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Historian and Activist: Joseph Lynn Clark and the Texas Commission on Interracial Cooperation

By
JEFFREY L. LITTLEJOHN AND CHARLES H. FORD

As the sun set on an East Texas afternoon in August 1935, Matthew W. Dogan rode in the back of his chauffeured car with a pleased grin on his face. The president of historically black Wiley College in Marshall, Texas, had just participated in a conference with his colleagues at nearby Prairie View A&M, where much of the conversation had centered on Wiley’s storied debate team. Four months earlier, students from Dogan’s tiny college had knocked off the national debating champions from the University of Southern California, sparking a wave of laudatory news coverage about the team and its school. That very month, in fact, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) had featured an article in its monthly magazine, Crisis, about Wiley and its celebrated debaters. Written by a brilliant young student named Hobart Jarrett, “Adventures in Interracial Debates” noted that Wiley had “won fame” through its team, and that its coach, Melvin B. Tolson, had “shattered precedent” on several occasions, taking his black students to white institutions and winning.1

As Dogan mulled over these recent successes on his return trip to Wiley’s campus, his chauffeur informed him that they needed to stop for gas. Dogan instructed his man to travel on to Huntsville, where they could re-fuel at a friendly Gulf filling station near the edge of town. On reaching the station, Dogan’s driver gave “an order for ten gallons of gas,” while the president’s daughter and her young friend “left the car and started toward the restroom.”
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When the white station attendant saw “the girls going to the restroom,” however, he “yelled at them at the top of his voice “You can’t go in there. I won’t stand for that. Come on back here.”” He then “repeated these statements several times loud enough to attract the attention of people passing.” Upset, Dogan got out of the car and told the man that he had “passed several stations” to do business at that particular spot, since he “had been given restroom privileges and other courtesies” there before. In reply, the gas station attendant responded that “the management had changed and that he would not stand for the members of [their] group to enter his restrooms.” Furious and embarrassed, Dogan crawled back to his car and headed for home.2

Once he arrived in Marshall, Dogan quickly penned a letter to a friend and colleague asking for help. “I will appreciate it,” he wrote, “if you find some way of having this man realize the wrong he has done me and [convince him] to conduct his business hereafter in a manner that will save other Negroes the embarrassment and humiliation I suffered.”3 Dogan sent this plea, not to a civil rights attorney or a state politician, but rather to Joseph Lynn Clark, the white chairman of the Social Sciences department at Huntsville’s Sam Houston State Teachers College. Although it might have seemed odd or even inappropriate for a black university president to appeal for help to a white professor at a different campus in the segregated South, Dogan had clear reasons for contacting Clark. By the mid-1930s, the two men had worked together for more than a decade on interracial matters, and Dogan believed that Clark had both the inclination and the power to intervene in conflicts of this type and bring out a positive result. In fact, many of Dogan’s black colleagues shared a similar faith in Clark. For example, Willette R. Banks, the President of Prairie View A&M, wrote to Clark for assistance on school and funding issues; Richard I. Hamilton, a Dallas physician and activist, requested help with the Texas Centennial and scholarships for black graduate students; and L.B. Pinkston, a doctor and member of the black Lone Star Medical Association, contacted Clark for help establishing a tubercular ward to aid black patients. For these key leaders of the black establishment -- men who were at once conservatives and advocates for change -- Clark served as a like-minded ally across the color line.
As a native Texan and state historian, Clark knew more about the racial problems that plagued the Lone Star State than just about anyone in the white community. He had written extensively on the slave system of the antebellum era, the riots and violence of the nineteenth century, and the lynching, disfranchisement, and segregation that black citizens endured during his own lifetime. In fact, Clark argued that the degrading treatment that whites inflicted on blacks, and the frustration and anger that such treatment engendered, threatened to poison race relations to such a degree that social progress might soon be impossible. To help reduce tensions and improve relations between whites and blacks, Clark led efforts with the Texas Commission on Interracial Cooperation (TCIC) to create a dialog between the two communities. He participated in anti-lynching efforts, public health campaigns, and educational programs of various kinds to build trust between whites and blacks and to help ameliorate the worst problems that the African American community faced. Yet, it would be wrong to suggest that he advocated anything resembling true equality between the races. On the contrary, like most Southern liberals of his generation, Clark channeled his religious and democratic ideals into a paternalistic form of managed race relations that was intended to soften the rough edges of Jim Crow without fundamentally challenging the system. From Clark's point of view, white supremacy and segregation were simply unquestioned, natural facts of life, which defined the place of whites and blacks in Southern society. At the same time, however, he and many of the other Christian, civically-minded whites associated with the TCIC believed that segregation required an intermediary group that could serve as both a link between the races and a force to “perfect” Jim Crow. Clark and his allies hoped that their actions as members of such a group could help bridge the gap between the realities of the Jim Crow system and the rhetoric that was used to justify it. Only then, they believed, could whites and blacks “live in friendliness and mutual respect,” leaving the controversial issue of segregation to be settled through “the wisdom and justice of oncoming generations.”

Scholars have offered a wide variety of perspectives on white liberals, like Clark, who participated in the region-wide Commission
Critics of the CIC, such as Morton Sosna, George Frederickson, and David Chappell, have argued that it "was seriously flawed and doomed to ineffectuality" because its white leaders refused to "object to the notion that blacks were inferior or even to the dictum that they remain a separate class." While these critics acknowledge that the CIC challenged the most egregious forms of racial oppression, such as lynching, they also note that individual members of the group proved to be "closet dissenters" who were complicit in the everyday aggressions that served as the most insidious aspect of Jim Crow. Indeed, Sosna even suggested that in their attempt "to soften and humanize segregation," the members of the CIC bestowed a sheen of professional, middle-class, and Christian respectability on Jim Crow, "in effect sanction[ing] the idea of the Southern Negro as a second-class citizen."

Scholars, such as William Link, W. Fitzhugh Brundage, John Kneebone, and Kimberley Johnson, have been more sympathetic to the white liberals of the CIC. Johnson points out, for example, that the South and its interracial movement were not simply "locked in a state of suspended animation for the first half of the twentieth century." Rather, white academics, religious leaders, and business people in interracial groups changed slowly in an effort to keep their organizations relevant. As individuals like Clark adopted more democratic and egalitarian positions in favor of the availability of black in-state graduate education, the elimination of the poll tax, and the eradication of the all-white Democratic primary, they quite naturally attempted to shape public opinion throughout the state. This, in turn, constituted what Johnson called "an important step in weakening the intellectual, economic, and social foundation of the Jim Crow order." Thus, although Clark and his allies rarely engaged in bold or disruptive activities, according to this interpretative model they did help to pave the way for a new era of race relations in the American South.

This paper argues that the appropriate interpretation of Clark and his role in the TCIC rests somewhere between these two conflicting poles. In a biographical narrative that focuses on his family background,
educational training, professional life, and racial activism, we show that Clark did far more than other whites of his generation to help address racial discrimination in the Lone Star State. Yet, at the same time, his work on behalf of the TCIC was riddled with ironies and contradictions. Neither he nor his white colleagues ever adopted a belief in true racial equality, and they were slow to accept even the cautious legal reforms put forward by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). While Clark’s positions on the white primary, the poll tax, and segregated facilities did evolve over time, his change of opinion was incomplete and came only after more progressive organizations had actually secured important legal and political reforms.

