for Their Own Social Betterment, receives only one major critique from Rudwick. Rudwick asserts that the 1909 study would have been more informative and persuasive had Dr. Du Bois, once again, incorporated previously collected data into his investigation. The common thread connecting the three poorly investigated monographs chosen by Rudwick is that they all highlight the economic condition of African Americans. Thus, as Rudwick asserts, "the later monographs would have contributed more to science if Du Bois had developed the data which he introduced in the earlier stud[i]es on the same subjects" (471). Although Rudwick reveals structural, methodological, and theoretical problems in the three monographs discussed, he believes the 1902 and 1912 volumes of The Negro Artisan "signif[y] a more thorough and ordered contribution to our knowledge of the Negro" (471).

The 1902 monograph receives a favorable critique from Rudwick for three reasons. First, unlike other Du Bois studies, this monograph is methodologically sound because "part of the material could be checked by 'third parties'" (471). For example, information collected from workers "was validated by making inquiries of their fellow workers and their employers" (471). Thus, the need for validity was met via the collection of data from a variety of subjects concerning the same research question. Secondly, the
author approves of this study because "The 1902 research was based upon many resources" (471). The utilization of various sources of information, or triangulation (Denzin 1970), greatly strengthened, according to Rudwick, this study. Lastly, Du Bois used his data comparatively to ascertain similarities and differences that existed between Black and White artisans. The utilization of comparison data between Whites and Blacks, according to Rudwick, extended this investigation beyond the realm of mere speculation and the careless usage of partial data.

Rudwick also finds the 1912 monograph to be a more sound investigation than other Atlanta University Conference studies. His conclusion is based on three factors. First, Rudwick suggests that this study is more scientific than other Atlanta University Conference studies because Dr. Du Bois sent the same questionnaire to many of the same groups participating in the project. Thus, researchers were able to gather data that could be used comparatively. Secondly, Rudwick suggests that a strength of this monograph lies in its utilization of census data that enables researchers to compare statistical data during the periods in which the first and second Negro Artisan monographs were conducted. The third strength of this study was the ability of researchers to make generalizations through the utilization of census data for comparative purposes. Although Rudwick finds this particular set of monographs to be more scientifically sound than the others investigated, he does not consider the impact of the Atlanta University Conference studies on the scientific sociological community to be significant.

Rudwick alleges that the Atlanta University Conference Publications are not significant for a variety reasons. While identifying the weaknesses of both the Atlanta
University Conference studies and its primary researcher, W. E. B. Du Bois, Rudwick first suggests that “[Du Bois’] method of case-counting was naive and influenced by his acquaintance with the work of social reformers and social workers” (473). This assertion implies that Du Bois and his fellow researchers were simply engaging in the collection of numbers without any serious scientific analysis. Relatedly, he asserts that Du Bois relied upon his colleagues for academic inspiration. Secondly, Rudwick found the Atlanta University Conference studies to be “lacking in systematic theory” (473). Thirdly, Rudwick suggests that “the Atlanta Studies served as a framework for the dissemination of [Du Bois’] propaganda on leadership” (474). It is for these reasons that Rudwick sarcastically alleges that “the Atlanta Studies may not have improved the conditions of the race very much, but they probably did improve its morale” (475).

A strength of Rudwick’s analysis of the Atlanta University Conference studies is that, unlike many before or since his time, he selected the social scientific/sociological scholarship of Atlanta University as his topic of research. Nevertheless, Rudwick’s study contains a serious flaw in the way that the term scientific is constructed. This author suggests that Rudwick attempts to place a 1950’s intellectual perspective upon a collection of scholarship more than fifty years older than his historical analysis of the research investigation. Relatedly, Francis L. Broderick (1959), commenting on contemporary critiques of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois’ scholarship, states that “A later generation has doubts about [Du Bois’] methodology, for styles in scholarship change, and men see their grandfathers’ ways as quaintly primitive” (42). Such a proposition as Rudwick’s lends itself to a, possibly, subjective critique of the methodology and data analysis utilized by
Atlanta University and Dr. Du Bois. Had Rudwick operationalized the term scientific and then expanded his investigation to include comparable scientific contributions of other sociologists at the time, then this specific critique of his analysis would be invalid.

In "W. E. B. Du Bois and the ‘Atlanta School’ of Social Scientific Research, 1897-1913," Shaun L. Gabbidon (1999) applies Martin Bulmer’s (1985) nine characteristics of a school to Atlanta University. According to Bulmer’s model, nine features must be in place in order for a “school” to exist.

- First, there must be a central figure around whom the department is organized.
- Secondly, a “school” must exist in a university setting and have direct contact with a student population.
- Thirdly, there must be interaction between those who work at the university and the general community in which the university is located.
- Fourthly, a “school” must have, as its key figure, someone with a dominating personality.
- Fifthly, the leader of a “school” must possess an intellectual vision and have a missionary drive.
- Sixthly, there must be intellectual exchanges between colleagues and graduate students and the school must have an outlet for the publication of scholarship written by members of the “school.”
- Seventh, a “school” must have an adequate infrastructure (e.g., advances in research methods, institutional links, and philanthropic support).
- Eighth, a “school” cannot last beyond the generation of its central figure.
Ninth, a “school” must be open to ideas and influences beyond its home discipline.

Bulmer suggests that the Chicago School of Sociology, circa 1915-1930, meets these criteria and, thus, comprised the first school of sociology in the United States.

Gabbidon argues that Atlanta University meets all of Bulmer’s requirements except the sixth and seventh criterion. Gabbidon (1999) begins by suggesting that “[Du Bois] never stated any theoretical perspective that he tested later” (31). This critique of Dr. Du Bois’ scholarship is problematic because it assumes that a theorist must test their ideas before they can become scientifically accepted and/or relevant. This narrow view of intellectual creativity prohibits the testing of theoretical constructions by anyone other than the theorist. Gabbidon’s limited critique can be viewed as a form of academic gatekeeping. Additionally, Gabbidon states that “we seldom find any discussion of other prominent figures who may have collaborated with Du Bois during his first tenure at Atlanta University” (31). This assertion is also problematic because of the ambiguity of the term collaboration. If Gabbidon operationalizes collaboration as the teaming of individuals for the express purpose of producing coauthored publishable scholarship, then his assertion is correct. However, if collaboration is expanded to include Dr. Du Bois’ personal conversations and correspondences with prominent figures such as Franz Boaz, Jane Addams, Max Weber, William James, Booker T. Washington other leading scholars at various prestigious universities and colleges throughout the United States and the world, as well as collaborative research projects with Atlanta University students, then Gabbidon’s assertion is incorrect (Du Bois 1968).
Gabbidon also suggests that Atlanta University, under the guidance of Dr. Du Bois does not meet one of the components for Bulmer's seventh criteria- strong outside philanthropic support. The author suggests that the publication of twenty volumes of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, without the philanthropic support enjoyed by institutions such as the University of Chicago, indicate the strength and determination of, not only the leader of the Atlanta University Conference studies, but its administrators, faculty, students, and supporters. Elliott Rudwick (1974) similarly argues that:

Since Atlanta University was a struggling and impoverished institution that could not afford to support Du Bois' research adequately for one year-much less for a decade or century-it is a tribute to his determination that he actually supervised the preparation of sixteen Atlanta University sociological monographs between 1897 and 1914. (P. 42)

Hence, instead of concentrating on the lack of funding, or philanthropic support, that led to the demise of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, a new focus should be directed toward the tremendous accomplishments that took place at Atlanta University despite the myriad obstacles faced by the individuals engaged in such an undertaking at that particular period in American history. Relatedly, according to another criteria, a school only lasts during the reign of its central leader. If this is so, then, during Du Bois' tenure at Atlanta University he obtained enough philanthropic support to publish the reports of his annual investigations. Additionally, Atlanta University meets the requirements for another component of Bulmer's seventh criterion-possessing an outlet for the publication of scholarship written by members of the school, through the Atlanta University Conference Publications (Adams 1930).
The strength of Gabbidon's study is that he, similar to Rudwick, places the social scientific/sociological scholarship of Atlanta University at the center of his research investigation and challenges that Atlanta University, during the period 1897-1913, qualifies as a school. Unfortunately, Gabbidon analyzes the data from a criminology/criminal justice perspective and does not fully address sociological issues. The author suggests that a sociological analysis of the data could possibly lead to alternative conclusions. For example, Gabbidon argues that "Du Bois, as stated earlier, never developed any rigorous theory for future testing. Rudwick, after reviewing his Atlanta Studies, commented that [Du Bois' Atlanta University studies] were lacking in systematic theory" (34). The author suggests that the ambiguous and, possibly, discipline specific definition of a term can sometimes negate an otherwise compelling critique. If one defines a theory as a set of interrelated statements that attempt to explain, predict, and/or understand social events, and that can be replicated and generalizable, then the resolutions offered in the conclusion of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, after being tested by interested social scientists, qualify as systematic theoretical constructions. This perspective discredits Gabbidon's argument.

The literature examined for this investigation indicates the existence of a continuum that, on one end, acknowledges Atlanta University research, provides basic information pertaining to the methods and findings in the middle, analyzes certain monographs to ascertain their methodological strengths and weaknesses, and provides in-depth critiques of specific Atlanta University Conference investigations on the farthest end. The present investigation differs from the existing literature in that it provides a
detailed analysis of the methodology and theoretical propositions offered in each Atlanta University Conference Publication while challenging the foundation upon which the, supposed, origin of urban sociological research rests. Each of these issues are addressed below.

As indicated above, many investigations focusing on Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois simply provide a cursory review the Atlanta University Conference Publications. Hence, the Atlanta University Conference Publications are sometimes summarized or specific monographs selected for critique. The Atlanta University Conference Publications have seldom been analyzed for the express purpose of ascertaining their sociological significance. Such little attention to the accomplishments of this early sociological laboratory has led some scholars to suggest that the research activities initiated at Atlanta University cannot be viewed as groundbreaking because the methods of investigation were not scientific. This critique the Atlanta University Conference studies is always presented without any clear-cut definition of the term scientific. To identify the simplicity of this task, scientific is operationalized here as being in accordance with the systematic and exact principles and methods of science (Neufeldt 1996). No critiques of Dr. Du Bois’ works have offered even this most elementary definition of the term. A detailed presentation of the systematic methods of research used in the Atlanta University Conference studies, presented in Chapter V, could provide indisputable evidence of the existence, or nonexistence, of scientific, even by the most elementary definition, research efforts conducted by Atlanta University investigators.
This investigation also departs from the existing literature through its examination of the theoretical propositions offered in almost every Atlanta University Conference Publication. To date, critics of the Atlanta University Conference studies insist that the investigations lacked theoretical implications. This allegation becomes tenuous when one discovers that a list of resolutions are offered by the Executive Board² of the conference in almost every Atlanta University Conference Publication. The resolutions suggest ways in which the social condition of African Americans can be improved in light of the data collected. Although this point will be explicated later and has been addressed earlier, it must be again stated that, similar to the subjective use of the term scientific, critics of the Atlanta University Conference Publications fail to define what is meant by the term theory. Once again, if a theory is defined as a group of interrelated statements that attempt to explain, describe, and/or predict social facts, and is generalizable and replicable, then the resolutions offered in the Atlanta University Publications certainly qualify. However, critics of the Atlanta University Conference Publications always fail to operationalize the term theory. Thus, the urban sociological research activities initiated at Atlanta University are sociologically negated while the exploits of institutions such as the University of Chicago are overzealously lauded.

Last, this investigation departs from the existing literature in that it challenges the assertion that the University of Chicago housed the first American school of sociology. Data presented in this study will reveal that Atlanta University scholars engaged in

---

² The Executive Board included the Atlanta University President, Director of the Conference, various university trustees, and prominent citizens.
systematic sociological inquiry that produced methodologically sound investigations with theoretical propositions a full twenty years before the Chicago School was awarded credit for similar achievements. Hence, this investigation should be viewed as an initial step toward a major paradigm shift away from the almost exclusive citation of University of Chicago scholars as the "fathers," "mothers," and "explicators" of urban sociological research advancements. From this point on, urban sociological scholars shall be impelled to acknowledge that Atlanta University researchers are also true ground breakers in this specific area of scientific inquiry.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

The primary method of research in this investigation is historical data analysis. Specifically, the historical data examined in this study are the Atlanta University Conference Publications, the American Journal of Sociology, publications by first generation faculty members of the Sociology Department at the University Chicago, and The Papers of W. E. B. Du Bois.

Atlanta University Conference Publications, 1896-1917

Analysis of the Atlanta University Conference Publications is the primary method of amassing data assessing the contributions of Atlanta University sociologists. The Atlanta University Conference Publications are the product of yearly Atlanta University Conferences on Negro Problems that were held from 1896-1924 and again in 1941, 1943, and 1944. The goal of these conferences was to examine the specific social and physical conditions affecting urban African Americans and offer resolutions (theories) to, possibly, ameliorate the conclusions drawn in these yearly research projects. An analysis of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, between the years 1896-1917, was selected to identify specific research methods, theoretical propositions, and data upon which the theoretical propositions were derived. Additional data, such as prominent figures who participated in the conferences and organizations and institutions who requested Atlanta University Conference Publication data are also recorded. The 1896 Atlanta University Conference Publication is the first monograph examined because it represents the first year of the annual conference. The final Atlanta University Conference Publication, 1917,
represents the final printed publication of the first phase of the Atlanta University Conferences. An objective of this investigation is to ascertain the extent to which Atlanta University sociologists contributed to the development of urban sociology as compared to University of Chicago scholars, who are generally credited with initiating and legitimating urban sociological research. The Atlanta University Conference Publications, 1896-1917, provide the necessary data to assess the contributions of Atlanta University sociologists. The method by which comparative data were garnered for University of Chicago sociologists is discussed below.

*American Journal of Sociology*

The *American Journal of Sociology* was established in 1895 at the University of Chicago. Since the *American Journal of Sociology* was established at the University of Chicago and is the first American sociological journal, it should have functioned as one of the primary outlets for the dissemination of sociological research and scientific knowledge for sociologists in general, and University of Chicago sociologists specifically. Consequently, this journal is examined to identify specific urban research investigations conducted by University of Chicago sociologists before they became known as the "Chicago School." The existing literature concerning urban sociology suggests that the Chicago School of Sociology, circa 1915-1930, is responsible for developing urban sociological inquiry into the specialized area of study that it is today. However, a pertinent question is how can the Chicago School of Sociology be credited for initiating urban research when Atlanta University scholars spearheaded similar projects some twenty years earlier? It is this dilemma that necessitates an examination of the *American Journal*
of Sociology and other publications of first generation University of Chicago sociologists. The author examined research studies published by first generation University of Chicago sociologists to ascertain the methodology and theoretical propositions offered by faculty members who may or may not have engaged in urban sociological investigations. The examination of the exact nature of urban research conducted by University of Chicago scholars is, then, compared to the works of Atlanta University scholars of the same period. The comparison of Chicago and Atlanta investigations will provide a clear and concise body of data identifying the specific urban sociological investigations initiated at each institution.

**Historical Data Research**

Historical data research, aimed at analyzing all scholarly books and articles published by first generation members of the Sociology Department at the University of Chicago during the period 1892-1917, is employed in this investigation. These data are utilized to identify specific urban research projects conducted by University of Chicago sociologists that may not be discovered by examining the *American Journal of Sociology*. Additionally, the collection of these data help place the urban sociological scholarship of the first generation of University of Chicago sociologists into a historical context.

**Papers of W. E. B. Du Bois**

The Papers of W. E. B. Du Bois are another data source utilized in this research investigation. The Papers of W. E. B. Du Bois is a collection of correspondences, speeches, published and unpublished articles, memorabilia, poetry, and miscellaneous materials that cover the lifetime of one of the preeminent social scientists in American
history. This data source is utilized primarily to identify unpublished sociological manuscripts written by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and correspondences that Du Bois may have had with other sociologists and scholars during his tenure at Atlanta University. Du Bois' correspondences with other sociologists and scholars is important because they may suggest that his scholarship and the annual conferences held at Atlanta University were known throughout the discipline of sociology and the academic world. If this is true, then identifying some of the individuals who attended the meetings and institutions that utilized data collected for the Atlanta University Conferences would provide ample evidence that the academic community was aware of the research being conducted at Atlanta University. The question then becomes, if a critical mass of informed and notable scholars were aware of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, why has Atlanta University not received its deserved recognition from classic and contemporary scholars? The Papers of W. E. B Du Bois are located at various universities throughout the United States. Historical data research for this investigation was conducted at the University of Memphis. The University of Memphis is the location of a microfilm collection of The Papers of W. E. B. Du Bois.
CHAPTER IV

"I WILL FIND A WAY OR MAKE ONE"

Between 1555 and 1863 the United States of America supported and promoted one of the most abominable degradations of human life the world has ever witnessed—the peculiar institution of slavery. For over two-hundred years many of the states comprising this nation were governed by laws prohibiting the promotion of education among its second class citizens. With a stroke of Abraham Lincoln’s pen the legalized illiteracy that had been allowed to function as a form of social control over the enslaved Africans during slavery was brought to an end. The abolition of slavery was both a blessing and curse for the millions of freedmen and women. The blessing was found in the freedom that finally enabled Africans in America to decide for themselves how best to live their lives and for whom they could sell their services. The freedmen were cursed because, although they were physically free, men like Frederick Douglass astutely recognized that the newly freed Africans were now “free to die.” Douglass asserted that this populous of people, newly delivered to the promised land from the fell clutches of their American Pharaoh, were free to die because the institution of slavery had not properly prepared them for the responsibilities of freedom (Martin 1984). Indeed, Africans were free, but they did not possess the proper life skills, specifically an adequate education, to procure the basic necessities of life—decent food, clothing, shelter, and the intellectual acuity necessary to obtain employment in the supposed land of equality. Many philanthropic organizations, including some supported by the United States government, initiated educational crusades
designed to properly educate Blacks so that they could take advantage of the rewards available to an educated cadre (Du Bois 1900).

Institutions of higher learning were erected for African Americans before the Civil War and were reflective of the Abolitionists’ efforts to provide free Blacks with the basic skills needed to survive and thrive in the American society. The three schools erected during this period were Lincoln University (PA) in 1854, Berea College (KY) in 1855, and Wilberforce University (OH) in 1856. After the Civil War, schools were “established . . . by Missionary and Freedmen’s Aid Societies under the protection and for the most part under the patronage of the Freedmen’s Bureau” (Du Bois 1900:6). Some of the schools established by these organizations were Roger Williams University (TN) in 1864, Southland College (AR) in 1864, Fisk University (TN) in 1866, Lincoln Institute (MO) in 1866, Howard University (Washington, D.C.) in 1867, and Atlanta Baptist College (GA) in 1867. Atlanta University was “established by the American Missionary Association aided by the Freedmen’s Bureau” in 1867 (6). The Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Atlanta University (1897) states that the founding of Atlanta University:

Dates back to the days immediately succeeding the Civil War, when farsighted missionary teachers and officers of the Freedmen’s Bureau saw the necessity of founding an institution in which opportunities for higher instruction should be afforded to colored youth, and which should be able to furnish teachers and other educated leaders to the newly emancipated race. A charter was procured in 1867, establishing the University as a corporate body for the Christian education of youth, and made broad enough to cover all possible requirements of an institution of the broadest scope and most permanent character. By money procured from the Freedmen’s Bureau and other sources, a noble site of about fifty acres of high ground in the western part of the city of Atlanta was purchased, and in 1869 the first building was
opened and at once crowded with students. (P. 43)

When Atlanta University officially opened in 1869, it became "the first educational institution of higher learning in Georgia to open its doors to all people, regardless of race, color, or creed" (24). The university's insistence upon an all-inclusive university community quickly affected the revenues extended from the Georgia state government to the all-Black school. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois (1968) reflects on Atlanta University's all inclusive philosophy and the repercussions that followed.

The University from the beginning had taken a strong and unbending attitude toward Negro prejudice and discrimination; white teachers and black students ate together in the same dining room and lived in the same dormitories. The charter of the institution opened the doors of Atlanta University to any student who applied, of any race or color, and when the State in 1887 objected to the presence of a few white students who were all children of teachers and professors, the institution gave up the small appropriation from the State rather than repudiate its principles. In fact, this appropriation represented not State funds, but the Negroes' share of the sum received from the Federal government for education. (P. 222-223)

Atlanta University administrators, aware of the tremendous need for educational facilities and teachers in the African American community, and firm in their philosophy of integration, chose to decline all funding offered from the state of Georgia instead of bowing to the racial pressure applied by state politicians. In so doing, university administrators placed themselves and their students in a situation in which the university motto, "I will find a way or make one," was quickly tested. Fortunately, the amount of money withheld by the state of Georgia did not drastically impede university plans and university administrators proceeded with their objective of developing Atlanta University
into the educational oasis, so desired by African Americans, that it was erected to become.

Although Atlanta University was founded as a university, this institution of higher learning served also as a normal and common school for the class of eighty-nine students originally enrolled in 1869. Normal and common schools are similar to contemporary high schools and middle schools in that they attempt to equip adolescents and young adults with the necessary knowledge to not only survive in the American society, but to prepare them for post-secondary education. The first three years of Atlanta University's existence were dedicated to this objective. Noteworthy, one must be reminded that the institution of slavery had only been eradicated a scant four years before Atlanta University opened. When viewed in this manner, this "university" served a functional purpose by attempting to bring into the intellectual and educational community of America a group of people who had heretofore been denied legal educational privileges. Atlanta University officials, relatedly and readily, assert that "This Institution was called a University at first in the faith of what it was to be, and in accordance with the lines upon which it was projected" (Chase 1896:44). Atlanta University's application of the term "university" should not denote inferior instruction by assumed non-university level teachers, but rather a mission centered upon providing holistic education to a people in dire need of instruction from the ground up. Referring to the quality of instruction provided by early Atlanta University teachers, Atlanta University President Horace Bumstead asserts that "throughout its entire history, this institution has been fortunate in having on its teaching force men and women of marked ability and consequence" (Adams 1930:15). Much of the curriculum offered at Atlanta University during the early years was directed at providing its students with basic
knowledge that comparable young European (White) Americans learned during their adolescent and freedom filled years.

