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ABSTRACT

William G. Brown was one of few black state education superintendents nationwide during Reconstruction, and the first in Louisiana. The study examines the significance of William G. Brown and his administration in relation to the educational development of Louisiana and relevant social and political issues of the day.

The manuscript initially addresses the pre-Civil War educational development of Louisiana and early, available information on Brown. The profound social, political, and economic changes precipitated by the Civil War and Reconstruction also had educational corollaries. Mixed (integrated) schooling, one of the most controversial measures in post-Civil War Louisiana transcended education to become one of the defining issues of Reconstruction.

During his tenure, Superintendent Brown’s integrity, leadership, and skill in navigating such matters earned him the respect of many. In an effort to gain greater insight into Brown’s personality, this study follows the course of Brown’s career immediately before and after the superintendency. Important factors such as Brown’s philosophy of education and administrative style are also considered in assessing the overall effectiveness of Brown’s educational leadership.
The administration of William G. Brown as State Superintendent of Public Education of Louisiana (1872-1876) was noteworthy in many respects. Brown was one of only four blacks elected state education superintendent in the United States during Reconstruction (1862-1877).\textsuperscript{1} He was also one of the few blacks elected to high administrative office, of any type during the period, which saw the first generation of black elected officials in the nation’s history.\textsuperscript{2}

Furthermore, Brown’s administration as State Superintendent of Public Education began amid the political difficulties occurring in the fallout of the Election of 1872. In hindsight, this proved to be a critical juncture in Louisiana’s history, the latter phase of Reconstruction. William P. Kellogg, elected governor in 1872, suffered from a severe crisis of political legitimacy, which not only undermined his ability to manage the state but also consumed his term. Within this environment, Kellogg’s substantial opposition questioned and challenged the legitimacy and effectiveness of the entire Kellogg Administration, which included Brown and the State Department of Education.

Despite Brown’s actual position of prominence in Louisiana’s government and history, very few studies have accorded his administration either attention or respect. Earlier studies of Reconstruction in Louisiana either ignored Brown’s presence entirely or minimized his


contributions. Revisionist approaches, while recognizing Brown’s importance, have usually focused on other concerns during the period. As a consequence, Brown was often relegated to background status.⁴

As the executive of the State Department of Education, Brown confronted educational parallels to the state’s larger political issues. The issue of mixed (integrated) schools proved to be the most divisive and volatile of educational concerns. Desegregation of schools, implemented by Brown’s predecessor continued through the Brown Administration and it was during his tenure that a definite and violent response to desegregated schools manifested itself.

This study will evaluate the manner in which William G. Brown and his administration approached these and other issues. The initial chapter provides early, available information on Brown and also general background on Louisiana’s educational development to the Civil War. Succeeding chapters discuss the roles of Presidential and Congressional Reconstruction on education, and the emergence of Brown. In the process, the study focuses on Brown’s public life and career up to the superintendency.

The fifth chapter is devoted mainly to Brown’s career as superintendent and his treatment of pertinent educational matters such as revenue, personnel, management, and teacher concerns. The following chapter discusses

desegregation matters, the racial climate, and the Election of 1876 and its outcome. The aftermath of the election continues into the succeeding and final chapter with a discussion of Brown’s public career and activities after the superintendency.

I am especially grateful for the constant and repeated assistance extended by the staffs of Louisiana State Archives, the Louisiana State University and A&M College Special Collections, the Southern University and A&M College Archives and Black Heritage Divisions, and also the Louisiana Collection of the State Library of Louisiana. The libraries and archival resources of the University of New Orleans and the Tulane University of Louisiana also warrant special commendation. Likewise, the library and interlibrary resources of the Florida State University and Savannah State University were of invaluable and necessary assistance.
CHAPTER ONE

PRELUDE: THE EARLY LIFE OF WILLIAM G. BROWN AND EARLY YEARS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA, To 1862

William G. Brown entered office as Louisiana’s newest State Superintendent of Public Education in December 1872. He was elected on the Radical Republican ticket headed by William P. Kellogg, Louisiana’s last governor during Reconstruction.¹ Prior to 1872, he held a number of minor posts such as Iberville Parish delegate to the Louisiana Constitutional Convention of 1867-1868 and Senate chief enrolling clerk in the Louisiana Legislature.²

William G. Brown was born August 12, 1832, to Henry and Sarah Brown of Trenton, New Jersey. During his childhood, the family moved to Jamaica where Brown’s father worked in journalism. Yet, available information on William G. Brown’s personal background tended to be vague and sometimes contradictory. An 1875 Harper’s Weekly interview mentioned the British West Indies, which included Jamaica as Superintendent Brown’s place of birth. Other sources were more specific if not always respectful. The Daily Picayune in 1872 referred to Brown as an “unnaturalized mulatto from Jamaica,” while historian Charles Vincent held

¹For general studies of Reconstruction in Louisiana see: Ted Tunnell, Crucible of Reconstruction: War, Radicalism and Race in Louisiana, 1862-1877 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1984); Joe Gray Taylor, Louisiana Reconstructed, 1863-1877 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1974); Willie M. Caskey, Secession and Restoration of Louisiana (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1938); Ella Lonn, Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868 (New York: G.P. Putnam & Sons, 1918); John R. Ficklen, History of Reconstruction in Louisiana (Through 1868) (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1910).

that Brown lived in Jamaica and Washington D.C. prior to New Orleans.³

Regardless of his place of birth, that William G. Brown spent time in the British West Indies seems to have been uncontested. For example, in a rebuttal that appeared in the *Louisianian*, a New Orleans semi-weekly newspaper Brown edited, he wrote authoritatively on the labor history of the British West Indies. Brown’s article refuted the assertion by Radical Senator Carl Schurz that black labor in the tropics could not be productive without the coercion of slavery. According to Brown, since the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies in 1836 and 1838, there occurred a steady improvement in the condition of blacks and a “four sided advance of civilization.” He further argued that the decline in staple crop production immediately following emancipation was linked to the withdrawal of British capital and abandonment of estate cultivation, not to any deficiencies associated with the former slaves. As a result of perseverance in the colonies, revenues eventually increased. Institutions formerly managed by the central government were handed over to colonial governments, which exhibited greater economy and efficiency of management. Brown further asserted, “In the carrying out of all this machinery, colored men are everywhere connected and associated. They possess as much intelligence, control as much wealth, and wield as much influence as any other class.”⁴

Recognized nationally as a “mulatto gentleman of evident culture who seems indeed quite up to the measure of

---

³Orleans Parish Marriage Certificates, 1872, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge; Daily Picayune, 17 October 1872, 15 May 1883; Harper’s Weekly, 13 February 1875; Vincent, Black Legislators, 150.
⁴*Louisianian*, 19 January 1871.
his task . . ." it was clear that Brown was well educated. However the extent and location are unclear. Historians Donald Devore and Joseph Logsdon asserted that Brown was trained in the British West Indies. By contrast, Harper’s Weekly and other sources claimed he was trained in England. That Brown was educated under the British system seems certain.5

Louisiana had become a state merely twenty years prior to William G. Brown’s birth. During the early statehood period, the trials and tribulations of statehood were numerous. The actual year of Brown’s birth, a yellow fever epidemic ravaged New Orleans, extracting a toll in excess of 5,000 individuals.6

The superintendency of William G. Brown was an embodiment of Louisiana’s educational history. His administration did not stand solely on the times in which it existed. Past policies and administrations affected his ability to lead and effect change. Certain educational issues permeated administrations throughout the decades such as racial, religious, and funding matters. Parallel educational systems, religious or private in origin, also helped create a climate of apathy towards public education. Some of these schools effectively competed for public funds. Thus Louisiana’s educational past always played a significant role in its educational present.

By 1832, Louisiana had over 100 years experience with systems of education. The French and Spanish built a unique

foundation that continued to exert major influence on the state’s educational efforts. The successors of Governor William C.C. Claiborne (1803-1816), Louisiana’s first governor under United States authority continued Claiborne’s struggle to create a state system of education.  

Fiscal responsibility emerged early as a key issue of concern. The 1831 inaugural address of Governor Andre Bienvenu Roman given to the legislature is both compelling and revealing:

From the books of the treasurer it appears that $354,012.57, since 1818, have been appropriated and paid out of public funds for the use of the schools, and it is doubtful whether 354 indigent children have derived from those schools the advantages which the legislature wished to extend to that class throughout the State. . . .

Governor Roman, in the same address, also condemned the existing system as a “useless waste of the public money,” and suggested suspending appropriations until a different course was charted.

During that period, Secretary of State duties also included management of public education. Common themes vexing secretaries included inadequate funding, widespread apathy, and lack of cooperation on the part of school officials and parents. Financial dishonesty and impropriety among school officials was also a severe problem. Likewise,

---


the ability of state secretaries to manage schools was seriously hindered.

In the meantime, major developments beginning in New Orleans in 1841 precipitated the rise of Louisiana’s first authentic public education system. Members of the New Orleans business community, all northern-born, sponsored a bill submitted to the legislature calling for establishment of city schools supported by the state. Of the individuals concerned, some were directly connected with Horace Mann, the noted and esteemed crusader for American public education.⁹

The legislature responded, authorizing establishment of public schools in each of the city’s municipalities. Schools operated on joint state-local funding, establishing a major precedent in the state. The following year, schools pursued a similar course in the rural parishes.¹⁰

The Constitution of 1845, replacing that of 1812, adopted a more conciliatory attitude towards education than did its predecessor. Article 133 created the Office of Superintendent of Public Education, appointed by the governor. Article 134 was considered by at least one educational historian as “one of the most advanced constitutional provisions for public education to be found

---


in any state at the time. The article committed the state to both implementation of free public schools and provision for their support, but maintained the prerequisite of local taxation. Article 135 provided that proceeds of federal land grants and proceeds of the estates of deceased persons, “to which the state may be entitled shall be held as a loan by the State.”

The Public School Law of 1847 provided the operative logistics for the new system. The law set the appointed term of state superintendent at two years at an annual salary of $3000. Responsibilities included deciding the course of studies and textbooks to be utilized in the schools, annual visitation and inspection of schools, and submitting annual reports and recommendations to the legislature. While the office’s responsibilities also included apportionment of school funds, the state treasurer exercised control over such funds, an inherent weakness in the system.

The School Law of 1847 also established the Office of Parish Superintendent. This officer was elected by the voters of each parish and earned an annual salary of $300. Additionally, parish superintendents in cooperation with police juries (governing bodies) of each parish were ordered to create school districts. The citizens of each school district were responsible for electing three-member district school boards.

Two taxes provided funding for the entire system, a state school tax of one mill on the dollar of all taxable

---

13Suarez, 117.
property, and a poll tax of one dollar levied on all white males over twenty-one years of age. Additional monies were acquired from the land grant and estate provisions of the state constitution.¹⁴

Alexander Dimitry, LL.D., was the first official State Superintendent of Public Education (1847-1851) in Louisiana. A native of the state, Dimitry was described as a "ripe scholar of national reputation" and "familiar with the best methods of instruction observed in the United States and Europe." Prior to 1847 he was Superintendent of Schools in New Orleans' Third Municipal District. A disciple of Horace Mann, Dimitry was also connected with Mann's associate Henry Barnard through the American Education Association.¹⁵

Reports filed by Superintendent Dimitry indicated continued apathy among the population and inefficiency among school officials. He advocated consolidation of schools in the rural parishes due to low enrollment in addition to poorly equipped teachers. However, by 1850 some 22,000 pupils, over half of the white educable population, attended 618 schools, an indication of progress made.¹⁶

Inadequate funding, despite the overhauling of the system continued to compromise the efforts of superintendents to perform the tasks at hand, a cry echoed by more than a few of Dimitry's successors in office. Dimitry himself expressed the fear that the number of children per year in schools would remain fewer than 25,000

¹⁴Dabney, 362-365; Suarez, 117.
¹⁵Leon O. Beasley, "A History of Education in Louisiana During the Reconstruction Period, 1862-1877," (Ph.D. diss., Louisiana State University, 1957), 31; Fay, 70; Knight, 244; Dabney, 362-365; Reinders, "New England Influences," 192, 193; Stumpf, 73.
¹⁶Cubberley, Public Education in the United States; Dabney, 362-365; Fay, 70, 106, 107; Knight, 245.
under the current state of affairs. Yet, he continued to exhibit hope and optimism for the ultimate maturity and success of the system while also realizing the tribulations ahead:

Many a day will the friends of education have to struggle before they can get the people to realize the idea that the first of rights is right to mind, and that all others are derivatives of this. . . . It may be a long struggle . . . but as often as the . . . people may be stricken to the ground, so often will they borrow new strength for a renewed contest. . . . It is a question between money and mind; money, one of the accidents of social life, and mind, the gift of God to creatures fashioned after His own image for imperishable destinies.\(^\text{17}\)

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

During the period 1852-1862 a number of recurring and newly created issues vexed Louisiana’s education superintendents. For example, issues of personnel, management, and funding continued to plague the system. At the state level, the Constitution of 1852 provided for the election of state superintendents and also reduced the annual salary of the office to $1500.\(^\text{18}\)

At the parish level as a budgetary measure the Constitution of 1852 liquidated the Office of Parish Superintendent. Post-1852, critical parish superintendent responsibilities such as handling school funds and submitting annual reports to the state superintendent were assigned to parish treasurers. District school directors

\(^{17}\)Fay, 106, 107.

were now obligated to furnish vital information concerning schools to the treasurers.\textsuperscript{19}

In reality the treasurer-director system of local administration did nothing to prevent flagrant abuses of the past and actually contributed to the structural bankruptcy and decline of schools in the rural parishes. In the case of those treasurers who faithfully performed their new obligations, directors were often found to be derelict in the handling of their responsibilities, a common theme echoed throughout state superintendent’s reports after 1852. As a result, superintendents’ annual reports of the period were often devoid of critical data concerning schools.\textsuperscript{20}

The loss of parish superintendence also further weakened the power of state superintendence at the local level. Especially in the rural parishes, local officials were subject to the control and influence of affluent classes such as the slaveholding aristocracy and others. The influence of these classes on the legislature itself also contributed to undermining state administration of schools at this level, especially regarding issues of local taxation.\textsuperscript{21}

During the final year of the administration of Superintendent Samuel Bard (1855-1857) the enumerated total of educable students numbered 65,811. Insufficient data precluded a fiscal analysis. However, Bard continued the tradition of flailing the legislature for the abolition of the parish superintendency. He also pointed to the

\textsuperscript{19}Suarez, 118; Stumpf, 113-15.
\textsuperscript{20}Ibid., 113-15.
\textsuperscript{21}Stumpf, 113-15.
necessity of employing competent, eligible teachers, and championed the role of teachers in society:

Of all the offices filled for the general purposes of society, there is certainly not one surpassing that of teacher in importance. . . . And whence should we get doctors, ministers, legislators, lawyers, editors, or other important and useful members of society, without teachers? . . . the position of teacher, instead of being put, at all events, on a level with that of members of other professions, is sunk so low that . . . [with] almost any of the less responsible occupations . . . a man can more creditably and more satisfactorily perform his duties, and more advantageously provide for the needs of himself and his family. . . .

Superintendent Bard proposed the establishment of a normal school as the best possible means of achieving a qualified teaching staff.\textsuperscript{22}

As could be expected, the physical condition of the system throughout the period mirrored its troubled monetary affairs. Bard saw direct correlation between the overall performance of school personnel, students, and the generally dilapidated condition of the school buildings and offices including the office of the state superintendent. According to Bard, improvement of the school system was necessarily linked to actual structural improvement.\textsuperscript{23}

During the administration of Superintendent W.T. Hamilton (1857-1859), the number of educable children increased by over 30,000 to a total of 95,851 in 1859. This excluded five parishes that did not submit information. The

\textsuperscript{22}Report of the Superintendent of Public Education to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (New Orleans: John Claiborne, State Printer, 1858), 4, 5, 8-14, 23.

\textsuperscript{23}Report of the Superintendent (1857), 17, 18. The titles of early superintendent’s reports did not include the actual year reported. For purposes of clarity, the year 1857 refers to the previously cited report published in 1858.
1859 budget amounted to $374,889 an increase of over $68,000 compared to the 1858 budget. However, with the legislative increase in spending to five dollars per student, the budget became a deficit.\textsuperscript{24}

Legislative increases did not necessarily preclude decisions that further damaged and weakened the system. Previously, in 1858 the legislature authorized that 2.5 percent of proceeds derived from the sale of school lands be utilized as partial compensation to parish treasurers. The lands, which had been donated by Congress, had been considered a sacred trust. Proceeds deriving from school lands were known as the free school fund and originally designated as belonging exclusively to the parishes in support of public schools.\textsuperscript{25}

As did his predecessor, Superintendent Hamilton pointed out the need for an entirely new system of schools. One of Hamilton's proposed major changes concerned increasing the duties, enlarging the powers, and augmenting the salary of the superintendency. According to Hamilton, a better salary would enable the superintendent to visit school districts across the state, deliver lectures on public education, and facilitate the development of teachers' associations.

Hamilton also called for the return of the parish superintendency and greater accountability in the hiring of teachers. He further requested appropriation for the establishment of a "Journal of Education" to promote the educational interests of the state.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{25}Report of the Superintendent (1859), 3, 4.
\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., 5-8; Stumpf, 64.
Issues concerning the employment of Northern teachers and the inculcation of Northern “prejudices” among students were singular and unique to the time period. Such issues reflected the ongoing debate over slavery in national politics and revealed continued Northern association with Louisiana schools. Superintendent Bard made early allusions concerning the growing conflict. By the end of Superintendent Hamilton’s term the situation had become extremely polarized and clear. Hamilton recommended closing the schools to Northern instructors who while “receiving quarterly money derived from our slaves,” opposed slavery.\(^\text{27}\)

The 1860 report of Superintendent Henry Avery (1859–61) published in January 1861, reflected such sentiment as well as revealed the extent to which the national debate informed local school policy. During the Avery Administration, both Orleans (New Orleans) and Avoyelles Parishes had taken steps to prevent the hiring of teachers “of doubtful character.” Superintendent Avery further recommended non-compensation of those teachers who did not share Southern sentiment.\(^\text{28}\)

As did his predecessor, Avery continued to press the need for publishing Southern textbooks as a remedy to diffuse “Abolition sentiments.” He also presented to the legislature the cost-effective possibility of re-editing the current texts then in use.\(^\text{29}\)

During the Avery Administration, the number of educable children increased to 96,522 along with a legislative apportionment of $650,000, a milestone of the

period. Per student expenditure amounted to $6.50. Among the state’s 757 public schools, a normal school, ‘State Normal School,’ opened in New Orleans.

Superintendent Avery recommended the return of the Office of Parish Superintendent as well as ways to force accountability of district directors. He advised the mass publication of the school law for distribution to parish treasurers and directors throughout the state. Avery also requested the ability to employ counsel for the protection of school lands then coming under encroachment by individuals.\(^{30}\)

In January 1861, upon recommendation of Governor Thomas O. Moore, Louisiana severed its connection with the United States in favor of joining the Confederate States. One of the first acts of Louisiana’s Confederate Legislature was the appropriation of nearly a half-million dollars for public education in 1862. However, beginning in April 1862 Union forces successfully invaded and occupied New Orleans and twelve surrounding parishes.\(^{31}\)

Superintendent W.H.N. McGruder (1862-1865) evacuated New Orleans taking along all official materials. With the rest of Louisiana’s Confederate government, he ultimately relocated to Shreveport in the extreme northwestern region of the state. There they remained for the duration of the Civil War.\(^{32}\)

\[^{30}\text{Ibid. , 5, 6; Stumpf, 64, 65.}\]
\[^{31}\text{Special Message of Thomas O. Moore, Governor of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly (Baton Rouge, 1860); James M. McPherson, Ordeal By Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1982), 127, 230, 231; Wall, Louisiana, 178-185; Fay, 79.}\]
\[^{32}\text{Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education to the General Assembly of the State of Louisiana (New Orleans: W.R. Fish, State Printer, 1864), 3; Wall, 194.}\]
Before the Civil War, although public schools existed in some southern cities, few southern states established tax-supported systems of education. The North Carolina system of schools, while considered the best in the South, was not the sole exception. Both Kentucky and Missouri implemented public schools in every county before the War. By southern standards of the day Louisiana also achieved more than a degree of success, implementing schools in a minimum of forty-two of forty-eight parishes. Moreover, the schools of New Orleans resting partially on a New England foundational structure served as examples to other southern cities and towns and compared favorably with the best city systems in the nation.

* * * * * * *

At least as far back as 1803, it was understood that any state system of schools in Louisiana would be a system for whites only. During the Territorial Period, the major objectives for educating the masses were self-government and statehood. William C.C. Claiborne, Governor of the territory argued that education of the masses was necessary to ensure a republican form of government.