Family Life and Texas Christian University

Although Joseph Clark is largely forgotten today, he and the members of his immediate family helped to shape the lives of thousands of Texans. Born on July 27, 1881, at Thorp Spring, Texas, Clark was named for his paternal grandfather, Joseph Addison Clark, who had migrated to Texas in 1839, shortly after the territory became an independent republic. Initially, the elder Clark had worked as a surveyor and acquired an interest in several newspapers, but, upon marrying Esther Hettie DeSpain in 1842, his life took a dramatic turn. DeSpain traced her roots back to Benjamin Lynn, an itinerant minister who was baptized by Barton Stone at Cane Ridge, Kentucky, during the Second Great Awakening. As the granddaughter of Lynn, DeSpain shared his devotion to reform theology and imparted those principles to her husband Joseph Addison Clark. Within a short time, grandfather Clark had developed a deep Christian faith and received an appointment as an evangelist for the Disciples of Christ. As an advocate for returning to the apostolic church of the first century, Clark insisted on the unity of all Christians, the primacy of Scripture, and the baptism of adult believers. Traveling throughout Texas during the mid-nineteenth century, he emerged as one of the most important educators, preachers, and journalists for the Disciples of Christ. Indeed, it was grandfather Clark and his wife, the appropriately named Esther, who provided the moral grounding and Christian vision that
would form the basic contours of the Clark family’s activities for the next two generations.8

Although grandfather Clark never owned slaves, two of his sons — Addison and Randolph — fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War. Addison, the older of the two brothers, volunteered for service at age 19 in 1862 and mustered in Company D of the 16th Texas Cavalry. He fought at the Battle of Mansfield, Louisiana, in April 1864, and his younger brother, Randolph, joined the army shortly thereafter. The two young men refused to defend the “doctrine of state’s rights, and were opposed to slavery,” yet the “South was their home, [and when] it was invaded, they answered the call to defense.”9 Following the war, Addison and Randolph exhibited a profound admiration for General Robert E. Lee, and they later claimed that his decision to serve as President at Washington University in Lexington, Virginia, inspired them to pursue a career in education. In 1873, the two young men joined their father in founding Add-Ran Christian College in Thorp Spring, Texas, a small settlement of 400 people that was about forty-five miles from Ft. Worth. The town had a general store, blacksmith’s shop, drug store, and post office, among other buildings. “The nearest saloon was at Granbury,” however, “three miles distant,” and the Clarks insisted that “only intermittent transportation facilities” went that far.10

Joseph Clark grew up in Thorp Spring, while his father, Randolph, served as Vice-President at Add-Ran College and his mother, Ella Blanche Lee Clark, managed their large, nine-person household. The family lived in a “comfortable and moderately commodious” home, which set on one hundred acres, with gardens, orchards, and a collection of horses, cows, and hogs. Despite the bucolic setting of his childhood, however, Clark later remembered that the small black community in Thorp Spring faced a terribly challenging situation. For instance, Kate, a black midwife, nurse, and domestic laborer who worked for the Clarks, found it necessary to take several additional jobs in local homes to support her family. “The tragic aspect of the situation,” Clark later wrote, “was that the mores of the white people did not tolerate the attendance of the Negro children at the local school.” This meant that Kate’s son, Leely, and the other black youngsters in
the area received no formal education. Obviously, there was nothing that Clark could do about this “lamentable situation” as a young boy, but it seems to have profoundly affected him and encouraged his belief that all children needed educational opportunities, even if they took place in a segregated environment.\(^{11}\)

After more than twenty years of operation in Thorp Spring, Add-Ran College found itself struggling to stay afloat as larger cities and universities cropped up in the surrounding area. In 1895, the economic pressures became so great that the Clarks and their associates moved the school to Waco, where it occupied the empty buildings that had formerly housed Waco Female College. As the school grew in its new location, administrators decided to change the institution’s name to the plain and emphatic, Texas Christian University (TCU). Then, when the school’s principal building burned down in 1910, a group of Fort Worth businessmen offered the university $200,000 and a 50-acre campus as an inducement to move the school to their city. This proposition was seen as an obvious blessing, and administrators quickly took advantage of the situation. They moved TCU to Fort Worth, where today the AddRan College of Liberal Arts commemorates the founding principles and figures associated with Texas Christian University.\(^{12}\)

As a young boy, Joseph Clark found his father’s stories about TCU and the Lone Star State to be riveting. Randolph knew many of the “heroes of early Texas,” Joseph said, and “his comprehensive knowledge of the geography of the state was acquired at the time when there was leisure for horseback riding and stage coach travel.” Yet, by the time Joseph was ready to enroll at TCU’s Waco campus in 1902, Randolph was serving as President of Hereford College, an extension project of TCU in northwest Texas. This meant that Joseph would encounter other professors and points of view at Texas Christian.

Indeed, Clark studied in a TCU History and Social Sciences Department headed by Walter Lee Ross. A native of Arkansas, Ross held an A.B. and an A.M. degree in history from Indiana University. He had previously taught history and civics at an Oklahoma normal school and was serving as superintendent of education in Clarksville, Texas, when he accepted a position at TCU. Ross was regarded as a “good scholar” and a “Christian gentlemen” by his former professors
at Indiana University. At TCU, he oversaw a standard curriculum in Western Civilization that included courses in Medieval Europe, Renaissance and Reformation Europe, Modern Europe, American History to 1789, American Politics, Church History, and (most popular of all) The Liquor Problem. Ross does not appear to have been a published author, nor to have had a particularly deep interest in teaching history. In December 1907, he was selected to serve as President of Northwestern Oklahoma Normal College, a politically appointed position that he held from 1908 to 1910. Ross then served the remainder of his career as an evangelist for the Disciples of Christ in Oklahoma.

Although Professor Ross’ course offerings in the History Department remained traditional fare, Clark enjoyed his time at TCU and developed a love for university life while in Waco. His older brother, Lee Clark, taught European History, Latin, and rhetoric in the preparatory department, and Joseph no doubt spent time with him going over key events from the past. Joseph also enjoyed participating in the Add-Ran Debating Club and the Walton Literary Society, two activities that gave him an opportunity to hone his speaking and critical thinking skills. But, without a doubt, Clark’s favorite pastime was baseball. As a competitive athlete, he played on the TCU team for several years and helped to win the 1905 association championship by going 10 and 1. The following year, Clark graduated from TCU with a history degree, but he elected to stay on at the school for the next three years to serve as an instructor of history and English. He also continued his work with the baseball team, helping in 1909 to establish the state’s first multi-college sports conference, the Texas Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Upon graduation from TCU, Clark elected to spend many summers away from Texas. In 1907, for example, he took classes at the University of Virginia with side trips to Monticello and the Jamestown Exposition in nearby Norfolk. The initial train trip to Charlottesville may have been the first time that Clark left the confines of central Texas; it was certainly the first time that he traveled outside the state on his own. He found the experience so moving that two weeks into his trip he began a diary, providing the first extant record of his thoughts
on American history, race relations, and religion. It is clear from the
diary that Clark had a very idealistic view of the antebellum South and
the revolutionary “heroes” who helped to found the United States. He
marveled, for instance, at the elegant architecture in Charlottesville,
saying that it reminded him “very forcibly of the romantic sentiment
that must have pervaded this country…during the time of slavery.
The liveried coachman and the ‘old Mammy’ of the times ‘before the
War’ come very vividly before me.” 20 That Clark would invoke the
stereotype of the “old Mammy” and write longingly of the “romantic
sentiment” that he associated with the “time of slavery,” speaks
volumes about his views of African Americans in 1907. He seems to
have viewed them as second-class citizens whose appropriate role was
in a service capacity for whites. In fact, in another diary entry, Clark
recalled an instance in which he and his friends “stopped at the window
of the ‘Shiloh Colored Baptist Church’” in Charlottesville, to listen to
“a learned brother ‘expound’ the scriptures to the satisfaction of his
congregation and to our amusement.” Clark and his friends ridiculed
the black preacher’s flamboyant style and joked about his attempt to
“fleece his flock.” 21 Looking back through the lens of his service in
the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, these words and deeds
acquire great significance, for they reveal in plain language that Clark
accepted many of the racial dogmas and stereotypes of his era.

Professional Historian

In 1910, after briefly serving as an instructor of history at John
Tarleton College in Stephenville, Texas, Joseph Clark received two
job offers in collegiate administration. The first came from Midland
College, a new partnership between the Disciples of Christ and the
local community in Midland, Texas. The president there, J. Stone
Rives, offered Clark $1,000 a year to serve as Dean of the College.
Despite the allure of the Dean’s position, Clark knew that the school
— founded in 1908 — faced a rough road ahead to secure funding and
students. He had seen his own father and uncle struggle with Add-Ran
College and chose not to accept the position. Instead, he opted for an
offer that came from Harry F. Estill, the President of Sam Houston
Normal Institute, a small, state-funded college that enrolled 400
students in Huntsville, Texas. Estill asked Clark to serve as Secretary-Registrar and Librarian and offered a salary of $1,200 a year with a $200 supplement for summer work. Clark accepted the post, began work in fall 1910, and soon was known simply as Secretary and Assistant to the President.22

Although little documentation remains from Clark's first years in Huntsville, his most important decision during the period was to offer marriage to Sarah Frances "Sally" Chism. Like Clark, Sally was a devoted member of the Disciples of Christ. She had grown up in the small town of Graham, Texas, 90 miles northwest of Fort Worth, where her father, Matt Chism, served as a pioneering dentist and photographer. Sally and Joseph met as students at TCU and developed a relationship that continued after graduation. Once Clark secured a long-term position at Sam Houston Normal, he and Sally agreed to marry in the summer of 1913. The ceremony took place at the First Christian Church of Graham on August 28, and the young couple then returned to live in Huntsville.