Atlanta University admitted its first class of college students, consisting of twelve individuals, in 1872. In 1876 Atlanta University bestowed college degrees upon its first class of graduates. The graduating class that began with twelve students in 1872 only had six to fulfill the requirements for graduation by 1876. The first graduating class of Atlanta University, referred to in future years as "The Class," consisted of six men who proved to be very successful. William Henry Cogman served as the President of Clark University (Atlanta), Samuel Benjamin Morse was a Professor of Latin at Lincoln University (MO), Edgar James Penney was the Dean of the Bible School at the Normal and Industrial Institute (Tuskegee, AL), Henry Harrison Williams worked as a mail agent in Atlanta, Richard Robert Wright served as the President of State Industrial College (Savannah, GA), and there is no information concerning the professional career of London Humes Waters (Atlanta University 1897). The prominent social positions and high social standing of these and subsequent Atlanta University graduates contributed to their selection as researchers for the sociological laboratory established at Atlanta University.

The Sociological Laboratory at Atlanta University

From its inception Atlanta University sought to improve the condition of African Americans through educational instruction and personal mentorship. This objective was achieved with much success during the university's first twenty years of existence. Graduates of Atlanta University often corresponded with faculty, administrators, and mentors who instructed and guided them through the often tumultuous educational mine
field (Chase 1896). It is through these correspondences that many university faculty and administrators learned of an emerging social phenomenon that would demand increasing attention. Immediately after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation many formerly enslaved Africans were resigned to maintain a rural existence. However, in an effort to obtain better wages and/or escape the ghosts of the plantation, many African Americans severed their rural roots in favor of the growing American cities that they often heard of during their years of forced servitude. Among the many African Americans seeking a better life in the growing cities of America was Atlanta University graduates.

On July 1, 1895, Atlanta University President Horace Bumstead submitted a proposal before the university Board of Trustees requesting to conduct yearly investigations into the social and physical condition of urban African Americans. This topic was selected because:

> Atlanta University always [drew] its students exclusively from the cities and large towns, and a great portion of its graduates [were] holding positions at these centers of influence. From these workers information [came] to the faculty and trustees of the University from time to time that led them to believe there exist[ed] a great need for a systematic and thorough investigation into the conditions of living among the Negro population of cities. (Chase 1896:5)

Atlanta University, under the leadership and guidance of President Horace Bumstead and George G. Bradford, an Atlanta University Trustee, outlined a plan of study to address the concerns of urban African Americans. On July 1, 1895, the Atlanta University Board of Trustees approved Bumstead and Bradford's proposal and the first conference on Negro problems was scheduled to take place during the Atlanta Exposition later that year.
However, "after further consideration, it was deemed wise to change the time to the
Commencement in May, 1896" (5).

George G. Bradford served as the lead researcher for the initial series of Atlanta
University Conference investigations. W. E. B. Du Bois (1968) expounds upon the origin
and original plan for the Atlanta University Conference studies on the Negro Problem as
outlined by George Bradford.

This program was grafted on an attempt by George Bradford
of Boston, one of the trustees [of the university,] to open
for Atlanta University a field of usefulness for city Negroes
comparable to what Hampton and Tuskegee were doing for
rural districts in agriculture and industry. At the Hampton and
Tuskegee Conferences, there came together annually and in
increasing numbers, workers, experts and observers to encourage
by speeches and interchange of experience the Negro farmers
and laborers of adjoining areas. Visitors, white and colored,
from North and South, joined to advise and learn. Mr. Bradford’s
idea was to establish at Atlanta a similar conference, devoted
especially to problems of city Negroes. (P. 213-214)

The original plan for the Atlanta University Conference was to investigate general social
problems faced by African Americans in cities in a manner similar to that of the
conferences held at Hampton and Tuskegee. However, three features would separate the
Atlanta University Conference from the existing conferences.

First, the Atlanta University Conference would focus on the concerns of African
Americans in cities while Tuskegee focused on rural African Americans and Hampton’s
conferences were directed at the concerns of African Americans in industry.

Second, the Atlanta University Conference studies were conceptualized and
designed to generalize to the entire United States population and not serve, solely, as a
series of monographs for the singular benefit of African Americans. In his keynote address at the First Atlanta University Conference in 1896, President Horace Bumstead clearly articulates this objective.

Let us not forget that the general subject of this and succeeding conferences-the study of Negro city life-and the particular subject of this year-the morality of Negroes in cities-constitute a human problem far more than a Negro problem. We shall use the words 'Negro' and 'colored,' not to emphasize distinctions of race, but as terms of convenience. We are simply to study human life under certain conditions-conditions which, if repeated with any other race, would have practically the same result...The improvement of Negro life anywhere will be a blessing to the life of the nation as a whole, regardless of race or color.

(Chase 1896:6-7)

W. E. B. Du Bois (1968), director of sixteen Atlanta University Conference studies, reemphasized this objective some years later when he stated that the Atlanta University Conference studies "[began] with a definite, circumscribed group, but [would eventually] end with the human race" (217). Both President Bumstead and Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois envisioned the benefit of intensive investigations of urban African American life resulting in critical data that could benefit other groups seeking a better life in the growing American cities. The result of the Atlanta University Conference studies, according to these men, would be a template that those following in the path of urban African Americans could safely and intelligently follow.

Third, President Bumstead and the Executive Board invited, as researchers for the conference, all United States citizens interested in helping improve the condition of Negroes in America. Graduates and students from Atlanta University, other historically black colleges and universities, and supporters of the improvement of the social condition
of African Americans (i.e., faculty and students at “White” colleges and universities) were especially encouraged to support and participate in this ambitious series of research investigations. Despite the inclusion of outside researchers, President Bumstead earnestly believed that the annual investigations should be led mostly by African Americans, and specifically by graduates and students of Atlanta University. During his opening remarks at the First Atlanta University Conference President Bumstead states that:

Nearly all of the graduates of Atlanta University are living and working in the cities and larger towns of the South. This fact is very suggestive, for the problems of Negro city life must be settled largely by Negroes themselves, and the body of our alumni are in some respects specifically fitted for this task. Not only are they familiar with the conditions of life in cities, but they have acquired, in their training in this institution, some degree of accurate observation and careful reflection, some acquaintance with high standards of living, some familiarity with measures of reform and of social and economic improvement that are indispensable for dealing with such matters. Herein is the great opportunity of Atlanta University and of this conference of its alumni for the investigation of city problems which we inaugurate this evening. (Chase 1896:6)

Summarily, the original plan of the Atlanta University Conference differed from the existing Tuskegee and Hampton conferences concerning Negro issues through its focus on city problems, generalizability, and the substantial utilization of students and citizens as researchers.

The first two Atlanta University Conferences, held in 1896 and 1897, followed President Bumstead and George G. Bradford’s original plan as being meetings of inspiration. However, a programmatic shift occurred when “[W. E. B. Du Bois] was approached by President Bumstead . . . in 1896 and asked to take charge of the work in
sociology, and of the new conferences which they were inaugurating on the Negro problem" (209). Dr. Du Bois, upon his hiring, was highly critical of the first two Atlanta University Conferences. His critique of the 1896 investigation asserts that "as a scientific accomplishment the first conference was not important" (Du Bois 1940:797). Dr. Du Bois believed the previous conferences to be of low scientific value because "[the investigations] followed the Hampton and Tuskegee model of being primarily meetings of inspiration, directed toward specific efforts at social reform and aimed at propaganda for social uplift in certain preconceived lines" (Du Bois 1968:214). After being selected to lead the Atlanta University Conference studies in 1896, Du Bois immediately implemented his own agenda for the Atlanta University Conference and "did not pause to consider how far [his] developed plans agreed or disagreed with the ideas of the already launched project" (214). Du Bois (1940) would later assert that:

> Without any thought or consultation I rather peremptorily changed the plans of the first two Atlanta Conferences. They had been conceived as conferences limited to city problems, contrasting with the increasing popular conferences on rural problems held at Tuskegee. But I was not thinking of mere conferences. I was thinking of a comprehensive plan for studying a human group. (P. 62)

Succinctly, Du Bois believed the first two Atlanta University Conference studies to be void of scientific importance and thus sought to make the subsequent studies scientific in nature and significant in their consequence. Dr. Du Bois (1968), some years later, expounds upon his original plans for the Atlanta University Conference studies after being hired to lead the sociological laboratory.
This program at Atlanta, I sought to swing as on a pivot
to one of scientific investigation into social conditions,
primarily for scientific ends. I put no special effort on
special reform effort, but increasing and widening emphasis
on the collection of a basic body of fact concerning the
social condition of American Negroes, endeavoring to
reduce that condition to exact measurement whenever or
wherever occasion permitted. (P. 214)

Du Bois' ultimate objective was to upgrade the Atlanta University Conference studies
from purely descriptive analyses of human behavior and the collection of census type data,
to one grounded in scientific truths and systematic inquiry.

In addition to making the conference more scientific, Du Bois proposed that each
year's investigation focus on one specific aspect of African American life instead of a
hodgepodge of issues to be addressed every year as Bradford's original plan suggested.

According to Dr. Du Bois (1904):

The method employed is to divide the various aspects of
[the condition of African Americans] into ten great subjects.
To treat one of these subjects each year as carefully and
exhaustively as means will allow until the cycle is completed.
To begin then again on the same cycle for a second ten years.
So that in the course of a century, if the work is well done
we shall have a continuous record on the condition and
development of a group of 10 to 20 million of men— a body
of sociological material unsurpassed in human annals.
(P. 58)

Du Bois' grand plan for the Atlanta University Conference was to amass a massive
collection of sociological data for the express purpose of charting the social condition of
African Americans from the first generation free from the shackles of slavery to
subsequent generations totally oblivious to the peculiar institution. Once again, such an
accomplishment was conceptualized and designed to serve as a template for other groups.
Dr. Du Bois resigned from the Sociology Department at Atlanta University in 1910 after thirteen years of service. Although Dr. Du Bois was no longer an Atlanta University faculty member, he continued to serve as the Director of the Atlanta University Conference from 1910-1914. In fact, Du Bois, at this time employed by the NAACP, served as the co-editor of the annual Atlanta University Conference Publications with Augustus Granville Dill for the next four years. When Du Bois totally severed his connection with Atlanta University and the annual investigations in 1914, the conference was poised to only produce two more monographs. Of the two Atlanta University Conference Publications released after Dr. Du Bois' departure, one was based upon a sociological research investigation and the other was an edited collection of essays authored by leading race scholars of the time.

The first era of Atlanta University Conference Publications lasted from 1896-1917. During this period W. E. B. Du Bois spearheaded the preparation of 16 monographs (4 in collaboration with Augustus Granville Dill), George Bradford prepared 2 monographs, and Thomas I. Brown and J. A. Bigham each authored 1 monograph. By 1924 the annual Atlanta University Conferences for the study of Negro problems were canceled due to a lack of funding (Du Bois 1968).

This chapter examined the founding of Atlanta University, the origin of the sociological laboratory, and the origin, plan, and brief history of the Atlanta University Conferences. The following chapter analyzes each Atlanta University Conference Publication between 1896 and 1917 revealing the methods of research, theoretical
propositions, and when possible data upon which the theoretical propositions were derived.
CHAPTER V

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS, 1896-1917

The Atlanta University Conference Publications are the product of yearly research investigations focusing on the moral, social, physical, and economic condition of urban African Americans during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The data collected for these investigations were presented annually at a conference sponsored by and held at Atlanta University between 1896 and 1924, and again in 1941, 1943, and 1944. The first period of the Atlanta University Conferences resulted in twenty published monographs and were discontinued in 1917 because of a lack of funds. Despite the loss of a publication outlet for the dissemination of its findings, the annual Atlanta University Conference continued until 1924. The second period of the Atlanta University Conferences, 1941, 1943, and 1944, was initiated by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois during his second tenure at Atlanta University and resulted in only three publications. Atlanta University’s abrupt dismissal of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois from its faculty in 1944 ended the second period of Atlanta University Conference studies. This research investigation focuses on the first period of Atlanta University Conference Publications because it was during this period that the characteristics of a school emerged at Atlanta University. What follows is a detailed analysis of the methods of research and theoretical propositions utilized for each conference, and the data from which the theoretical propositions are derived.
The First Atlanta University Conference's topic was "Mortality Among Negroes In Cities." This subject was selected by George G. Bradford, lead researcher of the 1896 and 1897 Atlanta University Conference investigations, because "In taking up the study of city problems, we feel that we cannot do better than begin by an inquiry into the physical and moral condition of the people. It is a line of inquiry which has not been previously pursued on any systematic or extensive scale. [Additionally], of the [study of the] physical condition of the Negro under the trying conditions of city life, we have little information" (Chase 1896:8). Atlanta University researchers and administrators were aware of the paucity of data concerning the social condition of urban African Americans and sought to amass an accurate and scientific collection of data to fill this void.

The data garnered by researchers for the First Atlanta University Conference mirrors that of census style data and encyclopedic facts. Atlanta University officials readily acknowledged the limitations of their first investigation, but remained steadfast in their belief that scientific findings would eventually become the normative expectation of subsequent studies. President Burnstead, speaking to the participants at the First Atlanta University Conference (1896) said:

It was not expected that much in the line of scientific reports based upon accurate data could be presented at this first conference, but it was believed that much information could be gathered from the ordinary experiences and observations of graduates and others, and that the subject could be considered in such a manner as to arouse interest and enthusiasm, and so pave the way for collecting
and digesting extensive and accurate data. Such it is believed, has been the result of the conference held. (P. 5)

President Bumstead and the Atlanta University Conference researchers entered this inaugural study knowing that the first investigation would rely more on observational data than systematic inquiry and scientific facts. Despite this acknowledged flaw, Bumstead commends the researchers for their efforts and declares that a major objective of future Atlanta University Conferences would include participation by serious scholars in an effort to collect more extensive and accurate data while utilizing scientific methods of research.

The methods of research used for the First Atlanta University Conference investigation are blanks and census data. Blanks are instruments of research that are designed to facilitate researchers in gathering the appropriate data by requesting specific information from subjects in the form of printed questionnaires. The "uniform sets of blanks [were] prepared and put into the hands of graduates of [Atlanta] University and of educated colored men and women located in different cities" (9). Records of the First Atlanta University Conference Publication do not identify every city to which the sets of blanks were sent. However, conference records do indicate that data were received from researchers in Atlanta, GA, Savannah, GA, and Washington, D.C.

Three sets of blanks were collected from each household participating in this investigation. "Blanks No. 1 and 2 [served] the purpose of a permanent record by which to measure the progress of each city community from year to year [and] Blank No. 3, called the Family Budget blank, provides for a more intimate inquiry into the conditions of life existing in a particular community" (9). The data collected from Blank No. 1 centers
around the general condition of home life, the size of the home, the sanitary conditions inside the home, and the amount of sickness in the home. Data collected from Blank No. 2 focused on the economic condition of the family, occupations of working family members, and the amount of income earned by each family member. Data collected from Blank No. 3 aimed at ascertaining the expenditures of each family for food, rent, alcohol, and extravagance. Atlanta University researchers analyzed the three sets of blanks and proposed that Blank No. 3 caused the conditions faced in Blanks No. 1 and 2. Although they hypothesized that the conditions experienced in Blanks No. 1 and 2 resulted from Blank No. 3, Atlanta University researchers ardently assert that they are not attempting to develop a grand theory on the condition of African Americans living in cities based upon these limited data. In fact, George Bradford states that “We are not attempting to prove or disprove any theory, but we are trying to get at the most unfavorable conditions affecting our communities, in order that we may improve those conditions” (10).

The 1890 United States Census data were used to examine the rates of “mortality for the white and colored population of five of our largest cities” (8). The five cities included in this investigation are Baltimore, MD, Louisville, KY, New Orleans, LA, St. Louis, MO, and Washington, D.C. These data were used comparatively to discern the major causes of death among African Americans in cities and were combined with the blanks to provide the foundation for the major findings presented in the resolutions of this conference.

The first resolution of the 1896 Atlanta University Conference asserts that, according to United States Census Bureau data, there was an increase in the death rate of
African Americans between the years 1880 and 1890. "Comparing [1880 figures] with those for 1890, we see that the latter year shows a greater actual and relative death-rate from those diseases. The conclusion to be drawn from this comparison would be that consumption and pneumonia were on the increase among colored people for the decade 1880-1890" (15). Atlanta University Conference officials suggest that the prevalence of these diseases is the result of Negro ignorance, poverty, negligence, and intemperance.

The second resolution of the 1896 Atlanta University Conference proposes that "the investigations thus far made show the necessity for continuing the search for exact data on a large scale, with a view to ascertaining more definitely the causes and seeking out and applying remedies for existing conditions" (24).

The third resolution of the 1896 Atlanta University Conference instructs the corresponding secretary and executive committee to continue the annual conference and to invite graduates of Atlanta University, and all others interested in studying the condition of African Americans in cities, to participate in future investigations.

The First Atlanta University Conference identified basic social conditions experienced by African Americans in cities that led to their death. A major discovery was that the death-rate for African Americans was higher than that of Whites. Despite the limited findings of the initial conference, it is significant because it signaled the first attempt at a systematic and scientific study of Africans in America.
The subject of the Second Atlanta University Conference, "Social and Physical Condition of Negroes in Cities," is an extension of the first conference. Specifically, "[this] investigation was begun [in 1895] by an inquiry on the part of three graduates of Atlanta University into the causes of the excessive mortality among Negroes" (Chase 1897:3). Atlanta University officials believed "the facts brought out at [the 1896] conference were so significant that the investigation [should be] continued for another year along similar lines, but on a more extensive scale" (3).

Unlike the first conference report, the second publication does not clearly indicate the methods of research used in this investigation. One can deduce, however, that since this is a continuation of the previous study, the methods of research used for the first study are applicable here. Intensive analysis of the second publication of the Atlanta University Conference reveals the use of blanks, reports from Boards of Health, and an investigation into the social and physical condition of various southern cities as the means by which data were obtained.

The Second Atlanta University Publication does not provide any information concerning the content of the blanks used in this inquiry. It is proposed that the information contained in the blanks used for the First Atlanta University Conference investigation are, hence, relevant. The only information pertaining to the blanks that are contained in the second publication refer to the total number of families from which data were collected, 1,137.
L. M. Hershaw was charged with the "laborious work of analyzing the reports of the boards of health for the past fifteen years" (5). The cities in which health data reports were collected were Atlanta, GA, Baltimore, MD, Charleston, SC, Memphis, TN, and Richmond, VA. These data were utilized to accurately ascertain the causes and rates of mortality of African Americans in the cities identified.

Professor Eugene Harris, Fisk University, served as the lead researcher of an investigation focusing on the social and physical condition of southern African Americans. Once again, the specific method(s) of research is (are) not cited. However, as best can be deciphered, Harris utilized data which were collected from over 18 cities by graduates and citizens in various locations. Additionally, data from the May Bulletin of the Department of Labor were utilized to identify the specific occupations held by African Americans during this period.

As indicated earlier, Atlanta University included as researchers all citizens and students interested in studying and improving the social and physical condition of urban African Americans. Along that line, conference officials officially recognized graduates of Atlanta University (50), Fisk (30), Berea (15), Lincoln University, Spelman College, Howard University, and Meharry Medical College for their assistance in collecting data for the First and Second Atlanta University Conference studies. The Executive Board of the conference also acknowledged the research assistance of "other" historically black colleges and universities. Butler R. Wilson, member of a research team that collected data on one-hundred families that migrated from North Carolina to Cambridge, Massachusetts, explains the process of selecting researchers for this investigation and the benefit of
utilizing, not only Atlanta University graduates and students, but African American researchers in general.

The results to be gained [for this investigation] depend entirely upon the intelligence and fitness of the investigators, who were selected with great care from the ranks of well-known colored educators, ministers, physicians, lawyers and businessmen, living among the people covered by the investigation. All the data were gathered by this body of trained colored leaders, and are believed to be, perhaps, more than usually accurate because of the investigators' knowledge of the character, habits and prejudices of the people, and because of the fact that they were not hindered by the suspicions which confront the white investigator, and which seriously affect the accuracy of the answers to his questions. (P. 5)

Wilson suggests that the "insider status" (Collins 1986) of Atlanta University researchers provides them with the unique ability to understand social behaviors and/or habits that could, possibly, be misinterpreted by non-African American, or outside, researchers. The use of "insider researchers" possibly eliminates problems such as W. E. B. Du Bois' (1903) notion of "car window sociologists." This Du Bois concept refers to, for example, a process by which a white researcher casually observes the behavior of an African American "subject" during a brisk jaunt through the country roadside and from this limited observation, according to Du Bois, develops incorrect theories based upon limited time in the research field. Wilson, and to an extent W. E. B. Du Bois, argue that, possibly, insider researchers are able to provide more insightful analyses of seemingly simple activities and/or situations than outsiders because of their social location. Another issue that Wilson raises is the difficulty that outsider researchers could possibly have in gaining access into the research setting. It must be asserted here that, arguably, Wilson is among the first
scholars to address issues concerning "insider status" and subject-researcher trust. Atlanta University's exclusive use of African American researchers contributed to the collection of data that lead to the five resolutions and four recommendations contained in this publication.

The first resolution asserts that the high death rate among African Americans is not mainly due to their environment. This conclusion is based upon health board reports and census data which reveal that "the rate [of death for African Americans] has decreased [over the past fifteen years] . . . in the face of hard, exacting and oppressive social and economic conditions" (18). Researchers assert that if the environment were the main contributor to the death rate of African Americans, the number of deaths would have increased over the past fifteen years instead of decreasing. In fact, Atlanta University officials suggest that "The history of weak and inferior races shows that they begin to decrease in number after one generation's contact with Anglo-Saxon civilization . . . We do not witness this decay and decrease in numbers in the colored race anywhere in the Western Hemisphere" (18). Thus, Atlanta University officials are left pondering, "When all of the facts in the colored man's case are taken into consideration, the wonder is, not that the death-rate is as high as it is, but that it is not even higher" (18). The second resolution states that the high rate of death among African Americans living in cities is due mostly to their "ignorance or disregard of the laws of health and morality" (33). Eugene Harris said:

In public conveniences the Negro must take separate apartments; but the air in them is just as invigorating, the water is just as healthful and pure, and the food
is just as nourishing as in the apartments for the whites. Regular bathing will throw off dead matter through the skin, and control of the appetites will contribute largely to health in Negro quarters as well as anywhere else. (P. 20)

Relatedly, the First Atlanta University Conference Publication supports this resolution by indicating that some African American workers "drive or walk all day in the rain or snow, come home and go to bed with his wet cloths on, with the belief firmly fixed in his mind that unless he lets these cloths dry on him he will contract a cold, and no argument we might use will convince him otherwise" (Chase 1896:16). This above passages suggests that, given equal environmental conditions as whites, the death rates for African Americans would equal Whites, and, consequently, the high mortality rates for African Americans is caused by their unwillingness to follow common sanitation and health rules. Relatedly, Harris reports on the disregard of morality that, supposedly, contributes to the high rates of death for African Americans:

It is true that much of the moral laxity which exists among us today arose out of slavery. It is due to a system which whipped women, which dispensed with the institution of marriage, which separated wives from husbands and assigned them to other men, which ruthlessly destroyed female virtue, and which made helpless women the abject tools of their masters. This is the correct explanation of our social status today, but to explain it is not to excuse it. (Chase 1897:27)

Atlanta University officials do an excellent job in identifying the social problems experienced by African Americans living in urban areas. Nevertheless, they can be perceived to adhere to a "blame the victim" philosophy while not fully exploring the social factors that may or may not have led to the situation as it existed. The author suggests
that a structural examination of the factors leading to the high rates of African American mortality by Atlanta University researchers could, possibly, lead to alternative conclusions.