Following statehood in 1812, maintaining the status quo became the primary educational objective. Slavery was both a major obstacle to the education of blacks as well as

---

34 Report of the Superintendent (1857), 7, 8, 24, 25; Reese, America's Public Schools, 43; Cubberley, 409-422; Pay, 45; Knight, 195, 196, 234, 243, 246; Reinders, 190-192; Stumpf, 63.
35 Martin Luther Riley, "The Development of Education in Louisiana Prior to Statehood," Louisiana Historical Quarterly 19, no.3 (July, 1936), 608; Knight, 242, 243.
a catalyst used by many whites to justify the existence of the educational system. Thus one of the major roles of public education in Louisiana was as a tool for social control; educating to maintain the existing order of white supremacy thereby helping to ensure the continued position of blacks as an enslaved class of laborers.

Nonetheless, the education of blacks in Louisiana had existed since before the 1800s and thus predated United States possession. In New Orleans by the early 1700s, the French system of apprenticeship training also taught skilled trades and the associated literacy and arithmetic skills to the enslaved. Both French and Spanish systems of military instruction offered training irrespective of color and augmented existing educational options. Also under the French and Spanish, the Roman Catholic Church ministered and taught the catechism to the slaves through religious orders such as the Capuchins, Ursulines, and Jesuits. Specifically, the Ursuline sisterhood taught reading, writing, silkworm farming and fabric-making to black and Native American girls.36

By the early 1800s the self-motivated efforts of Louisiana’s gens des couleur libres (free persons of color) created new educational possibilities within their

communities. At Île Brevelle on the Cane River, former slave Coincoin/Marie-Thérèze (ca. 1742-1817) and her descendents established a prosperous community, constructing St. Augustine Church in 1829. St. Augustine served both ecclesiastical and educational roles in the community and earned immediate mission recognition from the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{37}

The two most famous efforts of the New Orleans free black community, though not the earliest in the city, came to fruition in the 1840s. In 1842, Henriette Delille, Juliette Gaudin, and Josephine Charles founded the Congrégation de la Soeurs de la Sainte Famille, also known as the Sisters of the Holy Family. From the beginning the mission of the Holy Family sisterhood combined social welfare and education, caring for the poor, but also instructing young and old. The Holy Family as a Catholic religious order received the support of the Church. However, they were also of the free black community, which formed the Association de la Sainte Famille to provide additional financial and motivational sustenance.\textsuperscript{38}

The death of Madame Marie Couvent of New Orleans in 1837 led to the establishment of the first free school for blacks in the United States. Couvent bequeathed her real estate holdings to the Church for the establishment of a school for black Catholic orphans. Once again, the free black community of New Orleans rallied support, forming the

\textsuperscript{37}Davis, The History of Black Catholics, 72-77; Porter, "The History of Negro Education in Louisiana," 733.
\textsuperscript{38}Devore and Logsdon, Crescent City Schools, 41; Middleton, Louisiana Education Association, 17, 18; Davis, 105-109; Porter, 731.
Société Catholique pour l’Instruction des Orphelins Indigents.\textsuperscript{39}

The Institution Catholique des Orphelins Indigents, known also as the Couvent School, opened in 1848 and also began accepting non-orphaned youth of the free black community, some of whose families paid tuition. The Institution enrolled two hundred fifty pupils who were taught by black faculty trained in France and Santo Domingo. The school encouraged its graduates, especially males to enter apprenticeships with artisans or tradesmen.\textsuperscript{40}

In addition to the standard curriculum, teachers inculcated in students both political awareness and a sense of community with other free peoples of color in the French Caribbean and Latin America. Writer and poet Armand Lanusse of New Orleans served as principal from 1852-1866. Others such as graduate and teacher Paul Trevigne, who taught French history and literature, were later at the forefront in the struggle for equality. Outwardly, however, the Institution functioned as a dedicated school for the indigent and even gained occasional city and state appropriations.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{39}Liva Baker, The Second Battle of New Orleans: The Hundred-Year Struggle to Integrate the Schools (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 16, 17, 20, 21; Devore and Logsdon, 42, 43; Middleton, 17, 18; Porter, 733, 734.

\textsuperscript{40}Mary N. Mitchell, ““A Good and Delicious Country”: Free Children of Color and How They Learned to Imagine the Atlantic World in Nineteenth-Century Louisiana,” History of Education Quarterly, 40 (Summer 2000): 125, 126; Devore and Logsdon, 42, 43; Middleton, 17, 18; Porter, 733.

Other such schools existed in New Orleans. Other *gens des couleur* communities maintained private schools in parishes such as East Baton Rouge, Pointe Coupée, and St. Landry. Wealthy free persons of color in Louisiana also hired private tutors or educated their children in France, for example. Taken collectively, the varied labors of the *gens des couleur* represented early, systematic efforts of blacks to educate themselves in the face of slavery and added yet another dimension to the history of education in Louisiana.  

---


C. Peter Ripley, Slaves and Freedmen in Civil War Louisiana (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1976), 126; Woodson, Education of the Negro, 128, 129; Berlin, Slaves Without Masters, 305; Middleton, 19; Rankin, "The Politics of Caste," 123; Porter, 735-737.
CHAPTER TWO

PRESIDENTIAL RECONSTRUCTION AND EDUCATION, 1862-1867

In accordance with the policy of President Abraham Lincoln to restore Louisiana to its former place in the Union, Federal troops began the process of restoring civil order. Under the command of Brigadier General Benjamin F. Butler of the Department of the Gulf, public schools in New Orleans were reorganized shortly after the city fell under Federal control in 1862.¹

To some extent, Butler’s reorganization of New Orleans’ schools was a prelude to the statewide reorganization of schools under the Constitution of 1864. New Orleans’ four school districts were consolidated and placed under the authority of one superintendent of public schools for the entire city. In addition, regulations and textbooks were standardized throughout the city, and English was adopted as the language of instruction—to the dismay of New Orleans’ French speaking population.²

The restoration of civil authority continued with the February 1864 election of Governor Michael Hahn and organization of a new state constitution. Hahn was Louisiana’s first Governor during Reconstruction. A native of Bavaria and longtime resident of the state, Hahn was a Unionist, loyal to the government of the United States in a


²Franklin, Reconstruction, 14, 15, 21; Taylor, 455; Devore and Logsdon, 47-50; Beasley, 49, 50.
time of southern defiance to Federal authority. At the time
of Hahn’s election, a majority of the population lived
under Federal authority. However, the Louisiana Confederate
government still controlled a majority (29) of the state’s
parishes.³

* * * * * * * *

The Constitution of 1864, in addition to recognizing
the Emancipation Proclamation, also addressed issues of
critical importance concerning education. For the first
time, universal tax-supported education was extended to all
children between the ages of six and eighteen. Governor
Hahn and Superintendent John McNair provided their support,
becoming advocates for the cause of universal education.⁴

Other provisions of the Constitution of 1864 included
extending the term of office for state superintendents to
four years. The constitution also banned public funding of
private schools, an issue that in the past severely
compromised the effectiveness of public schools. The
Couvent School while no longer receiving external support,
still received private support. Other black private schools
relied entirely on private funding and were generally
unaffected by the ban.⁵

In addition, the Constitution adopted English as the
official language of instruction. Prior to the 1860s,

³W.E.B. DuBois, Black Reconstruction In America (New York: Russell
and Russell, 1966), 153; Dawson, Army Generals and Reconstruction, 11,
17, 18; Tunnell, 3, 27, 35; Taylor, 30–32; Franklin, 14, 15, 21;
McPherson, 401–405; Wall, 197, 198; Beasley, 67.
⁴Dart, Constitutions of the State of Louisiana, 550; Porter, 749,
750.
⁵Dart, 550; Devore and Logsdon, 60; Mitchell, 137.
language was an issue that had not been satisfactorily addressed, specifically in the southern half of the state. Into the 1860s the legislature continued to publish official documents in both English and French.\(^6\)

In the school system, a few state superintendents complained of district officials submitting reports in French. Many teachers also continued to utilize the language. Complaints by state superintendents of teaching personnel not being fluent in English or not knowing the language were also heard. The Constitution of 1864 for the first time established a consistent language of instruction in the public school system.\(^7\)

Louisiana’s first State Superintendent of Public Education during Reconstruction, John McNair (1863–1865) was elected on the Hahn ticket. Earlier in 1862 General Butler recommended McNair, a former high school principal in New Orleans’ First and Fourth Municipal Districts and a native of New York, as loyal and eligible for a teaching position in the reorganized school system of New Orleans.\(^8\)

Not having adequate information concerning the current state of schools, the 1864 report of Superintendent McNair was unique in that it provided an historical analysis of Louisiana’s previous attempts over the past sixty years to establish a state system of education. The report also covered the majority of the year it was published. McNair provided a sense of the educational state of affairs shortly after Union invasion:

> When the United States took possession of the city of New Orleans and adjoining parishes in May, 1862, they all decamped, my predecessor taking with

\(^6\)Dart, 550; Stumpf, 30, 31.
\(^7\)Dart, 550.
\(^8\)Devore and Logsdon, 52; Beasley, 52, 66.
him the records of this office. Hence it has been with considerable difficulty that I have been able to find the necessary data by which to conduct the ordinary business of the office, and from which to make my annual report to your honorable body; and this, with the fact that I have received no school reports from the parishes, must be my excuse for the meager details, and deficiency of statistics, contained in this paper.  

However, in New Orleans after a brief closing during the 1862 Union invasion, schools had already benefited from Federal reorganization. Superintendent McNair commended the schools in glowing terms for their work, praising the officials, teachers, and professors. He asserted that New Orleans’ public school system ranked favorably with other cities, “where public schools are, and long have been, among their most cherished institutions.”

For the year 1863, Superintendent McNair apportioned a total of $105,894 to schools in Federal controlled Louisiana. He alerted the legislature that over $1 million of the free school fund, bonds from the sale of school lands were still held in the treasury of Louisiana’s Confederate government. Both principal and interest, according to McNair were in danger of being lost.

McNair conducted a survey that led him to conclude that most of the public schools in the rural parishes had actually been closed for the previous two or three years. The comments of Superintendent W.H.N. McGruder who still controlled schools in Confederate-held Louisiana also helped confirm this position: “we have but little time to

---

10Ibid., 18, 19.
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attend to reports, unless it is war reports, for drilling here is as common as 'pig tracks.'" Significantly, such schools as of 1864 still awaited Federal control and reorganization.12

Superintendent McNair based upon his investigation of public education in Louisiana over the previous sixty years issued circulars asking a variety of probing questions. They were issued to different parishes and addressed to various supporters of public education. The circulars provided McNair with stark answers to the causes troubling Louisiana’s system.13

The McNair investigation found district directors negligent on four counts: employment of improper persons as teachers, “such as disgraced the profession by their immorality or incompetency”; not exercising proper oversight of schools; failure to submit proper reports as the law required; and general negligence in performance of official duties. In a subsequent section of the report, McNair summed up the job performance of directors as such: “They have been tried, and have failed—miserably failed. They cannot, it seems, be intrusted with the execution of such an important charge. They have been weighted in the balance and found wanting.”14

The McNair investigation shed further light on another evil closely intertwined with the state of public education in Louisiana, control and manipulation of poor whites. At least two of McNair’s questions produced responses that pointed to the conspicuous involvement of slaveholders. One response charged the slaveholders with

---
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keeping “the people in ignorance, so as to be able to control them at all times.” Another response accused slaveholders of not only opposing the system and trying to destroy it but also appointing as directors “men unable and incapable to fulfill the duties of the office, and sometimes men truly ignorant as teachers.”

Earlier in the report, Superintendent McNair blamed slaveholders for the 1852 liquidation of the parish superintendency. He subsequently summarized his findings with a harrowing indictment of the slaveholding classes:

Our children asked for bread, and they gave them a stone; they asked for fish, and they gave them a serpent; they asked for an egg, and they received—a scorpion. . . . Can it have been the settled purpose of the slaveholding aristocracy to balk in this way the cause of popular education? . . . Could they consent to provide family tutors for their own offspring, or send them to distant and expensive schools and colleges, while as for the children of the humble, honest, hard working classes, their schooling was provided for as above recorded! . . . If we are compelled to answer these questions affirmatively, as I believe we must, we cannot but thank a kind providence who has brought about the overthrow of an institution whose baleful principles, like the destroying Upas tree, poisoned and blighted every good thing that came within its influence. Such is slavery.

Consequently, McNair called for the reinstatement of the Office of Parish Superintendent not only to prevent the abuses of the past, but also to ensure that the state-supported establishment and operation of schools for blacks was successful.

McNair in his closing remarks reminded the legislature of the benefits and necessity of public education, arguing

---

15Ibid., 9-11.
that ignorance was one of the motives fueling the still ongoing rebellion against the United States. His charge to legislators to use sound judgment concerning educational policy has continued to ring true:

Liberal provisions for public schools, promptly and judiciously bestowed under good management, is the best economy. Ignorance and vice are expensive—intelligence and morality are thrifty, and true statesmen can have no choice for which they will provide.17

* * * * * * *

During the Civil War, the efforts and demands of the former slaves in attaining education for themselves and their children initiated new ventures by individuals, northern agencies such as the American Missionary Association (AMA), and the federal government. At least one of the newer schools of the period, the Pioneer School of Freedom, a black private school established at New Orleans in 1860, predated the War and illustrated the continued self-motivated efforts of blacks themselves. Such efforts provided the grassroots foundation for later educational activities of northern agencies, the federal government and ultimately state governments.18

17Ibid., 22.
Major General Nathaniel P. Banks, Butler’s successor created the Commission of Enrollment in August 1863 providing further impetus for the public education of blacks in Louisiana. By March 1864, Banks furthered such efforts by organizing the three-member Board of Education consisting of Major Benjamin Rush Plumly, Lieutenant and Chaplain Edwin M. Wheelock, and AMA representative Isaac G. Hubbs.¹⁹

Banks authorized the Board of Education specifically for the education of freedmen. In effect it was a system organized by the military and based on public funding, co-existing with Louisiana’s regular system of schools. As such, Banks advised the Board to cooperate with the state superintendent of public education when possible.²⁰

Banks empowered the Board to establish a school in each school district, purchase school sites, erect schoolhouses, choose curriculum and instructional materials, and employ loyal, local teachers when possible. To surmount educational expenses, the Board wielded the power to assess and levy a tax upon real and personal property, including crops of plantations. In an effort to reach a majority of black youth, Banks further authorized the Board of Education to establish plantation schools, a central concern of Hubbs and the AMA. However, Major

---


General Banks shortly rescinded this particular order due to pressure from former slaveholders. According to historian C. Peter Ripley, the racially conservative Banks was a politician who was not inclined to support the cause of black education on plantations when confronted by a committee of "loyal" white planters who opposed it. In addition, Board members Plumly and Wheelock also opposed plantation schools. Amidst mounting criticism of Hubbs and antagonism between the AMA and Banks, Hubbs was dismissed from the Board, which became a two-member operation. The AMA for a time suspended operation in Louisiana.²¹

For September 1864, the Board of Education operated 78 schools with 125 teachers employed, of which 100 were "of southern origin or of long residence in the South." A total of 8,046 students attended schools. By December 1864, at least 95 Board schools employed over 160 teachers and educated almost 10,000 pupils. At this time the vast majority of teachers were white, having been recently supplied by local populations or previously supplied by the AMA or other agencies. However, the Board also employed at least eighty-five black teachers. In addition, the Board conducted Sunday and evening schools attended by over 2,000 adults. During March 1865, an estimated 11,000 pupils attended Board schools. By the end of the war, the Board managed 121 schools, 216 teachers, and over 13,000 pupils. Besides pupils, blacks also donated funds, land, labor, buildings, as well as staff in support of the schools, attesting to a community-based impetus for education.²²

²¹Report of the Board of Education; Richardson, 31, 32, 271; Ripley, 130-134; Kassel, "Educating the Slave," 243; Porter, 738-740; Bahney, "Generals and Negroes," 214.
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With the advent of emancipation and increased educational opportunities for blacks, the majority of whom were former slaves, education now assumed a pivotal role in the socialization of freedmen—helping them to fully appreciate the privileges and responsibilities of freedom. Compared to previous experiences, this was a new, uncharted course for education in Louisiana.

* * * * * * * *

On March 3, 1865, Congress created the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands (Freedmen’s Bureau), which superseded local efforts such as Banks’ Bureau of Education and Bureau of Negro Labor. In June 1865, former Army Chaplain and Superintendent of Banks’ Labor Bureau, Reverend Thomas William Conway was named State Assistant Commissioner of the Freedmen’s Bureau. The Bureau continued to provide the only system of schools for blacks in the state at the time. Ultimately the Bureau assumed control of 126 schools, 230 teachers, and 19,000 pupils. One of Assistant Commissioner Conway’s exploits was the October 3, 1865, opening of the Abraham Lincoln School in New Orleans. The school, which had over eight hundred pupils, was housed in a former building of the University of Louisiana, and was the nation’s largest freedmen’s school of the time.23

23Harper’s Weekly, 21 April 1866; William P. Vaughn, Schools For All: The Blacks and Public Education in the South, 1865-1877 (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974), 78; White, The
During the Bureau years, many of Assistant Commissioner Conway's efforts helped ease the transition to freedom for the former slaves but failed to endear him to Louisiana's white population or even the gens de couleur. He took steps to prevent employers from defrauding black laborers of wages and supported redistribution of thousands of acres of abandoned and confiscated lands to the former slaves. Finally, Conway's re-implementation of the school tax for support of Freedmen's Bureau schools resulted in complaints to President Johnson and General Oliver O. Howard, Bureau Commissioner. Governor James Madison Wells, more acquiescent than many to the changes brought on by the war, branded Conway "an active political speaker and agitator for Negro suffrage and equality." In the aftermath of a Bureau investigation, Conway was deemed troublesome and ultimately removed from the Bureau in late 1866.²⁴

Conway's difficulties with the gens de couleur stemmed back to 1864 when Conway was Superintendent of the Bureau of Negro Labor. The two sides represented differing outlooks and methodologies regarding the fate of the freedmen. For example, gens de couleur leadership demanded the more radical universal male suffrage over the more moderate limited male suffrage favored by Lincoln and Banks. Ultimately, Superintendent Conway in 1864 canceled Army subsidies to L'Union, the ultra-radical news journal and voice of the gens de couleur. The journal, which debuted
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in 1862, was edited by Paul Trevigne and owned initially by Frank F. Barclay, then George Dutuit, who along with Trevigne were both connected to the Couvent School.  

The successor to *L’Union, La Tribune de la Nouvelle Orleans/New Orleans Tribune* debuted in 1864 under the ownership of Dr. Louis Charles Roudanez, his brother, Jean Baptiste Roudanez, and editorship of Paul Trevigne. The *Tribune* like *L’Union* continued to voice radical opposition to Lincoln’s policies and Banks’ programs. In particular, the *Tribune* clashed with Banks and Conway over Banks’ free labor system. The *Tribune*, the staunchest critic of the system took both Banks and Conway to task, likening the free labor system to slavery itself, and accused them of creating “mock-freedmen” and precluding black self-sufficiency.

Failing to silence the *Tribune*-led opposition, Conway and Plumly with Banks’ support, resorted to ethnic politics attempting to engineer a Creole-American rift in the New Orleans black community. On April 15, 1865, the day of Lincoln’s death, Banks forces launched the *Black Republican* as a counter to the *Tribune* publications. Edited by Dr. Stephen W. Rogers, a learned Baptist minister, the *Black Republican* claimed to be “the true organ of the American colored people of Louisiana.” The journal promoted Banks’ programs and exploited Creole-American differences in the black community. In contrast to the *Tribune* the moderate
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Black Republican also counseled patience in the quest for equality. In the end, Banks, Conway, and Plumly miscalculated. The Black Republican folded after barely six months. The Tribune agenda had the support of the black masses in New Orleans—Americans and Creoles.28

* * * * * * *

In accordance with the Constitution of 1864, statewide elections occurred in 1865 at the cessation of hostilities. Democrats won by a large majority. James Madison Wells, Unionist and former lieutenant governor under Hahn, was elected Governor. Robert M. Lusher was elected State Superintendent of Public Education (1865-1868). During this period Louisiana’s government witnessed complete domination by Democrats, many ex-Confederate officials, veterans, or sympathizers.29

Robert Mills Lusher, an 1839 graduate of Georgetown College (Georgetown University) and native of Charleston, South Carolina, was apparently well connected in Louisiana prior to 1865. Related by marriage to former State Superintendent Alexander Dimitry (1847-1852), Lusher often collaborated with Dimitry on various issues associated with education. As a former editor he wrote frequently on education and was known as a “bold advocate of an effective system of schools.”30
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Between 1854 and 1862, Lusher was a director of schools in New Orleans’ First Municipal District and designed some of the city’s school facilities. During the Civil War, he held a variety of posts in Louisiana’s Confederate government including ‘Chief Collector of the War Tax.’

Lusher’s 1866 report to the legislature provided insight into the status of public school funding since the election. Over the previous year the state treasury funded only twelve parishes, some of those for only a portion of the year. The lack of sufficient data added to the dearth of funds, rendering the superintendent’s knowledge of rural state-run schools and his annual report extremely cursory. He also failed to report on the many black schools supported by black Louisianians, benevolent societies, or the Freedmen’s Bureau.