Following his marriage and the new financial responsibilities it involved, Clark decided to pursue graduate work so that he might take a position in the professorate. Clark wrote to officials at the University of Texas, University of Chicago, University of California, and Columbia University to inquire about graduate work in education and history. Then, in the summer of 1915, he took courses in Ancient Imperialism, Rural Economics, and Adolescent Psychology at the University of California - Berkeley, while also completing a correspondence course in European History from the University of Chicago. Ultimately, however, Clark decided to pursue an MA through the Teachers College of Columbia University in New York City.23

Clark selected a vibrant, if controversial, time to pursue his education at Columbia. In August 1916, as he enrolled in classes, the university was engulfed in a heated debate about American involvement in the Great War. John Dewey, the eminent philosopher and educational reformer, supported American entrance into the war and noted the "social possibilities" that it would create, while his former student, Randolph Bourne, bitterly complained that Dewey and the nation's other leading intellectuals were too eager to support the
rush into battle. Meanwhile, in other quarters, the university’s board of trustees fired James McKeen Cattell, the first professor of psychology in the United States, and Henry W.L. Dana, a distinguished English professor, for their outspoken opposition to national conscription policy. Enraged by these and other examples of administrative overreach, the renowned historian Charles Beard resigned from the school, complaining that it was “under the control of a small and active group of trustees who have no standing in the world of education, who are reactionary and visionless in politics, [and] narrow and medieval in religion.”24 Although Clark, as an MA student, played no role in this controversy, memories of it must have come to his mind in the 1960s, when his colleague and friend, Rupert Koeninger, was fired from Sam Houston State Teachers College for voicing his support for civil liberties and civil rights.

In the heat of wartime, however, Clark seemed most concerned with the events taking place around him. A few months after his arrival in New York, he wrote home to say that “Noises very much like preparation for war are being made…. [L]ast week there was a great ‘Wake Up America’ parade down Fifth Avenue. Over fifty thousand school children [participated] in it, together with representatives of almost every other phase of the city’s life.” At the university campus, Clark told a friend at home, “Columbia is taking on the air of a military training camp—with many of the students in uniform, drilling noon and night, cancellation of all intercollegiate athletics, transforming of the Graduate Club Rooms into military headquarters, the formation of all sorts of emergency organizations, and the like comes pretty near to putting the institution on a ‘war footing.’”25 Despite these changes at Columbia, Clark’s education proceeded at a steady pace. He took courses on education, administration, and reform with two respected specialists in the area, Paul Monroe and David Snedden. At the same time, he attended seminars on European intellectual history with James Harvey Robinson, Latin American history with William Robert Shepherd, and American social history with J. Montgomery Gambrill.

These courses may have challenged Clark’s established views of history, but he also found many of his preconceived notions about the past confirmed in classes with Henry Johnson and Benjamin Burks
Kendrick. These two scholars were protégés of Columbia’s most famous historian, William Archibald Dunning, a renowned expert on nineteenth century America. Dunning had published his landmark book, Reconstruction, Political and Economic in 1907 as the first monograph in the American Nation Series. This study, along with his other publications and service as President of the American Historical Association, cemented Dunning’s national reputation and established Columbia as the foremost institution for students, like Clark, who wanted to study Southern history. In fact, Dunning’s work won wide acclaim because it offered a nationalistic take on Southern history, which brought the region back into the mainstream America narrative. This maneuver was possible, in part, because American imperialism abroad set the stage for a kinder, gentler interpretation of white supremacy at home. Thus, antebellum slavery became, once again, a beneficent institution in Dunning’s work. The Civil War appeared as a tragic misunderstanding between the white leaders of the North and South, and Reconstruction emerged as the worst example of federal overreach. By empowering the former slaves at the expense of the white Southern elite, Radical Republicans in Washington D.C. had opened the way for a period of political corruption and economic decline in the South. This backward slide away from civilization had been staunched, Dunning argued, only when Southern Democrats “Redeemed” the South and white supremacy returned.26

Although Clark imbibed the vital spirits of the “Dunning school” at Columbia, he did not simply repeat the lessons he learned at the Teacher’s College. Rather, upon receipt of his master’s degree and teacher’s diploma in October 1917, he returned to Sam Houston Normal Institute and began a career in Texas history. In four influential textbooks of his own -- A New History of Texas: With Aids for Study (1928), The Constitution and Government of Texas (1930), The Story of Texas (1932), and A History of Texas: Land of Promise (1939) -- Clark emphasized a heroic and romantic view of the past. Native Americans, Spanish explorers, and Sam Houston featured prominently in his textbooks as did the Civil War. In fact, the State Board of Education selected the last of his works as the basal text for high school courses in state history, and Rupert N. Richardson
of Hardin-Simmons University wrote in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* that the book presented its subject "in a masterly way" for a whole generation of high school students.\textsuperscript{27}

Yet, it cannot be denied, that when Clark turned to Reconstruction, the old racial lines from the Dunning school reappeared in even more exaggerated tones. For example, in *The Story of Texas*, Clark wrote that following the Civil War, "masters not only lost ownership of their slaves, but, most of the Negroes were unwilling to work for the wages which were offered them.... Many former slaves were too ignorant to understand that their new freedom did not mean freedom from work and that they could not expect to continue to be fed and clothed by the white people. So they wandered from place to place."\textsuperscript{28} Amidst this chaos, Clark argued, a new Texas constitution "was approved [in 1869] which permitted scalawags, carpetbaggers, and freed Negroes to seize complete control of the state government."\textsuperscript{29} Then, at the first election held under the new constitution, Republican Edmund Davis won the governorship. Clark complained that Davis "was given extreme powers by the Legislature, enabling him to rule with a high hand," and that, desperate to re-make Texas in the Republican image, his administration passed one evil law after another. Among the worst, Clark claimed, "was the one which gave the governor power to declare martial law and to create a state police force. The force thus established was made up largely of Negroes and was placed under the governor’s control. Governor Davis made frequent use of the police force and declared martial law in many counties, where his soldiers brought terror to the people."\textsuperscript{30}

This interpretation of events has now been thoroughly discredited by numerous scholars including Eric Foner, Carl Moneyhon, and Barry Crouch. In fact, in Clark’s own adopted city of Huntsville, Governor Davis had been forced to declare martial law following the infamous Walker County Rebellion of 1871, when three white men shot their way out of the county courthouse and escaped imprisonment for the murder of a black farmer.\textsuperscript{31} Despite this history, however, Clark was unrelenting in his critique of Davis and even went on to defend the tactics employed by the Ku Klux Klan. Like Woodrow Wilson and
D.W. Griffith before him, Clark argued that the members of the Klan were racial moderates who “discussed the cases of individual Negroes, ‘scalawags,’ and carpetbaggers” before taking steps “to terrify these individuals into behaving as the Klan believed they should.” In this way, Clark noted matter-of-factly, “Negroes were prevented from going to the polls to vote or exercising other privileges which they had not enjoyed as slaves.”

Despite our modern distaste for these old-fashioned and racist arguments, Clark’s interpretation of race relations during Reconstruction proved to be all-too-common in Texas during the Jim Crow era. In fact, over a forty-one-year career at Sam Houston State Teachers College, most of his colleagues shared his point of view. His superiors promoted him to Director of the Division of Social Sciences at the college and honored him with numerous awards, while his fellow faculty members feted him at dinners and invited him to speak at churches and local gatherings all over the area. In addition, he was elected to the Philosophical Society of Texas and served as the President of the Texas Association of College Teachers. In short, Clark enjoyed a stellar reputation as a scholar and teacher, and he worked diligently to maintain his professional and personal ties throughout the state.