The third resolution states that the high death rate and increase in immorality among African Americans is due mostly to the neglect of the home by both parents, especially the mothers who must, because of a lack of money, work outside of the home. This proposition is offered by the Executive Committee and is a continuation of an argument made at the First Atlanta University Conference in which it was presented that:

It may be that the work of the mother of the family requires that she be away from home all day. Leaving at six a.m., without giving any care to the house or children, she returns at eight o'clock at night. The children are asleep, in the street, or at some neighbor's, where they have been all day. The tired mother, after a few words, goes to bed. She awakes next day only to carry out the same program. (Chase 1896:19)

This passage could be perceived as a continuation of the "blame the victim" proposition that African Americans, particularly women, are the causes of high rates of mortality. Specifically, it seems to imply that working mothers do not provide guidance, protection, or nurturance for their children. The unprotected children are then left exposed as possible victims of city life. An alternate perspective may be that this passage does indeed highlight structural barriers (e.g., the need of Black women to work outside the home to, possibly, supplement the income of their spouse) that cause the conditions experienced by African Americans.

The fourth resolution claims that the inability of African American men to adequately support their families harms the race socially, physically, and economically. This proposition is not supported by empirical data. Similar to the proposal that the high
rates of death among African Americans is not due to their environment, Eugene Harris
asserts that "There is no black law upon our statute books regulating [the] private habits
[of African American males], or imposing upon him unsanitary surroundings, or restricting
him to deleterious occupations, or forcing him to immoderate indulgences" (20). Harris
and the Executive Board of the conference suggest that individual, not societal, factors
contribute to the social, physical, and economic well being of African American men.
Once again, the individual responsibility critique is made without fully analyzing the social
structures that, often, inhibit African American men from fulfilling the gender roles
expected of them.

The fifth resolution proposes that if African Americans relinquish their dependance
on charity and charitable organizations and take control of their own destiny they can
become an independent people. This resolution is not rooted in data, but grounded in
Atlanta University President Asa E. Ware's proposal that this series of investigations be
carried out by mostly African Americans. President Ware proposes that African
Americans must lift themselves up by their bootstraps in order to prove their worth to the
larger American citizenry.

In addition to the resolutions offered above, the Executive Board of the conference
also made recommendations addressing how the African American community could solve
the problems identified above.

The first recommendation made by the committee is to continue this line of inquiry
at the next year's meeting. Thus, the topic of that meeting will center around the family
life of African Americans. The second recommendation asserts that parents' associations
and mothers meetings be organized to provide better guidance for young African
American boys and girls. According to Atlanta University officials, parents' associations
and mothers meetings could, possibly, offset the deleterious affects of having a large
number of working mothers. Relatedly, the third recommendation calls for the
establishment of nurseries to provide care for the infants of parents who must work. The
fourth and fifth recommendations request that organizations and individuals visit the poor
and that regular meetings be held to discuss the distinct experiences of each visitor.

The Second Atlanta University Conference, similar to the first, was of limited
scientific value and could be interpreted to promote a "blame the victim" agenda.
Nevertheless, this conference was significant because Atlanta University officials were
amassing data on a social phenomena (e.g., social problems experienced by African
Americans in cities) that enabled the conference to live up to its motto-"We study the
problems that others talk about" (Du Bois 1899:78).

*Atlanta University Publication #3, 1898
"Some Efforts of American Negroes for Their Own Social Betterment"
Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

The Third Atlanta University Conference, "Some Efforts of American Negroes for
Their Own Social Betterment," marks the first study lead by Dr. William Edward
Burghardt Du Bois. Dr. Du Bois, chosen to lead the Atlanta University Conference
studies in 1896, quickly changed the unscientific format of the Atlanta University
Conference to one dedicated to investigating specific Negro problems in a systematic and
scientific manner. Du Bois' particular stamp of scientific inquiry included nationally
representative samples when possible, method triangulation, data comparison, and theoretical analysis. Du Bois' quest for scientific accuracy began with an inquiry into social programs established by African American organizations for the betterment of the race.

Originally, W. E. B. Du Bois wanted to collect a nationally representative sample of data for his first Atlanta University Conference investigation. Such an achievement would have resulted in a collection of data that could have been generalized to the entire African American population. Unfortunately, and what would prove to be a re-curing theme throughout Du Bois' tenure at Atlanta University, "funds were not available for such an inquiry" (Du Bois 1898:4). Instead of having a nationally representative sample, Du Bois chose "nine Southern cities of varying size and... selected in them such organizations of Negroes as were engaged in benevolent and reformatory work" (4). The cities included in this investigation were Atlanta, GA, Augusta, GA, Bowling Green, KY, Clarksville, TN, Fort Smith, AR, Galveston, TX, Mobile, AL, Petersburg, VA, and Washington D.C.

Atlanta University researchers relied upon each organization contacted to return a set of questionnaires that were mailed to them. The exact information requested on the questionnaires concerned the current enrollment of the organization, value of real estate, amount of indebtedness, cash on hand, total income, existence of literary societies, objects of expenditures, activities promoting social uplift, etc. Du Bois, stating the objective of this inquiry, asserts that this massive investigation is not an attempt to "catalogue all charitable and reformatory efforts but rather to illustrate the character of work being done
by typical examples" (4). Because of their inability to obtain a nationally representative sample of African American organizations, Atlanta University researchers were not able to make any claims of generalizability. However, they believed their data to be reliable and valid enough to form a solid foundation for the resolutions presented in this monograph.

The first resolution encourages churches to reduce their building and running expenses and use the remaining capital to establish shelters for the elderly and orphans. For example, Nineteenth St. Baptist Church in Washington D. C. reported a total 1895 income of $5,714.09. After church running expenses were subtracted the church was left with only $437. Conference officials suggest that expenditures such as the $2,840 spent on building improvements are unnecessary and take away from the uplift mission of the church. Additionally, data obtained from this study indicated a paucity of retirement homes and orphanages serving the needs of African Americans in the areas surveyed. Instead of relying upon charitable organizations, conference officials charge African American organizations, specifically churches, with the obligation of supporting and establishing these much needed institutions. Herefore, the options available for African Americans in need of these services was limited because of segregation.

The second resolution advises secret societies to not spend as much money on "pomp and circumstance" but, instead, use their money more constructively. Atlanta University data indicate that:

The secret societies represent much extravagance and waste in expenditure, an outlay for regalia and tinsel, which too often lack the excuse of being beautiful, and to some extent they divert the savings of Negroes from more
useful channels. (P. 17)

According to the Executive Committee, more benefits can be derived from spending money on community needs, such as retirement homes and orphanages, than on wasteful displays of organizational profusion.

The third resolution warns African Americans to be aware of unstable and unscrupulous insurance companies. Specifically, African Americans are warned of "white societies organized to defraud and exploit Negroes" (19). White societies are specifically noted because they were acutely aware that "the Freedman [was] noted for his effort to ward off accidents and a pauper's grave by insurance against sickness and death" (19) and they saw this as an opportunity to exploit an already ignorant and uneducated group of people.

The fourth resolution commends a few beneficial societies for serving the African American community well through systematic works centered upon uplifting the community, both social and economically. Returns from various beneficial societies in Galveston, TX, Augusta, GA, and Atlanta, GA, for example, provide evidence of philanthropic programs and social activities directed at improving the social, economic, and physical condition of African Americans. Atlanta University officials specifically note the amount of sick and death benefits offered by some beneficial associations as primary reasons for their acknowledgment.

The fifth resolution condemns the tendency of African Americans to conduct extravagant funerals. The data collected reveal that an extraordinary amount of money is usually expended on funerals. Atlanta University researchers believe that the monies spent
on funerals could be utilized more fruitfully. The Executive Board believes that "the system of death benefits often encourages this [overspending]. [Thus,] societies giving death benefits, churches, and thoughtful persons in general, should frown upon these excesses as wasteful, unbecoming and unchristian" (47) and instead use the money to serve the needs of the family members of the deceased or the community as a whole.

The sixth resolution requests more cooperation between African American businesses. It is believed that cooperative efforts between African Americans will reduce their economic dependance on European (White) Americans. Independence on the part of African American businessmen will, hopefully, enable the race to build a solid economic foundation on which businesses could better serve the needs of various African American communities. The Third Atlanta University Conference Publication records the success of a cooperative businesses endeavor in Hampton, Virginia.

These are all incorporated companies, officered and controlled by colored men. They have been organized and operated as an outgrowth directly of the demands of the people rather than as a speculative investment in the different forms of business in rivalry of those already in existence; and to this extent they have all been successful. (P. 25)

Researchers cite comparable levels of success for cooperative business enterprises in cities such as Birmingham, AL, Little Rock, AR, Jacksonville, FL, Richmond, VA, and Galveston, TX.

The seventh resolution calls for the establishment of hospitals and juvenile reformatories to serve the needs of the African American population. The dire need of
hospitals dedicated to healing African Americans is illustrated by Atlanta University researcher Dr. R. H. Lewis, Secretary of the North Carolina Board of Health.

If there is one thing more than another that the colored people need, it is hospital privileges, practically within their reach, both as to distance and cost. It has been a matter of surprise with me that some of the people of the North, who have been so generous in their benefactions to educational instructions for them, have not realized this fact and devoted some of it to the relief of sickness and suffering. (P. 33)

In addition to the need for hospitals, conference officials also recognized the need for juvenile reformatories. The absence of an institution designed to, possibly, alter the deviant behavior of adolescents in need of proper intervention has detrimental consequences. Data provided by the state of Virginia supports this assertion and condemns that state for:

Unconsciously...graduating under common and statute laws annually thousands of youthful criminals. There is no middle ground, there is no house of refuge, correction or reformatory for the black boy or girl-who from defective, and from no training, has taken the first step downward, and as a consequence, crime is accelerated and increased by law. (P. 32)

Heretofore, young African American boys and girls were treated similar to adult offenders in the absence of proper intervention facilities. The filling of this void, according to supporters for juvenile reformatories, could serve as a safety net for African American youth who would otherwise, possibly, become hardened criminals because of the absence of such a support system.

The eighth resolution commends African Americans for making strides toward bettering themselves and their social and physical condition. Throughout this publication
the efforts of African American churches, secret societies, beneficial and insurance
societies, and businesses are analyzed to determine their effect on the community. The
Executive Board asserts that tremendous strides have been made, but more should be
done along those lines by the educated and comfortable classes of African Americans.

The ninth resolution asserts that the death rate for African Americans is still too
high and that African Americans should be taught the importance of hygiene. For
example, in Charleston, South Carolina the death rate per 1,000 for scrofula and syphilis in
1896 was .40 for Whites and 7.77 for African Americans. Additionally, the regular death-
rate per 1,000 city residents for Charleston during the same period was 21.10 for Whites
and 40.32 for African Americans. These data were collected for Atlanta University
Conference investigations extending back to the first two conference publications and
were included in the third publication because of its incompleteness at the time of printing
for the 1896 and 1897 conference reports.

Although W. E. B. Du Bois served as the lead researcher and editor of the Third
Atlanta University Conference Publication, the topic for this study was chosen by George
G. Bradford before Dr. Du Bois took over the conference. As indicated in Chapter IV,
after Dr. Du Bois gained full control over the annual investigations he altered the plan and
aim of the conference. The next fifteen publications are reflective of Dr. Du Bois’ singular
vision for the Atlanta University Conference on Negro Problems.
The "Negro in Business" is the subject of the Fourth Atlanta University Conference. This study follows Du Bois' plan of investigating, annually, specific problems concerning African Americans as opposed to George Bradford's plan of investigating city problems in general. The major objective of this investigation was to ascertain the total number and different types of African American owned business located in various city communities.

The primary methods by which data were collected for this investigation included schedules and 1890 census data. A schedule is a research instrument that facilitates the collection of data by obtaining information such as the names of businessmen and their companies, location, kind of business, number of years in business, and the amount of capital each business amassed. Schedules were mailed to numerous African American businessmen in the United States and returns were received from 1,906 businessmen representing thirty states.

Some of the researchers used in this study participated in previous Atlanta University Conference investigations. The benefit in repeatedly including community researchers in these scientific projects is that it continually, and theoretically, reduced the amount of amateur mistakes as years passed. The schedules were limited in nature and "care [was] taken to make the questions few in number, simple and direct, and, so far as possible, incapable of misapprehension" (Du Bois 1899:4) since researchers were relying on the businessmen to serve as pseudo-researchers. The schedules were mailed to "well-
educated Negroes, long resident in the communities; by calling on the same persons for aid
year after year, a body of experienced correspondents has been gradually formed,
umbering now about fifty" (4).

The validity of the data gathered for this investigation, as in previous Atlanta
University Conference Studies, was grounded in the honesty of the subject/researcher.
Commenting on this, Dr. Du Bois suggests that the data obtained "represent[s], therefore,
the reports of businessmen themselves, interpreted and commented upon by an intelligent
investigator of some experience. [The data collected] can, therefore, on the whole, be
depended upon as substantially accurate" (5). Although Du Bois believes the data, in
general, to be accurate, he admits that "the item of 'capital invested' is naturally apt to
contain the largest amount of errors since it is in most cases an estimate" (5). Thus,
capital invested estimates and others deemed too high were removed from the data by Dr.
Du Bois and the resolutions of the conference reflect the necessary adjustments.

The first resolution encourages African Americans "to enter into business life in
increasing numbers. The present disproportion in the distribution of Negroes in the
various occupations is unfortunate. It gives the race a one-sided development,
unnecessarily increases competition in certain lines of industry, and puts the mass of Negro
people out of sympathy and touch with the industrial and mercantile spirit of the age" (Du
Bois 1899:50). This plea is made in light of data indicating a predominance of African
Americans identified as workers and not owners. The Executive Board of the Atlanta
University Conference postulates that the creation of additional African American
businesses will create a surplus of jobs for the community and enable more African
Americans to become owners instead of employees. Thus, the caste-like employment of African Americans in former plantation occupations such as barbers, shoe-dealers, florists and jewelers would be offset.

The second resolution proposes that "we need as merchants the best trained young men we can find. A college training ought to be one of the best preparations for a broad business life; and thorough English and high school training is indispensable" (50). This proposition is offered because an educated workforce, especially managerial staff, could reduce the amount of mismanagement that Atlanta University researchers found to exist in many Negro businesses. For example, publication data identify the grocery store market as a fertile ground for the possible mismanagement of business enterprises. Publication records indicate that, out of twenty-five African American grocery store owners investigated in 1898, only one had college training, nine had common school training, twelve could only read and write, and three had no education at all. This fact could possibly facilitate in the mismanagement of the financial matters of the stores, according to Atlanta University Conference officials. Additionally, 1890 census data indicate that a high proportion of African Americans were engaged in jobs as workers and not businessmen. As Miss Hattie G. Escridge states, "All the young people who are graduating from our schools to-day, cannot be school teachers and preachers," (61) some must take the extra step to become businessmen.

The third resolution recommended that African American businessmen "remember that their customers demand courtesy, honesty, and careful methods, and they should not expect patronage when their manner of conducting business does not justify it" (50). This
resolution extends from observations of various researchers in which they observed businessmen not being courteous to some of their patrons.

The fourth resolution encourages African Americans to support Black owned businesses in an effort to keep the revenues gained from their community in their community. Miss Hattie G. Escrige strongly supports idea and asserts that:

By Negroes sticking together and spending whatever they have to spend with their own race soon they would be able to unite and open large, up-to-date, dry-goods, millinery, hardware and all other establishments as run by their white brothers, thereby giving employment to those who have nothing to do...The Negro has helped to make rich every race on earth but his own. They will walk three blocks or more to trade with a white man, when there is a Negro store next to their door. They say the Negro does not have as good material as the white man. In all cases that is not true, for they have bought from the same wholesale grocer and have the same material...The different commodities that are brought into market by the Negro could be disposed of with the Negro merchants and by bartering as they do with the white merchants, benefit themselves, and aid the Negro merchant, and thereby the farmer and the grocer would be building each other up, and giving strength financially to both...We have aided the Jew from the time he came into our neighborhood with his store on his back...until now he has a large brick building, a number of clerks, and he and family ride in a fine carriage drawn by expensive horses, and they driven by a Negro. Why can we not help our brother who is struggling with all the odds against him, and has been since the day of his birth. (P. 61)

The fifth resolution congratulates and recognizes the 1,900 businessmen who mailed reports to the conference. Their efforts are duly noted in the official records of the conference and their assistance on future investigations is proposed.

The sixth resolution encourages young boys and girls to become businessmen, that thrift and savings should be encouraged among African Americans, and that there be
Negro Business Leagues established in every American city to guide and support new African American business enterprises.

The Fourth Atlanta University Conference Publication was the first investigation in which Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois selected the topic and directed the research investigation. This study signaled the beginning of the arduous process of departing from previous non-scientific Atlanta University Conference Studies to projects involving more systematic and scientific methods of data collection and data analysis. Additionally, the use of community researchers facilitated Dr. Du Bois in applying his scientific vision to the conference.

*Atlanta University Publication #5, 1900*
*"The College-Bred Negro"*
*Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

The topic of the Fifth Atlanta University Conference was the "The College-Bred Negro." This investigation concerned, primarily, the "number, distribution, occupations, and success of College-bred Negroes" (Du Bois 1900:5). These data were obtained by analyzing admissions data from various colleges and universities, letters received from white and black college presidents concerning African American students and their progress, or lack thereof, and data received from African American college graduates themselves.

Atlanta University Conference Publication data records twelve responses from college/university presidents as well as a response from the United States Commissioner on Education concerning the number and ability of African American college students. College presidents responding to this inquiry included those representing Amherst
College, Boston University, Bowdoin College, Harvard College, University of Indiana, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, and Yale University.

Data were also received from 1,312 African American college graduates. Information concerning their occupation, group leadership activities, political activity, and the ownership of private and public property were received. These data are combined to provide an analysis of the impact of an college education on the African American community.

No resolutions are offered in this research investigation. As indicated above, the main objective of this investigation was to amass data citing the kinds of occupations in which college educated African Americans found themselves employed. Despite the limited scope of this inquiry, Dr. Du Bois believed that "the central truth which this study teaches to the candid mind is the success of higher education under the limitations and difficulties of the past" (32).

Atlanta University Publication #6, 1901
"The Negro Common School"
Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois

The subject of the Sixth Atlanta University Conference concerned the condition and status of "The Negro Common School." This study emanated from the previous Atlanta University Conference investigation which uncovered data indicating that fifty-three percent of African American college graduates were employed as teachers. Upon learning this information, Atlanta University Conference officials decided to study, more intensely, the Negro common school to ascertain its effect on the social and economic
condition of African Americans. The methods of research used in this investigation are
the examination of school reports from several states, reports from the Freedmen’s Bureau
and the United States Bureau of Education, three sets of blanks distributed in various
school districts, and returns from numerous teachers.

School reports were received from sixteen, mostly southern, states and the District
of Columbia concerning the total number of school age children, illiteracy rates, amount of
money appropriated by each state for White and Black schools, amount of school taxes
paid, salary information, attendance, and per capita expenditure for Black and White
schools.

Reports from the Freedman’s Bureau and the United States Bureau of Education
provide data relative to the total number of African Americans working as common school
teachers, their age and sex, and other demographic information.

Three sets of blanks were mailed to subjects participating in this investigation. The
first set of blanks represent data received from various county and city superintendents in
the United States. Questions asked of these individuals include employee history of
African American workers, efforts at social betterment supported by various schools, the
strengths and weaknesses of African American teachers, wages of White and Black
teachers, and a performance comparison between Black and White teachers. According to
conference data, 42 responses were received from county superintendents and 34
responses were received from city superintendents. The second and third sets of blanks
represent data received from principals of various African American southern city and
town schools. Questions asked of these individuals concern the employee history of
African American workers, wages of White and Black teachers, the attitude of city officials toward Negro schools, school maintenance, needs of the school, and the strengths and weaknesses of African American teachers.

The final method of research was the comparative utilization of responses received from sixteen county school teachers located in various regions of the South. These teachers offered information concerning their experiences with African American students, the impact of their college education on their lives, and occupations they encourage their students to enter. Data received from these sources were compared to note similarities and differences based upon characteristics such as location. The exact location of the teachers participating in this publication is not given; however, researchers propose that this sample consists primarily of southern subjects. The combination of the methods cited above form the basis for the resolutions offered in this study.

The first resolution calls for an increase in state and national aid for Black high schools. Data collected for this study reveal that state monies allotted for the maintenance and running of African American schools was less than that of comparable white schools. For example, the state of Delaware, in 1896, expended $1.66 per capita for white students and $0.81 for its African American students. Additionally, it was discovered that African Americans were charged with bearing the brunt of the financial support of their schools. States such as Delaware, Arkansas, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana all reported that the cost of running their Negro schools was totally supported by the contributions of African Americans themselves. Relatedly, the disparity in pay between Whites and Blacks also fueled the call for increased state and national funding for
Black schools. For example, in 1898 Maryland paid their White teachers $8.76 while African American teachers received $4.07.

The second resolution called for "increased interest, effort, and sacrifice for an education on the part of the Negroes themselves" (Du Bois 1901:ii). Conference officials believed that increased support from African Americans could result in additional funding for African American schools. Additionally, conference officials ardently believe that an increase in the level of education among African Americans would lead to improved racial, as well as social and economic conditions.