Lusher, as state superintendent continued his previous quest for an effective system of schools. His prescription, while issued for the entire system was mostly geared toward solving the difficulties encountered in the rural school districts. First, he proposed an increase in the poll tax along with enforced payments for males over twenty-one years of age. Lusher also called for a graduated quarterly tax upon incomes exceeding $500 per quarter. In the event of either proposal failing the legislature, Lusher recommended limiting apportionments of the general school fund only to such towns, districts, or parishes that raised

---
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a sum four times the amount of the previous quarterly dispensation made to such areas.\textsuperscript{33}

One of Superintendent Lusher’s particular concerns included developing a competent corps of teachers. He recommended establishment of normal schools throughout the state and the re-opening of ‘State Normal School’ in New Orleans on a co-educational basis. Lusher advocated inquiring into the backgrounds of prospective teachers as well as evaluating their scholastic aptitude. He was also interested in encouraging youth to enter the teaching profession and offered to send “some approved work on the Theory and Practice of Teaching” to those interested in preparing for a teaching career.\textsuperscript{34}

Having examined parish treasurer reports from 1847–1861, Superintendent Lusher’s proposals also included plans to develop competent management. He recommended that local Police Juries be authorized to designate “competent fellow-citizens” as district directors. The directors would receive injunctions to inspect and examine schools at least once a month and “report quarterly on the condition thereof directly to the State Superintendent.” Lusher called for quarterly reports from treasurers as well as the authority to “disallow Treasurers’ commissions (or the compensation allowed them) in case of neglect on their part, and to withhold apportionments when Directors fail to report.”\textsuperscript{35}

Lusher’s dedication to white supremacy was at least as notable as his dedication to a well-run school system. During his term of office very little, if anything, was accomplished regarding state-supported education for
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\textsuperscript{34}Report of the Superintendent of Public Education (1865), 8, 9; Beasley, 76-79.
\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., 9, 10.
blacks. As far as Lusher was concerned, two classes of children awaited the re-opening of Louisiana’s public schools:

Those boys who left, at the beginning of the war, their forms and benches, to seize the musket and the sword—their education barely begun; and those children of milder miens and a more tender age, who, under ordinary circumstances, would long since have become accustomed to the exercises of the school-room. . . .

As late as 1866, with the Civil War and slavery over, Lusher apparently saw fit to recommend the adoption of textbooks by Southern authors. Consequently, he and fellow Democrats ignored the constitutional provisions of 1864, leaving the Freedmen’s Bureau and the private sector as the only providers of education for blacks.36

Lusher as superintendent, was a bold advocate for the furthering of education among Louisiana’s white population and thus the furthering of white supremacy. In the following memoranda, sent to parish assessors it is evident that his prejudices were not deeply hidden:

It is indispensable to the future honor and prosperity of Louisiana, and to the supremacy of the Caucasian race in her councils, that the benefits of liberal education should be extended to every white child within her limits. . . .

In an address to Louisiana’s police juries, Lusher stressed a similar message reiterating the importance of a liberal education to the “dignity of our race and generation.” With such sentiment emanating from Louisiana’s chief education
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officer, progress concerning public education and blacks was temporarily derailed and deferred.\textsuperscript{37}

More importantly during the Lusher years, the number of black community-based schools actually increased and eclipsed the number of Bureau schools. As Bureau support wavered and schools closed, Louisiana’s freedmen developed a parallel system of schools. Associations such as the Louisiana Educational Relief Association, established at New Orleans in 1866, managed by educated blacks, provided relief for poor students, purchased or leased school property, and employed and examined teachers. By January 1867, there were fifty-six Bureau schools to sixty-five community schools in the state. Specifically in New Orleans, less than a dozen Bureau schools survived.\textsuperscript{38}

As early as 1864, blacks in New Orleans were agitating for greater self-determination in AMA operated schools. The deficit in Bureau funding provided the desired opportunity for autonomy. The sentiments of J. Willis Menard, secretary of the Louisiana Educational Relief Association reflected the general realization of Louisiana’s freedmen: “Each race of men, each class in society, have to shape their own destinies themselves.”\textsuperscript{39}

Such sentiment also existed across the South where Bureau officials reported blacks active in all stages of community school building and support. The educational background of teachers attested to the cooperation of many in bringing such schools to fruition. Teachers varied from those who had the “stolen” education of slaves to those who
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received formal and classical educations as free persons
during slavery. As in Louisiana, community-based
educational associations mobilized to maintain the schools,
upholding the responsibility of making education a reality
for the former slaves.  

* * * * * * *

At the Federal level, Congressional elections in 1866
produced a Republican majority in both houses of Congress.
The stage was now set for Congressional action, considering
the widening rift between President Andrew Johnson and
Congress, and the regressive, reactionary policies of
Democratic regimes across the South. Congress beginning in
1867 took over the process of reconstructing the South.
Congressional policies voided previous state
administrations, setting the stage for the drafting of new
state constitutions and new elections based upon universal
manhood suffrage. Such actions heralded yet a dramatic new
chapter in the history of Louisiana. 
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CHAPTER THREE

CONGRESSIONAL RECONSTRUCTION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION, 1867-1872

Following the Civil War, William G. Brown settled in New Orleans. His exact whereabouts prior to this time are unclear. However, according to Harper's Weekly, Brown upon his arrival to New Orleans became a "public teacher." The exact details are vague. Thus far, documentation of Brown's presence and teaching career has been elusive. Not until the Louisiana Constitutional Convention of 1867-1868 does William G. Brown begin to emerge with a degree of clarity.

According to Congressional mandate, in Louisiana and all five military districts across the South, elections for constitutional conventions were organized by September 1867. All elections were to be based on universal male suffrage. For the first time in Southern history, black males cast their vote. On September 27, Louisiana voters overwhelmingly supported a constitutional convention. The following day, voters elected convention delegates, some of whom represented the first black elected officials in Louisiana history. In preparation for the convention, New Orleans' Mechanics' Institute received approximately $17,000 worth of repairs and renovations. The work continued just short of the convention's opening date. The delegates themselves also began preparations. A week before the convention began, a group of roughly forty unnamed delegates met in caucus. They supported having a new state constitution framed by January 1, 1868, and concluded that it was best

\begin{footnotes}
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to hold state elections along with the election to ratify the constitution. The delegates reasoned that by February 22, a new state government could be inaugurated.³

Ironically, just as a new Louisiana government was being conceived, signs of the closure of another government in the region also managed externally appeared in the local press. Less than one week before the convention opened, some 700 miles south on the Gulf of Mexico, the body of failed Emperor of Mexico, Austrian Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian Habsburg, arrived in the port city of Veracruz for the long voyage back to Europe. The analogy was one not likely lost on many of the delegates.⁴

The Louisiana Constitutional Convention of 1867-1868 opened at Mechanics’ Institute Saturday, November 23, 1867. The number of black delegates actually totaled 51 percent, comprising a slight majority of the convention. Some delegates, such as William G. Brown represented free persons of color from outside of Louisiana. Others, at least half of Louisiana’s black delegates were natives, the majority from the ranks of the gens de couleur libre.⁵

* * * * * * * *

As Creoles, leaders of the gens de couleur such as those in New Orleans maintained close contact with the Francophone world. Prior to the Louisiana Purchase, both French and Haitian revolutions heightened their aspirations for equality and freedom and contributed to their envisioning of an alternative social order. Thus, as in
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Sainte Domingue/Haiti, many among the *gens de couleur* also perceived themselves as heirs to the French revolutionary ideals of liberté, égalité, and fraternité.  

France, still in the throes of revolution in the mid-nineteenth century provided direct inspiration to the *gens de couleur* as many such as Dr. Louis Charles Roudanez and Francis E. Dumas who both returned to New Orleans, once resided there. Roudanez, publisher and owner of the *New Orleans Tribune*, participated in the 1848 French Revolution, which not only ended slavery in the French Caribbean, but also fully enfranchised the black populations there.

Still, visiting France was not a major prerequisite for exposure to such ideas. Between 1832 and 1861, from 3,000 to over 7,000 French per year immigrated to New Orleans, many settling in the same areas as the *gens de couleur*. Some as political exiles were revolutionaries. Additionally, institutions such as the Couvent School through the teaching of French literature and history exposed pupils to revolutionary thought.

Heavily influenced by the ideology and example of France, the *gens de couleur* fought for a society especially based on the ideal of civic fraternity—an egalitarian
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society, free of the chains and stigma of race prejudice. Thus, _gens de couleur_ leaders came to see the Civil War, emancipation, and Reconstruction in radical terms—an opportunity to create a new racial order based on merit, not color. Through convention delegates such as E. Arnold Bertonneau and activist news journals _L’Union_ and its successor _La Tribune de la Nouvelle Orleans/New Orleans Tribune_, they forged ahead in the struggle for nothing less than full emancipation, equal citizenship, and integrated public schools and facilities, exerting major influence at the Constitutional Convention and shaping Radical Reconstruction policy in Louisiana. The vision espoused by the _gens de couleur_, although not quite like William G. Brown’s own prior experience in the British Caribbean, nevertheless was one he could relate to and support.\(^9\)
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Prior to elections, the _Tribune_ urged black voters to elect men of high caliber and experience. Regardless of place of birth, at least eighty-five percent of black delegates were business owners, professionals, former military officers, and men of education who were free before the Civil War. Some had been instrumental in organizing the Louisiana Republican party in 1865. Consequently, ex-slaves actually comprised a minority of black delegates. Nonetheless, all members of the black delegation attended the convention well aware of the
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importance of public education and other necessary tools for freedom.\textsuperscript{10}

William G. Brown and Pierre G. Deslonde attended the convention as delegates representing Iberville Parish. Iberville Parish civil records revealed few, if any traces of Brown during the period concerned. According to the *Louisiana Weekly*, Brown was appointed to the Constitutional Convention. If accurate, this could explain his absence in Iberville Parish; he may never have lived there.\textsuperscript{11}

Considering the Reconstruction era, Brown’s case may not be unusual. For example, convention delegates J.B. Esnard and James F. Ingraham of New Orleans were elected and represented St. Mary and Caddo Parishes respectively. Perhaps William G. Brown lived in New Orleans, but was elected to the convention from Iberville Parish. An examination of the Orleans Parish tax assessment during the period did not locate William G. Brown. However, by 1870 he was certainly in New Orleans.\textsuperscript{12}

During the Convention, Brown was a member of the Committee on Printing, whose responsibilities included major decisions concerning the actual publication of the completed constitution. Significant issues concerning cost, binding, typeset, paper, choice of publisher, and number of

\textsuperscript{10}New Orleans Tribune, 5 June 1867; Taylor, 149; Vincent, 60, 61; Tunnel, 111-126; Williams, 79, 125; Dawson, 68; Butchart, 169-179; Anderson, 4-32; Rankin, 125-138.

\textsuperscript{11}Iberville Parish Civil Records: 1844-1920, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge; Louisiana Weekly, 2, 9, 16 April 1938; Tunnell, 231.

\textsuperscript{12}Orleans Parish Tax Assessment: 1866-1870, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge; Vincent, 49, 52; Rankin, 115.
copies printed fell within the responsibilities of the committee.\textsuperscript{13}

As demonstrated by historian Charles Vincent, the demands made by the convention's black delegates were not entirely revolutionary in character. Outside of certain obvious and necessary modifications such as civil rights and labor, they envisaged no radical change in Louisiana's economy or government. Accordingly, William G. Brown's record at the convention was a respectable one, if not outstanding. Unlike some of his peers, he offered no groundbreaking initiatives concerning public education or integration of public facilities.\textsuperscript{14}

The Constitutional Convention of 1867-1868 was William G. Brown's introduction to Louisiana politics. As is generally the case of those who initially enter such arenas, many of Brown's motions failed passage. One was a motion to allow each delegate four newspapers of their choice. Another motion would have repealed an act of the 1867 legislature issuing $4 million in bonds for levee purposes. Another was concerned with delegates presenting motions or resolutions having the right to explain their positions before being tabled. The motion was subsequently tabled.\textsuperscript{15}

Brown achieved a greater degree of success on issues concerning accountability. One article adopted upon Brown's motion concerned official sanction of state commissions. Henceforth, state commissions would be sealed with the

\textsuperscript{14}Vincent, 65; Tunnell, 115-126.
\textsuperscript{15}Official Journal of the Proceedings, 1867-1868, 4, 9, 209.
state seal, signed by the governor, and countersigned by the secretary of state.\textsuperscript{16}

A related area addressed by the convention involved stricter attendance policies for the legislature. Brown introduced an amendment, which helped strengthen the state’s ability to compel attendance of absent legislators. Brown’s seriousness about accountability and regular attendance was also felt at the convention itself. On the eighty-first and final day of the convention, Brown through an original resolution brought the assembly’s attention to a certain delegate who failed to appear at the convention. The resolution instructed the warrant clerk not to issue any warrants on behalf of said delegate. The resolution was subsequently passed.\textsuperscript{17}

In addition to individual motions and resolutions, the various roll calls of the convention also afforded some insight into Brown’s interests and concerns. For many of the larger issues Brown voted in the majority, ‘for’ public education, civil rights, issuance of convention bonds to defray expenses, and ‘against’ laws regulating and fixing the price of labor.\textsuperscript{18}

Still, there were other significant issues in which Brown voted in the minority. Such issues offered an even greater understanding of William G. Brown the individual. On at least two separate occasions, Brown supported provisions either eliminating or limiting per diem funding for delegates. On another occasion, he voted in favor of two-year as opposed to four-year gubernatorial terms.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 44.
\textsuperscript{17}Official Journal of the Proceedings, 1867-1868, 141, 280.
\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., 62, 120, 268.
\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., 139, 143, 226.
While it is unknown what Brown’s motives or political intentions were at the time, he voted against an article requiring two years residency immediately prior to election for gubernatorial and lieutenant gubernatorial candidates. Likewise, Brown voted in the minority to sustain a motion replacing Louisiana’s civil law legal system with common law, the system that was most familiar to him.\footnote{Official Journal of the Proceedings, 1867-1868, 143, 209.}

* * * * * * * *

The election to ratify the Constitution of 1868 was also designed to elect state officials to serve the new government. After the Constitutional Convention, William G. Brown was appointed to the State Board of Registration, serving as an election registrar for Iberville Parish. With the ratification of the constitution, twenty-six year old Henry Clay Warmoth (often spelled Warmouth) a carpetbagger from Illinois was elected Governor (1868-1872) and Oscar J. Dunn, a black former New Orleans Councilman and future trustee of Straight University was elected Lieutenant Governor. The Reverend Thomas W. Conway of Freedmen’s Bureau fame and future Vice-President of the Board of Trustees of Leland University was elected on the Warmoth ticket as State Superintendent of Public Education. While Brown’s whereabouts and activities are once again vague, many of his fellow delegates were elected into the legislature. The age of radicals, carpetbaggers, and scalawags had begun.\footnote{Daily Picayune, 12 March 1868; Vaughn, Schools For All, 78-79; Richardson, 296; Taylor, 156, 157, 173; Vincent, 67; Dawson, 56, 77, 79; Tunnell, 117, 134, 135; Blassingame, 128; Rodrigue, 98; Beasley, 147.}
Ironically, Radical Reconstruction in Louisiana would be an era without the voice and guidance of the *Tribune* group publications. Beginning in 1866, the journal had become the official organ of the Louisiana Republican Party. True to form, in 1867, the *Tribune* called for a black mayor of New Orleans. Likewise, during Republican Party nominations in 1868, the journal supported Major Francis E. Dumas over Warmoth for governor. Dumas, a black Civil War veteran, and New Orleans native had also been educated in France. Regardless, Warmoth’s supporters exploited to the fullest white fears of black empowerment. In addition, P.B.S. Pinchback, black constitutional convention delegate and soon to be state senator, broke ranks with the *Tribune*, supporting Warmoth.\(^{22}\)

Pinchback and his following felt the time was not right for a black governor and for the moment, charted a more moderate course. As a result of Pinchback’s support, Warmoth won the nomination for governor, albeit by two votes. Dunn replaced Dumas, who refused the offer of lieutenant governor on the Warmoth ticket.\(^{23}\)

The *Tribune* and more specifically owner Dr. Roudanez also rejected the Warmoth-Dunn ticket. Moreover, they generated an alternative Republican ticket nominating scalawag and State Supreme Court Justice James G. Taliaferro for governor, and Dumas for lieutenant governor. Taliaferro, a former Unionist had recently served as president of the constitutional convention. Taliaferro was also an ex-slaveholder who could mobilize some conservative votes despite his radical turnaround. The triumph of the

\(^{22}\)Vincent, 68-70; Blassingame, 131; Logsdon and Bell, 247-251; Rankin, 114; Taylor, 156, 157, 173; Tunnell, 117, 134, 135.

\(^{23}\)DuBois, 472; Taylor, 156, 157, 173; Tunnell, 117, 134, 135; Logsdon and Bell, 247-251.
Warmoth-Dunn ticket ensured the Tribune’s loss of official party status and funding. Ultimately in 1870, the journal suspended publication. As a result, Creole activism temporarily receded and was less pronounced for the duration of Reconstruction.  

* * * * * * *

Thomas W. Conway was born in Ireland in 1840 but was raised in New York. A graduate of Madison University, he was also an ordained Baptist minister. Prior to the Civil War, he was a minister in Staten Island, New York. Superintendent Conway’s first known appearance in Louisiana was as chaplain of the 79th United States Colored Infantry, a Massachusetts regiment. Beginning in 1863, he toured local plantations, compiling a registry of families of black soldiers enabling enlisted soldiers to locate families and allowing families to enjoy federal rights and protection as military dependents.

As the first superintendent since ratification of the Constitution of 1868, Conway focused on the realization and implementation of the constitution’s educational provisions. The Constitution of 1868 provided for the establishment of state-supported schools in every parish of the state. It further admitted all children between the ages of six and twenty-one into the public schools regardless of race, color, or previous condition. Among all

---

24Davis, 160; Taylor, 156, 157, 173; Vincent, 68-70; Tunnell, 117, 134, 135; Logsdon and Bell, 247-251.
25Roger A. Fischer, The Segregation Struggle in Louisiana, 1862-77 (Chicago: University of Illinois), 88, 89; Vaughn, 78, 79; Ripley, 61, 153-154; Porter, 753.
southern states Louisiana stood alone in providing for mixed schools.\textsuperscript{26}

Superintendent Conway’s initial report to the legislature covered two years, 1867 and 1868. As a result of the political upheaval brought by Congressional Reconstruction, former Superintendent Lusher filed no report for 1867. Conway summarily apologized to the legislature for the lack of sufficient information, which he traced to three sources: an inadequate school law, political instability, and negligent officials: “careless, incompetent, and disinterested officials have not even taken the trouble to report what they have not done, there being nothing they have accomplished to require reporting.”\textsuperscript{27}

One of Superintendent Conway’s observations concerned new developments in the education of black youth. Between September 1867 and November 1868, both Orleans Parish (New Orleans) and neighboring Jefferson Parish hoping to avoid desegregation, assumed the charge of educating black students. Both parishes were assuming control of Freedmen’s Bureau schools and also establishing additional schools for blacks. As Conway emphasized, such local efforts were largely proactive considering the reorganization of state government underway during most of the period and no individual at the helm of the state’s educational system. According to the superintendent’s estimate, the initiatives of the two parishes accounted for approximately 5,000

\textsuperscript{26}Report of Joint Committee of Investigation of the Department of Education to the General Assembly, Session of 1878 (New Orleans: Democrat Office, 1878), 11; Dart, 565, 566; DuBois, 468, 469; Franklin, 111; Taylor, 151; Fischer, 110; Morris, 229; Vaughn, 78, 84, 85.

blacks educated by the state, 85,000 receiving no accommodations except that of the Freedmen's Bureau.\textsuperscript{28}

During his tenure, Superintendent Conway provided the essential organizational structure of Louisiana's public school system during Reconstruction. His proposal, entitled 'An American System of Public Education,' appeared in his initial report to the legislature. Conway's system called for a state superintendent and state board of education; organization of the state into districts and sub-districts with local directors and school commissioners appointed on basis of integrity and educational qualifications; and a state normal school for training teachers along with "institutes and associations for their mutual improvement."\textsuperscript{29}

Based on Conway's recommendations, the legislature on March 10, 1869, passed "An Act to regulate public education in the State of Louisiana, and to raise revenue for the support of the same," known as the School Law. The history of the School Law until 1872 was one of "constant clinic treatment" in the "legislative hospital," at the behest of Conway himself. Constant amendment necessarily meant constant reorganization, which occupied most of Conway's term.\textsuperscript{30}

The School Law in its final form during Reconstruction, created a system divided into six divisions and supported by a tax of two mills. It provided for a state superintendent as executive of the education department whose duties included serving as ex-officio president and executive officer of the State Board of

\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., 10-12; White, 179-181; Vaughn, 85; Devore and Logsdon, 65, 66.