It was through these ties, in fact, that Clark became a founding member of the Texas Commission on Interracial Cooperation. Although it may seem ironic that a devotee of the Dunning School would join a group committed to interracial harmony, Clark proved to be one of the most active and crucial members of the TCIC. He and his colleagues worked to harmonize the social order, to perfect segregation, and to eliminate the most egregious forms of discrimination. In this sense, then, Clark’s work for the TCIC was not unlike his scholarship. In both endeavors, he sought to emphasize what historian Gregg Cantrell has called the “triumphalism” of the white heroic past, while also creating a “highly sanitized” understanding of the present, which explained both the origins of and the ongoing need for white management of race relations in Texas.
Post-War Chaos and the Founding of the Texas Commission on Interracial Cooperation

The Commission on Interracial Cooperation had its origins in the demobilization period that followed the First World War. On the eve of that conflict, African Americans had “closed ranks” with their white neighbors, as W.E.B. Du Bois, the noted scholar and famed editor of the NAACP’s Crisis magazine had advised. More than 360,000 black men served in segregated units during the fight to defeat the Central Powers in Europe, while thousands of their family members at home took up jobs in war industry. African Americans, thus, made great sacrifices to support President Woodrow Wilson’s “War to Make the World Safe for Democracy,” and they hoped to be treated with respect and justice when the conflict ended. Instead, black soldiers and their loved ones encountered a virulent white backlash to their service, as calls for “100 Percent Americanism” spread across the nation. Thousands of white Americans, responding to the threats they perceived from international communists, labor unionists, radical immigrants, and black militants, joined the new Ku Klux Klan to defend white, Anglo Saxon, Protestantism as they understood it. Confronted by determined black veterans, Klansmen and other white supremacists sparked race riots in major American cities, including Washington, D.C., Chicago, Illinois, and New York, New York. Meanwhile, in rural areas, like Elaine, Arkansas, whites massacred hundreds of African Americans after they tried to organize a sharecroppers’ union. No place was safe, as the NAACP’s publication, Thirty Years of Lynching (1919), made clear. The number of recorded lynchings in the South had risen after the war, from sixty-four in 1918 to eighty-three in 1919.35

In Texas, the period from 1917 to 1920 proved to be particularly violent. White Texans lynched at least 23 African Americans during that period, murdering, burning, and torturing victims without any respect for the due process of law. In 1917, nineteen black soldiers from Camp Logan were court martialed and executed after they dared to challenge Jim Crow discrimination in the Houston Riot. The following year, only miles from Joseph Clark’s home in Huntsville, white law enforcement officers and vigilantes attacked the home of the black Cabiness family, burning the structure to the ground and
In response, John Shillady, the executive secretary of the NAACP, wrote to Texas governor William P. Hobby pleading with him to “do everything” in his power to investigate the Cabiness lynching and “punish all [the] offenders” in the case. Governor Hobby, however, refused to take any action. In fact, the number of lynchings in Texas escalated throughout the following year, and the conclusion of World War I brought a new wave of racial conflicts known as the Red Summer of 1919. In the second of twenty-five major riots that occurred that summer, white citizens in Longview, Texas, lynched Lemuel Walters, murdered Marion Bush, and burned one of the city’s African American housing districts to the ground before martial law was implemented to stop the madness.

Following the Longview Riot, Governor Hobby launched what historian Patricia Sullivan has called the South’s “most aggressive campaign against the NAACP.” Working with federal investigators and local law enforcement officers, Hobby accused the NAACP of joining forces with “Bolsheviks” or some other “sinister source” to stir up Negroes and foment a revolution. As Hobby pushed his offensive, John Shillady traveled from New York to Austin to meet with the assistant attorney general of Texas and other officials to assure them that the NAACP was a patriotic and law-abiding organization. After a “court of inquiry” considered Shillady’s statements, however, the presiding county judge advised him to leave Texas immediately. Ignoring this threat, Shillady remained in the state the following day, and “a mob that included the county judge and a local constable attacked [him] outside his hotel, beating [Shillady] almost to unconsciousness.” Following this outrageous act of mob violence, the NAACP executive secretary quickly returned to New York and petitioned Governor Hobby to punish the officials involved in the offense. Hobby replied that Shillady had been the true offender and advised him that the NAACP could “contribute more to the advancement of both races” if it kept its “representatives and ... propaganda out of the state.” The governor’s position was further buttressed by the revival of the Ku Klux Klan in Texas, which – together with government discrimination – wiped out much of the NAACP’s activity in the state by 1920.
In this atmosphere of mob violence and state-sanctioned discrimination, Clark pursued a variety of strategies to address the worst forms of racial bigotry then plaguing the South. In 1920, for example, he served as secretary for the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) Student Conference on Race Relations in Hollister, Missouri. This all-white assembly gathered to discuss the latest techniques in managing racial relations for the alleged benefit of all groups in America. As Clark prepared for the conference, he reflected on the need for a muscular form of Christianity that valued action over talk and posturing. As he said in a letter that January to the secretary of Arkansas’s YMCA, the appropriate role of that organization on college campuses was an activist one. The “‘goody-goody’ ‘mollycoddle’ idea of Christianity and the church,” Clark wrote, “must be broken down and the strenuous Christian challenge for life and service substituted.” This kind of faith fit in well with his paternalism, which required a father-like approach to the timeless question of racial relations in the United States. With God on his side, Clark hoped to manage white supremacy for the good of all concerned.

On his return trip from the Hollister Conference, Clark visited Alabama’s Tuskegee Institute, which still followed the accommodationist vision of its founder, Booker T. Washington. Clark approved of Tuskegee’s deference to white leadership, clearly enjoying the attention shown to him by senior academic leaders, such as President R.R. Moton. Yet, this is not to say that Clark was ignorant of more independent, challenging African American voices at the close of the First World War. In fact, his call for racial management under white supervision was designed to address the challenges to the segregated order posed by black veterans. As Clark said: “There is no doubt that, growing out of the war and the subsequent unsettled conditions, we have among us an entirely new Negro. He is publishing his own papers and reading them, as well as those of the white press. He is more interested in education and is vitally concerned in the problem of the education of his own children. We white men who feel that we know the Negro must realize that unless we know what he is thinking about we are ignorant of the trend of his movements.” Clark
hoped to study, understand, and control the New Negro’s assimilation into larger white community.43

This kind of racial management clearly echoed the example set by Will Alexander and the new Commission on Interracial Cooperation (CIC), which was founded in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1919. Indeed, educators and business leaders in Texas were persuaded by Alexander and his colleagues in Atlanta to form their own state branch of the CIC in the spring of 1920. That March, Robert Vinson, the President of the University of Texas, and Lee Addison Coulter, the state Secretary of the YMCA, issued a joint statement inviting 25 white and African American men to attend a conference on racial issues. The meeting took place on March 31 in President Vinson’s office, where Robert H. King, a representative from Atlanta explained that the Commission on Interracial Cooperation was an “Adventure in Goodwill.” It aimed to “increase educational facilities for Negroes,” he said, “to secure for them a greater degree of legal justice; ... to decrease the recurrence of mob violence; ... [and to emphasize] the necessity of open and fair-minded attitudes in the solution of problems.” By the end of King’s presentation, the participants at the meeting, including Clark, had agreed to organize a state commission of their own and to work together to see that it succeeded.44

The establishment figures involved in the Commission made no mention of segregation or the poll tax in their group’s initial set of goals. As Clark himself later wrote, the TCIC was “in no sense a radical organization.” Quite the contrary, it was designed to render “unnecessary the entrance into Texas of radical organizations sponsored in other sections of the county.” Specifically, the TCIC opposed the “entrance of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, or some other more or less belligerent organization” into Texas affairs, which Clark wrote would “give all of us much concern.”45

In the months following the initial meeting of the TCIC, Clark served as field director of the organization and emerged as the most important leader of the state-wide movement. Drawing on his experience traveling the state during the war to raise money for the YMCA, he joined with Dr. H.L. Gray of Southwestern University, Samuel Walker Houston of the Walker County Training School, and
Matthew Dogan of Wiley College, to promote the new commission during the summer of 1920. This “flying squadron of men” visited forty counties in the state, interviewing prominent figures of both races and securing their pledges to form local branches of the new Texas Commission. Although many individuals agreed to support the organization, little actual headway was made in the earliest years of its existence. Part of the commission’s difficulties lay in the fact that the early chairmen of the organization -- Dr. Robert Vinson, President of the University of Texas, Dr. John C. Hardy, President of Baylor Female College, Alexander S. Cleveland, President of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, and Dr. William Penn Meroney, Chair of the Sociology Department at Baylor University -- had little interest in the day-to-day affairs of the group. These men were happy to sit as honorary chairmen of the organization, but they clearly saw the TCIC as a means to an end; it could handle any immediate racial controversy or crisis without making long-term changes to the established racial order in the Lone Star State.