As indicated earlier, a major goal of the Sixth Atlanta University Study was to ascertain the exact condition of African American schools. Atlanta University Conference data reveal African American schools to be in dire need of financial support and that African Americans were employed as teachers in such high numbers because other employment opportunities are blocked to them. This revelation enticed Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois to assert that:

If carpenters are needed it is well and good to train men as carpenters; if teachers are needed it is well and good to train men as teachers. But to train men as carpenters and then set them to teaching is wasteful and criminal; and to train men as teachers and then refuse them living wages unless they become carpenters is rank nonsense. (P. 117)

The Sixth Atlanta University Conference Publication was significant because it produced data citing the needs and inequality of African American schools as compared to White schools. It was discovered that Black schools were underfunded and more in need of maintenance, but were favorably engaged in technical and liberal arts education.
The Seventh Atlanta University Conference focused on the status of African American artisans. An artisan was defined as "a skilled laborer-a person who works with his hands but has attained a degree of skill and efficiency above that of an ordinary manual laborer-as, for instance, carpenters, masons, engineers, blacksmiths, etc. Omit barbers, ordinary laborers in factories, who do not do skilled work, etc" (Du Bois 1902:9). In this investigation, Atlanta University researchers attempted to identify the various occupations of skilled African Americans workers outside of the education arena. Data were obtained through secondary analysis, questionnaires, schedules, correspondences, and a collaborative investigation with a Tennessee newspaper, the Chattanooga Tradesman.

Secondary data were collected from the Conservative Review, Freedman's Bureau, Hampton University Negro Conference, United States Census Bureau, and the United States Department of Labor. Information gathered from these outlets enabled researchers to identify the number and exact location of African American artisans in the United States.

1,300 questionnaires were sent to skilled laborers, mostly in the state of Georgia, who were identified by Atlanta University graduates and other citizens of note. In their attempt to make this study as reliable as possible, Atlanta University researchers compared data received from workers of the same company to identify any substantial differences in their responses. Responses received from employees were then compared to the responses received from their employer. For example, data received from worker A is
compared with the data received from worker B, of the same company. This is done to insure that the responses do not vary greatly. The same data requested from the workers was also solicited from the employer. The collection of data from worker A, worker B, and their employer provide a research method by which the data received are reliable and the possibility of inaccuracy is reduced. Questions asked of the employees and employer concern the wages of African American employees, comparison of work habits between Whites and Blacks, education level of African American employees, and any information concerning the practices of local unions, if applicable.

Questionnaires were mailed to "every trade union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and all others that could be reached" (10). Researchers amassed ninety-seven responses with only eleven unions choosing not to respond after many attempts at gaining the desired information. The information sought concerned the number of African Americans in each union, possible refusal of African American applicants into the organization, work habits of African American workers, and the general opinion of African American artisans.

Two hundred responses were received from various "central labor bodies in every city and town of the Union" (10). These data came from thirty states and the questions concerned African American membership in the union, discrimination against African American members, working habits of African Americans, and overall ability of African American workers.

In addition to the questionnaires mailed to skilled laborers, trade unions, and central labor bodies, a "schedule was placed in the hands of correspondents of this
Conference-mostly College-bred Negroes and professional men-and they were asked to study their particular communities. Reports were received from 32 states, besides Ontario, Costa Rica, and Porta Rica” (9). Data received from the schedules centered on the number of skilled artisans in each community, type of jobs held by each artisan, amount of work managed by the artisans, affect of industrial school training on the artisan, amount of discrimination experienced, the ability, or lack thereof, of African Americans to join unions, and researchers were asked to provide a brief history of African American artisans in the community.

Letters were mailed to industrial schools seeking information pertaining to the occupation and location of their graduates, some of the difficulties graduates often met in finding employment, union affiliation, and a list of graduates was requested. In addition to the data cited above, “to the state and federations a letter was sent asking for whatever general information was not available on the subject” (11).

Last, Atlanta University and the Chattanooga Tradesman collaborated to conduct a study on African American artisans in the South. The Chattanooga Tradesman conducted similar investigations in 1889 and 1891. Hence, the plan for the 1902 investigation would be to replicate and expand the previous studies. The method of research by which information was garnered for this sub-investigation were questionnaires which were delivered to employers of African American artisans, Southern educators, and public school children. Also, United States census reports and reports from the Bureau of Education were utilized.
The information obtained from employers' concerned the number of African American employees and their skill level, wages, comparison of work habits to White workers, level and effect of education on African Americans, and the employers willingness to employ African American artisans in the future.

Researchers also wanted to determine the types of vocational training offered to African Americans. In order to obtain this information, "the Superintendents of Education in all Southern States were consulted as to Manual training in the schools, and most of them answered the inquiries" (12).

The last questionnaire was presented to six hundred public school children in Atlanta, Georgia. The questions focused on the kind of work that the children completed at home, the availability and use of hammers and saws at home, what they do best, and what they want to do when they grow up. The author proposes that Atlanta University researchers were attempting to identify any voluntary or involuntary habits that would lead African American children into skilled or unskilled occupations based upon their experiences in the home.

The final method of data collection in this investigation was the secondary analysis of census and education reports. These sources provided detailed information concerning the occupations of African American artisans and they were combined with the other sources of data to make this study the most scientific Atlanta University investigation thus far. The Atlanta University Publication records indicate that:

Finally such available information was collected as could be found in the United States' census, the reports of the Bureau of Education, and other sources as indicated
in the bibliography. On the whole the collected information on which this study is based is probably more complete than in the case of any previous studies. (P. 12)

The utilization of a triangulation methodology provided ample data for the resolutions offered.

The first resolution stressed the need of African Americans to increase the prestige of skilled artisan occupations. According to conference officials, "concerted action and intelligent preparation would before long restore and increase the prestige of skilled Negro working men" (7). To date, occupations in fields such as education, medicine, and religion were the highly valued and everything else was viewed as inferior. Conference officials asserted that skilled labor must be promoted among African Americans, young and old, as a desirable occupation.

The second resolution called for the preservation of African American participation in the artisan areas already entered, and for African Americans to enter areas where the number of African American artisans are low or nonexistent. 1890 census data reveal that African American artisans were over represented in areas such as masonry and carpentry, and under represented as machinists and wheelwrights. Conference officials urged African Americans to enter these areas in which they have little or no representation and, thus, decrease competition in saturated areas while entering the race in new business endeavors.

The third resolution requested all trade and labor unions to admit African American workers and end all discriminatory actions aimed at African American members once admitted into the organization. For example, "The prejudiced element prevailed, however, at the last meeting in Boston, 1902, of the Stationary Engineers and it was voted
to have the word ‘white’ placed before the word ‘engineers’ in one of the articles of their constitution” (165). Researchers also discovered that almost all African American artisans in the United States are omitted from union participation. Responding to these data, Atlanta University researchers suggested that a union can only be as strong as its most silenced members. Thus, omitting African Americans from membership is detrimental, not only to the social and economic conditions of African Americans, but to the economic well-being of the organization as a whole. If the two groups remain separated by race, then employers can use the pool of African American artisans, possibly, to drive down the total wages of the mass of workers. This, in effect, results in a decrease of possible income for both groups.

The fourth resolution commended the training of African Americans in trade schools. Data obtained from various trade schools indicate that “the movements in this line, especially in the last ten years, have been of estimable benefit to the freedmen’s sons” (8).

The fifth resolution called for the establishment of industrial settlements for African Americans. It is hoped that “the industrial settlements of Negroes...[will] offer peculiarly promising fields of enterprise for a philanthropy based on solid business principles” (8).

The sixth resolution requested help from public schools, agencies for the social betterment of African Americans, and colleges in advancing the ranks of African American artisans. “We insist that no permanent advance in industrial or other lines can be made without three great indirect helps” (8). This plea is made with the knowledge that the
social uplift of African Americans must include representatives from the entire American society, not just a few.

The Seventh Atlanta University Conference was significant because it was the first investigation to fully embody Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois' plan of scientific inquiry with the use of modern scientific techniques. The result was, arguably, the most methodologically sound investigation in the entire Atlanta University Conference Publication series. This prototype of sociological inquiry, promoted by W. E. B. Du Bois, would serve as the model to follow for subsequent Atlanta University Conference studies.

*Atlanta University Publication #8, 1903*
*"The Negro Church"
*Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

"The Negro Church" was the subject of the Eighth Atlanta University Conference. This topic was chosen because Atlanta University officials wanted to ascertain the "religion of Negroes and its influence on their moral habits" (Du Bois 1903:v). The methods of research used in this investigation include secondary data analysis, special reports, questionnaires, and a review of the existing literature.

1890 United States census data were used to identify the specific religious affiliations of African Americans. Additionally, financial and membership information were solicited from the annual conferences of the A. M. E. Z. Church, A. M. E. Church, C. M. E. Church, M. E. Church, and the National Baptist Convention.

The special reports utilized in this investigation included two hundred and fifty special reports from pastors and other church officials, one hundred and seventy-five
special reports from African American laymen, one hundred seventeen special reports from the heads of schools of prominent men, White and African American, fifty-four special reports from Southern white persons, thirteen special reports from African American Theological Schools, and one hundred and nine special reports from Northern Theological schools. All of these special reports contained data about the morality of African Americans.

Questionnaires were administered to 1,300 school children in Richmond, VA, Chicago, IL, Atlanta, GA, Deland, FL, Thomas County, GA, and Greene County, OH. These children were asked questions such as “Are you a Christian?,” “Do you go to church?,” “Why do you like a certain church the best?,” and “What does it mean to be a Christian?” The purpose of this inquiry, the author suggests, was to determine the level of religiosity of these children and to note possible similarities and differences when compared in light of their various socioeconomic conditions.

The final method of research used in this investigation was an examination of the existing literature. Religious Life in America by Ernest H. Abbott (1902) and Christianity, Islam, and the Negro Race by Edward W. Blyden (1887) are representative examples of the religion literature reviewed by Atlanta University researchers. The total review of this literature is voluminous and representative of every known religion practiced by Africans and African Americans.

The data collected for this investigation resulted in one resolution calling for the “strengthening of ideals of life and living” (207) among African Americans. Atlanta University officials, in this and previous publications, specifically identify African
American women as the individuals charged with leading the much needed spiritual revolution. Additionally, conference officials stress the need for African American women to be protected from the sexual terrorism emanating from white men. To this end, Atlanta University researchers asserted that “upon the women of no race have the truths of the gospel taken a firmer and deeper hold than upon the colored women of the United States. For her protection and by her help a religious rebirth is needed” (207).

The subject of the Ninth Atlanta University Conference was “Negro Crime in Georgia.” This study was initially conceptualized to cover the extent of crime committed by African Americans on a national scale. However, because “The whole discussion of crime in the United States has usually been based on the census returns, and these are very inadequate,” (Du Bois 1904:v) conference officials decided to gather as much accurate data as possible on the state of Georgia in the hopes of having some accurate and scientific data on the subject. Atlanta University researchers openly acknowledged that “These data are less complete than in the case of our previous studies and few conclusions can be drawn until further facts and figures are available” (v). Despite these limitations conference officials were confident that the methods of research used in this study provided essential information concerning Negro crime in Georgia. The methods used in this investigation included analyses of special studies of court returns and other data from Atlanta and Savannah, reports from mayors, chiefs of police, and other officers in 37
Georgia counties, reports from Black and White citizens in 37 Georgia counties, police data from 20 United States cities, seven reports of the Georgia Prison Commission, and questionnaires distributed to 2,000 school aged children.

Court returns and other judicial data from Atlanta and Savannah were used to discover the total number of arrests and convictions of African Americans, comparison of arrest records between African American males and females and Blacks and Whites, ages of offenders, and other demographic information.

Special reports were received from every chief of police in the state of Georgia as well as responses from various county officials and White citizens. The data provided by these individuals revealed their knowledge of the amount of crime committed by African Americans, the increase or decrease of crime committed by African Americans in recent years, and any additional remarks that they wanted to offer on this topic.

Reports were also solicited from African American residents of Georgia concerning the types of crime committed by African Americans, the fairness or unfairness, of the justice system and the condition of the Georgia prison system.

Arrest rates from cities such as New York, NY, Philadelphia, PA, Washington D. C., Cincinnati, OH, and Louisville KY were used to chart possible increases and/or decreases in the crimes of African Americans on a national level and to identify the difference between the number of arrests made with the number of convictions. These data were utilized mainly to elicit information about the wrongful and lengthy imprisonment of many African Americans by the unscrupulous American judicial system.
Data from the Georgia Prison Commission were used, in part, to verify the existence and extent of the convict lease system. The convict lease system was an arrangement in which, for example, the state government of Georgia leases the labor of its prisoners to private businesses for a profit that is garnered by the government. Data supplied by the Georgia Prison Commission cited the number and types of jobs that prisoners were assigned to, length of their prison sentence, and the amount of money received by the state for the lease agreement.

Questionnaires were administered to 2,000 school children. The questionnaires sought to discover "what Negroes think of crime." Children between the ages 9-15 were asked questions concerning the purpose of laws, what they believed the primary function of the court system to be, whether or not all people convicted of crimes are bad and guilty, etc. Atlanta University Conference researchers, arguably, were attempting to ascertain information concerning reasons why individuals engage in criminal behavior.

Once again, Atlanta University investigators acknowledged the incompleteness of their project. In fact, they assert that "these data are less complete than in the case of most of our previous studies and few conclusions can be drawn until further facts and figures are available" (v). Despite this admittance, conference officials presented several resolutions.

The first resolution acknowledged that there was a high amount of crime committed by African Americans in the State of Georgia. For example, arrest records from Atlanta and Savannah, during the years 1898-1903, indicated that African Americans committed crimes at twice the level of its White citizens.
The second resolution asserted that the causes of the high rates of crime were the inability of African Americans to make a smooth transition from slavery to freedom; race prejudice; less legal protection under the law, especially for African American women; race specific laws; white court justice and Black court injustice; and because the methods of punishment breed more crime. Highlighting the first part of this resolution, the Executive Board asserts that “The mass of Negroes are in a transient stage between slavery and freedom. Such a period of change involves physical strain, mental bewilderment, and moral weakness. Such periods of stress have among all people given rise to crime and a criminal class” (65).

The third resolution suggested that the amount of crime committed by African Americans was not on the increase in the State of Georgia. In fact, between 1895 and 1904 there was a substantial decrease in the total number of African Americans convicted of crime in the State of Georgia.

The fourth resolution posited that “the cure for Negro crime lies in moral uplift and inspiration among Negroes” (65). This resolution extends from the previous year’s study on the African American church in which it was proposed that the entire African American community would benefit from a spiritual awakening that would, hopefully, lead to increased morality and decreased levels of crime.

The fifth resolution was an appeal to Whites for fairer criminal laws; justice in the courts; abolition of the convict lease system; more intelligent methods of punishment; refusal to allow free labor to be displaced by convict labor; and the acknowledgment that it is the lower classes of people who are threats to the citizens of Georgia and not
necessarily all African Americans. This "appeal to Whites" was a class based attempt
educated African Americans to repudiate theories suggesting that biological factors led to
an over representation of African Americans as criminals and convicts.

The Ninth Atlanta University Publication was an examination of African American
crime in Georgia, but had national significance. This study was significant because it
provided scientific data identifying specific institutional injustices experienced by African
Americans that had, heretofore, been viewed as hearsay, myth, or cast as sporadic
occurrences. The physical violence and disfranchisement of African Americans by the Jim
Crow American North and South were scientifically exposed in this publication.
Additionally, the uncovering of the convict lease system extended the undocumented
grievances of many African Americans beyond the realm of mere speculation. Although
the civil rights of African Americans were not fully granted and protected by this nation
until the middle of the 19th century, this investigation, while documenting the existence of
social inequality against many African Americans, can be viewed as an early and scientific
strike at forcing Americans to recognize the need for the legal protection of Blacks from
some Whites.

*Atlanta University Publication #10, 1905
“A Select Bibliography of the Negro American”
Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

The Tenth Atlanta University Conference Publication contained a bibliography of
the existing literature concerning African Americans in the United States. This endeavor
was not the first attempt at such a bibliography. "A first modest attempt at a short
bibliography was made in a leaflet of 4 pp. Published in 1900. This was enlarged in a second edition (1901) to 9 pages. The present report is thus in a sense a third edition of this bibliography" (Du Bois 1905:5). This bibliography is a useful tool for those desiring to identify the major literary works concerning African Americans at the turn of the century.

The only resolution of this conference asserts that “the results of ten years’ study of these social questions have justified the meetings and the methods of study employed” (7).

After ten years of sociological analysis and investigations, the Atlanta University Conference established itself as one of the leading authorities on African Americans. Although the research efforts of Atlanta University Conference researchers were ignored or marginalized as a “them” issue, the accomplishments made during the first ten years of studies had an impact on future urban sociological researchers and scholars, even if vicariously.

*Atlanta University Publication #11, 1906*
*"The Health and Physique of the Negro American"
Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

The Eleventh Atlanta University Conference addressed the health and physique of African Americans. “This [investigation] marks the beginning of a second cycle of stud[ies] and takes up again the subject of the physical condition of Negroes, [first addressed in the 1896 and 1897 investigations], but enlarges the inquiry beyond the mere matter of mortality” (Du Bois 1906:5). The methods of research used in this study were
reports from the United States census, reports of life insurance companies, vital records of cities and towns, reports of the United States Surgeon General, reports from African American hospitals and drug stores, reports from medical schools, letters from physicians, measurements of 1,000 Hampton University students, and an examination of the general literature.

United States census data from the years 1790-1900 were utilized to obtain information concerning the geographic distribution of African Americans, increases or decreases in the African American population, mortality, causes of death, and birth rates. Additionally, census data were used comparatively to determine total number of United States citizens, their sex and age, number of defectives, mulattoes, delinquents, and the causes and rates of mortality.

Reports of life insurance companies were examined to identify the “distribution of the economic burden” (91) carried by these organizations. The perceived economic burden of insuring African Americans had previously resulted in the denial of insurance to them based upon the assumption that their rates of death were higher than other groups. In response to this unfounded belief, Atlanta University Conference researchers produced data suggesting a different conclusion.

The reports of the thirty-four leading companies conclude: ‘It has been supposedly in the past that colored people have less vitality than whites, but the somewhat scanty facts here available do not prove it.’ In fact the Negro makes a better showing than the Irish, nearly as good as the Germans, and better than the economic class of laborers in general. To be sure these Negroes were carefully selected, but this fact only emphasizes the injustice which would have been done them had they been discriminated against merely on account of color, as the insurance companies
so often do. (P. 92)

The vital records of various cities and towns and reports of the United States Surgeon General were used to identify death rates, causes of death, and the social conditions experienced by African Americans in cities such as New York, NY, Indianapolis, IN, Chicago, IL, Columbus, OH, Cleveland, OH, Memphis, TN, St. Louis, MO, Washington D. C., New Orleans, LA, and Charleston, SC.

Reports from African American hospitals and drug stores were used to identify the institutions that accepted African American patients, the total number of drug stores in twenty-five states, total number of dentists and pharmacists in the nation, capital held by these institutions, and the number of workers employed.

"A circular was sent to all [of] the medical schools in the country, asking if they had Negro students or graduates and [seeking information concerning] their character, etc" (98). Reports were received from 23 White medical colleges. Questionnaires were also mailed to various African American physicians attempting to identify their current location and place of graduation. As of 1906 the primary institutions charged with training African American physicians were Meharry Medical College (Nashville), Howard University Medical Department (Washington D.C.), Leonard Medical School (Raleigh, N.C.), Flint Medical College (New Orleans), and Louisville National Medical College (Louisville).

About 1,000 students from Hampton University participated in this study by allowing researchers to measure their head, cranio-facial skeleton, describe their racial type, and obtain other descriptive and physical data that could be compared with White
Americans. The purpose of this study was to dispel various myths concerning the, supposed, physical differences and biological inferiority of Blacks compared to Whites. Additionally, the data collected were used to catalogue differences between African Americans based upon skin tone and other physical characteristics. The combination of these methodologies produced data that debunked various myths concerning African Americans.

The first resolution suggested that the overall health of African Americans was improving. Atlanta University Conference data indicated lower rates of death, infant mortality, and decreased deaths from tuberculosis than were discovered in the 1896 and 1897 studies. Overall, the data collected for this study showed a marked decline in the total number of deaths from these conditions.

The second resolution insisted that, despite the drop in the African American death rate, the mortality rate of African Americans, when compared to other racial groups, was still too high. To this end, the Executive Board recommended the formation of local health leagues to address the health concerns and needs of African Americans.

The third resolution argued that special effort was needed to end tuberculosis in the African American community. As indicated earlier, the death rate due to tuberculosis declined between 1896 and 1906. Nevertheless, Atlanta University researchers asserted that African Americans needed additional assistance in conquering this disease because they continued to be disproportionately affected.

The fourth resolution found no evidence of the physical inferiority of African Americans when compared to Whites. This conclusion was reached, in part, through the
voluntary efforts of the 1,000 Hampton University students who assisted in debunking the popular myth that African Americans were genetically different and biologically inferior to Whites by serving as research subjects.

The Eleventh Atlanta University Conference embodied Dr. Du Bois' plan of systematic and scientific inquiry directed at analyzing and solving social problems and debunking unscientific facts. The significance of this study is that it provided data contradicting commonly accepted myths concerning African Americans. Once again, the data produced by Atlanta University researchers expose social injustice and ignorance.

*Atlanta University Publication #12, 1907*
"Economic Cooperation Among Negro Americans"
*Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

The Twelfth Atlanta University Conference Publication focused on the economic relationships established between African American businesses and "is a continuation and enlargement of [the 1898 conference, "Some Efforts of American Negroes for their Own Social Betterment"] made nearly ten years ago, with certain limitations and changes. The question set before us in the present study is: How far is there and has there been among Negro Americans a conscious effort at mutual aid in earning a living?" (Du Bois 1907:10). Information concerning the origin of African entrepreneurial activities, the development of cooperative efforts among Africans in America, and the current types of economic cooperation are presented in this publication.

The methods of research used in this investigation were not as clearly defined as previous studies. However, an examination of the bibliography indicate that some data
were collected via personal correspondences with businessmen and social societies throughout the southern United States, conference reports citing economic data from various churches, and an analyses of the existing literature. The data collected focused on the extent and types of economic cooperation between African American institutions such as the church, school, beneficial and insurance societies, banks, etc. From these sources a single resolution was offered by the Executive Board of this conference and it was that “efforts should be made to foster and emphasize [the] present tendencies among Negroes toward co-operative effort and that the ideal of wide ownership of small capital and small accumulations among many rather than great riches among a few, should persistently be held before them” (4).

Conference officials suggested that economic cooperation, emanating from the church and extending into the private business world, was vital in an era in which African Americans were disfranchised economically and politically, and faced a crossroad that could determine the fate of the race.