\textsuperscript{29}Report of the State Superintendent for 1867 and 1868, 20, 21.

\textsuperscript{30}Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 12, 24.
Education; carrying the school system into effect and
general supervision of the six division superintendents;
conferring with division superintendents; visiting schools
throughout the state; printing and distributing school laws
to division superintendents and preparing such forms and
blanks necessary to implement the law. Further duties
included appointing a secretary and prescribing duties and
responsibilities; appointing time and location of teachers
institutes; annually investigating condition of school
lands and employing counsel upon failure of district
attorneys to fulfill responsibilities concerning lands.
Finally, the superintendent was responsible for compiling,
printing, and distributing 500 copies of an annual report
to both houses of the legislature. The report was to
contain vital educational statistics, matters related to
the office of superintendent, and recommendations for
management and improvement of school funds and better
organization and efficiency of schools. The Constitution of
1868 set the annual salary of the state superintendent at
$5,000.31

The Louisiana State Board of Education consisted of
the state superintendent who was president of the board,
and the division superintendents, who were nominated by the
state superintendent.32 Through the State Board, the
superintendent-president managed and supervised the schools

31Official Journal of the Proceedings of the House of
Representatives of the State of Louisiana, at the Session Begun and
Held in New Orleans, January 3, 1870 (New Orleans: A.L. Lee, 1870),
336, 337; Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 8, 11, 13, 14. See Appendix
A for the administrative structure of the State Department of
Education.

32The State Board of Education, composed of the state and division
superintendents, followed an executive school officer organizational
model thus consolidating and exercising three critical stages of
policy—formulation, governance, and execution.
of the state. State board duties and responsibilities included formulating school administrative policy, examination and choice of textbooks and school furnishings; serving as an appellate court for school officials and teachers; and appointing boards of school directors.\textsuperscript{33}

Division superintendents managed each of Louisiana’s six school divisions and served as mediums of communication between the state superintendent and local school boards. Division superintendents were charged with such duties as examination of teachers and issuance of teaching certificates; submitting division reports to the state superintendent; serving as appellate officers concerning decisions of school boards; organizing teachers institutes and forming teachers associations; and performing duties of school boards when such boards failed. The annual salary of division superintendents was $2,000.\textsuperscript{34}

At the district level, actual implementation, direct management and supervision of the schools themselves was the responsibility of the boards of school directors (school boards). The School Law allowed each district the discretion to levy a voluntary local tax of five mills maximum per year for the construction and acquisition of school buildings. Each district consisted of one school board to each parish, city, or incorporated town. As mentioned, the State Board appointed school board directors, which were unpaid positions. Each board elected from its own directors, a president, bonded secretary, and bonded treasurer. School boards were responsible for annually electing teacher personnel and were considered

\textsuperscript{33}Proceedings of the House of Representatives, 1870, 336, 337; Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 8, 11, 13, 14; Beasley, 144.

\textsuperscript{34}Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 15, 16.
bodies “corporate and politic in law.” They were endowed with the ability to hold property, make contracts, bring parties to suit or vice-versa, and engage in other corporate acts.  

By 1870, many of the school divisions were sufficiently organized to begin holding teachers institutes for the professional improvement of teaching personnel. The first New Orleans Teachers Institute convened in 1870 at Boys’ Central High School on May 5 and 6. Superintendents Conway, J.B. Carter of the Sixth Division, and Mr. F.A. Allen, principal of the State Normal School of Pennsylvania addressed the institute. Between three and five hundred teachers attended the sessions.

The following year Conway and local division superintendents organized institutes at New Orleans, Franklin, Carrollton, and Amite City of the Sixth, Third, Second, and First Divisions, respectively. Conway took a broad, convention-type approach to teaching institutes, they were organized to meet at least annually, were held over a period of three days, included a host of lecturers, and were expected to attract teachers from across the divisions in which they were organized. For 1871, Conway also hired a special assistant, Miss Hattie N. Morris of the Oswego Training School of New York, a center of object teaching methods. Morris was considered an “accomplished

---


36 Beasley, 177-180.

37 Object teaching, one of the newest methods of the period, revolved around the inculcation of object lessons—the use of objects to
instructress in the normal branches” specifically “object
teaching.” Conway hired Morris exclusively to conduct
institute work for the state.  

The 1871 Carrollton Teachers Institute included an
address by Superintendent Conway entitled “Elements
Necessary to a Successful School Work.” Other lectures and
discussions were delivered by the Reverend William
Rollinson, Secretary of the State Board of Education, who
lectured on the “Moral Influence of the Teacher in the
School;” and Dr. J.S. Clark, of the New Orleans Board of
Health, whose address “Health,” stressed the importance of
healthy personal regimens, and healthy school environments
to education. Throughout the proceedings, Miss Morris and
others lectured and provided demonstrations on the
pedagogical aspects of various subjects and proper use of
the blackboard.

Superintendent Conway also used the institutes to
express his discontent with certain issues affecting
schools. During the 1871 New Orleans Teachers Institute at
Lyceum Hall, Conway elaborated upon six major
“unaccountable and inexcusable” difficulties of the school
system. He classified the inadequacy of revenues as the
greatest difficulty. Second was the continued existence of
passions brought about by the war. Third was the
disorganized condition of the state after the war.

Conway listed general ignorance in rural school
districts as fourth. Fifth were the provisions of the law
requiring integrated schools. The final difficulty listed

stimulate development of a child’s senses. For further discussion, see
Chapter Five.

38 Annual Report, 1871, 15, 19, 68, 69, 116, 117, 138-156; Reese,
92, 93; Beasley, 177-180.


40 Louisianian, 11 June 1871.
by Conway was the “malicious, groundless, vindictive” opposition of the conservative press, “men who seem to have been asleep during the past ten years.”\textsuperscript{41}

\* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Total public education revenue for the years 1867 and 1868 amounted to $232,023. An increased apportionment for 1869 totaled $310,660. The year 1871 saw a reduction to $304,665. Annual reports during the Conway Administration often suffered from insufficient information from the school divisions. As a result, expenditures per student were often unavailable.\textsuperscript{42}

As mentioned previously, lack of revenue constituted one of the greatest ills of the school system. During the Conway Administration, the superintendent was designated the apportioning agent of school funds as opposed to the state auditor as previously. However, in other areas related to school funding Superintendent Conway met with less success. His recommendations to increase the school tax to four mills seemingly fell on deaf ears. Conway’s position was that with the increase in pupils stemming from the inclusion of black youth and extension of the school age to twenty-one, two mills was not sufficient to support the system.\textsuperscript{43}

Conway intensified efforts to account for school lands, which were subject to a number of abuses such as illegal sale, trespassing, and theft of valuable resources. He recommended appointing an officer legally authorized to

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{42}Report for 1867 and 1868, 6; Annual Report, 1871, 10; Beasley, 142.  
\textsuperscript{43}Annual Report, 1869, 13, 14; Annual Report, 1871, 46; Beasley.
manage school lands. He also sent out circulars to district attorneys reiterating their duties as guardians of school lands and requested vital information concerning the status of land holdings. According to Superintendent Conway, out of fourteen individuals addressed, he received four replies.44

The superintendent’s requests for increased funding apparently did not preclude the legislature closing out pre-existing channels of school funds. The abolition of the Free School Fund in 1872 dealt a critical blow to school finances. The fund, which was considered a sacred trust, existed since 1841 and was designed as a dedicated source of income for schools based on revenue from the sale of school lands. As of 1872, the fund amounted to $1,193,500. However, interest owed the schools had gone unpaid since the war. The 1872 legislature, on the advice of the state auditor, in the name of eliminating the floating debt of the state abolished the school fund along with other existing state funds. In what was described as an act of spoilage and robbery, the legislature sold school bonds and paid the interest to bond purchasers. Thus, schools were forced to exist solely on an annual appropriation basis.45

Being the first to preside over Louisiana’s reconstructed school system, Superintendent Conway was the first to implement the mixed (integrated) school provisions of the 1868 Constitution. Indeed, it was Conway’s determination buoyed by the unyielding stance of black leaders that helped bring about desegregation of schools. For instance, Conway’s School Law in its original form

44Annual Report, 1871, 41-45.
45Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 45; Fay, 103, 104; Beasley, 153-155.
would have required compulsory attendance with mandatory desegregation, thus making such schools unavoidable for whites.\textsuperscript{46}

Superintendent Conway committed himself to the impartial admittance of all to public schools: "no public schools must be established from which any children are excluded by reason of color." However, he early realized the adversities involved with implementation. Conway cautioned patience and warned that "time is needed for the public mind to adjust itself to the change," and he warned against forcibly mixing schools in areas where such actions were not desired by any: "If an irrational prejudice is exhibited on one side of this question, let it not be met by an equally irrational precipitancy on the other side."\textsuperscript{47}

The attempts to circumvent and undermine the desegregation decree were numerous and existed on many levels. During actual passage of the School Law, David F. Boyd, Superintendent of Louisiana State Seminary and Military Academy was instrumental in having an additional rider attached to Conway’s bill. The clause made segregated schools possible by allowing one or more schools to be established in each district as opposed to a single school. The Conservative press, no admirers of Conway, simply encouraged white parents to withhold school taxes and either patronize private schools or keep their children at home.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{46}Walter L. Fleming, \textit{Louisiana State University: 1860-1896} (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1936), 154; Taylor, 150; Fischer, 89, 90; Vaughn, 78-80; Devore and Logsdon, 42, 55, 56; Baker, 20, 21; Logsdon and Bell, 227, 228.
\textsuperscript{47}Annual Report, 1869, 12-13; Vaughn, 83, White, 193; Fischer, 89, 90; Morris, 229.
\textsuperscript{48}Fleming, \textit{Louisiana State University}, 154-157; Vaughn, 81-86; Baker, 20, 21; Morris, 229.
The New Orleans Board of School Directors until 1870 relied upon noncompliance and a series of legal maneuvers such as suits and injunctions to elude and evade the School Law as well as the State Board. Beginning in 1870, the State Board placed the New Orleans Board under direct control. Outside the city, rural school districts although under direct State Board authority, mostly avoided the decree by either maintaining separate facilities, excluding blacks completely, or refraining from public schools altogether.49

During the aforementioned Teachers Institute address in 1871, a jaded and embittered Conway elaborated frankly and allegorically on the subject of desegregation:

The difficulty growing out of the legal requirement to admit colored children into any of our schools on an equality with the whites, is one which has taxed my conscience, my judgment, and my sense of human calculation... Often have I been asked to put my personal comfort in the scale with my earnest convictions, in the hope that my interest might outweigh my love of principles. Often have I been asked whether it was not needless that I should become a scoff and a reproach to the proud and fashionable because of my devotion to a moral obligation. I have found it difficult to stand up in this community for eight years the unwavering, uncompromising friend of the newly enfranchised element. For this cause I have suffered the curses of the vulgar and the contempt of some of the professedly “educated and refined” elements of the community.

This cross was hard to bear. A crown of thorns would not have given me much more pain than I have endured on this account... 

In connection with the adversities mentioned above, Superintendent Conway was also the target of death threats and warnings to leave the state.\(^50\)

The following illustrated the manner in which mixed schooling affected other significant educational issues and verified that indeed Conway was held in contempt by at least one of the “professedly educated and refined elements of the community.” It also revealed yet another form of resistance to the controversial policy. As early as 1869, Superintendent Conway expressed a desire for State Board management of the Peabody Fund, which in his opinion was logical from an administrative and economic standpoint. The fund was named after benefactor George F. Peabody, Baltimore millionaire and philanthropist. At his death in 1867, Peabody initially bequeathed $1 million for the promotion and encouragement of “intellectual, moral, or industrial education among the young of the more destitute portions of the Southern and Southwestern States of our Union.” Peabody intended the fund to be administered “without other distinction than their needs and the opportunities of usefulness to them.”\(^51\)

However, Peabody Fund administrators were using monies to undermine desegregation and Louisiana’s public schools. Superintendent Conway’s attempt to gain the support of the Peabody Fund precipitated a conflict between

\(^{50}\)Harper’s, 13 February 1875, 148; Louisianian, 11 June 1871.

superintendents—Conway and former Superintendent Lusher, the local administrator of the fund.52

The development of a dedicated institution for professional training of teachers highlighted the precarious position of the school system with respect to the Peabody Fund administration. The old State Normal School in New Orleans closed its doors before the end of the war. In 1868 New Orleans Normal School, its successor opened. Like its predecessor, the new school was a state institution and educated female teachers. Louisiana State Seminary opened a Normal Department for the education of male teachers. Throughout the period Superintendent Conway continued to recommend establishment of a singular, co-educational, new State Normal School, "wholly devoted to the training of teachers," as the best way to achieve desired outcomes.53

By 1869, New Orleans Normal had yet to receive its share of state appropriations, but did receive partial Peabody funding. As a result of being inadequately funded by the state, the institution was forced to operate as an evening and Saturday school, using the facilities of Boys Central High School and depending on the volunteer services of teachers. In 1870, with no state appropriations yet received, New Orleans Normal was co-opted by the Peabody authorities and designated 'Peabody Normal Seminary.'54

In subsequent correspondence to Reverend Doctor Barnas Sears, general administrator of the fund and President of Brown University, Reverend Superintendent Conway not only accused Lusher of interfering with public schools, but also

52West, "The Peabody Education Fund," 418, 419.
53Annual Report, 1869, 19; Fischer, 102, 103; White, 193.
54Annual Report, 1869, West, 407, 408; Beasley, 155-157.
of using the fund, which was intended for educating the poor, to support whites-only private schools. He indicated that such actions were directly antagonistic to establishment and support of state schools and fostered the creation of a caste system in education. Conway requested the removal of Lusher as local administrator and use of the State Board of Education as managers of the fund.  

Sears took the position that use of the fund to support white private schools was warranted given the fact that whites chose to avoid public schools rather than attend with blacks. Furthermore, this development produced a need for the education of whites. Sears further argued that if the situation had been reversed, preference would have been given to blacks. Finally, he informed Conway that Lusher had been instructed to avoid “controversy and antagonism” with state authorities.  

Conway refuted Sears’ arguments with the point that notwithstanding an exodus of whites from the system, the white population still constituted a majority of scholars, “threelfold that of children of color.” He concluded in the 1871 report that Sears’ ability to be misled by Lusher failed to add to his “religious fame” or “political sagacity.”  

The embarrassing and unnecessary loss of the state’s only normal school also illustrated the position of the school system with the state itself. Superintendent Conway charged that as much indifference to education existed among many current Republican officials in the state as...
among any of their Democratic predecessors. The normal school fiasco undoubtedly lent credence to such charges.\textsuperscript{58}

Nevertheless, by 1871, Conway was able to claim some degree of success concerning mixed schooling:

As a rule, the children have chosen to attend schools made up principally of those of their own race, and their parents have preferred they should. Yet in many of the schools white and colored pupils may be seen together, and where this exists, it is not too much to say that the latter are treated with greater kindness by their fellow pupils than, under similar circumstances, they would be in many northern cities. . . .

Following the December 1870 State Board takeover, some New Orleans schools such as the Madison Girls School and the Bienville and St. Philip Street Schools for boys began desegregating soon after the Christmas holidays. The three daughters of Lieutenant Governor Oscar J. Dunn led the effort by enrolling in the Madison School. The children of Senator P.B.S. Pinchback and others were also a part of early efforts.\textsuperscript{59}

Louisiana in ratifying and actually implementing mixed schooling was truly alone among southern states. Ultimately, desegregation affected at least twenty-one schools, roughly one-third of city public schools during Reconstruction. Outside of New Orleans, as mentioned earlier, rural school districts usually avoided mixed schooling entirely. However, a few isolated cases occurred in Lafourche and St. James Parishes of the Second Division;

\textsuperscript{58}Annual Report, 1869, 87.  
\textsuperscript{59}Annual Report, 1871, 46, 47; White, 194; Middleton, 29; McPherson, 536, 537; Fischer, 102, 103; Baker, 20, 21; Porter, 762.
and Assumption and Iberville Parishes of the Third Division.  

* * * * * * *

As editor of the *Louisianian* and Senate enrolling clerk during the middle and late stages of the Conway Administration, William G. Brown was not indifferent to Conway’s activities or adversities in office. The two individuals moved in similar professional circles and attended many of the same official events. In addition, Brown often accompanied Senator P.B.S. Pinchback, a member of the New Orleans Board of School Directors on visits to city schools.  

Brown’s opinion of Superintendent Conway often appeared in the pages of the *Louisianian*. In the fourth issue of publication, Brown severely criticized Conway for open involvement in the re-election campaign of Mortimer Carr for State Speaker of the House. In the same issue, Brown scolded Conway for not appointing any black members to the State Board.  

Likewise, Brown also criticized Conway’s *New Orleans Advocate and Journal of Education* for other reasons. Having been adopted as the official journal of the State Board of Education, Conway’s journal apparently left much to be
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desired. He chided Conway to conduct a true education journal. Instead, according to Brown, the contents of the journal consisted of three education articles glorifying Conway, two campaign articles, one laudatory article on Governor Warmoth, and an endorsement of Carr for State Speaker, plus “a lot of school-booksellers advertisements.”

While not always crediting Superintendent Conway with the use of sound judgment, Brown expressed at least grudging support:

Mr. Conway, like every man in earnest, has his faults. . . . But that any of us should turn against our principles because there are personal defects in the representative of them, is either to show heedlessness or a heartlessness which deprives us of all right of criticism. . . . while the bitter rebels denounce Mr. Conway we can not as colored men, forsake him had he done far less, in the position he holds, for the people of whom this journal is a representative.

Brown further argued that the creation and successful launching of any great system at times involves “absolute dictation on one side and unquestioning submission on the other” and that wounded feelings are results “neither new nor surprising.” He claimed that Louisiana’s school system at the time was the best in the reconstructed states and that Conway had the experience, ability, and courage to place it on the same level as its New England models.

* * * * * * *

In the midst of Reconstruction, apparently Southern Louisiana could still find the capacity to celebrate an

---

63 Louisianian, 22 June 1871.
64 Ibid., 11 June 1871.
important festival. Mardi Gras 1872 found New Orleans exuberant and spellbound over the visit of Russian Grand Duke Alexis Alexandrovich Romanov and entourage. As is still the practice, Superintendent Conway closed New Orleans' schools in honor of the Carnival celebrations.65

Later that year, Conway and the State Board of Education held the "Educational Convention of the State of Louisiana," which preempted teaching institutes for 1872. The "State Educational Convention" met at Lyceum Hall in New Orleans on May 23, 24, and 25 and featured former Governor Michael Hahn as President and Senator P.B.S. Pinchback as one of twenty-four vice-Presidents. The at-large delegation consisted of Superintendent Conway along with the Reverend William Rollinson, Secretary of the State Board, Reverend M.C. Cole, Secretary of the State Superintendent, plus the division superintendents. The regular delegation included Senator George Y. Kelso, S.S. Ashley, acting President of Straight University, and General James Longstreet, commander of the Louisiana Militia, and member of the New Orleans Board.66

Then in his final year of office, Superintendent Conway stated the object of the Educational Convention as "far nobler than any political creed." The gathering was intended to bring the "school magnates" of the state together to become better acquainted and devise plans for the future management of the schools. The convention was well attended by those from within and without the city, attracting large numbers of teachers, "old citizens and friends of education," as well as "professional leaders of

65Daily Picayune, 9, 13 February 1872.
66New Orleans Republican, 24-26 May 1872; Daily Picayune, 25, 26 May 1872; Blassingame, 129.
youth.” In particular, the New Orleans Board granted teachers a half-day furlough enabling them to attend Friday’s proceedings.  

With the exception of statewide organization, the Educational Convention essentially mirrored the structure of the teaching institutes. Superintendent Conway’s address, “School Work of Louisiana,” provided a sweeping overview of educational progress since 1868, and highlighted key areas for improvement. A lecture by the Reverend E.G. Taylor, D.D., entitled “Self-Help,” used the past accomplishments of self-made men to critique traditional educational models.

Likewise, Dr. Thomas Nicholson’s “Useful Education,” criticized the spirit of education at the time as “discipline and development contrary to the course of nature.” For example, Nicholson asserted that cramming depressed the nervous system. He favored teaching methods reflecting active learning and object lessons. The Reverend Myron W. Reed’s “Compulsory Education,” resulted in applause. One of Reed’s assertions stressed the importance of education to properly exercising basic civic responsibilities: “Suffrage in the hands of an ignorant man is as a loaded gun. I claim that he at least ought to know at which end of the gun to stand, so that he may not kill his friends . . .” Besides the many addresses, the
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67 *New Orleans Republican*, 24-26 May 1872; *Daily Picayune*, 25, 26 May 1872. The dates of Pinchback’s Third Ward Republican Club nominating convention coincided with the dates of the educational convention. As a result, Brown did not attend the education convention neither did the *Louisianian* dispatch another correspondent. However, the May 25 edition of the *Louisianian* briefly mentioned the education convention. During the Pinchback convention, Brown received an early nomination.

convention also presented a forum entitled “School Systems.”