Not all people were so willing to be associated with the TCIC, however. W.C. Crawley, the superintendent of schools in Liberty County, wrote to Clark in January 1922 to ask that he be cleared of any association with the organization. According to Crawley, when he was a student at Sam Houston Normal College in the summer of 1921, Clark had written him a letter on TCIC stationary intimating that he had accepted a position on the Liberty County interracial commission. Crawley said that there “was some mistake in this intimation,” since he “had never before heard of the Texas Inter-Racial Commission and had not accepted any position.” Nevertheless, Crawley told Clark, the letter had fallen “into the hands of someone” who used it “for the sole purpose of prejudicing the minds of the people ... against me.” Indeed, “the story was soon twisted to the extent that I had been in correspondence with some Northern organization that desired social equality of the races and that I was considering the union of the White and Negro schools.” Crawley insisted that he was “as far as anyone in the State from entertaining any ideas of social equality of the races or the union of the schools,” and therefore, he found the criticism to be terribly unfair. “It has been my intention since coming to this State,”
he told Clark, “to affiliate with the best class of people and to advocate only those things that were best for the citizenship as a whole. Among other things, I have always stood for White Supremacy.”

On the other hand, the NAACP’s W.E.B. Du Bois presented an encouraging, if complicated, statement on the interracial movement in May 1921. Arguing that the interracial movement had sprung from the efforts of the NAACP, he advised his white friends not to fill their “committees with ‘pussy footers’ like Robert Moton or ‘white-folks’ Niggers’ like Isaac Fisher.” Instead, Du Bois said, get “real black men who dare to look you in the eye and speak the truth.” Addressing concerns that had already surfaced in the black community about the CIC and its state organizations, Du Bois said, “Do not dodge and duck. Face the fundamental problems: the Vote, the ‘Jim Crow’ car, Peonage and Mob-law.”

Buffeted by both sides, the TCIC floundered after its auspicious launch by a group of beneficent, if paternalistic, white men. It was actually a white woman, though, who raised the profile of the TCIC. After a tentative start, the Texas Commission grew and developed when Jessie Daniel Ames emerged from the new Women’s Division to serve as the first full-time director of the Commission in March 1924. Once Ames took control, she discovered that “the original forty counties” involved in the organization were “dormant, except [for the group] in Huntsville.” This, of course, was the group that J.L. Clark was leading with his friend, Samuel Walker Houston. Although the historical record remains largely silent on the relationship between Ames and Clark, it is clear that the two figures shared a similar vision for the Interracial Commission. Both saw the organization primarily as an educational enterprise designed to smooth over the rough edges of white racism. As Ames wrote in 1926, “The whole foundation of the movement rests upon the profound belief that human beings who know and understand each other will not develop racial antagonisms which result invariably in exploitation and injustice.”

The Commission had no mandated objectives set by state or national functionaries. Rather, a bi-racial state board of 100 men and women encouraged local communities to form interracial committees. From there, the techniques of the organization were simple. Local
committees functioned as the need arose, and the state commission met in an annual convention to hear reports from local committees, evaluate their work, and plan for the coming year. "In short," said Clark, "fair-minded people of both races are brought together to face common problems and obligations resting upon them as citizens of the same government. In the light of ascertained facts and in the spirit of justice, agreements are reached through deliberative counsel and accomplishments are achieved through cooperative effort."  

Despite these high-minded democratic ideals, however, Ames and Clark saw the TCIC primarily as a benevolent, paternalistic enterprise to help "uplift the Negro." In fact, in 1923 Clark published an article entitled "The effect of the World War Upon the National Spirit of the Colored Peoples," in which he saw white paternalism as the best antidote to increasingly resistive people of color around the world. Acknowledging the benefits of the World War to Africans and Asians, he assured his white readers that white supremacy could continue if only with a confident and optimistic face. Indeed, this stance was reflected in the policies and procedures of the TCIC. In describing the activities of the local committees, for instance, Ames wrote that each of the county and city organizations "have but one purpose: to interpret the needs, desires and aspirations of the weaker race to individuals and groups of the stronger race with the sure knowledge that a permanent bond of sympathetic cooperation will grow and result in everlasting good to both races."  

Even when African Americans cooperated with their white colleagues on the TCIC, the thinly-veiled contempt of paternalism was never absent. For example, Samuel Walker Houston, the organization's black field secretary, received both praise and blame for his efforts. In one instance, Ames commended him in a letter to Clark, writing that "Houston makes the most inimitable reports of any person I ever heard of. His use of English, the dramatic element he puts into the words, well, it is a sheer joy to read them. I think also that they are as nearly unbiased as it is possible for reports to be." Clark shared this positive view of Houston's work, but he never hesitated to critique his black ally for his alleged shortcomings. In one particularly revealing letter, Clark
told Ames that Houston had “really been accomplishing something, but in the usual Negro style, he has not paid careful attention to reports and other details.”

The Anti-Lynching Campaign

Although white paternalism hampered the development of a truly democratic organization, the TCIC did accomplish several achievements through its southern, liberal campaign. To begin with, during the 1920s the group focused on an anti-lynching effort, which formed “the main theme” of all the commission’s activities during that period. Race-based murders and violence had plagued the Lone Star State since before the Civil War, but the scale and ferocity of such violence skyrocketed during the Jim Crow era. Between 1882 and 1930, 492 recorded lynchings took place in Texas, making it the third most violent state in the country. In cities like Waco, Paris, and Houston, men and women were beaten, burned alive, and publicly tortured in front of thousands of onlookers in the name of racial purity and white power. In many cases, law enforcement officers sanctioned the violence, while the state’s political leaders, many of whom were members of the Ku Klux Klan, turned a blind eye to lynching. Official malfeasance thus allowed hundreds of violent perpetrators to create a climate of fear in the black community that was intentionally designed to buttress white supremacy and racial segregation.

To counteract this campaign of violence, the leaders of the TCIC launched an educational effort to convince their fellow Texans of the immorality of lynching. Beginning in 1922, the organization spoke to local ministers and laymen, met with newspaper editors and beat reporters, and sent hundreds of letters to sheriffs and other law enforcement officers, providing them with facts and figures on lynching. Then, when acts of racial violence did occur, Ames, Clark, and other members of the Texas Commission investigated the events and spoke with local, county, and state officials, including the governor, to point out that lynchings were “of state and national concern and not [simply] of local interest.” By 1925, the TCIC’s informational campaign in coordination with activities by other groups, including the NAACP, the Texas Association of Colored Women’s Clubs, and the
all-white Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs, achieved a significant milestone: a lynch-free year in Texas. Together, TCIC Director Ames and Chairman Alexander S. Cleveland credited this historic development to the state’s newspapers, which had played an important role in changing people’s attitudes about mobs and lynchings.60

Despite the TCIC’s efforts to quell racial violence in Texas, lynching continued. In 1927, for example, Clark himself felt compelled to send a letter to Governor Dan Moody and the District Attorney of Montgomery County, J.F. Pitts, in regard to a grisly lynching that took place near Conroe, Texas. On the night of February 1, forty white men in three automobiles confronted police on the road from Conroe to Huntsville, and demanded that they turn over Tom Payne, a 25-year-old sawmill worker, who was accused of assaulting a white co-worker named Jack Rogers. The two officers escorting Payne to Huntsville complied with the mob’s request and stood by as Payne was tortured and hung from a roadside tree. Clark was outraged by the “barbarity” of the crime and told District Attorney Pitts that the mob represented people on the “lowest scale” of civilization. “For the good name of the state and the dignity of the law,” Clark wrote, the guilty parties should be arrested and “justice ... should be speedily done.”