One way lead[s] to the old trodden ways of grasping fierce individualistic competition, where the shrewd, cunning, skilled, and rich among them will prey upon the ignorance and simplicity of the mass of the race and get wealth at the expense of the general well being; the other way leading to co-operation in capital and labor, the massing of small savings, the wide distribution of capital and a more general equality of wealth and comfort. (P. 9)

The Executive Board asserts that the best course of action for African Americans is one leading to increased racial solidarity and, as stated in previous publications, reliance upon
one other economically. This, Atlanta University officials posit, will result in the economic and political strengthening of the African American community.

Atlanta University Publication #13, 1908
"The Negro Family"
Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois

The topic of the Thirteenth Atlanta University Conference concerned "The Negro Family." This study was a continuation of previous Atlanta University Conferences focusing on family issues. For example:

In 1897 the Atlanta University Negro Conference made an investigation into the 'Social and Physical Condition of Negroes in Cities,' which involved a study of 4742 individuals gathered in 1137 families, living in 59 different groups, in 18 different cities. These data were compiled by the United States Department of Labor and published in Bulletin number ten; and, as the editor said, 'Great credit is due the investigators for their work.' The object of the investigation was to study the mortality of Negroes and the social and family conditions. The study of Mortality was continued in 1906 by Atlanta University publication number eleven. The present study continues the study of social conditions from the point of view of the family group. (Du Bois 1908:5)

The methods of research used in this investigation included an examination of the existing slavery literature, United States Census Bureau reports, reports from the United States Bureau of Labor, previous Atlanta University Conference Studies, and local studies conducted by Atlanta University students. Similar to previous investigations, Atlanta University researchers acknowledged the limitations of their study and noted the dearth of existing and accurate data regarding the subject. Conference officials argued that “there is
perhaps enough [data collected for this study] to give a tentative outline which more exact research may later fill in" (9).

The slavery literature was useful in that it provided data concerning the structure and organization of the African American family during that period of American history. Some of the slavery data collected (i.e., personal narratives and diaries) were utilized to assess the structure and organization of African tribes prior to European contact. Overall, this data source helped specify the types of social and familial relations existing among people of African descent before and immediately after the introduction of kidnapped Africans into the American colonies.

Census reports of 1890 and 1900 were used to gain demographic information such as the size of the African American population in each state, the number of African Americans by age and sex, conjugal conditions, number of farms and homes owned, employment status, etc. Additionally, previous Atlanta University Conference Publications, specifically numbers 2 and 11, were used as sources of demographic and qualitative data concerning particular characteristics of African American families.

Eight reports of the United States Bureau of Labor were analyzed to gain information concerning the working condition of African Americans in various cities. The data, garnered through the use of schedules, were collected by Atlanta University Conference researchers who either resided in the particular location investigated or traveled to various locations specifically for the purpose of gathering data. The data contained in these reports were combined to assess the experiences faced by working class African Americans in various geographic locations. The collection of employment data
assisted Atlanta University Conference researchers in assessing the economic condition of families in Farmville, VA, the Black belt (e.g., Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee), Sandy Spring, MD, an unspecified county in the state of Georgia, Litwalton, VA, Cinclaire Central Factory and Calumet Plantation, LA, and Xenia, OH.

Sixteen Atlanta University students supplemented the data offered above with their own research investigation. As part of their academic requirement, the college classes of 1909 and 1910 investigated the social and familial conditions of thirty-two families in the Atlanta, Georgia area. These students walked door-to-door in various neighborhoods gathering data through the use of schedules. The information collected by the Atlanta University students was combined with the aforementioned data to form a substantial collection of information about the African American family.

Similar to previous investigations, Atlanta University Conference officials were aware of their lack of accurate and complete data. Despite this limitation, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois asserted that data collected for this study were:

> Based on first-hand knowledge, and are unusually accurate. They do not, however, represent properly the proportion of different types among the mass of Negroes. Most of the families studied belong to the upper half of the black population. Finally, to repeat, this study is but a sketch with no pretense toward attempting to exhaust a fruitful subject. The main cause of its limitation is lack of material. (P. 9-10)

In spite of the limitations identified above, the Executive Board offered three resolutions.

The first resolution instructed older African American women to teach young women “to appreciate the seriousness of marriage, its solemn import and its sacred
responsibilities” (153). This resolution was offered in light of the Atlanta University Conference Publication data that revealed high rates of illegitimate births and female headed households. As suggested in previous Atlanta University Conference Publications, the morality and subsequent success of the race must be championed by the women of the race.

The second resolution suggested that young men be taught to revere womanhood and motherhood “so that their purity may be no mere prudent restraint, but a generous and chivalrous Christian knightliness” (153).

The third resolution emphasized that marriage and family were sacred institutions and should be treated as such. All of these resolutions extended from census data indicating the virtual mockery of African American marriages during slavery, low levels of marriage for African Americans in 1890 and 1900, high rates of illegitimate births, and, in some cases, complete disregard for the sanctity of marriage as evidenced by the existence of broken families resulting from “the abnormal number of widowed and separated, and the late age of marriage [that result in] sexual irregularity and economic pressure” (31).

The Thirteenth Atlanta University Conference investigation represents the first study of the African American family unit. Rutledge M. Dennis (1975) shares and extends this proposition by asserting that “Du Bois' 1908 study, The Negro American Family, was the first study of the sociology of family in the United States” (106). Whether or not this publication was the first sociological investigation of the American family is not the focus of this inquiry. What is important to note is that Atlanta University provided the discipline of sociology with one of its first family investigations and, yet, neither the scholars nor
their scholarship are recognized in the literature. It should be apparent to any objective observer that the social scientific scholarship taking place at Atlanta University deserves at least, minimal attention in the many compartmentalized areas of sociological fields that now exist and, ideally, substantive courses devoted to the specific contributions of this laboratory.

*Atlanta University Publication #14, 1909*
*"Efforts for Social Betterment among Negro Americans"
Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois*

The Fourteenth Atlanta University Conference investigation was a continuation of the 1898 study into the “Efforts of American Negroes for their Own Social Betterment.” The main objective of this project, similar to the initial investigation, was to ascertain the number and type of programs and activities designed to better the social condition and morale of African Americans. Similar to previous studies, the Atlanta University Conference researchers readily acknowledged the limitations of their study. Official publication records suggest that “it is...again not possible to make an exhaustive study of Social Betterment among the ten million people of Negro descent in the United States. An attempt has been made, however, to secure in all parts of the country a fairly representative list of typical efforts and institutions, and the resulting picture while incomplete is nevertheless instructive” (Du Bois 1909:5). The methods of research used by Atlanta University researchers include questionnaires, census data, and reports from various benevolence oriented organizations.
The questionnaire used in this investigation was designed to accumulate information concerning the charitable activities of various organizations devoted to socially uplifting African Americans. This objective was achieved by mailing letters "in all the chief centers of [the] Negro population [to] a number of persons of standing" (9). The mailed letter admonished each recipient to identify all charitable institutions, clubs, and/or organizations in their community and mail the questionnaire back to Atlanta University when completed. Once these data were received by the Atlanta University researchers, letters were then mailed to the various charitable institutions, clubs, and organizations identified in the correspondence provided by the people contacted initially. Data obtained from this method concerned the history of the organizations contacted, material facts of the group, actual pictures of buildings and members, economic data, examples of activities supported for the purpose of social uplift, and the amount of property owned. Despite the absence of an accurate recording of the total number of reports received from various organizations, the Atlanta University Publication records reveal that "a large number of reports were obtained" (9) and they comprise the data that supports the resolutions of this conference.

The first resolution, a reaffirmation of a resolution presented in an earlier publication, insisted that African American churches become more institutional and reformatory while employing social workers. Data best reflective of this resolution and procured at the 1898 Atlanta University Conference suggests that:

The Negro Church is the only social institution of the Negroes which started in the forests and survived slavery; under the leadership of the priest and medicine man, afterward
of the Christian pastor, the Church preserved itself the remnants of Negro social life. So that to-day the Negro population of the United States is virtually divided into Church congregations, which are the real units of the race life. It is natural, therefore, that charitable and rescue work among Negroes should first be found in the churches and reach there its greatest development. (Du Bois 1898:16)

This resolution is a continuation of the conferences’ challenge to the church to bear the brunt of uplifting African Americans because of its extensive history and longevity as the only African institution to survive the institution of slavery.

The second resolution requested that African American public schools be supported with government monies. Similarly, the 1901 Atlanta University Conference Publication, "The Negro Common School," produced data indicating a large disparity in the amount of monies allotted White and Black schools. For example, although African Americans comprised thirty-five percent of the students in Virginia, thirty-three percent in North Carolina, and forty-six percent in Georgia, only 14, 13, and 17 percent of the total cost of African American schools were funded by each respective state government.

The third resolution championed the establishment of more women’s clubs in each African American community for the express purpose of engaging in charitable programs. This resolution was offered in response to data that revealed the extraordinary accomplishments of many women’s clubs. For example:

The White Rose Mission of New York city, organized about twenty years ago by Mrs Victoria Earle Matthews, has done much good work in that city. A large number of needy ones have found shelter within its doors and have been able to secure work of all kinds. This club has a committee to meet the incoming steamers from the South and see that young women entering the city as strangers are directed to proper homes.
Mrs. Frances Keyser, who has charge of this work, is the right woman in the right place. (P. 62)

The fourth resolution advocated the establishment of old folks homes, orphanages, and hospitals specifically for African Americans— a plea that was also made at a previous Atlanta University Conference. Reports returned from Atlanta University Conference researchers indicated the need for such institutions in cities such as Memphis, TN, St. Louis, MO, and Winston-Salem, NC. These and many other cities had very few, if any, institutions established to meet the various needs of the African American population in the cities investigated.

The fifth resolution insisted that organizations within the African American community engage in “work of rescue among women and children especially and also among men and boys is greatly needed, particularly among city Negroes, and has been neglected too long” (133). Thus, organizations such as the Young Mens and Women’s Christian Associations, as well as refuges and rescue homes for women, were encouraged to participate in this endeavor.

The sixth resolution encouraged additional artistic training for African American youth. Data from various social, literary, and art clubs in cities such as Houston, TX, Washington D. C., Dallas, TX, and Cleveland, OH, indicated a dearth of artistic training for African Americans. Atlanta University Conference officials suggested that, instead of simply focusing on traditional vocational and technical training, a combination of artistic and educational training be encouraged.
The seventh resolution advocated the establishment of nurseries, social settlements, and kindergartens for the children of working parents. Conference officials recognized the need for these services and contended that "There ought to be not only several in each city and town, but also in county districts" (119).

The eighth resolution asserted that African Americans be allowed to express their political rights without being disenfranchised. The Executive Board addressed this issue directly by stating that:

While something can be accomplished by organizations for civic reform among Negroes themselves, yet so long as the race is deprived of the ballot it is impossible to make such organizations of the highest efficiency in any avenue of life, whether it be education, religion, work, or social reform; the impossibility of the Negro accomplishing the best work so long as he is kept in political servitude is manifest even to the casual student. (P. 133)

The Fourteenth Atlanta University Publication was significant in that it succinctly captured the efforts of African Americans to promote their own uplift and it, once again, scientifically exposed various social barriers placed before African Americans in their quest for civil rights. Heretofore, many of the social injustices experienced by African Americans were, as stated earlier, either disregarded or minimized by many White Americans. The refusal to repudiate the social injustice experienced by African Americans became extremely difficult for White Americans with the presentation of scientifically gathered data from this investigation and similar investigations like Atlanta University Conference Publication #9. Possibly, the collection and presentation of these scientific observations was beneficial in helping African Americans achieve their civil rights.
"In 1900 the Atlanta University Negro Conference made an investigation of the college graduates among Negro Americans. This study received widespread publicity and did much towards clearing up misapprehension in regard to educated colored people" (Du Bois and Dill 1910:5). Ten years later the Atlanta University Conference revisited this subject with the intent of identifying the total number of African American college students enrolled in college, the occupations of African American college graduates, current curriculum of African American colleges, attitudes of "other" colleges toward African Americans, and the attitudes of various college and university presidents concerning African American students. The methods of research used to obtain this information included an examination of various college catalogues, letters from numerous college and university officials, and reports from eight-hundred African American college graduates.

The catalogues of thirty-two African American colleges and universities were analyzed to identify the specific requirements for admission, courses needed for graduation, number of graduates and current students, amount of time devoted to specific areas of study, and general curriculum information. These data were gathered from "First Grade Colored Colleges" such as Howard University, Fisk University, Atlanta University, Wiley, Leland, Virginia Union University, Clark College, Knoxville College, Spelman College, Claflin, and Atlanta Baptist College, as well as twenty-one additional African American institutions of higher learning.
Letters were mailed to the presidents of many predominately White universities seeking information concerning the number of African American students enrolled at their particular college/university and their academic performance as compared to the White students. Replies were received from over thirty-five institutions including Princeton University, Yale University, Union College (Nebraska), University of North Dakota, South Dakota State College, Oberlin College, Oregon Agricultural College, Des Moines College, University of Nebraska, University of Kansas, and the University of Iowa.

Questionnaires received from eight-hundred African American college graduates comprised the final method of research used in this study. The information requested from respondents pertained to their age, sex, marital status, number of children, early life training, education, degrees, current occupation, membership in learned societies, publications, public offices held, activity in charitable work, amount of land owned, value of property, plans on educating their children, chief hindrances, and present philosophy regarding current condition of African Americans in the United States. All of the data collected via the students, presidents, and catalogues combined to form the foundation for the resolutions offered.

The first resolution, that is not grounded in any tangible data, suggests that there was a demand for college trained African Americans. This pronouncement was made, in part, because of the growing number of jobs created by industrialization. With only a small number of educated African Americans at this time, the growing economy demanded an enlarged and educated cadre of mental workers to fill various jobs.
The second resolution reported that African American college graduates were usefully employed. Data collected by the Atlanta University Conference researchers indicated that eighty-five percent of the eight hundred respondents were gainfully employed. Of these, fifty-four percent worked in education, twenty percent were preachers, seven percent practiced medicine, and four percent practiced law. This fact, according to Atlanta University Conference officials, affirmed that “Negro graduates are at present, with few exceptions, usefully and creditably employed” (7) and dispelled the myth that college educated African Americans are unable to find employment because of racial prejudice.

The third resolution argued for the holistic college training of African Americans. Data elicited from the catalogues of various American colleges and universities revealed that an enormous number of credit hours were devoted to ancient and modern languages. The Executive Board suggested that the attention given foreign languages be reduced while increasing the instruction of social science courses.

The fourth resolution proposed that each state in America establish one college devoted primarily to the training of African Americans. This resolution was presented because the Atlanta University Conference researchers discovered that some African American youth in pursuit of a college education traveled the distance of several states to attend college. The establishment of a university in each state would provide easier access for those students unable to attend college far from home.

The fifth resolution requested that “there should be every effort towards co-operation between colleges in the same locality, and towards avoidance of unnecessary
duplication of work" (7). This resolution probably emerged from the fact that Atlanta University was geographically surrounded by other historically black colleges and universities, namely Spelman College, Atlanta Baptist College, Morris Brown College, Clark College. It is reasonable that institutions of higher learning in close proximity to one another should be engaged in collaborative projects.

The sixth resolution, also not grounded in tangible data, called for the establishment of additional African American public high schools in the South. Conference organizers argued that the establishment of southern high schools would provide a means by which to properly provide young African Americans with the skills needed to survive in this society and for the rigors of college.

The seventh resolution challenged African American colleges to strictly adhere to the admission requirements stated in their catalogues. This resolution emerged from Atlanta University Conference data indicating subjective admission practices by some colleges.

The eighth resolution argued for the reduction of Greek and Latin taught in African American colleges and universities and the ninth resolution, conversely, argued for an increase in the instruction of the natural sciences, English, History, and Sociology. These resolutions, as indicated earlier, were presented in light of data that revealed an extraordinary amount of foreign language requirements.

The tenth resolution called for both the vocational and cultural training of young African Americans. This resolution proposed that neither type of training was superior to the other. However, conference officials asserted that young African Americans be
afforded a holistic education to provide them with the skills needed to gain intellectual as well as vocational employment.

The Fifteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication was significant because it successfully debunked the commonly held notion that African Americans did not benefit from a college education. The data presented in this investigation indicated that African American college graduates benefitted from their college education through better employment opportunities and increased political and social intelligence.

_Atlanta University Publication #16, 1911_
_
_"The Common School and the Negro American"_
_Edited by W. E. B. Du Bois and Augustus Granville Dill_

The Sixteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication addressed the status of African American common schools and was an extension of the 1901 investigation, "The Negro Common School." The data collected for this investigation included reviews of annual reports of the United States Commissioner of Education, state school reports, reports from various city school superintendents, and reports from teachers and citizens in various Southern communities.

Data from the United States Bureau of Education, reports from the years 1896, 1901, and 1902, were used to obtain demographic and economic information concerning public education and African Americans. Data from these sources revealed the number of students and the amount of funding allotted for various schools committed to educating African American students.
State school reports were received from seventeen mostly southern and Atlantic coast states and the District of Columbia. The data from these sources provided information concerning the number of students enrolled in school, the salaries of Black and White teachers, the total number of Black and White teachers, attendance of students, federal and state appropriations, and illiteracy rates.

School superintendents in various states were mailed questionnaires requesting information concerning their location, number of school buildings for African Americans in their district, seating capacity of schools, number of African American students, number of African American teachers, institutions where teachers were educated, work habits of teachers, strengths and weaknesses of African American teachers, salary, and opinions on the work of African American schools. Replies were received from one hundred and twenty-four superintendents representing fifteen states.

School teachers and various citizens throughout the South were mailed questionnaires soliciting data concerning their location, number of White and Black schools in the area, length of school term for Black and White schools, number of Black and White teachers, amount of money spent on Black and White schools, school facilities, and general condition of African American schools in their area. The number of reports received from school teachers and various citizens was not identified in the publication.

This Atlanta University Publication, similar to previous ones, carried a disclaimer concerning the limitation of the data collected. The Executive Board proclaimed that:

The object of these studies is primarily scientific—a careful research for truth; conducted thoroughly, broadly and honestly as the material resources and mental equipment at command
will allow. It must be remembered that mathematical accuracy in these studies is impossible; the sources of information are of varying degrees of accuracy and the pictures are woefully incomplete. There is necessarily much repetition in the successive studies, and some contradiction of previous reports by later ones as new material comes to hand.
(Du Bois and Dill 1911:5)

Despite these limitations, the Executive Board resolutely asserts that “All we can claim is that the work is as thorough as circumstances permit and that with all its obvious limitations it is well worth the doing” (5). The resolutions below are presented in light of the limitations cited above.

The first resolution noted a reduction in the amount of money allotted to finance African American schools over the past few years. For example, a 1909 report from Houston County in Georgia revealed that that school system educated 3,165 African American students and 1,044 White students. However, the amount of funding received from the state government for each group of children was $4,509 and $10,678 respectively. This disparity in funding for African American students, as disheartening as the data may appear, was actually an increase over what had been offered to African Americans over the previous ten years.

The second resolution reported that the wages of African American teachers were lower than their white counterparts. Additionally, it was posited that many school districts preferred to hire poor teachers rather than better ones in an effort to maintain low teacher salaries. In North Carolina, for example, “the colored teachers were paid $224,800 in 1907 and $221,800 in 1908; during the same time the amount paid white teachers in the rural districts was increased by $50,000” (117).
The third resolution charged that many superintendents neglected to properly supervise their African American schools. This neglect led to inferior buildings, poor educational materials, and low salaries for African American teachers. A representative example of the neglect of African American schools was noted by Mr. W. K. Tate, state supervisor of elementary rural schools of South Carolina. Mr. Tate said:

It has been my observation that the Negro schools of South Carolina are for the most part without supervision of any kind. Frequently the county superintendent does not know where they are located and sometimes the district board can not tell where the Negro school is taught. (P. 103)

These comments indicate a gross neglect of South Carolina schools in particular and the prevailing apathy concerning African American schools in general.

The fourth resolution argued that few schools had been established for African American youth and the schools that existed were in great need of repair. The Executive Board of the conference purports that:

It seems almost incredible that Atlanta with a Negro population of 51,902, Savannah with a Negro population of 33,246 and Augusta with a Negro population of 18,344, should make no provision for the high school training of their black children. (P. 127)

These data indicate the need for an educational program designed to serve the needs of the African American population.

The fifth resolution argued that African Americans were prevented from participating in the governance of the public schools that their children attend. Atlanta University Conference researchers discovered that African Americans' parents were denied input into the governance of their school systems through both the Black Codes and the
rule of Jim Crow. This Atlanta University Conference Publication listed eight ways African Americans were denied input into the politics of their communities.

1. Illiteracy: The voter must be able to read and write.
2. Property: The voter must own a certain amount of property.
3. Poll Tax: The voter must have paid his poll tax for the present year or a series of years. 4. Employment: The voter must have regular employment. 5. Army Service: Soldiers in the Civil War and certain other wars, or their descendants, may vote.
6. Reputation: Persons of good reputation who understand the duties of a citizen may vote. 7. 'Grandfather Clause' clause: Persons who could vote before the freedmen were enfranchised or descendants of such persons may vote. 8. Understanding clause: Persons may vote who understand some selected clause of the Constitution and can explain it to the satisfaction of the registration officials. (P. 115)

According to Atlanta University officials, these disenfranchisement laws, combined with the threat of physical violence by the Ku Klux Klan, made it virtually impossible for African Americans to exercise their right to participate in the democratic American political process at this particular period in American history.

The Sixteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication is significant because it, similar to previous studies, uncovered specific structural inequalities that made the African American participation in the American political process virtually impossible (i.e., Black Codes and Jim Crow Laws). As suggested earlier, the scientific uncovering of specific social injustices experienced by African Americans by Atlanta University researchers may have contributed to the transformation of the moral consciousness of the United States.
The Seventeenth Atlanta University Conference Publication, "The Negro American Artisan," was an extension of the 1902 investigation and was revisited by the Atlanta University Conference, in part, because of prevailing societal beliefs that "The Negro is lazy [and] Negroes have a childish ambition to do work for which they are not suited" (Du Bois and Dill 1912:5). "This study is an attempt to get at facts underlying such widespread thought as this by making a study of the trained Negro laborer, his education, opportunity, wages and work...The present study seeks to go over virtually the same ground [as the study conducted ten years prior]" (5). The methods used were contemporary and classic studies of African life, ante-bellum American historical studies, local studies, reports from the United States Department of the Census, catalogs of African American colleges and universities, and questionnaires.