The final day of the State Educational Convention was devoted mainly to resolution drafting. In relation to the recent state liquidation of the Free School Fund, the convention body supported efforts in Congress to secure a bill granting to public education the proceeds generated by the sale of public lands. They demanded “earnest and enlightened” state legislation to remove the illiteracy caused by past injustice and urged local authorities across the state to levy the school tax “for the erection of schoolhouses and the more efficient prosecution of the educational work.” The body also urged school boards to furnish schoolhouses with appropriate furniture for the overall health and well being of the pupils. Finally, the convention body resolved to create a permanent State Educational Convention.

Apart from the Educational Convention, Superintendent Conway spent much of 1872 either incapacitated or away from the state. During the year he lost both his wife and son. After almost a year of protracted yellow fever, he officially left office December 10, 1872, his term having officially expired with the election of William G. Brown to the superintendency. Unofficially, Conway had left the state shortly after holding his final State Board of Education meeting in late October. In presenting his first annual report to the legislature, which covered Conway’s final year, Superintendent Brown expressed astonishment that Conway had been able to give any attention to schools:
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His ability to exhibit a record of successful labors has been largely curtailed by a year of almost constant sickness, and afflictions of so overwhelming a character that I am surprised to find as much attention paid to the duties of his office as its record shows.  

* * * * * * *

With the successful placement of public schools in Louisiana, a major benchmark was achieved. For the next major stage of the school system, maintenance, management and possible perfection of the system were important objectives of attainment.

---

INTERLUDE: WILLIAM G. BROWN, 1870-1872

During the period 1870-1872, William G. Brown continued to work in and around the political arena. In 1870, immediately prior to becoming education superintendent, Brown was appointed chief enrolling clerk in the Louisiana Senate.¹ He was also editor of the Louisianian from 1870 to early 1873. Both positions were sufficient to maintain an acute awareness of the political issues of the day. Also, the two positions complimented one another.

As Senate enrolling clerk, Brown worked in the Senate enrolling room. However, enrolling clerks due to the nature of the position were also floor personnel. Thus, he also was active on the floor during Senate proceedings. As chief enrolling clerk he played a crucial role in two key stages of the legislative process, engrossment and enrollment. Both stages employed his skills and ability as an editor. At the engrossment stage, when the Senate adopted original legislation, Brown’s major responsibility was to prepare a copy for the House of Representatives. The engrossed copy had to reflect all amendments adopted by the Senate. In addition, Brown proofread engrossed legislation to ensure each amendment was precisely placed, spelled, and punctuated as when adopted.²

¹Daily Picayune, 15 May 1883; During this time Senator Pinchback was chair of the Senate Committee on Enrollment and was a member of the Committee on Engrossing Bills. See Agnes Smith Grosz, “The Political Career of Pinckney Benton Stewart Pinchback,” Louisiana Historical Quarterly XXVII (April 1944).
²Donald C. Bacon, Roger H. Davidson, and Morton Keller, ed., The Encyclopedia of the United States Congress (New York: Simon & Schuster,
At the enrollment stage, when both houses had agreed upon legislation, accuracy and precision assumed an even greater importance. The enrolled copy had to reflect all amendments as agreed upon by both houses. After enrollment, Brown prepared the final form on parchment paper for eventual presentation to the governor.³

The position of Senate enrolling clerk offered Brown an insider’s familiarity with the various laws passed by the legislature and consequently the major issues affecting the state. It also brought association with many legislators, especially Senators. When elected Superintendent of Education in 1872, Brown entered the office with a detailed knowledge of education legislation over the past two years. Moreover, he had access to critical information generated by the superintendent’s office such as annual reports, special reports requested by the legislature, and petitions to the legislature. All provided deeper insight into the educational affairs and politics of the state.

* * * * * * * *

The premiere issue of the Louisianian debuted on December 18, 1870, under the editorship of William G. Brown and the ownership of Senators P.B.S. Pinchback, C.C. Antoine, James H. Ingraham, and George Y. Kelso among
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³Blair, American Legislatures, 234.
others. Pinchback, the major proprietor was soon to be promoted to the governorship. Antoine was a future lieutenant governor. Ingraham was a future U.S. Surveyor of Customs. During the Civil War he served as captain of the 1st Louisiana Native Guards. All of the named gentlemen were former delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1867-1868.4

According to the editor, the issue was published amidst much anxiety and determination as the staff toiled and labored through the morning of the 18th:

With all the anxiety of anxious parents, we and the majority of the Proprietors of “The Louisianian,” watched the patient labors of our staff through the night of the 17th inst. The morning of the 18th dawned, and yet our labors were incomplete, but with the resolution that our vocabulary contained no such word as “cannot,” we were determined to “get it out,” and we did it.

That evening, the owners, editor, and various associates gathered at the residence of Pinchback for a much anticipated celebratory feast where all involved toasted, “The success and perpetuity of the Louisianian.” Evidently, others shared the elation as well. Members of the Louisianian—owners and staff were invited and given complimentary tickets to a “Grand Christmas Festival” hosted on December 24th by the Ladies of the Fourth African Baptist Church.5

At the time of its initial appearance, the Louisianian was a four-page semi-weekly published every Thursday and Sunday at 114 Carondelet Street, New Orleans.

4Louisianian, 19 October 1871, 16 November 1873; Vincent, 49, 57, 142, 150; Foner, 113, 14; Davis, 160, 161.
5Louisianian, 18-22 December 1870.
Interestingly, this location also housed the local branch of the National Freedmen’s Savings and Trust Company (known as the Freedmen’s Bank) as well as a brokerage house known as Pinchback & Antoine, Commission Merchants. A subscription for one year was set at five dollars, while a single issue sold for five cents.⁶

The *Louisianian*, whose masthead proclaimed “Republican at all times and under all circumstances,” was conceived and came of age in the fires of the political and racial antagonisms then consuming Louisiana and most of the South. The premiere issue appeared on the heels of an 1870 state election in which Republicans made a number of apparent gains in power and influence. For example, Republicans solidified power in the legislature; Democratic New Orleans, a constant thorn in the side of the Republican state government of the period, was brought under Republican control; five party members went to Congress; and Antoine Dubuclet, black, was re-elected state treasurer.⁷

However, such developments were merely the latest chapter in an ongoing saga then playing in Louisiana. The recent presidential election of 1868 saw over 1,000 deaths associated with Louisiana’s political troubles. By 1868, at least six covert terror organizations operated in the state along with others across the South. Such organizations rejected Radical Reconstruction and its Republican governments. Republican governments in the South
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⁶*Louisianian*, 18-22 December 1870.
acknowledged the 14th and later, 15th amendments and thus recognized black citizenship such as their right to vote and hold public office. Indeed, the success or failure of republicanism in the South stood upon such recognition.8

Considering the circumstances, New Orleans, then capital of Louisiana was the logical refuge of choice for embattled Republican leaders from across the state. However, safe-haven it was not--a contemporary observer described the city in such generous terms as “Overrun with gamblers, prostitutes, and thugs. . . .” Furthermore, roughly half of the city’s white male population belonged to such local terror organizations as the Knights of the White Camelia, Crescent City Democratic Club, Seymour Legion, Innocents, and Wide Awake Club. The New Orleans area alone claimed at least sixty of the total deaths associated with the election of 1868. Such was the immediate backdrop against which the Louisianian emerged.9

In the prospectus, which also appeared in subsequent issues, Brown set forth the basic precepts of the journal, and those of its owners and editor by inference:

In the endeavor to establish another Republican journal in New Orleans, the proprietors of the Louisianian, propose to fill a necessity which has been long, and sometimes painfully—felt to exist. In the transition state of our people, in their struggling efforts to attain that position in the Body Politic, which we conceive to be their due, it is regarded that much information, guidance, encouragement, counsel and reproof have been lost, in consequence of the lack of a medium, through which these deficiencies might be supplied. We shall strive to make the Louisianian a desideratum in these respects.

8Trelease, White Terror, 127-133; DuBois, 474; Taylor, 162, 163; Dawson, 84-91; Tunnell, 153, 155-60, 164.
9Trelease, 127-133; Taylor, 162, 163; Dawson, 84-91; Tunnell, 153, 155-60, 164.
Brown's referral to the "lack of a medium" concerned the 1870 demise of the Tribune group publications. Their absence left a void among Louisiana's black publications.\(^{10}\)

Predecessors of the Louisianian such as L'Union (1862-64), and the Tribune group (1864-70) provided significant examples that helped shape the character and tenor of the paper. First and foremost, the editor and owners of the Louisianian like those of L'Union and the Tribune group sought to transcend or eradicate racial barriers by refusing to be confined or stereotyped by color. Apparently, the Louisianian also shared an underlying faith in the creation of a society that transcended the limitations of race. Consequently, the Louisianian's character was that of a general newspaper accessible to all. As the editor asserted, the primary focus of the paper was republicanism as opposed to racial issues:

> We regret that it should become necessary thus early in our editorial career to correct a false impression . . . that we are about to conduct our journal exclusively in the interest of the colored man. We beg once and for all, distinctly and emphatically to denounce and repudiate any such imputation.

> We shall strenuously maintain the doctrines and principles of that Republicanism from whose hands we have received all the rights and privileges we now possess, and from whose hands we hope to receive all that remains for us to enjoy in common with every other citizen of our great Commonwealth, and we will urge the unity and harmony of all classes in our State. If our advocacy of equal civil and political rights, justice, and fair representation, inure incidentally more to the advancement of the interests of the colored man, than some people desire then, we shall be prepared to claim that hitherto, those things which most materially, and most favorably affected

\(^{10}\)Louisianian, 18 December 1870; Davis, 160; Logsdon and Bell, 249.
him, have been the most studiously overlooked and neglected and we shall glory in our advocacy. Actually, we know of hardly any interest, that under existing circumstances can be justly said to exclusively belong to the colored man. . . .

Ultimately, despite original intentions, as the racial climate further intensified as Reconstruction progressed, the **Louisianian** was forced to grapple with issues of race. However, they also attempted to maintain a balance with general accessibility.¹¹

As stated by historian John W. Blassingame, the **Louisianian** was one of the few black New Orleans newspapers to try to appeal to whites. The prospectus clearly expressed support for the removal of political sanctions placed on former confederates by the federal government. It also called for a climate of mutual cooperation “among all classes and between all interests.” The **Louisianian** saw such outcomes as a major step toward furthering progress in the state.¹²

The prospectus also highlighted three key public policy issues as necessary for progress: justice, taxation, and education. Justice pertained to the security and enjoyment of civil liberties, equality of all men before the law, and “an impartial distribution of land and patronage to all who merit them.” Taxation issues discussed involved the equitable division of taxes among all classes, “faithful collection of the revenues,” and “economy in the expenditures.” Concerning education, the **Louisianian** affirmed support for the new laws reorganizing the public schools. Henceforth, the reorganized school system took

¹¹**Louisianian**, 18 December 1870; Blassingame, 132; Davis, 8.
¹²**Louisianian**, 18 December 1870; Blassingame, 132.
responsibility for all regardless of color. Additionally, the journal urged as a “paramount duty” the education of African-American youth (“our youth”) in the interests of their own enlightenment as well as for the “security and stability of a Republican Government.”

An addendum to the prospectus entitled, “Our Salutatory,” appeared in the premiere issue. In this article, the editor and staff of the Louisianian publicly accepted the challenges and responsibilities placed upon them: “Without the hundred eyes of Argus, we shall be required to see everything. Divested of the wisdom of Apollo, we shall yet be demanded to know everything. Not having the belligerence of Mars, we shall be required to engage in every encounter.”

In addition, Brown dedicated the journal as much as possible, to impartial judgment free of “fear, favor, or affection” when discussing such issues as “public measures, and the conduct of Public men.” The Louisianian also pledged itself to struggling “heroically” for the elevation of African-Americans, the “diffusion of useful knowledge,” and the advancement of “what we believe to be the best interests of the State.”

Brown committed the journal to upholding its professional standards when involved in “keen encounters” of wit or differences of opinion with contemporary journals. The journal would also refrain from degrading its columns “with vulgarisms” or dispensing the “curses of
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13 Louisianian, 18 December 1870.
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Billingsgate.” Likewise, the editor requested reciprocity from fellow journals when in similar circumstances.\textsuperscript{15}

Although the \textit{Louisianian’s} primary concern was politics, it was a general newspaper, and not simply a political journal. In addition to the usual editorial, correspondence, and local news columns, the \textit{Louisianian} also contained columns devoted to national news, society, fashion, theater, book reviews, variety, and telegraphic dispatches. A column, entitled ‘Our Story-Teller,’ featuring a serialized short story, normally appeared on the front-page along with a short poem. The ‘Varieties’ column often contained articles on health, self-help, or well-being topics, such as the importance of becoming a homeowner, or the health benefits of a well-ventilated bedroom. The column entitled ‘Telegraphic Dispatches,’ often carried international news. For example, the \textit{Louisianian} kept readers highly informed concerning the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71. Besides regular columns, the journal also featured the prospectus of the National Colored Labor Union.\textsuperscript{16}

By 1872, there were regular correspondents in states such as Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Kentucky. Primary cities covered included Washington D.C., Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, and Memphis. Rounding out its original content, the \textit{Louisianian} maintained a system of exchanges with numerous journals both in and out of state.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Louisianian}, 18 December 1870. \\
\textsuperscript{16}\textit{Louisianian}, 1870 - 1882. \\
\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}, 1870 - 1882.
Some of the journals included were the Washington Chronicle, Chicago Tribune, New York Tribune, Harper’s Weekly, New York Weekly, the Nation, Chicago Inter-Ocean, National Monitor, and Lippincott’s Magazine. Other journals of interest included the New National Era, edited and managed by Frederick Douglass, and the Savings Bank, the official journal of the Freedmen’s Savings and Trust Company. A letter of appreciation written by the Honorable H.M. Turner of Macon, Georgia, to Senator Pinchback concerning the Louisianian is both informative and telling:

I must say, it deserves the support of our people, not only in your State, but in every State. It not only teems with original matter, but the culled portions are of the best possible kind. There is no hope for the colored race in this country aside from the exhibitions of talent. One pound of properly cultivated brain is worth more to us at present than a thousand pounds of bone and sinew. The civilized world is satisfied that we can and will work, but whether we are intellectually progressive people or not, remains to be attested by the most indubitable proofs, and such indispensable testimony can only be obtained by such exhibitions of mind as none can gainsay. . . .

Apparently, the Louisianian suffered few wants concerning adequate backing to sustain itself. The advertising section was divided into various subheadings and represented to some extent a visual testimony of success concerning support for the journal. This section also revealed an interesting array of services and products available to the Louisianian’s audience, which must have represented a broad cross-section of society considering the scope of the advertisements.

---

18Louisianian, 18 December 1870.
The subheadings ‘Lawyer’s Advertisements,’ ‘Insurance Companies–Banks,’ and ‘Commission Merchants,’ usually appeared on the front page of the journal. The Pinchback & Antoine brokerage firm usually appeared on this page along with banks such as the Freedmen’s Savings and Trust Company. Ad solicitations from New York were located among the general advertisements but given their own category, ‘New York Advertisements.’ Two local retailers advertising in the *Louisianian* were Philip Werlein, musical retailer, and Leon Godchaux, clothier. Both businesses went on to become anchors of the New Orleans economy.\(^{19}\)

Among other local retailers of interest the Louisiana State Lottery Company was a regular client. The firm of Stagg & O’Neil Patent Attorneys captured the spirit of the age. Jules Abelard offered carpentry and building services while both LaCroix Brothers and the United Brotherhood Protective Association were grocers. Mrs. A.M. Parrish was a shirt maker. F.R. Harden, and Mrs. G.E. Craig both offered millinery services. Paul Granzin dealt in gold and silver watches and fine gold jewelry. The New Orleans Manufacturing Co. sold home washers at a price of eighteen dollars a piece. A. Brousseau & Co. were proprietors of the Carpet Warehouse, while G. Casenave was an undertaker who also offered carriages for hire.\(^{20}\)

The Union League Clubhouse regularly published its hours of operation along with lunch and dinner schedules. Black educational institutions local and away also appeared in the *Louisianian*. Straight, Leland, and Alcorn Universities were regular clients. Howard University Law

\(^{19}\) *Louisianian*, 1870 - 1882.  
\(^{20}\) Ibid.
and Medical Departments announced commencement exercises. Journals patronizing the newspaper included the *New York Times*, *The Aldine* (an art journal Brown endorsed), Harpers Periodicals, the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, and the *Christian Union*—edited by Henry Ward Beecher. Beginning in 1872 an ad by the *Louisianian* Book and Job Printing Establishment promoted the newspaper’s printing services to the public.\(^{21}\)

Numerous articles and correspondence on education appeared in the pages of the *Louisianian*, evincing the editor’s special interest in education. For example, in the first column of the premiere issue was actually an article in which Brown called public education the “chief reliance of American liberty” and the “true American conservatism.” The same article further announced that based on Bureau of Education statistics, Americans were “no longer the most generally educated people in the world.”\(^{22}\)

The types of education articles highlighted by William G. Brown fit into three categories: general education, politics of education, and child development articles. General education articles were concerned with issues such as philosophies of education, women’s education, school outings and events, university events, and educational development. For example, an article entitled “Educational,” quoted the educational philosophies of individuals such as Milton, Horace Mann, Thomas Jefferson, DeWitt Clinton, Guizot, and George Washington. Another article entitled “Capacity of the Negro,” concerned an evaluation of the learning capacity of blacks.\(^{23}\)

\(^{21}\) *Louisianian*, 1870 – 1882.
\(^{22}\) *Ibid.*, 18 December 1870.
Politics of education articles dealt with topics such as speeches and opinions of political figures on education, legislative activities concerning education, school board elections and issues, Democratic opposition to education, and race issues affecting the schools. An article entitled “Mixed Schools,” assessed the policy in Massachusetts, Michigan, and Kansas. Another article entitled “Education,” was an address given by Florida Representative Josiah T. Walls before the Florida House.24

Child development articles while not concerned with education per se, nevertheless concerned topics of interest to the educator such as child behavior and children’s rights. An article entitled “Have Children Any Rights Grown People are Bound to Respect?” asserted that parents also owe respect to their children given that “all rights are reciprocal.” An article slyly entitled “Advice to Children,” admonished parents for failing to display by example the good behavior and manners they demanded of their children.25

Based on the nature of the education articles contained in the Louisianian under the editorship of William G. Brown, four points became apparent and clear: Brown placed unconditional faith in the beneficial effects of education for all; he was a tireless proponent of mixed schools; he was a sincere advocate for children; and he also evinced concern for higher education. The Louisianian offered Brown an environment to discuss his educational priorities and philosophies. The Office of State Superintendent of Public Education offered him an ideal

24Ibid., 26 October 1871, 22 February 1872.
25Louisianian, 23 April, 8 June 1871.
arena to act on those priorities and philosophies as a successful candidate.

* * * * * * * *

The background to the election of 1872 began during the administration of Governor Henry Clay Warmoth. Prior to 1870, the United States Custom House, located in New Orleans had become the center of opposition to Warmoth. It had also become a center of corruption concerning federal patronage. James F. Casey, Collector of Customs and brother-in-law of President Grant, and U.S. Marshal Stephen B. Packard were two of the recognized ringleaders. Enmity between Grant and Warmoth traced back to the U.S. Army and the Civil War itself.26 Consequently, the attempt by Warmoth in 1870 to have Casey removed as collector did little to earn the governor friends in either of the two houses--the White House or Custom House.27

By 1870, Warmoth, a prewar Democrat also began alienating leading black Republicans such as Lieutenant Governor Oscar J. Dunn, due to lack of support for civil rights, specifically integration of public accommodations and schools. Moreover, by 1871, Warmoth made attempts to checkmate Dunn’s power by making deals with Democrats in the legislature. At least one journal had already withdrawn Warmoth’s name as its candidate for governor in 1872. The Custom House opposition quickly capitalized on the

26Lieutenant Colonel Warmoth of the 32d Missouri was wounded at Vicksburg. Grant dishonorably discharged Warmoth after Warmoth returned home on supposedly extended leave. He also charged Warmoth with being absent without leave and exaggerating Union losses. Warmoth appealed to Lincoln, who saved his career. See Dawson, 108 and Tunnell, 151.