In his efforts to quell racial violence and discrimination, Clark received supported from his friend and colleague, Ramsey M. Woods, who served as director of the TCIC from 1928 to 1930. Granted a two-year leave of absence from his position as Professor of Sociology at Sam Houston State Teachers College, Woods worked closely with Clark and other like-minded allies to educate the press, public, and law enforcement organizations about the immorality of lynching. In fact, for six years between 1921 and 1927, Woods and Clark designed and offered an interdisciplinary class on race relations at Sam Houston. In addition, Woods sent dozens of letters to law enforcement officers around the state, congratulating them when they stood up against the forces of mob violence. He commended them for the “fearless performance of their duties in enforcing the laws and the protection of their prisoners,” and made it clear that the TCIC appreciated their dedication to justice and the higher calling of law enforcement.61

In 1933, as the newly elected Chairman of the TCIC, Clark assumed
a more public role in the campaign against lynching. He immediately wrote to Governor Miriam A. Ferguson of Texas requesting that she “use the official powers of her office to apprehend ... law violators and to require the peace officers of the state to preserve peace and dignity.”\textsuperscript{62} Although the effort to convince Governor Ferguson to intervene in the lynching crisis eventually proved fruitless, Clark also reached out to other politicians and opinion makers to comment on their efforts. He sent telegrams to law enforcement officers and decision makers, like Governor James Rolph Jr. of California, condemning their failure to prevent mob violence or arrest lynching perpetrators. In a particularly heated letter, Clark told Rolph that by allowing the citizens of San Jose to lynch Thomas Thurmond and John Holmes, two white men accused of murder, he had “violated the spirit of [his] oath” and “disgrace[d] the high office” to which he had been elected. Clark did not simply complain about lax law enforcement, however. On the contrary, he also took time to commend key Texas news outlets, including the Houston Post and Dallas Morning News, for consistently editorializing against mob violence, while sending in opinion pieces of his own for publication on the subject.\textsuperscript{63}

Clark’s anti-lynching efforts with his colleagues in the TCIC never approached the scale or intensity that would have been necessary to secure the passage of an anti-lynching law in the state legislature (a feat that 36 other states had accomplished by 1934).\textsuperscript{64} In fact, the most active anti-lynching activist in Texas’ interracial movement, Jesse Daniel Ames, left the TCIC in 1929 and moved to Atlanta, Georgia, where she served as national director of the Commission’s Women’s Committee before founding the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching the following year. As historian Jacquelyn Dowd Hall has shown, Ames continued to work vigorously to end vigilante violence, but she broke with other activists, including Walter White, Roy Wilkins, and Mary McLeod Bethune, because of her opposition to a federal anti-lynching law. Nevertheless, Ames, Clark, Woods and their colleagues in the TCIC did make a difference in Texas, as they helped to destabilize what historian William D. Carriagan called
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the "lynching culture" of violence and vigilantism that had taken
took root in Texas during the first two decades of the twentieth
century.\textsuperscript{65}

**Child Welfare and Health Care**

As the leaders of the TCIC fought to combat lynching in the mid-
1920s, they also hoped to address the long-term child welfare and
health care problems that plagued the black community. Indeed, as
Alwyn Barr and William S. Bush have shown, the need for reform
in these areas was significant, given the fact that the state provided
virtually no tax-supported eleemosynary institutions to aid African
Americans. The legislature had long refused to fund a black orphan’s
home, like the one it had established for white children in 1887, and it
offered little more than lip service to those unfortunate black juveniles
who were caught up in the justice system. Making matters worse,
the state almost completely ignored the medical needs of the African
American community. Doctor’s offices and hospitals in Texas were
completely segregated during the period, and most blacks “relied on
druggists’ advice or home remedies because medical services proved
costly.” This meant that black Texans suffered from higher morbidity
rates and “died from smallpox, tuberculosis, pneumonia,” and other
disorders at a higher rate than whites.\textsuperscript{66}

At the request of the State Health Department, the TCIC initiated
its child welfare efforts with a study of conditions at the Dickson
Colored Orphanage in Gilmer between 1926 and 1929. Reverend W.
L. Dickson, a black Baptist preacher, had founded the orphanage in
1900, and it served as one of only six private orphanages for black
children in Texas.\textsuperscript{67} Over the course of its investigation, the TCIC
noted that the meager voluntary aid given to the orphanage failed
to provide the necessary equipment for educational, vocational,
industrial, or domestic science training. Furthermore, the TCIC
found that the sanitary conditions and morale at the orphanage were
unspeakably bad because the children lacked adequate food, warmth,
and clothing. As a result of the investigation, and the declining health
of Rev. Dickson, plans were made to seek a state take-over of the
institution. With the support of the orphanage’s trustees, members of
the Upshur County Chamber of Commerce traveled with local Court Judge Gus Morris and Mayor Nolan Coe to Austin, where they met with Senator Tom Pollard and Governor Dan Moody to discuss the process. After a legislative committee visited the institution in the spring of 1929, Ramsey Woods, Joseph Clark, and other member of the TCIC worked with Claude Teer, the Chairman of the Texas Board of Control and former member of the original interracial committee of Williamson County, to push through legislation that would purchase and maintain the orphanage. Although minor problems cropped up along the way, both Texas houses passed the legislation on July 15, and Governor Moody signed the bill on August 9, 1929, transforming the Dickson Orphanage into the State Colored Orphans Home.68

Despite the state’s takeover, however, conditions at the home improved only slightly. To begin with, Governor Moody vetoed $7,500 in immediate funding to support the 135 black children at the institution until the start of the new biennium on September 1, 1929. This setback meant that little money was available for needed repairs, and conditions at the site deteriorated in the short-run. In fact, the following November, a disastrous fire broke out at the orphanage, destroying both the kitchen and the dining room, making it almost impossible to serve daily meals. Nevertheless, some progress did occur. Under the leadership of the Board of Control, G.W. Couch, a black Agricultural Agent from Smith County, served as Superintendent of the home from 1930 to 1934, before P.J. Rowe, a similar agent from Freestone County, took over from 1934 to 1943. These men worked with the all-black staff at the home to offer rudimentary educational courses in agricultural production, industrial trades, and home economics. In addition, the state financed the installation of four fire hydrants at the orphanage, as well as the painting and re-roofing of buildings, and modest improvements around the grounds. Yet, even the official biennial reports of the Board of Control demonstrated the second-class nature of the site. In the mid-1930s, the Board reported that “100 unneeded beds from the [white] Orphans’ Home at Corsicana were transported [to Gilmer] to replace older beds,” and that the thirty-two buildings, barns, and outhouses at the black orphanage represented “fire hazards and constitute[d] a menace to the children’s
Based on these findings and the TCIC’s ongoing inspections of the orphanage, the Commission recommended on December 5, 1942 that a black training school be established at Gilmer and the orphans be moved to the state’s Deaf, Dumb, and Blind School for Colored Youth in Austin. The following year, after repeated refusals by the legislature to appropriate the necessary funds for the Gilmer Orphanage, the Board of Control followed through on the TCIC’s recommendations, closing the orphan’s home altogether and moving the children to Austin. The state then sold the buildings and most of the land in Gilmer, bringing to an end a brief and flawed chapter in state leadership.

While Clark and the TCIC invested considerable time and attention to the Gilmer orphanage, the group also focused on other black institutions in the state. For example, the leadership investigated St. John’s Orphanage in Austin, the state’s Deaf, Dumb, and Blind School for Colored Youth in Austin, and the state’s Juvenile Training School for Boys at Gatesville. All of these sites faced significant institutional problems and overcrowding, but Gatesville was the worst of the lot. Both white and black boys were sent to the Juvenile Training School, but black children were required to spend the vast majority of their time in agricultural work away from the classroom and any real hope of self-improvement. In addition, the school superintendent, C.E. King, and his staff engaged in what can only be called the grossest form of discrimination and abuse against the juveniles incarcerated there.