Studies of African life and ante-bellum American historical studies were used because "A study of the Negro American artisan quite naturally begins with the entrance of the Negro into American life" (24). The data gained from these sources identified the types of occupations and work habits of Africans immediately before and after their forced exodus to North America.

United States Census data from the years 1850, 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, and 1900, the catalog of Negro institutions, and local studies from forty-one states and the District of Columbia were used to identify the total number of African American workers in the United States and their specific occupations.
Questionnaires were mailed to four groups; interested citizens, heads of Negro institutions, Negro artisans, and various labor unions across the nation. Data received from interested citizens focused on the number of African American laborers in specific communities, their specific trade, visible results of industrial training on African Americans, and the success of African American tradesmen in the communities investigated. The heads of Negro institutions provided data regarding specific occupations of graduates and their current location, difficulties they may have experienced while attempting to obtain work, and the number of graduates currently teaching industrial education in schools. Data received from Negro artisans included their wages, location where their trade was learned, union affiliation, working relationship with whites, prejudice experienced in workplace, and the general condition of Negro artisans. Information obtained from organizations such as the United Mine Workers of America, International Union of Pavers, Rammermen, Flaggers, Bridge and Stone Curb Setters, and Boot and Shoe Makers' Union produced data concerning the membership, or lack thereof, of African Americans and the, if applicable, working relationship between Black and White employees. These methods of research combined to produce the resolutions presented at this conference.

The first resolution stated that African American skilled labor was gaining ground in both the North and South. This resolution was offered in response to census data and reports from artisans themselves indicating a growth in the number of skilled laborers gaining employment in both the northern and southern United States.
The second resolution asserted that the advancements of African American artisans were being accomplished despite the opposition and racial prejudice of whites. For example, Atlanta University Conference Publication data reports that:

The opposition of white mechanics to Negro workmen which was evident in ante-bellum days became more intense after the emancipation of the slaves and in the competition which followed, the untutored, inexperienced black mechanic found himself outdistanced by his thriftier white competitor, sometimes by fair means, sometimes by foul. Without the protection, and with less of the patronage of his former master, the Negro artisan found himself being gradually supplanted by the white working man. (P. 37)

Although faced with racial prejudice from working class Whites over competition for employment, the Atlanta University Conference researchers asserted that African American artisans, as a group, were able to gain a foothold in many areas of skilled labor in the United States.

The third resolution encouraged African American laborers to embrace and support their fellow White laborers in a massive labor movement that could, ultimately, benefit all working class laborers. The Seventeenth Atlanta University Publication (1912) reports that:

The salvation of all laborers, white and black, lies in the great movement of social uplift known as the labor movement which has increased wages and decreased hours of labor for black as well as white. When the white laborer is educated to understand economic conditions he will outgrow his pitiable race prejudice and recognize that black men and white men in the labor world have a common cause. Let black men fight prejudice and exclusion in the labor world and fight it hard; but do not fight the labor movement. (P. 7)
It is quite reasonable to assume that the Executive Board recognized the exploitation of poor white workers as well as African American artisans, and that this resolution was offered in the spirit of Karl Marx's class consciousness concept. Realizing the immense economic and political power to be gained from an alliance of working class artisans, conference officials strongly supported a labor movement designed to unite Black and White workers.

The fourth resolution suggested that an emphasis be placed on liberal arts and technical training and asserted that it was fruitless to train people for jobless areas. The Executive Board, similar to W. E. B. Du Bois theory of the Talented Tenth (1903), asserted that holistic education should be strongly encouraged because it equips African Americans with the skills needed to survive in the American society. An over emphasis on one type of training, according to Atlanta University officials, which had been technical to this point, would leave African Americans ill prepared to face the dilemmas of the ever growing American society that was becoming dependant upon mental, as well as physical, labor.

The Seventeenth Atlanta University Conference Publication was significant because it promoted the urgency with which African American and White workers should unite. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, undoubtedly influenced by Karl Marx, believed that a class consciousness, combined with a liberal arts education, could improve the poor economic condition of African Americans and poor Whites. Unfortunately, this call for unity between working class Blacks and Whites was extended at a period of high racial tension and fell upon deaf ears.
The Eighteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication focused on "Morals and Manners Among Negro Americans." This problem was selected because "There is without a doubt a deep-seated feeling in the minds of many that the Negro problem is primarily a matter of morals and manners and that the real basis of color prejudice in America is the fact that the Negroes as a race are rude and thotless in manner and altogether quite hopeless in sexual morals, in regard for property rights and in reverence for truth" (Du Bois and Dill 1913:5). The data collection methods used in this investigation were United States Department of Census data which were analyzed by a Sociology class at Atlanta University, questionnaires, and a local study.

1904 Department of Census data were examined by members of the Sociology class at Atlanta University and their findings were presented in a number of essays included in this publication. The research efforts of this class resulted in articles entitled, "Negro Americans in the United States," "The Negro American Farmer," "Marital Conditions among Negro Americans," and "Religious Bodies among Negro Americans."

Questionnaires were mailed to three groups; African American churches, "trustworthy persons," and 4,000 United States residents. African American churches in Atlanta were mailed questionnaires seeking information concerning the type of denomination, total membership, assets, expenditures expended for missions, educational activities, buildings and repairs, charitable work, care for old people, efforts at encouraging young people, other social services, and the greatest challenge facing this
institution. Replies were received from fifty-five of the sixty-three churches contacted. These data, also secured by students of a class in Sociology at Atlanta University, provided information concerning the morals and manners of some church going African Americans in Atlanta, Georgia.

Trustworthy persons were included in this investigation because the Atlanta University researchers believed that this group "ought to know of the morals and manners of the Negro" (12). Data received from this group addressed manners, morals, cleanliness, honesty, home life, child rearing, caring of old, and a comparison of the present condition of African Americans with the conditions faced by the same group of people ten to twenty years prior. This questionnaire was sent to 4,000 people and ten percent of the recipients, representing thirty states, replied.

The first resolution called for a strengthening of the home life of African Americans. This Atlanta University Conference Publication cited data from numerous trustworthy persons and African American churches in Atlanta indicating an increase in the morality of African Americans over the past ten years.

The second resolution advanced the proposition that there were two hindrances in the path of African American advancement: the persistence of older habits due to slavery and poverty and racial prejudice. Conference officials suggested that habits learned during enslavement and the poverty stricken years of reconstruction were hindering the advancement of the race. The Executive Board asserted stated:

The environment of the American Negro has not been in the past and is not today conducive to the development of the highest morality. There is upon him still the heritage of
two hundred and fifty years of slave regime. Slavery fosters certain virtues like humility and obedience, but these flourish at the terrible cost of lack of self respect, shiftlessness, tale bearing, slovenliness and sexual looseness. (P. 16)

Ultimately, conference officials believed that only time would enable African Americans to caste off the grime of slavery and embrace the heightened morality of freedom.

Additionally, conference data indicated that racial prejudice continued to be a major problem and greatly impeded the moral advancement of the race.

The third resolution saw an awakening of the African American church to its duties and responsibility as a leading community organization and the fourth resolution commended the work of African American women’s clubs in their efforts to better their various communities through social uplift. Neither of these resolutions were supported by tangible data.

The Eighteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication was an examination into the morals of African Americans and signaled the final monograph of the first period of investigations that was directed and edited by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois. Although two monographs follow this study and maintain Dr. Du Bois’ plan of scientific inquiry, they do not meet the level of scientific quality as previous Atlanta University Conference Publications.
The Nineteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication centered on the

"Economic Cooperation Among the Negroes of Georgia." This study was a continuation

of an investigation first explored in 1907.

Ten years ago the Atlanta University Conference conducted
an inquiry into the progress of 'Economic Co-Operation among
Negro Americans.' That study, ably directed by Dr. W. E. B.
Du Bois, aroused national attention and international interest.
Following the arrangement by which the Atlanta University
studies are repeated every ten years, the twenty-second annual
Conference took up this year that study; but with this difference,
that whereas the inquiry of 1907 was national in scope the present
one has been confined to the state of Georgia. (Brown 1917:9)

The methods of data collection included correspondences, a first-hand investigation by
Asa H. Gordon (Atlanta University Class of 1917), and field work by members of the
sociology class at Atlanta University.

Correspondences were made with "business people and other responsible persons"
regarding economic cooperation among African Americans in Georgia. Unlike previous
Atlanta University Conference Publications, this monograph did not identify the research
instrument used in this investigation, the number of questionnaires mailed, or the number
of responses received from subjects. Additionally, unlike previous publications, the data
supporting the resolutions were not included in the final printing. Another difference
between this study and previous publications was that the data used in this investigation
was compiled and presented in essay form by the editor.
Asa H. Gordon, a 1917 Atlanta University graduate, conducted first-hand investigations in "all cities and towns [in Georgia] having a population of ten thousand or more, and in some instances, for special reasons, places of less than ten thousand inhabitants" (9). Publication records indicate that "His mission was fruitful of good results; not only from the standpoint of actual information secured, but also from the point of view of his illuminating report on the conduct of Negro business throughout the state" (9). Gordon recorded an accurate number of African American business in the towns investigated and provided detailed descriptions of the conditions of the buildings and peculiarities of the business.

A final supplement to the data amassed by correspondence and Asa H. Gordon was the fieldwork conducted by members of an Atlanta University Sociology class. The city of Atlanta experienced a disastrous fire that destroyed many African American businesses in the year preceding this investigation. Nevertheless, Atlanta University students sought out every African American business in the area and amassed as much data that was available concerning Atlanta businesses. As indicated earlier, data supporting the resolutions were not offered in this publication. However, the four resolutions offered by conference officials are listed below.

The first resolution commended the progress made by African American businessmen in Georgia. The second resolution criticized many African American business for lacking etiquette and neat and clean establishments. The third resolution called for increased patronage of African American businesses. The fourth resolution commended interracial business cooperation.
The Nineteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication marked the first investigation conducted without the input of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois in over fifteen years and the difference in the planning and structure was marked. This study was not significant because of its narrow focus and lack of generalizability. The major difference between this and previous studies was the omission of the collected data in the actual publication. Nevertheless, the method of scientific research attempted in this investigation mirrored that of previous Atlanta University Conference Publications.

*Atlanta University Publication #20, 1915*
*"Select Discussions of Race Problems"
*Edited by J. A. Bingham*

The Twentieth Atlanta University Conference Publication consisted of essays on the race problem. Included in this volume were articles written by W. E. B. Du Bois, Felix von Luschin, Franklin P. Mall, R. S. Woodworth, W. I. Thomas, Franz Boas (two articles), and Alexander Francis Chamberlain. The publication of this monograph signaled the end of the first twenty year cycle of the Atlanta University Conference Publications. The end of the first twenty years of Atlanta University Conference Publications was captured in the nine resolutions, based upon data collected during the first period of the Atlanta University Studies, 1896-1917, that were offered by the Executive Board.

The first resolution asserted that the death rate of African Americans had shown a downward tendency since 1896. The second resolution stated that African Americans were able to advance economically despite many hindrances placed in their path. The third resolution commended colleges and universities of this nation for improving the
moral, social, and economic condition of African Americans. The fourth resolution called for increased effort to educate children in the South because over fifty percent were not enrolled in high school. The fifth resolution suggested that the morals and ideals of African Americans are being raised with the assistance of common schools. The sixth resolution sought increased attention to, and the scientific study of conditions that made criminals of Negroes. The seventh resolution posited that the monies expended upon the Atlanta University Conferences and reports were well spent. The eighth resolution asserted that “these social studies have furnished one of the most important contributions, in tested facts and scientific conclusions, toward a foundation for the advancement of the Negro in the United States” (Bingham 1915:9). The ninth resolution called for an emphasis in continuing future Atlanta University studies and reports.

The final Atlanta University Conference Publication of the first era was released in 1917 and the final conference was held in 1924. The demise of the annual publication and conference was eminently predictable and can be traced to a lack of funding, the dominating personality of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, and additional factors cited below.

“I Insist On My Right To Think and Speak”

The last Atlanta University Conference Publication was released in 1917 and the last conference took place in 1924. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, director of sixteen publications, suggests that a number of factors lead to the termination of the Atlanta University Conference Publications. Below, four hypotheses are examined.

First, Du Bois cited the lack of advertising by Atlanta University and himself as a major reason why the publications ended. Du Bois (1968) said:
Where had I failed? There were many answers, but one was typically American, as the event proved; I did the deed but I did not advertise it. Either myself or someone for me should have called public attention to what had been done or otherwise it would quickly be forgotten. (P. 221)

Succinctly, Du Bois asserted that “the Deed without Advertising was worthless and in the long run Advertising without the Deed was the only lasting value. Perhaps Americans do not realize how completely they have adopted this philosophy. But Madison Avenue does” (221).

Second, Du Bois suggests that the publications ended because of a lack of financial support from philanthropists and academic support from scholars who could not fathom the value of scholarly investigation focusing on African Americans. Accordingly, Dr. Du Bois states:

It was crazy of me to dream that America, in the dawn of the 20th century with colonial imperialism, based upon the suppression of colored folk, at its zenith, would encourage, much less adequately finance, such a program at a Negro college under Negro scholars. (P. 227-226)

Critiquing his colleagues, Du Bois declares that:

So far as the American world of science and letters was concerned, we never ‘belonged’; we remained unrecognized in learned societies and academic groups. We rated merely as Negroes studying Negroes, and after all, what had Negroes to do with America or science? (P. 228)

Third, Atlanta University’s “unbending attitude toward Negro prejudice and discrimination” (221) resulted in a lack of funding for the conference and, ultimately, the termination of the annual publication and conference. As stated earlier, Atlanta University’s refusal to accept funding from the state of Georgia had a deleterious financial
effect on the conference. According to Dr. Du Bois, had Atlanta University accepted funding from the state of Georgia, they would have been forced to succumbed to racial intolerance that contradicted the original charter of the university (Du Bois 1968). Hence, Atlanta University's refusal to succumb to racist educational policies contributed to the demise of the annual conference and publication.

The fourth, and perhaps, most decisive factor leading to the termination of the Atlanta University Conference Publications was W. E. B. Du Bois' ideological battle with Booker T. Washington. Dr. Du Bois asserts that "there came a controversy between myself and Booker Washington, which became more personal and bitter than I had ever dreamed and which necessarily dragged in the University. . . . I did not at the time see the handwriting on the wall. I did not realize how strong the forces were back of [Booker T. Washington's] Tuskegee [University] and how they might interfere with my scientific study of the Negro" (223-224). Du Bois alleges that Booker T. Washington, the Negro leader at the time, campaigned against his efforts to obtain financial support for the Atlanta University Conference studies. For example, in 1905 Du Bois wrote to a prominent philanthropist in hopes of procuring funding for a "high-class journal to circulate among the intelligent Negroes" (224). According to Du Bois:

Mr. Schiff wrote back courteously, saying: 'Your plans to establish a high-class journal to circulate among the intelligent Negroes is in itself interesting, and on its face has my sympathy. But before I can decide whether I can become of advantage in carrying your plans into effect, I would wish to advise with men whose opinion in such a matter I consider of much value.' Nothing ever came of this, because, as I might have known, most of Mr. Schiff's friends were strong and sincere advocates of [Booker T.}
Washington and] Tuskegee. (224-225)

Shortly thereafter, Du Bois was finally able to view the handwriting on the wall. He soon resigned from Atlanta University hoping that the conference and university would be able to obtain philanthropic support in his absence. In his 1910 letter of resignation, Du Bois wrote that:

I insist on my right to think and speak; but if that freedom is made an excuse for abuse of and denial of aid to Atlanta University, then with regret I shall withdraw from Atlanta University. (P. 229)

Du Bois resigned from the Atlanta University Sociology Department in 1910 but remained as Director of the Atlanta University Conference until 1914. As indicated earlier, the final Atlanta University Conference Publication was released in 1917 and the annual conference ended in 1924. The conference reemerged almost twenty years later when Dr. Du Bois rejoined the Sociology Department at Atlanta University. In an unpublished manuscript, Du Bois (1960) discusses the rebirth of the Atlanta University Conference studies.

In 1934 John Hope and I set out to revive the old Atlanta University conferences and studies of the Negro problems. Hope sought unsuccessfully to obtain funds for this enterprise. After his death I tried to see if some cooperative plan might supply some funds. Frederick Keppell of the Carnegie Foundation gave us some money for preliminary work in 1940 and 1941. I called the ‘First Phylon Conference’ in April 1941. A good cross section of Negro leaders in education attended. Reports were made from each state on the economic condition of Negroes. (P. 19)

The new Atlanta University Conference, now titled The Phylon Institute, released publications in 1941, 1943, and 1944. However, in 1944, “Without notice to [Du Bois] of
any kind, [he] was retired from [his] professorship and headship of the department of Sociology at Atlanta University" (36). The conditions surrounding Dr. Du Bois' dismissal from Atlanta University were unclear and vary depending upon whom is asked. According to Clarence A. Bacote, in *The Story of Atlanta University*, in 1939 the university instituted a system of rank and tenure and, according to Mrs. Lucy Grigsby, Du Bois voted for the program. The University, in 1939, gave Dr. Du Bois a five-year appointment which expired June 30, 1944. At this time Dr. Du Bois was 'seventy-six years of age, eleven years beyond retirement age.' However, Du Bois was not ready to retire. President Rufus Clement recommended Du Bois' retirement to the Board of Trustees and the Board agreed. (Yancy 1978:64)

Du Bois, however, believed that Atlanta University President Clement may have had an ulterior motive for pushing his retirement. Accordingly, Du Bois (1960) proclaims that:

> My sudden retirement then savored of a deliberate plot, although this cannot be proven. The retirement age at Atlanta University was sixty-five. But I was sixty-five when President Hope called me to the University. Nothing was said between us about the conditions of eventual retirement—due to my usual neglect of financial considerations and because my good health gave me no thought of stopping my work at any near time. Hope must have mentioned the matter to Florence Reed, treasurer, but they reached no decision that I knew of. Later I opposed Miss Reed's election as president to succeed Hope; and the new plan gained me wide acclaim. Even the General Education Board which handled Rockefeller funds favored my plan. President Clement while supporting the plan was not enthusiastic. As a new young unknown president, perhaps, he saw my reputation overshadowing him. Letters came to me; visitors asked for me and no doubt Miss Reed encouraged his jealousy. I was conscious that this might occur and tried to be careful. On all my plans I consulted him. All invitations went out in his name. His delays and small objections seemed petty and I said so. Perhaps I was too brusque and not diplomatic enough in this end and did not take into account his inexperience and lack of understanding. Doubtless too he had no desire to stop the development of the plan, but had no idea that I was at least for the time being so necessary for its
firm establishment. Neither Miss Reed nor President Clement said a word to me about retirement; but at the meeting of the Board of Trustees in 1944, Miss Reed proposed that I be retired. President Clement seconded the motion and apparently with little or no objection the Board passed the vote. Presumably most of the members assumed that the matter had been discussed with me and had my agreement. No pension was mentioned. (P. 37-38)

Although Atlanta University’s forced retirement, or termination, of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois signaled the end of its support of the annual studies on Negro problems, “there were some earnest attempts to carry the proposed program on. [The Phylon Institute] was transferred to Howard University, with E. Franklin Frazier in charge. An excellent conference was held in 1945. But Frazier was not given funds for continuing the project and the Land Grant Colleges gradually ceased to cooperate. The whole scheme died within a year or two. It has never been revived” (39).

Summary of Atlanta University Conference Publications, 1896-1917

The Atlanta University Conference was originally established to investigate the social, economic, and physical condition of Atlanta University graduates living in cities. From its inception this objective was expanded to include the concerns of the growing urban population of African Americans. Over the twenty year period of investigations, Atlanta University scholars displayed marked advances in their methods of research, attempted to form a singular theoretical perspective from a collage of seemingly unrelated resolutions, and engaged in specific research practices that were, seemingly, years beyond the mainstream sociological academy. Each of these scholarly contributions are addressed below.
Methods. Early Atlanta University Conference studies, directed by George G. Bradford, used United States census data as their primary source of information. With the hiring of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois in 1896, the methods of research utilized in subsequent investigations were expanded beyond the mere usage of census, or secondary, data to one including primary data collected through methods such as complete member participant observation (Adler and Adler 1987), direct correspondences with subjects, questionnaires, blanks, schedules, and examinations of relevant existing literature. Additionally, Dr. Du Bois sought to upgrade the conference by obtaining nationally representative data samples whenever possible. To further illustrate these features, the methods of research used for the first three Atlanta University Conference studies are compared with three later studies.

Data for the first three Atlanta University Conference studies were obtained through census records, blanks, limited community studies, and reports from various boards of health. Although these data sources provided useful information concerning the subjects addressed, they were lacking in generalizability and validity since the data were received mostly from subjects in Georgia by inexperienced researchers. The non-academic training of many Atlanta University researchers should not abrogate the data collected. As indicated in Atlanta University Publication Number 3, the repeated utilization of non-academically trained researchers by Atlanta University resulted in on the job training for researchers who became proficient in this genre. Thus, “by calling on the same persons for aid year after year, a body of experienced correspondents had been gradually formed, numbering...about fifty” (Du Bois 1899:4). The methods of data collection slowly ascended to a level to where concerns of generalizability and validity were appeased by
utilizing primary data sources, employing method triangulation (Denzin 1970), analyzing data comparatively, and harnessing the increasing qualitative research skills of local researchers.

Atlanta University Conference Publications 5, 7, and 15 are highlighted because they best represent investigations in which primary data sources were utilized while employing method triangulation, and capitalizing on the increased research experience of some non-academically trained Atlanta University researchers. Researchers for these studies relied upon complete member participant observation, correspondences, university catalogs, questionnaires, and schedules to obtain their primary data. These data sources were an improvement over earlier studies because they provided first hand information concerning the issues investigated. Additionally, method triangulation enabled Atlanta University researchers to capture data that could have possibly been omitted and/or overlooked. Although method triangulation was used in earlier Atlanta University investigations, the data were lacking in generalizability and validity. Nationally representative data were obtained for these studies and the validity of the data was secured by analyzing data comparatively. One can unabashedly note that the methods of research used by Atlanta University researchers became more refined with each successive investigation. Similarly, the resolutions of the annual conference became more advanced and, had the conference proceeded as originally planned by Dr. Du Bois, could have resulted in a comprehensive theoretical analysis of urban African American life.