27Taylor, 210-212; Dawson, 108, 109, 129.
situation through an alliance with the lieutenant governor. However, Senator Pinchback, who wielded influence among black voters nearly equal to the lieutenant governor’s, still remained in the Warmoth camp.\textsuperscript{28}

To be certain, August 9, 1871, New Orleans saw the convening of two state Republican Party conventions. The Custom House faction held one meeting under the security of the army and federal marshals. Warmoth and his supporters held the other after being denied admission to the Custom House gathering. Both nominated a state central committee of which Custom House nominations received the advantage of the sanction of President Grant and the national Republican Party. The battle lines were drawn. Others were also taking notice. An article taken from the Missionary Record assessing the situation and its consequences ended with the question “When, Oh When will these people learn wisdom?”\textsuperscript{29}

The upcoming election of 1872 tested the mettle of the Republican Party in the face of factionalism and fragmentation. At the national level the party was divided into Grant Republicans and Liberal Republicans. Having been “read out of the party” by state Speaker George W. Carter and others of the Custom House faction, Warmoth without a place to go became head of the state Liberal Republican camp. Meanwhile, Pinchback who was now Lieutenant Governor (resulting from the death of Dunn) broke ranks with the Warmoth camp. Thus at the state level, the party was rent three ways, Grant Republicans (Custom House), Liberal Republicans (Warmoth), and Pinchback Republicans,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28}DuBois, 478; Taylor, 210-212, 218; Dawson, 108, 109, 129.
\item \textsuperscript{29}Louisianian, 3 August 1871; Taylor, 216-218; Dawson, 109-112; Tunnel, 169-170.
\end{itemize}
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representing the President, Governor, and Lieutenant Governor respectively.  

In order to insure victory, Louisiana’s three Republican factions had to unite or face utter defeat by the Democrats. The following reveals the extent of interparty factionalism among the state’s Republicans. In an amazing feat of political engineering, Liberal Republicans united with Democrats creating a joint, Fusion ticket, which included Democrats John D. McEnery for governor, and none other than Robert M. Lusher for superintendent of public education. Renowned scholar W.E.B. DuBois, offered a compelling synopsis of the situation which placed Louisiana’s black officeholders and electorate in a very difficult position with few genuine choices:

There is no question but that if Negroes had been offered a chance to make their leadership effective in alliance with some party of social uplift, they would have followed it in large and increasing numbers. . . . But what could one choose between men like Warmoth, McEnery, and Carter—a carpetbagger, a planter, and a scalawag; a buccaneer, a slavedriver, and a plain thief.  

Pinchback, William G. Brown, and other associates attended the Regular Republican Convention, held August 1872 in New Orleans. Brown was a delegate, representing New Orleans’ 3rd Ward. During the proceedings, Custom House and Pinchback factions reluctantly brokered a necessary compromise. In what was designated the ‘United Republican State Ticket,’ U.S. Senator William P. Kellogg, a
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30 DuBois, 479, 480; Taylor, 217, 227-231; Dawson, 129, 130; Tunnel, 170.  
31 DuBois, 477; Taylor, 235, 236; Dawson, 130, 131.
carpetbagger from Vermont and Illinois, remained the nominee for governor while Pinchback now received the nomination for U.S. Congressman. Brown and Pierre G. Deslonde, Brown’s old associate, garnered the nominations for superintendent of public education and secretary of state, respectively. Along with the nominee for lieutenant governor, Caesar C. Antoine, the Republican ticket now contained four black candidates.\textsuperscript{32}

The conservative press wasted little time in capitalizing upon the newly revised Republican ticket. The \textit{Daily Picayune} referred to Brown as possessing a low standard of “personal and official morality.” Furthermore, after accusing Brown of complicity in the notoriously corrupt legislatures of 1870 and 1871, the \textit{Picayune} also labeled him as ignorant and presumptuous. In short, he was totally unfit for the position he aspired to, an opinion supposedly shared by black voters. Previously, Brown had already been stigmatized as an “ignorant, brutal, plantation negro.”\textsuperscript{33} The \textit{Picayune} article added insult to injury.\textsuperscript{34}

Following the \textit{Picayune}’s defamation of Brown’s character, the Regular Republican Convention evidently saw fit to adopt the following resolution:

Whereas certain misguided and disaffected persons have banded together, and by insidious and disgraceful means to injure, if possible the chances of the election of William G. Brown, a colored man as

\textsuperscript{32}New Orleans Republican, 17 August 1872; Louisianian, 14 September 1872; Taylor, 235, 236; Dawson, 130, 131; Grosz, “The Political Career of Pinckney Benton Stewart Pinchback,” 552-554.
\textsuperscript{33}Quoted in Harper’s Weekly, 147. See Clara Lopez Campbell, “The Political Life of Louisiana Negroes,” (Ph.D. diss., Tulane University, 1971), 92. According to Campbell, the comment originated in the New Orleans Times.
\textsuperscript{34}Daily Picayune, 17 October 1872.
Superintendent of Public Education, on the Republican state ticket; and whereas William G. Brown has been unanimously and repeatedly endorsed in a number of ways, officially, by the leaders and committees of the Republican party and also by every parish which has endorsed the Republican ticket:

Be it resolved, that this convention approve and endorse said nomination and deprecate and denounce any and all attempts to interfere with the nomination of so faithful, true and worthy a Republican as William G. Brown.\textsuperscript{35}

Brown’s own response appeared in the \textit{Louisianian} of November 2, merely two days before the election. In an article entitled ‘Recklessness and Its Results,’ he took Picayune editors and others to task, calling such behavior one of the worst vices for journalists to indulge in:

\textit{It is deplorable that this practice prevails to such an extent among the Democratic dailies of New Orleans; and that too in matters and qualities that demand the utmost scrupulousness and honesty in dealing with character and with men.}

For instance a man hitherto enjoying the confidence and respect of his neighbors and his fellows thoroughly under the tongue of good report, is selected on account of known and approved qualities, as a representative in some official capacity; and forthwith the city editors not the paragraphists, not the sensational contributors, not the police, or the gossip reporters, but the editors proper, the men who are supposed to act with caution and deliberateness, lend willing ears and promptly use facile pens in the vilification of private character in the robbing a man of his good name, purely and exclusively on ex-parte accusations, on the malicious and false representation of some unscrupulous partisan, with as little scruple as they would crush a gnat. Now, such conduct must frequently meet with refutation and execration and involve the perpetrators in the loss of popular respect in the integrity of the Press. It also produces another evil, it encourages a disposition to

\textsuperscript{35}New Orleans Republican, 26 October 1872.
resort to any means for the defeat of a mere political adversary.

No journal pretending to respectability or aspiring to the confidence of its readers, the conductors of which claim to be gentlemen, that is to have some regard for the conventionalities of life, and a higher respect for the sacredness of private character, and a cultivated abstention from acts of malice and contemptible meanness, can indulge in such practices and escape the penalty which is inevitable. . . The habit of falsely charging vice, immorality, theft and other crimes against persons known to be free from these vices, has naturally rendered the public incredulous, and thus the respectability of a powerful, and honorable institution is daily sacrificed by being under the control of men who disgrace their calling. . . .

Considering the intense power brokering and sub-plotting during the campaign, the actual election held on November 4, was no less complicated. Neither Republicans nor Fusionists proved inculpable or incapable of election fraud and malfeasance in spite of the presence of Federal supervisors of elections on hand as observers. Ultimately, most supervisors weighed in against Fusion election tactics, which lent support to the Republican cause.

Governor Warmoth who controlled the state’s election machinery, which included the State Board of Returning Officers known as “the Returning Board” now worked on behalf of the Fusion ticket. The five-member board, which included Warmoth as governor, compiled and certified the
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36Louisianian, 2 November 1872.
37Daily Picayune, November-December, 1872; Louisianian, November-December, 1872; New York Times, 5-10 November, 1872; Chicago Tribune, 5-11 November, 1872; The Louisiana Adjustment, Abstract of the Evidence of Governor Kellogg’s Election in 1872, and the Frauds of the Fusionists (New Orleans, 1875); McPherson, 591; Taylor, 239, 240; Dawson, 133-135; Foner, 188, 189.
official returns of each election. In theory, the Returning Board was also legally authorized to discard the returns of any precinct in which violence and intimidation occurred. In practice, the board discarded returns for less than noble purposes. Thus, the governor and now the Fusionists had control of a powerful weapon capable of legally altering election results. William G. Brown, commenting on Warmoth’s machine described it as such: “Governor Warmoth had agencies and helps as numerous and obedient as the strings of a harp, under the hands of a professional player. . . .” Reflecting back on Reconstruction and the election, Governor Warmoth admitted to doing all he could for the “success of the ticket.”

The goal of Warmoth and his supporters was to facilitate as many Fusion votes as possible mostly white, and exclude as many Republican votes as possible especially black. Significantly throughout the state, voting registrars were appointees of the governor and supporters of the Fusion Party. Supervisors of Elections were largely persons running as candidates on the Fusion ticket. Other election personnel also left much to be desired being in many cases known racists or persons of violent and dangerous character.

Accordingly, across the state especially in Republican parishes registration offices were often closed or remotely located. Similarly, the number of polling locations was reduced and removed without notice. Some were only opened

---

39 *The Louisiana Adjustment* (New Orleans, 1875), 41-58; Warmoth, 200, 201.
at unusual hours while others were located in remote areas. In one location, polls were accessible only by boat. In others, they were over twenty miles from voters. Other tactics included obstructing federal elections supervisors, erasing names of voters especially blacks from registration polls, sending voters to the wrong polls, registering names of fictitious and deceased voters, allowing minors to vote, repeat voting, discarding returns, duplicate ballot boxes and ballot stuffing.\textsuperscript{40}

As a result of their potent election machinery, the Fusionists successfully stole the election away from the Republicans. Almost one year after the election, in sworn testimony before United States Commissioner F.A. Wolfley, Brainard P. Blanchard, a former Assistant Secretary of the Senate and then current State Registrar of Voters under Warmoth, admitted no less than twenty-four violations of state and federal election codes.\textsuperscript{41}

Blanchard explained how he and others diverted a total of 9,314 Republican votes to the Fusion cause. He further asserted that had it not been for the fraudulent practices resorted to by the Fusion party a large majority would have elected the Republican state and national tickets. Two Warmoth Returning Board officers further attested that votes in many critical Republican parishes were simply thrown out, affirming Blanchard's assertions.\textsuperscript{42}

However, due to the levels of impropriety scaled by both sides, and the sheer magnitude of political infighting

\textsuperscript{40}The Louisiana Adjustment (New Orleans, 1875), 41-58; Taylor, 240.
\textsuperscript{41}The Louisiana Adjustment (New Orleans, 1875), 41-58.
\textsuperscript{42}The Louisiana Adjustment (New Orleans, 1875), 57, 58.
and out-fighting, it was impossible at the time to determine who actually won. Both parties claimed victory, as did the newspapers associated with them. Even the federal government proved just as unable to identify a winner. After an initial federal investigation, Congress recommended new elections.\footnote{Daily Picayune, 16 November 1872; Louisianian, 14 December 1872; New York Times, 5–10 November 1872; Chicago Tribune, 5–11 November 1872; Stampp, 193; McPherson, 591; Foner, 188, 189; Beasley, 199.}

In the meantime, the Returning Board itself split into two opposing boards, “the Warmoth board,” and “the Lynch board.” The difficulty began with Senator John Lynch’s opposition to Warmoth attempting to pack the original board in favor of the Fusion Party. Although Warmoth and Lynch were officially members of the two boards, both men discredited the other board as illegal. More importantly, as a result of his control of the state’s election machinery, Warmoth refused to allow the Lynch board access to election returns. Before the election was finally settled, a total of four boards would make their appearance.\footnote{R.H. Marr and others, Report of the Committee Appointed by the Committee of Seventy to Review Decisions of the Supreme Court of Louisiana in the Cases Growing Out of the General Election of November, 1872 (New Orleans: privately printed, 1873), 3, 20; Dawson, 134–142.}

However, of crucial significance to the election, in Kellogg v. Warmouth (1872) the prosecution brought suit in United States Circuit Court on behalf of the illegality of the Warmoth board and the suppression of votes—through either registration impediments or suppression of actual votes cast, all of which violated the Fifteenth Amendment. They also submitted some 4,000 questionable affidavits signed by voters attesting to vote suppression. During the proceedings, Warmoth applied to have the United States...
Supreme Court take over jurisdiction of the case but was denied. The Circuit Court recognized the legality of the Lynch board and therefore their right to certify election returns. The Louisiana Supreme Court in a subsequent collateral ruling also sustained this position.45

* * * * * * *

As a result of developments following the election, William G. Brown along with running mates P.G. Deslonde, Pinchback, and other associates, formed a Committee of Colored Men. The main point of the committee, which was formed on November 17, was the necessity of blacks representing and speaking for themselves, issues undoubtedly stirred during the campaign. Despite being members of the Republican Party, committee members apparently harbored few illusions of trust and loyalty concerning their Custom House associates. Brown made the particulars of this association with the state Republican Party very clear. Given the choice between "false Republicanism" in Louisiana and "real Democracy, such as our race lives under in Georgia, Tennessee and Alabama," false Republicanism was the lesser of two evils.46

Brown as a member of the Election Conduct Committee of the Colored Men’s commission published a special report in the Louisianian reflecting the Circuit Court findings and conclusions. For example, in seventeen parishes outside New Orleans, a Warmoth board returned a combined total 17,698

45Kellogg v. Warmouth, 14 Fed. Cas. 257 (D. LA 1872); Marr, Report of the Committee (New Orleans, 1873), 4; Dawson, 134-142.
46Louisianian, 27 August 1871; New Orleans Republican, 11 November 1872.
Fusion votes to 14,518 Republican votes. However, the parishes contained a combined population of 67,570 whites to 145,220 blacks, 15-18,000 of whom were deprived of the right to vote. As the report indicated, more than enough black votes remained to produce a Republican majority. During a stopover at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1873, Superintendent Brown in an interview with the *Courier-Journal*, further confided “very few of the colored people voted the Conservative ticket, while there were 10,000 white aliens in the State, who did not vote and could not do so...” \(^47\)

The legally sanctioned Lynch board certified the entire Kellogg ticket including the new legislature on December 7, 1872. With the Fusionists remaining obdurate about surrendering election returns, the board based certification on its affidavits plus data of Louisiana’s political composition. Two days thereafter, the Kellogg Legislature convened under the security of federal troops. During the proceedings, Lieutenant Governor Pinchback revealed that Warmoth offered him fifty thousand dollars to organize the legislature according to his specifications. By adjournment, the Kellogg Legislature counted among its first day accomplishments the impeachment of Warmoth and promotion of Pinchback to governor. For the time being, the Kellogg Legislature had become the Pinchback Legislature. Also for the time being, the *New Orleans Times* labeled

\(^47\) *Louisianian*, 11 January 1873; *Courier-Journal*, undated, Honorable C.C. Antoine Scrapbook, Archives, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge.
Governor Pinchback, for his part in the matter, a "graceless rascal".\textsuperscript{48}

The following day, William G. Brown along with other members of the Kellogg Administration, entered office. However, for Brown (who sensibly stayed on as editor of the \textit{Louisianian} during the period) and all concerned, the victory must have been hollow and fleeting.\textsuperscript{49} On the eleventh of December, Warmoth declared the Pinchback-Kellogg Legislature illegal (which undoubtedly must have bolstered his own decision to stay on as governor in the face of impeachment, suspension, and Pinchback assuming the governorship).\textsuperscript{50}

The illegitimacy of the Lynch board and its actions would continue to figure prominently among Fusionist charges and actions against the Republicans, notwithstanding the judgment rendered in federal circuit court. Moreover, they obtained three injunctions in state district court preventing the Lynch board from compiling or certifying returns. In an appeal to Congress, after Kellogg assumed office, Fusionists charged the Lynch board with certifying election returns they did not possess, in violation of the injunctions and the law. Other charges included taking possession of the State House allowing the legislature to organize, and the Pinchback Legislature's abolition of the Eighth District Court, the tribunal that

\textsuperscript{48}\textit{Louisianian}, 14 December 1872; Marr, \textit{Report}, (New Orleans, 1873), 19; Taylor, 246, 247; Dawson, 134-142.

\textsuperscript{49}\textit{Louisianian}, 18 January 1873; Brown remained as editor of the \textit{Louisianian} through January 25, 1873. After Brown's departure, the journal suspended publication for most of the remaining year.

\textsuperscript{50}\textit{Report of Joint Committee, 1878}, 30; Taylor, 248; Dawson, 134-142.
rendered the injunctions and issued a rule of contempt against the Lynch board.\(^{51}\)

In the meantime on December 12, President Grant recognized the legitimacy of Governor Pinchback and the Pinchback-Kellogg Legislature. Such developments apparently meant little to the Fusionists who on the same day began organization of a rival legislature and administration based on certification by one of the Warmoth-controlled Returning Boards. Consequently, in addition to William G. Brown as superintendent of public education, Robert M. Lusher also acted in the same capacity. The process of establishing dual governments was completed on January 13, 1873 with the separate, simultaneous inaugurations of both Kellogg and McEnery as governor. Regarding McEnery’s political “appointments” according to Brown, “he might as well appoint a few for Mississippi, Maine or California or China.”\(^{52}\)

As asserted by historian Joe Gray Taylor, Reconstruction in Louisiana was an era when many preferred to settle their difficulties by way of knives, pistols, or shotguns as opposed to utilizing the services of law enforcement. George Washington Williams, editor and pioneer black historian, on a later visit to New Orleans commented to Pinchback, “The religion of this section is the revolver and rifle.” Not surprisingly, the 1872 election was one such example of the times. Indeed, prior to the election, the *Louisianian* carried a message from the Congressional Republican Committee entitled “Address to Southern

\(^{51}\)Marr, (New Orleans, 1873), 18-20.

\(^{52}\)Louisianian, 14 December 1872, 18, 25, January 1873; New York Times, 14 January 1873; DuBois, 482; Taylor, 246, 248, 249; Tunnel, 171; Rodrigue, 160; McPherson, 591; Dawson, 134-142.
Republicans.” The committee rallied Republicans to be diligent and stand firm regarding their right to vote “regardless of all threats of violence.” Such an urgent message spoke volumes on the South’s postwar political climate and of the importance of Southern Republicanism to the existence of the national party.  

The outcome (or lack of outcome) concerning the 1872 election guaranteed the ascendancy of violence. Winter and spring of 1872-1873 witnessed a reign of terror settling over the state as the two rival regimes attempted to solidify their authority. The tools of their control were the Metropolitan Police, an integrated multi-parish (Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard) police-paramilitary unit deployed throughout the state and controlled by Kellogg; and the “Louisiana militia”, an unofficial body controlled by McEnery and commanded by “General” F.N. Ogden of the Crescent City Democratic Club. McEnery’s militia was illegitimate and not to be confused with the actual integrated Louisiana Militia of the time commanded by General James Longstreet. 

The two sides clashed on the evening of March 5, 1873, provoked by the attempt of the McEnery forces to take control of New Orleans’ police precincts. It should be noted that at some point before hostilities began, the McEnery forces burglarized and looted at least two firearms establishments. With the outbreak of hostilities, the
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53Louisianian, November 2, 1872; John H. Franklin, George Washington Williams, A Biography (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1985), 28; Taylor, 238.
Metropolitans held their footing and subsequently arrested sixty-five of the opposing forces, which suffered one dead and some fifteen wounded. On March 6 the McEnery government suffered a major blow when the Metropolitans took control of Odd Fellows' Hall, the official headquarters of the McEnery government and arrested members of the legislature.\textsuperscript{55}

In correspondence with McEnery's running mate D.B. Penn, Colonel David F. Boyd, Superintendent of Louisiana State University advised compromise with Kellogg. Boyd remained unconvinced of McEnery's victory. Moreover, he argued that it was not possible to have the "Fusion government" recognized by Washington D.C.\textsuperscript{56}

For New Orleans, which was the seat of the state government as well as its own local and parish government, excitement was sufficient to bring the city to a halt. Beyond the city, many parishes suffered from similar misfortunes. One of the most notorious cases occurred in Grant Parish.

In the case of Grant Parish, which was said to have a white majority, the Lynch board refrained from certifying parish officials. The citizens committee of Grant Parish subsequently claimed that five Republicans were actually elected to the parish government, including two black officials. The remaining majority were Fusionists. Former Representative J.S. Calhoun, Republican, who did not run

\textsuperscript{55}Daily Picayune, 6, 7 March 1873; George C. Rable, But There Was No Peace: The Role of Violence in the Politics of Reconstruction (Athens: University of Georgia, 1984), 125; Foner, Reconstruction, 550; Taylor, 254, 255; Dawson, 88, 89, 106, 143, 144.