Yet, in spite of the limitations at these existing institutions, the TCIC decided to join ongoing efforts by the Texas Association of Colored Women’s Clubs and the Texas Federation of Women’s Clubs in their efforts to establish a training school for delinquent black girls in the state. While delinquent boys of both races were sent to Gatesville, and white girls received training at the state’s school in Gainesville, delinquent girls of color received a short reprimand and were released to the public. In November 1925, the TCIC and the Association of Colored Women’s Clubs worked to encourage legislation on the girls’ behalf, and Senator Ralph Hall of Paris County saw that it passed the 40th Legislature. The bill lacked funding, however, and, after
repeated attempts to win an appropriation, the TCIC issued a pamphlet entitled, “Why a Training School For Colored Girls” in 1929. This document revealed both the paternalistic progressivism that motivated the members of the TCIC and the deep-seated racial stereotypes that lingered within the organization throughout its existence. On one hand, the pamphlet called for “an institution to care for those girls” who had “no home-life, no schooling, [and] no training.” The new institution would teach these girls about “gardening, laundering, canning” and other work in order to rehabilitate and reform them into productive citizens. On the other hand, the leaflet demonized these same “subnormal [and] criminally-inclined girls” who pursued deviant sexual behaviors and brought “danger and disease” into white homes where they worked as maids and nurses. The contradictory tones in the pamphlet exposed underlying tensions at the heart of the entire training school project, and, after a failed attempt to build a black ward at the Gainesville school, these tensions emerged into full view when the state finally established the Colored Girls Training School on the site of a former World War II POW Camp in Brady in 1947. As historian William Bush has shown, the first superintendent of the school, and incoming president of newly renamed Texas Federation of Colored Women’s Clubs, Iola Winn Rowan of Houston, favored a rehabilitation model for the institution, while Carl M. Tibbitts, a white Brady grocer and business manager at the school, preferred to run the site himself as a hiring agency for black maids. Ultimately, the dual system of leadership caused Rowan to resign along with several of her reform-oriented teachers, but her successor, Emma Harrell, proved to be an excellent administrator who was able to lead the school at Brady until its removal in 1951 to a 125-acre farm near Crockett in Houston County. There, as she had at Brady, Harrell employed a policy of excluding the most dangerous and unruly girls so that the site enjoyed “relative institutional harmony” during her tenure. It that sense, the school proved to be successful, and it was renamed the Crockett State School for Girls when it was integrated in 1966.

Educational Reform Efforts
In addition to its anti-lynching and child welfare, the TCIC also
engaged in an educational reform program meant to both improve interracial relations and advance African American opportunities. These efforts began in 1925 following the publication of a series of important studies on the state of education in Texas. The first, a massive, eight-volume, state-sponsored review -- Texas Educational Survey Report -- revealed the disparities between white and black schools in received by similarly trained black teachers, while whites students received per-pupil funding for facilities and materials that far exceeded the allocations provided for black students. These obvious inequities also affected collegiate education, where the state offered only a single public institution of higher education for African Americans at Prairie View A&M. As the historian of education Frederick H. Eby showed in his classic 1925 study, The Development of Education in Texas, the Lone Star State had fewer than 700 black college students in 1922 -- this in a state with 741,694 black residents.75

Although the statistics in the various educational reports of 1925 provided a detailed accounting of the discriminatory system of education in Texas, many white business leaders and politicians actually congratulated themselves on the effort they were making on behalf of African Americans. Drawing on the Survey Report in particular, these white leaders noted that Texas ranked above all the other states that were surveyed, besides Oklahoma and Maryland, in the average amount paid to black teachers and the amount invested in black schools. Moreover, these leaders pointed out that Texas had the second highest number of black students in school and ranked fourth from the top in overcoming black illiteracy. In short, most white political figures in Texas saw the Survey Report as a confirmation that Texas was a leader in Southern educational opportunities for blacks, not as an indictment of the system of segregated education. As a result, they focused, not on improving black education, but on establishing junior colleges for whites, creating an “opportunity” college for poor students, and passing a free textbook law to provide books to the state’s vast student body.76

In contrast to other whites, Clark and the leaders of the TCIC adopted a broad-based, if condescending, approach to education issues in Texas, seeking to “uplift the Negro” through a series of
informational campaigns, collegiate courses, and regional meetings designed to improve relations between whites and blacks. Perhaps the most revealing statements from Clark on black education in Texas came from his own textbooks, in which he offered a particularly Whiggish take on the matter. To begin with, he emphasized that African Americans had “made rapid progress [in education] since the slaves were freed.” At the end of the Civil War, he noted, few of the 200,000 blacks in Texas “could read or write,” and “Negro children were not allowed to attend the same schools the white children attended.” He then highlighted the creation of Prairie View A&M in 1879, writing that “since its establishment, and with the aid of white friends of Negro education, financial agencies, and other influences, Negro education has made commendable progress in Texas.” Although these statements were obviously patronizing and privileged white agency in the freeing of the slaves and the establishment of Prairie View, Clark truly believed that improvements had been made in Texas education, and he hoped to further that progress through continued action.

In a series of efforts between 1930 and 1934, Clark and his friend Ramsey Woods worked to create a dialog between whites and blacks about the state of education in Texas. The two men introduced a race relations course into the curriculum at Sam Houston State Teachers College, and encouraged their colleagues at other institutions to do likewise. They invited speakers from outside the state, including H.L. McAlister, the President of Arkansas State Teachers College, and Dr. Channing Tobias, the national secretary of the YMCA’s Colored Work Department, to address college students across the state about race relations. In addition, Clark served as the chairman of the region-wide Peabody Conference on Education and Race Relations at Nashville, Tennessee during the summers of 1931 and 1932, and he made efforts of his own to desegregate the annual conferences of the two major teachers’ associations in Texas.

Through these and other activities, Clark developed an encyclopedic knowledge about the state of black education in Texas. His mastery of the facts and figures related to educational policy made him a sought-after speaker, but Clark’s interpretation
of the plight of black students and teachers remained Pollyannaish. For instance, in an address before the state’s Colored Teachers Association annual meeting in November 1932, he noted that African American educational facilities and teacher training programs were inadequate, but he never linked these shortcomings to the state’s discriminatory funding policies. Instead, he suggested the old pabulum that time and patience would soon correct the deficiencies in the system. Worse still, Clark sometimes marshalled the evidence that he had accumulated to make arguments that ignored the traditions and trajectories of the people he was hoping to assist. For example, in that same 1932 speech before the Colored Teachers Association, he argued that the “Negro colleges of Texas are not located strategically with reference to either Negro population or high school output.” While this assessment may have been accurate, Clark then suggested the merger of three sets of colleges: Wiley and Bishop in Marshall; Seguin, Tillotson, Samuel Huston, and Paul Quinn at either Austin or Waco; and, Tyler, Hawkins, and Crockett junior colleges at either Fort Worth or Dallas. In short, he proposed to reduce the number of state-wide African American collegiate institutions from thirteen to seven, without concern for faculty appointments, student traditions, alumni ties, or the looming question about graduate and professional education.80

On this final matter -- the lack of state-sponsored graduate and professional education for black students in Texas -- Clark evolved over time. In 1932, following his experience at the Peabody Conference on Education and Race Relations, he favored “the development of a well-organized graduate school centrally located in the South.” He argued that such a school could offer work in traditional industrial education, including trades, home economics, and agriculture, as well as new options in the social sciences, economics, language, religion, and education. Importantly, he said, the “development of such an institution would preclude the necessity of Texas colleges, which are now struggling for existence, from ever having to make added effort in the direction of graduate education.”81

Pushed by Richard T. Hamilton, a Dallas physician, member
of the Dallas Negro Chamber of Commerce, and colleague in the TCIC, Clark began in 1934 to reconsider his position. The fact that African Americans seeking professional and graduate degrees in fields such as medicine, law, and engineering were forced to seek higher education outside the state, and at their own expense, required some action. Yet, it seemed unlikely that any region-wide university system for African Americans would ever get off the ground. So, Clark began to work with Hamilton to advocate for a scholarship program to help African Americans offset the cost of graduate education outside the state.