Theory. The author suggests that the resolutions offered in the Atlanta University Conference Publications were continually advancing and combining to possibly form a
comprehensive theoretical analysis of urban African American life. Dr. Du Bois (1968), circuitously articulating his desire for an eventual theory on the urban African American condition, said "The [Atlanta University Conferences] ought to have been-and as I think would have been if I had kept on this work-the Economic Development of the American Negro Slave: on this central thread all the other subjects would have been strung" (217).

If one were to follow the progression of Dr. Du Bois' thought, a convincing argument can be made that a holistic theory focusing on the economic condition of African Americans was a possibility. If a theory is defined as a set of interrelated statements that attempt to explain, predict, and/or understand social facts and is generalizable and replicable, then the fruition of Dr. Du Bois' grandiose plan for the Atlanta University Conference could have produced such an artifact. It is quite reasonable to suggest that economic independence may have been the thread upon which a theory concerning urban African Americans would have been drawn since it was a constant theme in early and late Atlanta University Conference Publications. For example, Atlanta University Conference Publication Number 2 provides the foundation for a theoretical framework by suggesting that African Americans cease their dependence on the charity of White Americans and increase their efforts to better their own social condition. This resolution (theory) is extended in Atlanta University Conference Publication Number 3 when the Executive Board suggests specific ways in which the independence of African Americans from Whites could be accomplished-through the promotion of economic cooperation between African Americans. With the release of the fourth publication, *The Negro In Business*, a framework for the economic development of a subordinate American group becomes
more refined. This publication encouraged young African Americans to enter the business world, cited deficiencies in the way that many businesses were run, and promoted an entrepreneurial agenda for all African Americans. With the release of the Fourteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication, the theoretical framework promoting the economic advancement of the race was extended beyond concerns of how to earn money to how best to utilize the monies amassed from the utilization of the economic framework stressed in previous conferences. It is here that the resolutions of the conference begin to stress the necessity of city needs like hospitals, orphanages, retirement homes, and social service agencies to serve African Americans in the growing American cities. The theoretical development of the Atlanta University Conference’s economic model, I believe, evolved from the initial plea to African Americans to become self reliant to a specific plan suggesting how to achieve economic independence. From there specific strategies for improving the social condition of African Americans were promoted while identifying specific needs of the community. The end result, had the conference fulfilled its stated and original objectives, would have been the creation of a template that future minority groups could utilize in their attempts to gain an economic footing in this nation.

Summarily, contained in the Atlanta University Publications are sets of resolutions that can be subjectively interpreted. The exact form of Dr. Du Bois’ desired theoretical formulation will never be known. However, the repetition of the economic issues cited above indicate that Dr. Du Bois was possibly attempting to develop a theory aimed at explaining and understanding the economic condition of urban African Americans and, thus, providing a template to be used by future minority groups.
Atlanta Sociological Laboratory Contributions. Three contributions of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory, the label bestowed on Atlanta University scholars engaged in sociological research between 1896 and 1924, are highlighted here. First, Atlanta University researchers were among the first academics to openly discuss the benefits and limitations of insider/outsider researcher status. As presented earlier, Atlanta University officials preferred African American researchers over White researchers because "All the data gathered by this body of trained colored leaders, are believed to be, perhaps, more than usually accurate because of the investigators' knowledge of the character, habits, and prejudices of the people, and because of the fact that they were not hindered by the suspicions which confront the white investigator, and which seriously affect the accuracy of the answers to his questions" (Chase 1897:5). This idea is similar to Patricia Hill Collins' (1991) outsider within concept that suggests that insiders "[provide] a special standpoint on self, family, and society for [African Americans]" (35). Collins adds that, as scientific scholars, insiders are able to "look both from the outside in and from the inside out [because] we understand both" (36). In the context of this investigation, insider Atlanta University researchers possibly provided a different and more accurate analysis of African American life than their White counterparts could have offered. Additionally, Collins' concept suggests that outsider researchers are more prone than insider researchers to misinterpret the behaviors and actions of the observed group. This idea is similar to W. E. B. Du Bois' (1903) notion of "car window sociology." According to Dr. Du Bois, a person who engages in research for a limited period of time and then makes generalizations on the subject investigated without having extensive
knowledge of that subject is engaging in car window sociology. Du Bois notes that this method of researching African Americans was common during the early twentieth century and he, through the Atlanta University Conference investigations, sought to replace the incorrect data on African Americans with more accurate and scientific studies.

Relatively, the quote concerning the utilization of African American researchers infers that these individuals possibly reduced heightened levels of suspicion that many African Americans held toward academics and White Americans. Atlanta University officials, aware that many African Americans would be reluctant to participate in their studies because of their distrust of White researchers, employed the research strategy necessary to obtain the desired data. This is similar to Cannon, Higginbotham, and Leung’s (1991) study in which they employed a special strategy to obtain their data.

We expected that Black women might also be apprehensive about participating, since the request came from researchers at a predominately White educational institution. Anticipating many of these concerns, we devised research strategies to minimize their impact. For example, we made explicit in every communication about the study that the coprincipal investigators for the study were a Black and a White woman, that the research team was biracial, and that we sought both Black and White subjects. We also sent Black members of the research team to speak exclusively to Black groups, White members to speak exclusively to White groups, and a biracial team to speak to every group that had both Black and White women. Only Black interviewers interviewed Black subjects, and White interviewers interviewed White subjects. (P. 113)

Atlanta University officials, similar to Cannon et. al., recognized the benefits of using insider researchers and employed, what they believed to be, the best strategy to obtain the desired data- the utilization of African American researchers.
The triangulation of research methodologies is the second contribution of Atlanta University to the sociological community. The use of two or more methods of data collection was a constant and important component of most Atlanta University Conference investigations. Arguably, Atlanta University scholars were not the first to engage in method triangulation individually, but it can scant be denied that Atlanta University was the first "school" to institutionalize this data collection strategy in their program of collective and university sponsored research investigations. Atlanta University scholars, aware of the "car window sociology" of some White scholars studying African Americans, desired to obtain the most systematic and scientific information available and from a variety of sources. Their means of accomplishing this objective was method triangulation. As stated earlier, the primary source of information concerning African Americans during this period was census data. Atlanta University researchers found this source to be limited and instead implemented additional methods to fill-in-the-gaps left from the census data.

The third contribution of Atlanta University to American sociology was theory triangulation. Many critics of the Atlanta University Conference studies suggest that the absence of pure theories weakened these investigations. I believe that the ambiguity of the term theory has led to multiple understandings, or misunderstandings, of the theoretical contributions of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. A working definition of the term theory is offered before proceeding. If a theory is defined as a group of interrelated statements that attempt to explain, describe, and/or predict social facts, and is generalizable and replicable, then the resolutions presented in the Atlanta University
Conference Publications certainly qualify. Historically, sociologists have sought to construct a narrow definition of what constitutes a theory. This objective is often embarked upon as if a singular proposition is sufficient to answer most, if not all, of the questions emanating from the social events of the world. Atlanta University researchers, on the contrary, offered multiple theoretical perspectives in their attempts to better understand, explain, and, possibly, ameliorate the social conditions (or events) identified in their data. This technique is not overly promoted by contemporary sociologists and, possibly, has been historically undervalued. Nevertheless, Atlanta University scholars must be recognized as some of the earliest academicians to promote theoretical triangulation.

Summary

This chapter contains an examination of each Atlanta University Conference Publication released between 1896 and 1917. The methods of data collection, resolutions, and support for the resolutions are presented for each years publication. Also, Du Bois' hypothesis concerning the termination of the annual conference is offered and the entire publication is summarized. Summarily, the Atlanta Studies became more advanced after each publication, Dr. Du Bois was attempting to develop a singular theoretical perspective explaining the economic condition of African Americans, and Atlanta University researchers were engaged in specific research practices that were, seemingly, years beyond the mainstream sociological academy. The data presented in this chapter are also used to provide support for the next chapter in which the author challenges that Atlanta University housed the first American school of sociology.
CHAPTER VI

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY:
The First American "School" of Sociology

The explicit objective of this inquiry is to demonstrate that Atlanta University was the location of one of the earliest American schools of sociology. A circuitous objective of this study is to challenge the generally accepted belief that the first school of American sociology was established at the University of Chicago. The first objective is achieved by applying Martin Bulmer's (1985) model of a school to Atlanta University. The second objective is accomplished by comparing data presented in Bulmer's article, "The Chicago School of Sociology: 'What Made It A School'?," to data obtained for this study.¹

Bulmer's article suggests that the Chicago School (circa 1915-1930) meets the criteria for school status and was the first American school of sociology. As presented in Chapter II, Shaun L. Gabbidon challenged this proposal but was unable to successfully prove that Atlanta University qualified for school status as outlined in Bulmer's model. Gabbidon's criminal justice perspective may have caused him to incorrectly concede certain characteristics of a school when applied to the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. Hence, a sociological critique of Bulmer's model may result in an alternate understanding.

Was Atlanta University A "School?"

The initial step towards establishing Atlanta University as a school begins by operationalizing the term school. Bulmer (1985) proclaims that "A 'school' in the social

---

¹ Replication of Bulmer's model as applied to the Chicago School of Sociology is not attempted here. Bulmer's data are used comparatively with data obtained by the author concerning the school status of Atlanta University so as to prevent replication.
sciences may be thought of as akin to the term used in art history to designate a group of
contemporaries sharing a certain style, technique or set of symbolic expressions, and
having at some point or other in time or space a high degree of interaction (e.g., the
Impressionists, the Bauhaus School, etc.)" (61). Bulmer further clarifies his definition of a
school when he notes that:

Schools of social science, particularly those committed to
systematic empirical inquiry, are sufficiently unusual to merit
some consideration. Most university departments of sociology
are an assemblage of more or less independent scholars, pursuing
diverse interests either individually or in small groups. They
cooperate for purposes of teaching and administration, but in
research go their own way. Any suggestion that there should be
an integrated research program across a department, or that
individuals should orient their research to certain central themes,
ideas or problems, would be regarded by most academic
sociologists as anathema. Yet such a collective enterprise was
the Durkheim school. In social anthropology, the
'schools' associated with Bronislaw Malinowski at the
London School of Economics in the 1920's and 1930's, and
with Max Gluckman at the Rhodes-Liningstone Institute in
Northern Rhodesia and the University of Manchester in the
1940's and 1950's produced much significant work. (P. 61)

Schools, according to Bulmer, possess nine features. Below the nine features of a school
are applied to the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory and the Chicago School of Sociology.

The first characteristic of a school is that it "requires a central figure around whom
it is organized" (63) and, supposedly, this "ideal type does not allow for joint leadership"
(63). The Atlanta University Conference was initiated by President Horace Bumstead and
Trustee George G. Bradford in 1895. These men served as the chief officers of the annual
conference until Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois was "approached by President Horace Bumstead of
Atlanta University in 1896 and asked to take charge of the work in sociology, and of the
new conferences which they were inaugurating on the Negro problem" (Du Bois 1968:209). Upon his hiring, as indicated in Chapter IV, Dr. Du Bois was granted full control of the annual investigations and quickly marked the annual studies with his particular stamp of systematic and scientific inquiry. For twelve years Dr. Du Bois served as the sole director of the annual conference and editor of the resultant publications. Dr. Du Bois continued to serve as the director of the Atlanta University Conference, 1910-1914, even after his resignation from Atlanta University. Myron W. Adams (1930) notes that:

After the retirement of Dr. Du Bois in 1910 to become editor of the Crisis and director of publicity in the newly organized National Association of Colored People, his successor as professor of sociology was Augustus G. Dill, an Atlanta University graduate of the class of 1906, of Harvard in 1908, and who also continued the work of the conferences. Mr. Dill had, however, the benefit of a certain measure of assistance from Dr. Du Bois, whose name still appeared in the catalogue as director of the conference. (P. 93-94)

Although Adams suggests that Dr. Du Bois provided "assistance" to Augustus Granville Dill, the conference continued to follow the exact plan of systematic and scientific inquiry that Dr. Du Bois outlined upon his hiring at Atlanta University some twelve years earlier. The solitary indication of "assistance" offered to Dill by Du Bois during this period resides in the fact that Du Bois and Dill are listed as co-editors of the four publications. Any suggestion that Augustus Granville Dill, a former student of Dr. Du Bois who terminated his connection with the Atlanta University Conference in allegiance to Du Bois in 1914, allowed Dr. Du Bois to assist him during this period is vacuous, unintelligible, and not empirically substantiated. After Dr. Du Bois relinquished his position as director of the
conference in 1914, the singular published research investigation released after his
departure followed his model of urban sociological inquiry. Thus, even after his complete
separation from Atlanta University and the annual conference in 1914, Du Bois continued
to be the central figure from whom the annual studies relied upon for its scientific
guidance since the studies initiated after his departure followed his plan of scientific
inquiry.

Comparatively, Bulmer asserts that Robert Park was the central figure around
whom the Chicago School of Sociology was organized although “Leadership of the school
was shared, first between [W. I.] Thomas and Park, then between Park and [Ernest]
Burgess (63). Although Park shared leadership of the school during his tenure with
Thomas and then Burgess, Bulmer tags Park as the central figure of the school because
“[his] was the dominant contribution and intellect, but the case is a reminder that there
may be one or two key figures at the head of a school” (63).

The second characteristic of a school is that it “exist[s] in universities and requires
students as a necessary and integral part of their activity” (Bulmer 1985:64). Included
within this feature are the benefits derived from the location of the university and the
“training [of] graduates in research [rather than] undergraduate teaching that was common
in universities in the English-speaking world” (64). The city of Atlanta served as an ideal
research site for the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. Dr. Du Bois (1903), discussing the
benefits derived from having Atlanta as a sociological laboratory, said:

Atlanta University is situated within a few miles of the
geographical centre of the Negro population of the nation,
and is, therefore, near the centre of that congeries of human
problems which cluster round the black American. This institution, which forms in itself a 'Negro problem,' and which prepares students whose lives must of necessity be further factors in this same problem, cannot logically escape the study and teaching of some things connected with that mass of social questions. (P. 62)

Atlanta proved to be a suitable location for the study of urban African Americans and, also, a research training field for the learning of sociological research techniques by undergraduate and graduate Atlanta University students. Dr. Du Bois, discussing the training of Atlanta University undergraduate students in sociological research, asserts that, "We have arranged, therefore, what amounts to about two years of sociological work for the junior and senior college students" (62). "Our main object in the undergraduate work, however, is human training and not the collection of material, and in this we have been fairly successful. The classes are enthusiastic and of average intelligence, and the knowledge of life and of the meaning of life in the modern world is certainly much greater among these students than it would be without such a course of study" (63). Du Bois later proclaims that "we carry on in our conferences postgraduate work in original work" (62).

Sometimes [the original work conducted by postgraduates for the Atlanta University Conference studies] are of real scientific value: the class of '99 furnished local studies, which, after some rearrangement, were published in No. 22 of the Bulletin of the United States Department of Labor; the work of another class was used in a series of articles on the housing of the Negro in the Southern Workman, and a great deal of the work of other classes has been used in the reports of the Atlanta Conferences. (P. 63)
Similar to Atlanta University, the University of Chicago benefitted from a location that provided a fertile ground for community studies initiated by some Chicago School sociologists. The result, as indicated in Chapter I, was that “significant research was expected from [University of Chicago] faculty and publication was fostered” (Bulmer 1985:64) while “greater importance was attached to training graduates in research than to undergraduate teaching than was common in universities in the English-speaking world” (64). Although Dr. Du Bois and Atlanta University stressed similar objectives twenty years prior (e.g., the training of graduate students over the teaching of undergraduates), Bulmer suggests that the University of Chicago was the first American university to institutionalize and emphasized the training of graduate students over the teaching of undergraduates.

The third characteristic of a school is that it is not isolated from the city in which it is located. Atlanta University faculty, specifically Dr. Du Bois, frequently came into contact with members of the Atlanta community. Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois occasionally participated in meetings held by organizations such as the First Sociological Club of Atlanta where, upon his hiring, he addressed the club and presented his vision for the organization (Du Bois 1965). Dr. Du Bois (1968), discussing his activities beyond the ivory tower, said “also I joined with the Negro leaders of Georgia in efforts to better local conditions; to stop discrimination in the distribution of school funds; and to keep the legislature from making further discrimination in railway travel” (219). Du Bois’ activities indicate that he was indeed a part of the Atlanta city community and Atlanta University community.
In Chicago, Bulmer asserts, “members of the university staff were heavily involved in local affairs from the [university’s] beginning, providing an orientation and a set of connections which helped stimulate local research. . . Park’s involvement in the Chicago Urban League, for example, led directly to the appointment of Charles Johnson as research director for the riot commission, and his collaboration with Park that produced *The Negro in Chicago*” (Bulmer 1985:64). The University of Chicago and Atlanta University both meet this criteria because they were engaged in community focused activities with the intent of providing their academically trained services to the community in which they lived.

The fourth characteristic of a school is the dominating personality of its key figure. Bulmer asserts that dominating personalities are the very reason that schools exist and that the leader commands “personal loyalty and admiration of their colleagues and students.” (65) Additionally, leaders of schools “look for talented collaborators to participate in the research they conduct” (65-66). That Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois possessed a dominating personality need not be addressed here since Chapter’s IV and V demonstrated how he almost singlehandedly upgraded the Atlanta University Conference investigations beyond their, perceived, primitive scientific state. More important here are the personal loyalty extended to Dr. Du Bois and the many “collaborators” who participated in his research projects.

Dorothy Yancy (1978) suggests that “Du Bois was recognized by his students and colleagues as ‘one of the greatest scholars the race has ever produced’” (59). The loyalty of some of Dr. Du Bois’ students can be ascertained through the impact that he had on
some of their lives. Some indication of this impact was revealed when one student became an Episcopalian and later a priest because he thought "the Doctor' was Episcopalian" (60). The loyalty and admiration extended to Du Bois from his colleagues was equally impressive. Yancy writes that some "colleagues had warm memories [of Du Bois] and called him the perfect host...in a small group he was all right...very warm. He was also witty in these small groups. He was known for proclaiming that he 'got his Ph.D. when Ph.D.'s were Ph.D.'s" (63-64). Although the comments presented to this point are favorable of Du Bois, some of his former students and colleagues loathed his aloofness, reserved nature, and bluntness. A former student of Dr. Du Bois reported to Yancy that "Even though there was the intimacy of his suite and the small classes, many students felt he was aloof and an 'intellectual snob.' One student felt he was definitely not a 'hail fellow well met...he was very gracious, [but had] a great deal of reserve. He laughed a lot, but even his laughter was reserved...He made jokes, could see fun in things, but never a good horse laugh" (61). A colleague of Dr. Du Bois provides a similar example. "Benjamin Mays recalled an example of Dr. Du Bois' bluntness when people walked up to him and asked him if he remembered them. Du Bois' tart reply was usually, 'why should I'" (62)?

In Chapter II the issue of Dr. Du Bois' collaborations is addressed. However, it is restated here that, according to Dr. Du Bois (1968), "In addition to the publications, we did something toward bringing together annually at Atlanta University persons and authorities interested in the problem of the South. Among these were Charles William Eliot, Booker T. Washington, Frank Sanborn, Franz Boaz, Walter Wilcox, [Max Weber,
and Jane Addams)" (219). Each of the above mentioned scholars and noteworthy citizens were instrumental in collaborating with Dr. Du Bois if collaboration is expanded to include personal conversations and correspondences that assisted in the framing of specific ideas and/or concepts (Du Bois 1965).

Bulmer (1985) asserts that the dominating personality of “Park aroused the curiosity of his students, built on their capacities, and pushed them toward the empirical study of phenomena in which he was interested” (65). This aspect of Park’s dominating personality resulted in classic sociological investigations from some of his students (e.g., Nels Anderson’s (1923) The Hobo and E. Franklin Frazier’s (1932) The Negro Family in Chicago.) Additionally, Bulmer proposes that Chicago School sociologists engaged in collaborative projects with, among others, University of Chicago political scientists and University of Chicago sociology graduate students.

Bulmer’s fifth characteristic of a school mandates that a clear intellectual vision and missionary drive be possessed by the leader. Dr. Du Bois clearly possessed an intellectual vision and missionary drive that he, unfortunately, was unable to bring to fruition because of a lack of philanthropic support and two coerced departures from Atlanta University. As indicated in Chapter IV, when Dr. Du Bois took charge of the Atlanta University Conference studies he immediately implemented his own program of systematic and scientific inquiry to replace the primitive methods of data collection used in the first two Atlanta University Conference studies. Dr. Du Bois’ plan of systematic and scientific inquiry included triangulation, data comparison, theoretical analysis, and,
whenever possible, nationally representative data. Du Bois (1940) also sought to alter the
existing Atlanta University Conference by:

[M]inimizing the conference part of the program, that is
speeches, the reminiscences, the meeting of people and
put the whole stress upon the preceding year-long
investigation of social condition. Moreover, instead of
trying to study the whole mass of social conditions and
discuss the whole Negro problem, I deliberately put
an ‘s’ upon ‘problem’ and emphasized the study of
Negro problems and then took up one problem or one
phase of a social problem affecting Negroes for a
year’s intensive study. . . . My idea, finally, was to set-up
a series of annual special studies each to be repeated
at decennial intervals and covering the whole condition
of the American Negro. (P. 3)

Had Du Bois been allowed to fulfill his intended plan, the Atlanta University Conferences
would have developed to a point where it would have addressed the “weak. . . . economic
side [of the Atlanta Conferences. The Conference] did not stress enough the philosophy
of Marx and Engels and was of course far too soon for Lenin. The program ought to have
been—and as I think would have been if I had kept on this work—the Economic
Development of the American Negro Slave: on this central thread all the other subjects
would have been strung. But this I had no chance to essay” (Du Bois 1968:217).