\textsuperscript{56}D.F. Boyd to Col. D.B. Penn, 9 March 1873, David F. Boyd Papers, Special Collections, Louisiana State University and A&M College, Baton Rouge.
for election in 1872, ran the parish. However, the fact of
the parish courthouse being located on his property and
subsequent events pointed to his continued involvement in
the parish’s affairs.57

The installation of rival parish officials in the
capital of Colfax—named after President Grant’s vice
President fostered a race war as both sides jockeyed for
control. The situation offered a microscopic view of
postwar political realities in Louisiana: Republicans—in
this case Kellogg-appointed officials relied on the support
of local blacks, while local whites supported the opposing
interest, the Fusionists. Below the surface, there was also
evidence of conflict between Kellogg and local blacks.58

The conflict in Colfax, which centered on the
courthouse, quickly intensified after the March 25 takeover
of the building by Republicans, not including any of the
five previously noted officials. Approximately four hundred
local blacks armed themselves and drilled for the
protection and securing of the courthouse. They dug
trenches around the building and placed guards along the
pathways into town.59

Subsequently, the Fusion candidate for sheriff
assembled a posse of whites for the liberation of Colfax.
The final clash, which occurred on Easter Sunday, April 13,

57Daily Picayune, 22 May 1873; Rable, But There Was No Peace, 126-
128; Dawson, 144-147.
58Daily Picayune, 11, 16 April 1873, 22 May 1873; New York Times,
16 April 1873; Chicago Tribune, 16 April 1873; McPherson, 592; Taylor,
269; Rable, 126-128; Dawson, 144-147.
59Daily Picayune, 11, 16 April 1873, 22 May 1873; New York Times,
16 April 1873; Chicago Tribune, 16 April 1873; Taylor, 268-271; Tunnel,
189-192; McPherson, 592; Rable, 126-128; Dawson, 144-147.
1873, included the use of Enfield rifles by the Republicans and homemade missiles by the Fusionists.\textsuperscript{60}

The Colfax Massacre, which has been called the "worst single day of carnage in the history of Reconstruction," resulted in over 100 casualties, the overwhelming majority of whom were local blacks employed to maintain and protect Republican power. Ironically, the vast majority of the white Republicans who instigated the conflict such as Calhoun could not be found. The arrival of the Metropolitans and later federal troops restored a sense of order to the area. Some arrests were made and Kellogg-appointed officials were installed in office. As one could surmise, there were no school boards in Grant Parish for the years 1873 and 1874.\textsuperscript{61}

Ultimately, the final verdict in the election of 1872 was rendered not in New Orleans, but Washington D.C. Neither Congressional Committee nor federal court rendered the verdict. President Grant in a May 22, 1873, proclamation recognized the Kellogg Administration as the legitimate government of Louisiana. After another investigation, Congress in 1875 ultimately affirmed Grant’s decision, concluding that Kellogg actually possessed “a majority of the legal votes cast.”\textsuperscript{62}

Thus, the Republicans successfully took back an election that had been taken from them. Among the weapons in their effective arsenal were the Louisiana Supreme

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{60}Daily Picayune, 11, 16 April 1873, 22 May 1873; New York Times, 16 April 1873; Chicago Tribune, 16 April 1873; McPherson, 592; Rable, 126-128; Dawson, 144-147.
\textsuperscript{61}Daily Picayune, 16 April; 22 May 1873; New York Times; Chicago Tribune; Annual Reports, 1873-1875; Taylor, 271; McPherson, 592; Foner, 550; Dawson, 144-147.
\textsuperscript{62}Daily Picayune, 22 May 1873; New York Times, 23 May 1873; Chicago Tribune, 23 May 1873; The Louisiana Adjustment (New Orleans, 1875), 12, 33; Tunnel, 171, 172; Stampp, 193; Rodrigue, 160.
\end{footnotesize}
Court, the federal courts, the President’s brother-in-law, and the President himself. As asserted by one historian however, the election of 1872 was to be a “costly and barren victory. . . .Kellogg would rule the corpse of Republican Louisiana.” However, as a result of this settlement, William G. Brown was truly the state’s officially recognized Superintendent of Public Education.  

* * * * * * * *

In the midst of political turbulence, William G. Brown celebrated a major personal milestone. Just prior to the election, on October 22, 1872, he was married in New Orleans to Ms. Catherine Murchison, a native of Louisiana. Henceforth, the couple entered the social circle, attending and hosting engagements during Reconstruction.  

---

63 Tunnel, 171, 172.  
64 Orleans Parish Marriage Certificates, 1872, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge; Louisianaian, 1870-1882.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUPERINTENDENT WILLIAM G. BROWN, 1872-1876

Superintendent William G. Brown entered public office December 10, 1872, amidst the political turmoil of Louisiana. His earliest act was the formation of his administration. Superintendent Brown presented his commission to the State Board of Education on January 5, 1873.¹

Brown maintained the external features of the system implemented by Conway. As a result of term expirations administrative offices from division superintendent to board school director were due to be filled, which necessarily involved the reorganization of the State Board of Education and most school boards. One source of continuity between the Conway and Brown administrations was the Reverend M.C. Cole, Secretary of the State Superintendent. Cole also served as secretary of the New Orleans University Board of Trustees and lecturer in the university’s Theological Department. Immediately upon assuming office, Brown offered to retain Cole in his secretarial capacity.²

During March 1873, Superintendent Brown nominated P.M. Williams—First Division, George B. Loud—Third Division, and Charles W. Keating—Fourth Division as division

¹Minutes of the State Board of Education, 6 January 1873, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge.
superintendents. Brown retained E.S. Stoddard—Second Division, a member of the previous board. The new State Board of Education convened March 31 and M.C. Cole was elected Secretary of the State Board. During the July session the Board accepted the commissions of James Brewster—Fifth Division, and Captain Charles W. Boothby—Sixth Division as superintendents.

With the exception of James Brewster, all were previously connected to education. P.M. Williams, a black Dartmouth graduate was a former Normal Department principal and mathematics professor at Straight University. Williams was also a former teacher in both Freedmen’s Bureau schools and New Orleans public schools. He had previously taught in the North for twenty-six years. In 1875 T. Morris Chester replaced Williams, who retired from public education. E.S. Stoddard as Superintendent of the Second Division had been a member of the previous Board. Stoddard had also been a teacher, then superintendent of Freedmen’s Bureau schools in New Orleans.

George B. Loud was an Educational Convention secretary and former member of the Iberville Parish Board of School

---

3Generally, during the Brown Administration, Fourth and Fifth Divisions comprised the parishes associated with North and Central Louisiana, while South Louisiana parishes were represented by the First, Second, Third, and Sixth Divisions.

4Minutes, State Board, 31 March, 14 July 1873. Superintendents Stoddard, Loud, Keating, and Boothby were white. While the race of Superintendent Brewster is unknown, he is assumed to be white.

5Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education, William G. Brown to the General Assembly of Louisiana For the Year 1875 (New Orleans: Republican Office, 1876), 36; Richardson, 132; Morris, 23, 107, 111, 112; Blassingame, 129; Rankin, 123. Chester, a black Pennsylvanian studied law in England and was a Civil War correspondent. See R.J.M. Blackett, ed. Thomas Morris Chester, Black Civil War Correspondent: His Dispatches from the Virginia Front (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1989).

6Annual Report, 1873, 9, 10, 423; Ibid., 1875, 31, 32.
Directors. Charles W. Keating received the original Republican nomination for State Superintendent in 1872, and was a former member of the Caddo Parish Board. Charles W. Boothby was an Educational Convention delegate, New Orleans University trustee, and former member of the New Orleans Board. By July 14, the State Board began appointing boards of school directors after division superintendents visited their divisions and gathered names of suitable persons for school director. 7

During the Brown Administration, State Board of Education standing committees were as follows: Finance, Claims and Bonds; Rules and Regulations; Appeals and Complaints; Textbooks and School Furniture (eventually dissolved); Teachers Institutes and Educational Conventions; and Model Grammar and High Schools. Special committees included the Educational Journal and the Commemoration Medal committees. 8

* * * * * * *

Unfortunately the economic outlook was just as troubled as the political outlook during Brown’s superintendency. The Depression of 1873 seriously affected the entire country. Additionally, Governor Kellogg painted himself a fiscal conservative and favored retrenchment policies. Moreover, there was also an active tax resistance movement against the Kellogg Government. To what extent each factor individually affected educational spending is
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7 New Orleans Republican, 24 May 1872, 7 September 1873; Annual Report, 1873, 9, 10, 423; Ibid., 1875, 32-34. 8 Minutes, State Board, 14, 16 July 1873. For the educational journal committee proposal see Appendix B.
difficult to ascertain. Collectively the presence of such indicators meant definite limitations to the educational budget.9

Superintendent Brown made his first report to the legislature January 29, 1873. By nature, the report was based on the work of Superintendent Conway’s final year of office. Brown’s analysis demonstrated the inadequacy of total school revenue in funding schools of Orleans Parish alone. He also made the point that although the credit of the state kept the schools going, over the previous three years teachers went unpaid and rent monies for use of school buildings were neglected. In addition, bills for fuel, books, and supplies went unsettled.10

He utilized the address of Reverend M.W. Reed given at the 1872 Educational Convention to reiterate the obligation of the state to provide for its children. Brown saw this as the first duty of the legislature. Consequently, he called for an increase of the state millage. Levying a tax of five mills on all taxable property of the state as opposed to two mills would produce gross revenue of $1,255,000 for education. He also recommended grouping revenues designated for education into a new “public school fund.” According to Brown, such was necessary to “at once lift the public schools of the State out of embarrassment and establish them on an enduring basis.”11

---

9Inaugural Address of Governor Wm. Pitt Kellogg to the General Assembly of Louisiana, January 13, 1873 (New Orleans: Republican, 1873), 7, 8; Annual Message of His Excellency Governor Wm. Pitt Kellogg to the General Assembly of Louisiana, Session of 1874 (New Orleans: Republican, 1874), 23-27.


In January 1874 Brown issued his first full report to the legislature for the year 1873. As there were no improvements in funding, the 1873 report continued the fiscal analysis offered the previous year, and set the tone for his remaining reports. Typically, annual reports during the Brown Administration were educational treatises, usually over four or five hundred pages in length with tables of content and indices. Brown always utilized tables to illustrate the system’s financial standing.\textsuperscript{12}

For 1873, Brown reported the educable population as 272,334. Of this number, a total of 57,433 were enrolled in 864 schools operating in 483 districts.\textsuperscript{13} The state employed 1,467 teachers, over 500 more than the previous year and disbursed over $551,000 in teachers’ wages. Total revenue approached $700,000, which equated to twelve dollars per child. However, to educate half of the educable population would require revenue of $1,500,000. To meet the deficit between current and proposed funding, Brown recommended increasing state millage to four mills on the taxable property of the state, a reduction from the previous recommendation.\textsuperscript{14}

By 1874 under Brown’s management, the system began exhibiting greater financial solvency. Total revenue approached $800,000, or an increase of more than $110,000 compared to the previous year’s budget. Besides a marked increase in state apportionment, Brown started the school year with increased balances on hand, a result of his strenuous efforts to increase accountability. Consequently, greater diligence exhibited by division superintendents

\textsuperscript{12}Annual Report, 1873, 11-14.
\textsuperscript{13}During the Brown Administration, annual reports did not enumerate students or teachers by race.
\textsuperscript{14}Annual Report, 1873, 11-14.
rendered an improvement in the management of school funds. For example, receipts from former school board treasurers were more than double the total of the previous year.\textsuperscript{15}

As Brown reported, the financial condition of the system was "fully adequate to maintain the schools established and in some localities to open others." A total of 1,039 schools operated in 474 schools district. The number of teachers increased to 1,494. Total state expenditure for teachers' salaries amounted to over $600,000, an approximately $50,000 increase over the previous year. The educable population increased to 280,387. The number of children enrolled for 1874 was 74,309, an increase of over 16,000 from the previous year. Educational spending equated to eleven dollars per child. However, as Brown pointed out, over 145,000 of the educable population was still unaccounted for, "growing up in ignorance, a crushing weight and hindrance to the prosperity of the state."\textsuperscript{16}

Also of budgetary significance, Brown in the 1874 report included a table compiled by Superintendent Stoddard of flood damage wrought in the Second Division bordering New Orleans. Heavy rains in April 1874 swelled the rivers, lakes, and bayous of Louisiana, placing additional strains on the state budget and assets. The flood of 1874 also imposed tremendous pressures on the levee system. Levee overflow and crevasse--levee breaches, inundated twenty-three parishes outside New Orleans. New Orleans (Orleans Parish) also flooded but averted disaster. As could be

\textsuperscript{16} Annual Report, 1874, 9-13.
expected, in some areas of the state, the 1874 academic term was shorter than during the previous year.  

According to Superintendent Brown, the flood “affected disastrously the school interests in every division of the State.” Stoddard’s report of the Second Division alone illustrated over $1 million in submerged property, an estimated state revenue loss of approximately $45,000. School revenue loss amounted to greater than $6,000. The grand total of estimated damage in the division exceeded $2.2 million.

The year 1875 saw the alienation of close to $200,000, nearly one-third of school revenue, by joint legislative committee. Superintendent Brown requested restoration of funds, which had been diverted to various towns and Charity Hospital in New Orleans. With the increased operating expenses of 1874, the 1875 budget was over $89,000 short of the 1874 budget and mirrored that of 1873. According to Brown, the present budget was not enough to keep the entire system open. However, at the time Brown submitted the 1875 annual report, January 1876, the system was still in operation.

For 1875, the educable population remained constant. However, in Louisiana’s 473 school districts a total of 74,846 students were enrolled in 1,032 schools at a cost of $9.40 per child, a net gain of 546 students while per child expenditures declined by $1.60. New Orleans schools operated a total of ten months, while outside of New Orleans the average was three and a half months. According to Brown, the improved reputation of the system played a
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17Daily Picayune, 7-28 April 1874; Louisianian, 18 March 1875; Annual Report, 1874, 43-47.
18Annual Report, 1874, 43-47; Louisianian, 18 March 1875.
19Annual Report, 1875, 1-8.
significant role in enabling him to keep schools open. As school boards successfully attracted better quality teachers, they were able to cut back on exorbitant teacher salaries, thus enabling them to pay less for good teachers. The system employed a total of 1,557 teachers—797 males and 760 females, an increase in the teaching corps by sixty-three. As Brown remarked, teachers’ salaries were determined not by gender but by the grade they occupied. The state average monthly salary was $37, while in New Orleans the maximum was $125. Total state expenditure for teachers’ salaries declined to approximately $573,000, representing a difference of $27,000 compared to the previous year.\(^20\)

An additional consideration in keeping schools open included school boards becoming “desirable lessees” as a result of their increased integrity in paying rents for school buildings. However, improved stature could not overcome stark reality. Specifically in New Orleans (Sixth Division), operating under a shortfall of some $77,600, the school board was forced to pay teachers in certificates of indebtedness (school certificates) earlier than usual.\(^21\)

In reality, the New Orleans Board was debt-ridden through both the Conway and Brown Administrations. By the end of 1876, the board had accumulated at least a half-million dollar insolvency. As a retrenchment measure, both the State and New Orleans boards had earlier deliberated closing high schools and adding a grade to the grammar schools.\(^22\)

\(^{20}\)Louisianian, 24 August 1875; Annual Report, 1875, 1-8.
\(^{21}\)Annual Report, 1875, 1-8; Daily Picayune, 1874-1875.
\(^{22}\)Daily Picayune, 29 December 1874; Louisianian, 24 April 1875; Joint Committee of Investigation, 1878, 61.
The necessity of leasing schoolhouses contributed at least in part to the insolvency of the New Orleans Board. In 1873, out of seventy-five school buildings, thirty-eight were owned by the city and thirty-seven rented by the board. For the school year 1873-1874 alone, the board expended some $37,000 in rent, comprising eighty-six percent of the total state leasing expenditure for schoolhouses.23

Overall, Superintendent Brown felt the need for schoolhouses was one of the state’s greatest embarrassments:

With the exception of a few buildings in New Orleans and one or two of the older towns in the interior of the State, we have no school buildings worthy the name. Of the school houses in this city, even the best of them would not be tolerated in any city or large town at the North any longer than to give time to erect others...24

Pontchartrain Boys and Girls School in New Orleans, located near Lake Pontchartrain was plagued with frequent flooding and needed numerous repairs. In 1875 the division superintendent claimed that unless such repairs were made, “the building will probably be found floating on the lake.”25

Schoolhouse construction was primarily a responsibility of the local governments. As Superintendent Brown observed, availability or general maintenance of buildings was not always assured: “Scholars, for want of buildings, have been taught under trees, and in buildings (rather sheds) that had no doors, windows or floors.”26

---

23Annual Report, 1873, 12, 278, 279.
24Annual Report, 1873, 14, 15.
25Annual Report, 1875, 175.
26Ibid., 1873, 14, 15.
Still, there were a number of above-average schoolhouses in the state with some considered exemplary. In New Orleans, Division Superintendent Boothby considered Madison Girls, St. Philip, and Barracks Street Schools exceptions to the schoolhouse rule. Outside of New Orleans, respective superintendents commended the Kelso School in the town of Alexandria; Wharton Union School in the town of Plaquemine; the Hahnville School in St. Charles Parish, and the Live Oak School in St. John the Baptist Parish for the quality of buildings.²⁷

Existing schools whether owned or leased were generally constructed of log, frame, or brick. Most schoolhouses utilized fireplaces or iron stoves for heating with coal or wood as the chief fuel source. New Orleans schools burned coal, while outside of New Orleans wood was primarily used. Median annual heating costs over a three-year period, 1873-1875 amounted to approximately $31,000. Generally, schoolhouses were equipped with wells or cisterns as water sources and utilized privy houses as restroom facilities. In New Orleans, the Sanitary and Excavating Company periodically treated privy vaults at a total expense of some $15,000 over the 1873-1875 period.²⁸

Compared to buildings specifically constructed as schoolhouses, leased buildings were usually ill suited for schooling, having been built for other purposes and often posed health hazards. Churches were the most common buildings leased for school purposes. Yet there were numerous exceptions. For example, the Beauregard Girls

²⁷Annual Reports, 1873, 1875.
²⁸Annual Reports, 1872-1875; Beasley, 242, 243.
School in New Orleans was originally a coffeehouse, a fact not satisfactory to the City Board of Health.\(^{29}\)

Superintendent Brown advised local authorities throughout the state to construct schoolhouses to give the children “all the facilities for education that our public school system is expected to furnish.” Over the 1873-1875 period he presided over the construction of two hundred thirteen schools located mainly outside New Orleans in the Fourth and Fifth Divisions, where the need for schoolhouses was even more acute.\(^{30}\) Despite the recent flood damage, by 1875, as a result of the increase in new school buildings, Brown succeeded in cutting overall school repair costs by thirty percent. However, school rent expenditures declined by merely eight percent from the previous year, a reflection of flood damages and the general need for school facilities.\(^{31}\)

As mentioned in a previous chapter, a major responsibility of the State Board of Education included choice of school furniture. Superintendent Brown and the division superintendents placed a premium on quality furnishings. In 1873, after a rigorous evaluation and examination of various manufacturers, the State Board endorsed Excelsior School Furniture of Cincinnati, Ohio, as “superior to all others.” During the Brown Administration, Excelsior was a major supplier of school furnishings to Louisiana. Over the 1873-1875 period, estimated value of

\(^{29}\)Annual Reports, 1872-1875; Annual Report, 1873, 278-280; Beasley, 242, 243.  
\(^{30}\)The largest numbers of schoolhouses were constructed in the Fifth Division—72, which was followed by the Fourth Division—59. The First Division constructed 48 schoolhouses of which 42 were located in Livingston Parish.  
\(^{31}\)Annual Report, 1873, 14, 15; Annual Reports 1873-1875.
school furniture holdings increased from approximately $77,000 to $97,000.\textsuperscript{32}

During the Brown Administration, major changes also transpired at the office of the State Superintendent. In April 1874, the legislature in an effort to centralize the location of state offices and economize rent expenditures at the state level, purchased the St. Louis Hotel over Governor Kellogg’s veto. The elegant and plush St. Louis, which occupied a city block and had once served as a slave market, became the official State House, superseding Mechanics’ Institute.\textsuperscript{33}

Previously, the State Superintendent’s office at 166 Julia Street was one of many state offices leasing space away from the old State House. The office cost an annual rent expenditure of $1000 and apparently failed to supply the ambience expected of an executive state administrative post. According to Superintendent Conway, at the time of his election in 1868, the superintendent’s office was “worthy of exhibition in a museum of curiosities.” It consisted of two record books, a borrowed chair “with the bottom almost entirely worn away,” borrowed desks and a single inkstand and penholder. “There was nothing in the superintendent’s office to indicate what had been done, or what there was to do.”\textsuperscript{34}

Previous superintendents had called for a more adequate office, but the appeal went unheeded. Effective

\textsuperscript{32}Minutes, State Board, 16 July 1873; Annual Reports, 1873-1875.  
\textsuperscript{34}New Orleans Republican 25 May 1872; Annual Reports, 1872-1874; Soards’ New Orleans Directory, 1875 (New Orleans: Soards & Co., 1874), 167; Honorable C.C. Antoine Scrapbook.
1874, the State Superintendent’s office consisted of several rooms on the second floor of the new State House in which Superintendent Brown convened the State Board as well as transacted educational affairs specific to the superintendency. 35

* * * * * * *

As mentioned earlier, Superintendent Brown beginning in 1872 labored to develop greater fiscal accountability. His initial proposal concerned an amendment authorizing division superintendents to audit accounts of school board treasurers. The proposal further designated the state superintendent the final authority in settling treasurer’s accounts. Indeed, one of the State Board’s first exercises during the Brown Administration was the settlement of over $9500 in unpaid teachers’ claims in St. Landry, St. Martin, and Iberville Parishes (Third Division). Brown and State Board attorney E. Filleuel also considered various possibilities of contending with the legislature for restoration of the Free School Fund. According to Brown, “No greater wrong was ever perpetrated by any legislative body.” 36

In the 1873 annual report, Brown expressed himself at length on the issue of financial culpability as one of the causes that prejudiced and destroyed confidence in the system. He argued that bringing offenders to justice was a shared responsibility of all state and local authorities. Brown further criticized then current efforts as merely

---

35 Daily Picayune 16 April 1874; Annual Report, 1875, 51.
designating crimes and criminals, which would continue until the public denounced all crimes and those who committed them:

Intelligent and honest administrators are not secured by shouting “venal, ignorant black men and carpet-baggers,” when venal, ignorant white men (not carpet-baggers), are as frequently found. No, all venality and crime, in whites as well as blacks, in high as well as low places, must meet with censure and opprobrium at all times and in all places, in order to be made odious, and to enable the authorities to arrest, convict, and punish the guilty. 37

During his term, Superintendent Brown immediately prosecuted cases of corruption of various school boards and officials. In 1873 he recommended that the State Board indict the St. Charles Parish Board (Second Division) on charges of incompetence and criminal neglect of duty. The entire affair stemmed from the board’s failure to prosecute a delinquent tax collector who withheld school monies. The board’s inaction according to Brown was “prima facie evidence of indifference or unfitness for the trust confided to it.” In another case, the Sabine Parish Board (Fourth Division) received monies but did not establish schools. Upon being notified of the situation, Brown in correspondence to the President and Secretary of the board requested an account of the board’s expenditures. Apparently Brown was successful in increasing accountability. In March 1874, the Picayune claimed, “Not a single dollar has been misapplied or embezzled since the

37Annual Report, 1873, 16, 17.
reorganization of the parish boards under the present administration.”