This transformation in Clark’s position may have been related to the personal appeal that Hamilton made to him. For, the two men first worked together on securing a place for African American representation at the Texas Centennial scheduled for Dallas’ Fair Park in 1936. Clark had been appointed in late 1933 to represent Huntsville and Walker County on one of the Centennial committees, and in July 1934 he was appointed to the important Historical and Cultural Planning Committee for the state. When the group met in October, Clark realized that no African American had been asked to serve on the committee and that there was no plan to represent black history at the Centennial. As a result, he quickly sent telegrams to key African Americans around the state, asking that they join the committee’s meeting on Friday, October 12, 1934. Seven people did come -- Richard T. Hamilton of Dallas, W.R. Banks, President of Prairie View A&M, C.G. Grannam, President of Samuel Huston College, Mary Branch, President of Tillotson College, J.W. Rice of Houston, J. Alston Atkins of Houston, and Samuel Walker Houston of Huntsville. Together, these individuals drafted a plan for African American representation at the Centennial and presented it to the committee along with a budget request of $498,750. When this bill later went before the legislature, it appeared that it would be rewritten and that funding for African American activities would be cut altogether. So, Clark again intervened -- this time with the new TCIC Centennial Committee including W.R. Banks, D.B. Taylor, and H.D. Winn. Arguing that the African American contribution to Texas history could not be ignored, this group sent dozens of
telegrams to legislators and Centennial planners requesting that the funding go forward. After a year of correspondence and activity, their work paid off. Not only were African Americans included in the Centennial celebration, but the federal government erected a Hall of Negro Life at the expense of $50,000 and provided additional funds for administrative and exhibit costs. In turn, black activists A. Maceo Smith and John L. Blunt planned beautiful displays including African American paintings, musical exhibits, displays of books by and about black Americans, and showcases highlighting black contributions to the fields of medicine, agriculture, and industry. In truth, Clark had done nothing more than open the door for African American activists, but Hamilton and others appreciated his efforts and kept up ties with him and the TCIC.82

As Hamilton and Clark worked on the Centennial project, the Dallas doctor also put together a plan for state scholarships for African American students seeking to attend graduate or professional school beyond Texas. Hamilton contacted schools in Oklahoma, Missouri, West Virginia, and Maryland for information on their programs, and in December 1935 he presented a statement to the annual TCIC meeting at Prairie View. It called for the TCIC “to sponsor an enactment by the Texas Legislature” of a law that would “give aid to Negro students who are denied permission to enter the state universities on account of race, and who desire to enter the professions or take post-graduate work, by paying their tuition and their transportation to recognized institutions outside the state wherein they are admitted.” Clark and his colleagues unanimously endorsed the measure and quickly set about to achieve its ends.83 In dozens of letters, meetings, and newspaper editorials, the TCIC launched a four-year campaign with Hamilton, A. Maceo Smith, and numerous other black activists to pressure for legislation.84 Ironically, the Supreme Court’s decision in Gaines v. Canada, outlawing a similar program in Missouri, pushed the Texas government to act. The legislature in June 1939 passed House Bill No. 225, which required the government to provide out-of-state scholarships for the 1939-1940 biennium. In
addition to appropriating $50,000 in scholarships for graduate and professional studies for African Americans, the bill also designated $20,000 to Prairie View State College so that it could add graduate courses to its curriculum. In 1940, the legislature finally passed the bill, and an all-white committee was established to oversee the funds. During the first two years of the program, the state provided roughly seventy-five African American students with funding for out-of-state graduate and professional training. Yet, most activists by this time saw the out-of-state tuition program as nothing more than a temporary measure. In fact, the NAACP soon took the case of Heman Sweatt, a black postal worker who had been denied admission to the University of Texas Law School in the spring of 1946. In that case, District Court Judge Roy C. Archer ruled that Sweatt be admitted as a student to UT Law “unless the state within six months established a law school for negroes.”

In response to the lower court’s Sweatt decision, the governing boards of Texas A&M and the University of Texas recommended that Prairie View offer graduate and undergraduate instruction in engineering, mechanical arts, teaching, and vocational courses, while the board of regents establishes “a first-class university for negroes” at Houston.

In response, Governor Coke Stevenson appointed a Bi-racial Commission to study the proposal of a university for Negroes. Since the TCIC sought “adequate educational opportunities for Negroes” as one of its chief objectives over its twenty year existence, Clark notified the members of the TCIC education committee, which included Dr. T.H. Shelby, Dr. W.B. Banks, Dr. M.W. Dogan, and Dr. E.C. McLead, and requested that they be present at the August conference at the state capital.

A few weeks later, when Clark left the conference, he was confident that African Americans in Texas would support a new black university. The Texas legislature soon authorized the establishment, organization, and maintenance of the Texas “University for Negroes at Houston” to train blacks in the Arts and Sciences, Literature, Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Journalism, Education, and other professional courses. Yet, the
NAACP felt that the state had not gone far enough. Although the TCIC continued to seek the equalization of Texas schools in the 1950s, the NAACP took the Sweatt case to the U.S. Supreme Court and won a landmark ruling in 1950 requiring Sweatt’s admission to UT Law School. Then, four years later, the NAACP secured an even greater victory in Brown v. Board of Education, which overturned racial segregation in public schools and helped set the stage for the modern civil rights movement.91

The Last Years of the TCIC

As early as 1937, Joseph Clark and his colleagues at the TCIC had worked to secure the attendance of students at the organization’s state conferences. While students represented almost every section of the state at the 1937 conference, the organization’s membership continued to decline as participants died or became too old to continue their work in the commission.92 In that same year, Clark chaired the long-established YMCA conference in Blue Ridge, North Carolina, on education and race relations. The cautious membership in attendance seemed out of step with the less deferential times. Furthermore, the TCIC especially failed to adapt to wartime changes in racial expectations and attitudes. Clark did use his experience with the TCIC to coordinate the reeducation of Japanese Prisoners of War at Camp Huntsville in 1945, but even this effort at democratization seemed absurd in the segregated South.

After joining the Southern Regional Council as an affiliate in the mid-1940s, the work of the TCIC slowed considerably.93 Within the next fifteen years, the TCIC slowly petered out as Clark received word from TCIC director Thomas S. Sutherland that the organization was “without any funds for operating since the funds that SRC have granted us are allocated exclusively to the salaries of staff.”94 This is not to say that Clark avoided key issues on the road to public school desegregation. In 1955, he published an essay called “Our Racial Background,” which favorably compared the work of the TCIC with the NAACP. This was ironic, given Clark’s earlier claims that the TCIC was established to prevent the entrance
of the NAACP into Texas. The success of the NAACP, of course, was in stark contrast to the dormancy of the TCIC. In fact, Clark's friend and colleague, Rupert Koeninger, was fired from their own Sam Houston State Teachers College in 1962 for collaborating with the Southern Conference Education Fund, an ally of the NAACP in the cause for racial equality.

The last official meeting of the TCIC occurred on February 8 and 9, 1963, at Austin's University Baptist Church. No official decision was made to disband, but the lack of funds and obvious changes in society made the organization seem irrelevant. As the organization's first historian, J.D. McLeod, a colleague of Clark's at Sam Houston, wrote: "There was the failure to cultivate young people. The organization died because time caught up with it.... The Commission's method of operations was to work through established structures. The results were slower than the activists were willing to accept. Action people took over. The Commission ended up as a small group of people doing public relations work, which was not related to the young Negroes who were holding the sit-ins at the Walgreens Drug Stores."95

Despite the long and drawn out decline of his organization, Clark remained an active if increasingly conservative figure in civil rights until his death in 1969. He and the TCIC had not revolutionized race relations in Texas, nor had he or the organization even played the primary role in many of the campaigns of the mid-century. Yet, Clark and the TCIC did play what historian Ann Ellis called "a vital role in preparing the minds of [white] Southerners to accept a more liberal view of race relations."96 In addition to fostering cooperative relationships between whites and blacks, the TCIC challenged lynching, pushed for child welfare, health, and educational reform, and lobbied to include African American contributions in the existing whites-only narrative of Texas. While Clark and the TCIC came late to voting rights and desegregation, they did endorse an end to the poll tax and white primary, and later acquiesced to the ground-breaking effects of the Brown v. Board of Education (1954). It may be little wonder, then, that Clark wrote to his friend Matthew Dogan in 1940 to say how much he
enjoyed their work together. "I regard the Interracial Commission as one of the most important organizations of our day and one whose achievements will have lasting effect upon the life of our country," Clark said. "The small part I have had in this work has brought to me the greatest returns in personal satisfaction of anything I have done." 97
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