Park’s intellectual vision for the Chicago School of Sociology was similar to that
of Atlanta University in that it involved using “the city as a social laboratory” (Bulmer
1985:67). The result of this vision was the collection of “a series of intensive field
studies” (67) like Thomas and Znaniecki’s (1918-1919) The Polish Immigrant in Europe
and America, Charles S. Johnson’s (1922) The Negro in Chicago, Paul Cressey’s (1923)

The sixth characteristic of a school concerns the "seriousness and intensity of the intellectual exchanges between the leader and other members of the group, whether these are colleagues or graduate students" (67). This criteria is further divided into two areas- "the existence of seminars where ideas and approaches are developed and applied, and the availability of avenues for the publication of the work of the school" (68). The Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Atlanta University (1898-1899) indicates that seminars covering statistics, general sociological principles, social and economic conditions, and methods of reform were offered at Atlanta University during Dr. Du Bois' tenure. "In addition to this, graduate study of the social problems in the South by most approved scientific methods [was] carried on by the Atlanta Conference, composed of graduates of Atlanta, Fisk, and other institutions" (13). In addition to instructing undergraduate courses and serving as, what can be called, the "director of ethnographic research" for graduate students, Dr. Du Bois also fulfilled the duties of a teacher:

Many of his graduate students remember most the monthly seminars he held in his suite of rooms in Ware Hall, the Atlanta University Men's Dormitory. Du Bois often invited his classes to what he called 'at home.' His classes discussed various seminar topics and he served coffee and cookies in his 'Harvard Cups.' According to one student, these evenings were 'Perfectly delightful...The atmosphere was different from the classroom [because it was more intimate]. We were special and he let us know it. In his apartment he usually wore his smoking jacket and, according to one student, he was a 'charming host...thoughtful and entertaining. He told anecdotes and
showed that he did understand his students. . . he seemed very
relaxed in his apartment, very witty and permissive.'
(Yancy 1978:61)

Other students have “described [Dr. Du Bois] as a ‘[hard] task master.’ In one class each
student wrote one paper a week on some aspect of the Afro-American experience,
presented it to the class and defended his point of view. According to one student, ‘no
one took a class from Dr. Du Bois voluntarily. [He was] no softy.’ His assignments were
lengthy, yet interesting” (60-61). Reflecting on his teaching skills, Dr. Du Bois asserts
that:

I was, for instance, a good teacher. I stimulated inquiry
and accuracy. I met every question honestly and never
dodged an earnest doubt. I read my examination papers
carefully and marked them with sedulous care. But I did
not know my students as human beings; they were to me
apt to be intellects and not souls. (P. 62)

The comments from Dr. Du Bois and his students suggest that, per Bulmer’s prerequisite,
“the qualities to be developed in students. . . the ability to understand, apply, and develop. .
. . the central tenets of the school” (Bulmer 1985:67) were met.

Also included in the sixth characteristic is the ability of the school to publish its
works. Atlanta University published the results of their yearly reports through the Atlanta
University Press from 1896 to 1917. In addition to the publication of twenty conference
monographs, the Atlanta University Press also published a variety of books, catalogues,
and pamphlets (Adams 1930).

“Park and Burgess’ seminars on Field Studies” (Bulmer 1985:68) and Park’s
“conferring with students” (68) are identified as the ways in which intellectual exchanges
between students and leaders of the Chicago School were actualized. Additionally, dissemination of the schools' scholarship was accomplished because "Chicago enjoyed advantages in that the *American Journal of Sociology* was edited there and the University of Chicago Sociological Series provided an outlet for the best Ph.D.'s to be published. Park and Burgess' textbook (1921), the 'green bible' was its first title, is generally credited with spreading the Chicago approach to other departments across the country" (Bulmer 1985:70). Thus, intellectual exchanges with students and colleagues, and the means of publishing the scholarship of the school were met.

The seventh characteristic proposes that a school have an adequate infrastructure that is able to promote advances in research methods, develop institutional links, and garner philanthropic support. First, the advances that Atlanta University made in research methods is addressed in Chapter V and does not bear repeating here. Second, institutional links are reflected in cooperative efforts between Atlanta University and other historically black colleges and their students during the annual investigations (Chase 1896). Relatedly, the collaborative efforts of various national and international scholars previously cited also constitute institutional links. Third, it is no secret that Atlanta University officials experienced tremendous difficulty attempting to procure funding for their annual investigations. Nevertheless, Atlanta University amassed enough philanthropic support to publish monographs and various books during the tenure of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois (Adams 1930). It must be stated here that one criteria of a school is that it cannot last beyond the generation of its central figure. If this is so, then the fact that the Atlanta University Conference Publications were continually published during Dr.
Du Bois' tenure should not be diminished because he and Atlanta University encountered obstacles while attempting to obtain additional financial support for their endeavor. In 1904 Dr. Du Bois, during the middle of the first era of Atlanta University Conference Publications, commented on the difficulties that Atlanta University officials experienced while attempting to obtain economic support from philanthropists and others who preferred hunting African Americans to scientifically studying them. Du Bois (1904) said:

> If the Negroes were still lost in the forests of central Africa we could have a government commission to go and measure their heads, but with 10 millions of them here under your noses I have in the past besought the Universities almost in vain to spend a single cent in a rational study of their characteristics and conditions. We can go to the South Sea Islands halfway around the world and beat and shoot a weak people longing for freedom into the slavery of American color prejudice at the cost of hundreds of millions, and yet at Atlanta University we beg annually and beg in vain for the paltry sum of $500 simply to aid us in replacing gross and vindictive ignorance of race conditions with enlightening knowledge and systematic observation. (P. 55)

Despite their troubles gaining financial support for their publications, Atlanta University meets this requirement of a school since the publication of the conference reports were timely disseminated during Dr. Du Bois' tenure.

The Chicago School of Sociology also meets the requirement for Bulmer's seventh criteria. First, advances in methods were met through the Chicago School's emphasis on ethnographic research as exemplified in the studies cited earlier. Second, the philanthropic support of John D. Rockefeller excused the University of Chicago from financial problems as experienced by Atlanta University. Third, the Chicago School of Sociology fulfilled the requirements for institutional links by joining with "the Institute for Juvenile Research, the
Juvenile Protection Association and the Chicago Crime Commission, to which [University of Chicago graduate] students could be attached, provided [with] valuable outside contacts” (Bulmer 1985:70).

The eight characteristic of a school is that it doesn’t last beyond the generation of its founder. This characteristic is exemplified in both of Dr. Du Bois’ departures from Atlanta University. After Dr. Du Bois’ initial break from the Atlanta University Conference in 1914, his successors managed to publish only one research investigation and one compilation of articles on “the race question” before the publications were ended. After Dr. Du Bois’ second departure from the Atlanta University Conference, then known as the Phylon Institute, E. Franklin Frazier attempted to carry on the annual investigations at Howard University (Washington D.C.) but was unsuccessful after having held only one meeting. Summarily, both eras of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory ended because Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois no longer served as the central leader of the school.

Martin Bulmer proclaims that the dominance of the Chicago School of Sociology began to wane in the early 1930's. Although Robert Park didn’t retire from the University of Chicago until 1934, the Chicago School of Sociology began to decline “in the early 1930’s, and within a decade both Harvard (where Parsons was increasingly influential) and Columbia (where Lazarsfeld and Merton were in partnership) rivaled Chicago as leading departments” (Bulmer 1985:71). Bulmer suggests that the Chicago School declined because “the department failed to maintain its cohesion, and failed to recruit sociologists familiar with European social theory or new fields such as organizational sociology or media research where Harvard and Columbia were strong” (72). After Park’s departure
from the University of Chicago in the mid-1930's, the Chicago School of Sociology failed to maintain its school status.

The ninth, and final, characteristic of a school is that it is open to the ideas and possible influence of other disciplines. The Atlanta University Conferences, by the very nature of their subject matter, were open to the ideas and influence of various disciplines. Werner J. Lange (1983) said:

It is important to note that Du Bois, evidently operating upon the conception of anthropology as 'Anthropologie', clearly delineated four approaches to 'the study of the Negro as a social group': (1) historical study; (2) statistical investigation; (3) anthropological measurement; and (4) sociological interpretation. The fact that these social scientific domains—now departmentally separated at most United States universities—constituted a single unit for Du Bois reflects the degree to which the young scholar valued and used a cross-disciplinary approach in his work. He was an accomplished historian, sociologist, statistician and anthropologist at a time when these disciplines were in their infancy in the United States. (P. 143)

As indicated previously, the conference benefitted from various academic perspectives espoused by invited guests. Booker T. Washington (Economics), Jane Addams (Social Reform/social work), and Franz Fanon (Anthropology) are a few of the scholars from non-sociology disciplines who offered their assistance. Additionally, that Dr. Du Bois utilized various research approaches from various disciplines provides additional evidence of his dedication to academic triangulation.

Bulmer (1985), demonstrating that the Chicago School of Sociology was receptive to perspectives other than sociology, promotes that "Park drew particularly on ideas from biology, literature, and anthropology" (73).
The data presented in this chapter reveal that the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory, 1896-1917, meets the requirements for a school as defined by Martin Bulmer. More noteworthy, that the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory achieved school status a full twenty years before the generally acknowledged first American school of sociology, the Chicago School of Sociology (circa 1915-1930), is fascinating. As indicated in Chapter II, contemporary and past sociologists have omitted the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory from the discipline’s historical record while a wealth of data citing the accomplishments of the Chicago School abound. A reasonable question that one may ask in light of the data presented in this chapter is, “why has the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory been sociologically negated although it comprised, seemingly, the first American school of sociology?” This question is addressed in the final chapter.
CHAPTER VII

WHAT ABOUT ATLANTA UNIVERSITY?:
Explaining Atlanta University's Sociological Negation

For more than twenty years Atlanta University hosted conferences and published monographs focusing on urban sociological issues. The existence of the Atlanta University Conference Publications has gone largely unnoticed and unappreciated by many contemporary and past sociologists who have, instead, chosen to magnify the urban sociological accomplishments of the Chicago School of Sociology. By all accounts, the Chicago School of Sociology came into prominence around 1915 and dominated urban sociological scholarship until the early 1930's (Bulmer 1984 and 1985). Data presented in this study indicate that Atlanta University scholars engaged in collective sociological research while utilizing modern and scientific methods of investigation and analysis as early as 1895. That Atlanta University scholars collectively investigated urban sociological issues two decades before the Chicago School of Sociology and, yet, are not recognized sufficiently in the scientific literature is baffling. A reasonable question to ask in light of the data presented in this study is, "why have the academic exploits of this group of scholars not been sufficiently recognized by the mainstream academic sociological community?" This question is addressed below using a sociology of knowledge theoretical perspective.

The sociology of knowledge perspective of Karl Mannheim (1968) is used in this study because it "does not refer only to specific assertions which may be regarded as concealment, falsifications, or lies," (238). Additionally, this perspective "does not
criticize thought on the level of the assertions themselves, which may involve deceptions and disguises, but examines them on the structural, [cultural, and/or ideological] level[s], which it views as not being the same for all men, but rather as allowing the same subject to take on different forms and aspects in the course of social development" (238).

Essentially, this theoretical perspective acknowledges the, possibly, subjective analysis of certain social facts by separate entities that could cause them to arrive at extremely different conclusions based upon their social location. That two people could look at a set of data and arrive at completely different conclusions is the strength of this perspective. The sociology of knowledge perspective enables the author to offer four explanations for the sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory.

The first explanation for the sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory is racism. When W. E. B. Du Bois (1903) wrote “the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line” (xi) he was referring not only to the general American public, but also to academics raised in a racially polarized society. During this period in America’s history racist ideologies grounded in the assumed biological and intellectual inferiority of African Americans were accepted and promoted by many intellectuals and regular citizens. In a 1904 article, “The Atlanta Conferences,” Dr. Du Bois chastised intellectuals and other leaned individuals because they “fail[ed] to recognize the true significance of an attempt to study systematically the greatest social problem that has ever faced a great modern nation” (59). Reflecting further on racist academics and his sociological negation, Du Bois (1968) said:
So far as the American world of science and letters was concerned, we never "belonged"; we remained unrecognized in learned societies and academic groups. We rated merely as Negroes studying Negroes, and after all, what had Negroes to do with America or science? (P. 228)

It is implied here that the, alleged, racial inferiority of African Americans contributed to the minimal levels of attention paid to scholarly issues affecting this group by the dominant culture. The sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory is then validated when the dominant group's ideology only enables them to view the Other as a subordinate and inferior people. The result of such a perspective is often the inaccurate and ethnocentrically based assumption that issues affecting our group and our particular way of conceptualizing the world are more accurate and worthy of note than others. Dr. Du Bois (1904), articulating the racially based sociological negation of Atlanta University research, proposes that:

[If the Negroes are not ordinary human beings, if their development is simply the retrogression of an inferior people, and the only possible future for the Negro, a future of inferiority, decline and death, then it is manifest that a study of such a group, while still of interest and scientific value is of less pressing and immediate necessity than the study of a group which is distinctly recognized as belonging to the human family, whose advancement is possible, and whose future depends on its own efforts and the fairness and reasonableness of the dominant and surrounding group. (P. 55)

This particular ideology, according to Barbara Peters (1991), has existed in the discipline of sociology since "the founding of the first academic department at the University of Chicago . . . [S]ociology has had a history of silencing voices that were different from the dominant white, male, bourgeois, and 'moral' voices of the founding 'fathers'" (248-249). When viewed in this manner, the sociological negation of African American and female
scholars by the White, male, bourgeois dominated discipline of sociology can be viewed as
an attempt to preserve certain academic accomplishments deemed acceptable by those
with power. Relatedly, Elliott Rudwick (1974) adds that:

Despite the depth of Du Bois’s commitment to sociology, he was in the main ignored by the elite in the profession. It is interesting that Albion W. Small, a founder of America’s first department of sociology in 1892, of the American Journal of Sociology in 1895, and of the American Sociological Society a decade later, had, like Du Bois, been trained in Germany by Schmoller (Barnes 1948, pp. 766-92). In spite of this similarity in professional background and although the American Journal of Sociology, in addition to publishing theoretical articles, devoted many pages to social welfare problems, Small clearly considered Du Bois’s work of minor importance. Yet books by known racists were reviewed and often warmly praised. In 1906, Thomas Nelson Page’s The Negro: The Southerner’s Problem was glowering lauded by Charles Ellwood, who had been Small’s graduate student (American Journal of Sociology 11(1905-6: 698-99); Barnes 1948, pp. 853-55). In another review, Ellwood gratuitously commented, ‘it is only through the full recognition that the average Negro is still a savage child of nature that the North and South can be brought to unite in work to uplift the race.’ (P. 47).

Charles Lemert (1994) provides additional support for this proposition in an article in which he discusses the sociological negation of W. E. B. Du Bois’ scholarship. Lemert begins by suggesting that “a Du Boisian answer [for Du Bois’ sociological negation] might just as well be that white sociology does not see clearly beyond the veil [or a persons physical characteristics.]” However, Lemert extends his analysis when he asks “How can it be that an academic discipline-one noted for its long and serious intellectual (and political) commitment to the race question, one aggressively liberal as to racial inclusiveness- allows the exclusion of Du Bois and his great work?” Lemert answers that:
It is easy to conclude that what is at work in canonical exclusions are the indirect but powerful requirements of the dominant culture. Here Du Bois' theory of the veil again suggests that such a dominant culture, not excluding sociology, might operate through the occluded vision of those on the dominant side. It is a widely discussed, and plausible, position that Euroamerican culture was founded upon, and still today proudly entails, a structured inability to see those in the racially Other position. (P. 387)

Lemert then suggests that the dominant White American culture, through years of racist socialization, was incapable of awarding Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois or Atlanta University their "classic" status because of prejudice. Lemert's final offering on Dr. Du Bois' sociological negation promotes that:

There should be no particular reason to believe that sociology, however excellent its values or pure its motives, has escaped the powerful influence of Western culture. This, then, is the likely more sufficient explanation for the exclusion of Du Bois, and Souls, from the sociological cannon. He, and others in his position, having been veiled, were not clearly visible. (P. 388)

These examples provide support for the assertion that racism was a major factor in the sociological negation of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. Hence, in a society where racism is normalized, it is quite reasonable to expect a racially based sociological negation of scholarly contributions by Others.

Related to the previous argument, some may suggest that the sociological negation of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory occurred because of academic obscurity and not a racist ideology. Academic obscurity is operationalized as the inability of Atlanta University to properly promote and circulate its sociological scholarship. This argument is deemed invalid after examining the records of Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and the Atlanta University Conference Publications and discovering that
professors and graduate students from various colleges and universities from across the United States requested and received copies of specific Atlanta University Conference Publications. Data from the Fourth Atlanta University Conference Publication indicated that copies of previous conference reports were sent to graduate and undergraduate students at Harvard University (MA), The Catholic University (Washington, D.C.), Wellesley College (MA), Wooster University (OH), University of Texas and to professors at various African American and predominately White colleges and universities. If graduate students at these particular schools were utilizing Atlanta University data, is it not reasonable to suggest that their mentors knew about the scholarship taking place at the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory? In addition to the mailing of reports to students, publications were sent to national organizations and ordinary citizens like the American Missionary Association, the New York Independent, McClure's Magazine, the Northern Inter-Collegiate Oratorical League, Carroll D. Wright (United States Bureau of Labor), Professor Katharine Coman (Wellesley College), Dr. David J. Fuller (Brooklyn, New York), and Miss Jane Porter Scott (Social Settlements Association). In addition to the mailing of reports to graduate, undergraduate students, ordinary citizens, and national organizations, the Seventh Atlanta University Conference Publication indicated that "during the past few years lectures [focusing on the sociological investigations initiated at Atlanta University] have been given at the Unitarian Club of New York, American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, and the American Negro Academy" (Du Bois 1902:4). The Eighteenth Atlanta University Conference Publication reported that "the publish results of
these studies are used in America, Europe, Asia, and Africa. Very few books on the Negro problem, or any phase of it, have been publisht in the last decade which have not acknowledged their indebtedness to our work" (Du Bois and Dill 1912:6). Last, Du Bois (1968) asserts that:

I had heartening letters from persons of eminence and character. William James wrote in 1907: 'I have just looked through the last installment of your studies on the American Negro. I wish the portraits might have been better printed. But it is splendid scientific work.' Frank Taussig of Harvard wrote the same year: 'In my judgement no better work is being done in the country, and no better opportunity is afforded for financial support on the part of those who wish to further the understanding of the Negro problem.' Booker Washington, who spoke at our conference on the Negro artisan in 1911, said: 'The whole country should be grateful to this institution for the painstaking and systematic manner in which it has developed from year to year a series of facts which are proving most vital and helpful to the interests of our nation.' Professor E. R. A. Seligman wrote: 'I take great pleasure in testifying to my very high appreciation of the studies on the Negro problem which you have been editing for the past few years. They are essentially scholarly and that means sober and temperate, and they are covering a field which is almost untilled and which is not apt to be cultivated by others.' Jane Addams attended our conference in 1908 and commended our work. (P. 218)

The data presented here neutralize the assertion that the sociological accomplishments of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory were not recognized because they were hidden in academic obscurity. If graduate students, undergraduates, various professors, and ordinary citizens requested and received conference reports and were aware of the Atlanta University Conference Publications, why did the sociological gatekeepers omit and minimize the accomplishments of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory?

The second explanation for the sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory was the perceived lack of generalizability of the conference findings. This
issue is addressed in Chapter IV and receives minimal attention here to prevent redundancy. The Atlanta University Conferences focused primarily on African Americans and some academics, possibly, considered the findings limited and not applicable to the general African American population. This argument is tenuous because Atlanta University officials overtly stated during their first investigation that the collection of vital information on America's foremost minority group could eventually serve as a template for future subordinate groups. Fruition of this plan by Atlanta University could have possibly resulted in an assimilation theoretical model that other minority groups could have utilized to prevent them from making similar deleterious economic and social mistakes as African Americans. Although Atlanta University researchers focused primarily on African Americans, many of the social problems identified in their investigations (i.e., financial needs of schools and health and crime problems experienced by city residents) were applicable to the general urban population. This fact extends the Atlanta University Conference reports beyond issues singularly affecting African Americans.

A third explanation for the sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory concerns the unsophisticated and low quality methods of investigation used by Atlanta University researchers. This assertion, made by Elliott Rudwick, is refuted in Chapter's II and V and the author, similar to Francis L. Broderick (1959), suggests that

---

1 A goal of the Atlanta University Conference under the tenure of W. E. B. Du Bois was to annually amass a random sample of African American subjects whose responses to issues confronting African Americans could be generalized to the entire population of Blacks in the United States. Because of various factors, limited funding being a major contributor, this goal was not achieved and Atlanta University often relied upon convenient samples to obtain their data.
"A later generation [of scholars] has doubts about [W. E. B. Du Bois’] methodology, for styles in scholarship change, and men see their grandfathers’ ways as quaintly primitive" (42). As argued in Chapter V, the methods of data collection utilized by Atlanta University researchers were not unsophisticated or of low quality because they were systematic, triangulated, analyzed comparatively, and when possible, consisted of a national sample. A tangible argument that can be made regarding, possible, unsophisticated and low quality methods used by Atlanta University could concern the utilization of some untrained researchers. This issue is also addressed in Chapters IV and V. What bears repeating here is that the continued utilization of non-academically trained researchers, over a period of twenty years, resulted in a body of on-the-job-trained researchers who admirably and successfully performed their duties.

A fourth explanation for the sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory is the, supposed, omission of theory from the Atlanta University Conference Publications. As stated in Chapter II, if one defines a theory as a set of interrelated statements that attempt to explain, predict, and/or understand social events, and that can be replicated and generalizable, then the resolutions offered in the conclusion of the Atlanta University Conference Publications qualify as systematic theoretical constructions. Undoubtedly, the presentation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory theories does not mirror that of traditional scholars. Despite this fact, should Atlanta University’s theoretical contributions be minimized because, although they qualify for theoretical status according to a strict definition of the term, they do not qualify ideologically?
The findings of this particular inquiry suggest that racism, non-generalizable data, perceived unsophisticated and low quality methods of research, and a perceived lack of theoretical insight are the reasons for the sociological negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory.

**Conclusion**

The major objectives of this investigation were to uncover some of the sociological contributions of this group of sociologically negated scholars and to demonstrate that the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory comprised one of the earliest schools of American sociology. Both objectives were accomplished by examining the Atlanta University Conference Publications, 1896-1917. Specifically, in addition to forming the first American school of sociology, it was discovered that Atlanta University scholars made tremendous advances in research methods. The triangulation of methods and emphasis on institutionally supported ethnography were institutionalized at Atlanta University years before other American universities. Additionally, concerns of outside/inside researcher status were, possibly, first openly discussed by Atlanta University researchers. Last, theory triangulation was another institutionally supported achievement that, possibly, was the first in American sociology. Thus, the data presented in this investigation should establish Atlanta University as one of the earliest and most influential schools, even if vicariously, of American sociology. Fittingly, the final statement on the significance of the Atlanta University Conferences comes from Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois' (1968):

> It must be remembered that the significance of these studies lay not so much in what they were actually able to accomplish, as in the fact that at the time of their publication Atlanta
University was the only institution in the world carrying on a systematic study of the Negro and his development, and putting the result in a form available for the scholars of the world. (P. 219)
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