Superintendent Brown’s goal of increasing accountability ultimately led to contention with former Superintendent Conway. In 1871, the legislature placed Franklin College in Opelousas, Louisiana, (Third Division) under State Board jurisdiction and appropriated $6,000 to the Board for repairing and refitting the institution for normal or high school use. The State Auditor’s report of 1872 listed under ‘outstanding warrants’ the Franklin College appropriation. Upon learning of the situation in which no repairs were made, Brown investigated and submitted the matter to the State Board.

The State Board authorized Brown to take legal recourse for the protection and recovery of the appropriations. Superintendent Brown met with Conway, then residing in New Jersey and secured a promise to settle the matter. After writing Conway in September and the passage of almost three months without response or settlement, Brown removed himself from any further negotiations:

After the lapse of many months of deliberation and effort over the Franklin College affair, and observing that I have hitherto utterly failed to effect any adjustment of the matter as I hoped . . . I have therefore to announce that I wash my hands of any connection with any compromise. The path of safety for

---


39Louisianian, 2 April 1871; Minutes, State Board, 18 July 1873; Vaughn, 92.
me will be the one of duty, and the responsibility of complications or of trouble must rest with yourself.\(^{40}\)

Superintendent Conway, prior to any renovations had allegedly drawn the six warrants from the state treasury in 1872 before leaving office. After leaving New Orleans with the outstanding warrants, Conway allegedly sold them at an unknown rate of discount.\(^{41}\)

Conway maintained that a State Board committee drew three warrants, which were redeemed by an unscrupulous broker who withheld the proceeds. The remaining warrants were allegedly stolen during Conway’s illness and recovered in May 1873, through lawsuit. Conway subsequently sold the remaining warrants to cover legal expenses. By September 1873, he arranged with Governor Kellogg to make restitution.\(^ {42}\)

Conway’s November 26 reply to Brown, maintained that he was still attempting to raise the money, which included mortgaging furniture and his late wife’s piano. According to Conway, he previously failed at cashing a second mortgage on his property. In closing, Conway informed Brown of his arrangements to purchase the warrants and requested that Brown “avoid mention” of the matter in his report.\(^ {43}\)

By December 1873, all six warrants had been paid into the state treasury, and were listed as ‘cancelled.’ However, in part due to the depression, the warrants had depreciated to less than half of their original worth. Instead of $6000, the treasury contained a $2000 certified


\(^{43}\)Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 33, 34; Vaughn, 92.
check from Conway in settlement of the Franklin College account. However Superintendent Brown later denied that the
check settled the claim, which was also denied by M.C. Cole, Secretary for the State Superintendent and State
Board. The situation deadlocked for the remainder of the Brown Administration. During a subsequent legislative
investigation in 1877 of both Brown and Conway administrations, the investigative committee charged former
Superintendent Conway the outstanding balance of $4000 in liquidating the Franklin College claim. The committee also
listed the balance as a total loss.44

During his tenure, Superintendent Brown presided over
the restoration of the McDonogh Educational Fund. The fund
was named after benefactor and millionaire John McDonogh,
the “patron saint of public education in New Orleans.” In
the 1875 annual report, Brown compiled an extensive history
of McDonogh. McDonogh, who was known in life as a notorious
miser, died in 1850 leaving behind detailed instructions
bequeathing his enormous 610,000 acre estate to New Orleans
and his native Baltimore, Maryland, for the establishing
and support of free schools in both cities for the poor “of
all classes and castes of color.”45 As stated by McDonogh
through his will:

I was laboring and had labored all my life, not
for myself but for them and their children. . . .
The plan which my mind formed (influenced, I
trust, by the Divine spirit), and has pursued for near
forty years, to accumulate and get together a large
estate in lands, lots of ground in and near the city,
houses, etc., for the education of the poor, will, in

45Annual Report, 1875, 53-73; Grace King, New Orleans: The Place
and the People (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 362-370; G. Leighton
Ciravolo, The Legacy of John McDonogh (Lafayette: University of
Louisiana, 2002), 9-11; Devore and Logsdon, 33, 54; Baker, 15, 16.
time, I doubt not, yield a revenue sufficient to educate all the poor of the two States of Louisiana and Maryland. . . .

McDonogh stipulated that students would be instructed “in the knowledge of the Lord,” and subjects such as reading, writing, arithmetic, history, and geography.

The McDonogh estate alone was valued at roughly $1.5 million in 1850. The fund was detained for eight years as a result of litigation involving familial beneficiaries, legal counsel, land surveyors, and executors. The Louisiana Supreme Court in 1858 approved a partition plan between the cities of New Orleans and Baltimore. Thus, the estate, which had depreciated to half of its value, was sold against the original intentions of McDonogh. The Court apportioned sale proceeds to the two cities. New Orleans through the McDonogh Educational Fund received $704,440 from which four schools were built. During 1861-1862, city officials misappropriated some half-million dollars of the fund to protect New Orleans against Union invasion. The Civil War, subsequent litigation, and mismanagement further devaluated the McDonogh holdings.

Superintendent Brown’s public acknowledgement of the McDonogh Fund first appeared in the 1873 annual report based on information compiled by Superintendent C.W. Boothby of the Sixth Division. Privately, Brown and Kellogg also discussed the fund. Boothby’s report initially made to the State Board of Education highlighted Confederate abuse

---

47 Annual Report, 1875, 53-73.
48 Annual Report, 1875, 53-73; Ciravolo, 12-14, 21, 22; King, 362-370; Devore and Logsdon, 33, 54.
of the fund and recommended legislative action extending the city debt for restoration of the amount misappropriated.\footnote{William G. Brown to William P. Kellogg, 26 December 1873; Annual Report, 1873, 17.}

An 1874 United States Supreme Court decision rendered additional fund monies to New Orleans and Baltimore. New Orleans authorities also remunerated some $29,000 in fund money to the McDonogh Fund Commission, which commenced the planning of five new school facilities. At the April 1875 State Board session, Superintendent Boothby offered a resolution thanking New Orleans Mayor Louis Wiltz and fund commissioners J. Calhoun and Louis Schneider for their efforts.\footnote{New Orleans Republican, 13 April 1875; Annual Report, 1875, 53, 73; Devore and Logsdon, 73, 76, 310; Ciravolo, 12-14, 21, 22.}

All five structures, designed largely by architects William Freret, son of a former New Orleans mayor, or C.L. Hilger, were completed by January 1876. The new buildings as in the original schoolhouses constructed in 1861, were all brick multi-storied facilities. They were certainly among the best school buildings Louisiana had to offer, many boasting such modern features as central heating, expandable teachers rooms, sliding doors, multiple stairwells, and indoor plumbing.\footnote{Annual Report, 1875, 177-181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 193, 195, 197, 198; Devore and Logsdon, 73, 76, 310.}

One of the original schools constructed in 1861 was named for benefactor John McDonogh. Beginning in 1875, as proudly noted by Superintendent Brown, all schools generated by the fund were named after McDonogh and numbered in order of their completion. Before the end of the Brown Administration, three more schools were slated for construction at least one of which was completed in
1877. Ultimately, during the following century an excess of thirty-five New Orleans schools would be generated by the fund, thus far the largest private bequest made to public education in the city.\textsuperscript{52}

As Superintendent of Public Education, Brown took a comprehensive approach, evincing interest in all things educational, public and private. Naturally the Peabody Fund still managed by Lusher fell within the purview of Brown's educational concerns. However, numerous obstacles to friendly co-existence were present: the obvious conflict between Lusher and Conway, the animosity of Peabody officials towards Louisiana's public school system, Lusher's hatred of blacks, and Brown's own recent political victory over Lusher. Nevertheless, Brown earnestly requested that Lusher submit a statement concerning the fund to be included in the 1873 annual report.\textsuperscript{53}

Lusher's response was less than diplomatic:

To Mr. William G. Brown, occupying the office of State Superintendent of Public Education for Louisiana:

Sir—Your letter of the thirty-first ultimo has been received and filed for future reference.

After it shall have been proven by equally truthful and legal evidence that you are entitled by election to possession of the office of State Superintendent, the undersigned will consider the propriety of giving you the information solicited of his courtesy.

As long, however, as you remain a beneficiary of the \textit{prima facie} fraud and actual usurpation by which the liberties of the people of Louisiana have been sacrificed . . . no self-respecting citizen of the

\textsuperscript{52}Annual Report, 1875, 53, 73; Ciravolo, 14, 33, 49, 55; Devore and Logsdon, 103.

State can deem it an honor to appear in your “annual report” as an auxiliary in the compilation of educational statistics.\footnote{Annual Report, 1873, 31, 32.}

The amount of self-respect nurtured by Lusher is unknown. Still, he appeared in Brown’s annual report. Unable to obtain any useful information on the management of the fund, Brown published Lusher’s response as a manifestation of the Peabody Fund in Louisiana.\footnote{Annual Report, 1873, 31, 32.} Superintendent Brown regretted that Lusher had nothing better to say of his management of the fund than the letter’s contents, which according to Brown displayed the agent in an “unenviable light” in contrast to his reputation. Brown himself had previously expressed a desire to view the fund more positively after the severe criticisms made by Conway.\footnote{Annual Report, 1873, 31, 32.}

As major educational providers in their own right, the Roman Catholic Church’s general opposition at the time to public education was well established. Thus, Louisiana with its large, diverse Catholic population, added another dimension to the difficulties encountered by public education: religion—a fact recognized by Superintendent Brown. Nevertheless, Brown forwarded a request for relevant educational statistics to the Monseigneur Napoleon J. Perché, Archbishop of New Orleans. Judging from Brown’s reports of the period, information concerning Catholic educational efforts, like the schools, remained private.\footnote{William G. Brown to Monseigneur Napoleon J. Perché, Archbishop of New Orleans, 31 October 1873, Letter Copy Book, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge; \textit{Louisianian} 24 August 1875.}
While maintaining the structural integrity of Conway’s system, Superintendent Brown aimed to perfect the system’s operation and efficiency. Consequently, his administrative style was central to achieving desired outcomes. During an 1875 session, in commending the State Board for its work, Brown also gave evidence of his style of management:

The selection of suitable persons to constitute parish boards has been, as usual, a difficult task. I have sympathized with you in your endeavors to select what I think you believed to be the best material. Giving you each credit for singleness of purpose, a sincere desire to subserve the interest of popular education, I have purposely, to a great extent, subordinated my own judgment on some of your recommendations and deferred to your preferences. I am aware that this does not in any manner relieve me of the measure of responsibility attached to my position, but it devolves the full quota on each respective coadjutor, as it also furnishes the opportunity for the exhibition of such qualities as either commend or do not commend to popular esteem. . . .

An earlier exhibit of Brown’s managerial style concerned an individual member of the State Board. In 1873, Superintendent George B. Loud was indicted on thirty-eight counts of embezzlement. The offenses were allegedly committed while Loud was treasurer of the Iberville Parish Board of School Directors. Loud was subsequently jailed without bond.

After Loud’s incarceration, Superintendent Brown was pressured to appoint a successor. The Republican quoted his response, as “Very well, I’ll keep his office ‘till he is out of jail.” In the 1875 annual

---

58Louisianian, 24 April 1875.
59New Orleans Republican, 7 September 1873.
report, Brown explained that he was satisfied of Loud’s innocence. Brown further explained that unless substantial proof of Loud’s guilt was furnished it was his duty not to contribute to Loud’s injuries by removing him from office. Loud’s subsequent acquittal, Brown concluded, was a “sufficient indorsement of the course pursued.” As seen in the foregoing examples, it is clear that Superintendent Brown demonstrated a consultative, occasionally democratic style of administration; he placed confidence in his personnel, and expected them to perform their duties.\textsuperscript{60}

Superintendent Brown utilized State Board sessions to suggest topics for legislative action. One of Brown’s concerns brought before the State Board and approved for submission to the legislature was the responsible administration of school lands. In response to numerous past exigencies he took measures to prevent further damage and alienation of school lands. He recommended estoppels of school land sales until property could be re-surveyed, appraised, and documented. Sales would commence only after a code for the control, sale, renting, and investment of funds accruing from school lands was implemented.\textsuperscript{61}

He also argued for centralizing the control of lands in a state agency and creating a state superintendent of school lands. This officer would be a member of the State Board and empowered with sufficient authority to protect school interests. The legislature responded with Act 122 of 1874, authorizing the State Superintendent of Public Education to appoint division superintendents of school


\textsuperscript{61}\textit{Minutes, State Board}, 27 January 1874; \textit{Annual Report}, 1873, 32, 33.
lands. Implicitly, the legislature also voted confidence in Brown as the State Superintendent of School Lands and he now added the role of chief school lands officer to his many duties.\textsuperscript{62}

By the time of the 1875 annual report, Superintendent Brown had appointed A.E. Livaudais, Esq.—First Division, O. McLeran—Second Division, and J.B. Slatterly—Fourth Division as Superintendents of School Lands. He noted the difficulty of procuring not only persons with the proper qualifications and legal credentials, but also persons willing to accept the position. He requested an appropriation of $5,000 from the legislature to efficiently organize an office of school lands.

Brown also called for a provision to convene school lands superintendents as often as advisable to adopt a uniform mode of protecting the rights of the state. In the interest of propriety, Brown recommended that the legislature cover all expenses of travel, maps, land transcripts, as well as clerical and legal expenses of school lands officers. He also requested a transcript of all school lands donated by the general government to the state.\textsuperscript{63}

Concerning school lands management, Superintendent Brown uncovered much neglect and necessity for improvement, thus underscoring his recommendations and vindicating the urgent appeals of earlier superintendents. School Lands Superintendent Livaudais of the First Division made the following observation of Plaquemines Parish adjoining West Bank New Orleans:

---


\textsuperscript{63}\textit{Annual Report, 1875}, 37-39.
The school lands in the parish of Plaquemines are so located in the rear swamps and bayous, with the exception of such as I will refer to hereafter, that no possible revenue or advantage can be derived therefrom. Such as could have been disposed of on advantageous terms have, since the twenty-third of March, 1874, been leased to various parties by the police jury of Plaquemines. . . .

In the Fifth Division, St. Joseph, the seat of Tensas Parish was established on school land still owned by the state. Once discovered by the Tensas Board, the State Board brokered a settlement with the local police jury, which compensated several thousand dollars into the school fund.

As witnessed with school lands, Superintendent Brown placed a premium on proper organization and record keeping. Brown extended this concept to every aspect of system management, including the schools themselves. He placed the weight and responsibility for correct and accurate school records on the school boards. He instructed school boards to record every item of interest. School board secretaries should have board reports ready to be submitted to division superintendents.

Brown’s position was that teachers should be required to make proper monthly reports to be furnished to school boards at the close of each month’s tuition. Payment of teachers should be withheld until reports were made. School boards should ascertain at meetings whether or not teachers’ reports were made and board secretaries should be required to transcribe reports into record books supplied by the state superintendent.

---

64 Annual Report, 1875, 37–39.
65 Annual Report, 1875, 37–39
66 Annual Report, 1873, 44, 45.
According to Brown, such actions in turn would enable division superintendents to prepare correct statistical returns for their reports to the State Board of Education. Accurate information would also eliminate the two to three month period required for division superintendents to compile necessary material.67

Upon the recommendation of Superintendent Brown, the New Orleans Board in June 1873 fired Mrs. K.R. Shaw, the principal of Girls High School—Upper Division, for insubordination.68 The entire affair was a vivid example of the intersection between race, politics, and education although the lines of delineation between the three areas were not always clear.

The termination stemmed in part from Shaw’s consistent negligence in submitting specific reports to Brown’s office. He paid a visit to the school to obtain the information. When Brown arrived, Shaw was engaged in examinations. Brown introduced himself, to which Shaw did not reply. The principal’s behavior according to Brown was “contumacious.” After the elapse of a few seconds, Brown “took a chair” in the front of the classroom for the remainder of the class, approximately an hour. As Brown observed, Shaw resumed her examinations.69

During the visit Brown also observed two other classes and was “politely received and immediately invited to sit by the respective teachers.” At the end of his call, he returned to Shaw’s room to accomplish the objective of his visit. However Shaw was not to be found, Brown having also

67Annual Report, 1873, 44, 45.
68Mrs. Shaw was white.
enlisted the assistance of a school portress in finding her. According to Brown, “she had left the room and building . . .” He subsequently left a message for Shaw with a Mrs. Richardson, a teacher who treated him “very courteously.”

Brown also maintained he was “credibly informed” that the reason for the dereliction of duties was that Shaw did not acknowledge him as Superintendent. Shaw later argued that she simply did not recognize Brown during the visit.

In correspondence to Superintendent C.W. Boothby after the visit, Brown expressed satisfaction in appropriate measures being taken to prevent such actions from recurring in the future:

> I have every confidence that the city school board will promptly adopt measures that will rebuke the spirit of such intolerance and effectually prevent the repetition of such conduct in this school and secure as a negative example to all the schools of the city and State apprehending as they must the demoralization and injury necessarily resulting from immunity from penalties for . . . defiance of official superiors. . . .

Academic soundness and integrity were necessarily paramount to Brown’s accountability campaign. Superintendent Brown believed that fewer schools of acknowledged character and efficiency were better than “many of inferior grade that cannot command the respect and support of the community that patronizes them.” Thus he utilized the services of a corps of teachers—
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70 William G. Brown to C.W. Boothby, 20 June 1873.
71 Ibid., 20 June 1873; Daily Picayune, 27 June 1873.
72 William G. Brown to C.W. Boothby, 20 June 1873.
schoolmistresses and schoolmasters, in which many were educated locally or abroad.\textsuperscript{73}

Just prior to the Brown Administration, Northern religious agencies such as the American Missionary Association (AMA), at times in conjunction with the Freedmen’s Bureau provided trained white and black instructors from outside Louisiana. During the Conway and Brown administrations, they were joined by local whites who were often graduates of institutions such as New Orleans Normal or the Normal Department of Louisiana State Seminary. Others were graduates of the public high schools of New Orleans.\textsuperscript{74}

Local black instructors were often graduates of the normal departments of Leland University, New Orleans University, or the AMA-managed Straight University. Others had earlier received Freedmen’s Bureau normal training. Fewer instructors were graduates of recently integrated New Orleans public high schools. There were still others educated elsewhere such as the Couvent School or abroad.\textsuperscript{75}

Yet the school divisions abounded with excessive numbers of “unqualified”, “incompetent”, and “unworthy” teachers. In addressing the issue, the State Board in 1873 adopted \textit{Methods of Instruction} by James P. Wickersham as a

\begin{footnotesize}
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text to be utilized by teaching personnel. Superintendent Boothby of the Sixth Division complained of "many . . . who have gone directly from the school room as pupil to the school room as teacher." According to Superintendent Loud of the Third Division, "not more than eight or ten came up to the mark of a perfect teacher." Superintendent Brewster of the Fifth Division revoked teacher certifications warning teachers "they must make themselves better acquainted with the common branches of learning if they expected to obtain certificates again." Not only did Brown agree with Brewster's policies, he also endorsed placing a Webster or Worcester unabridged dictionary in each school.

Superintendent Keating of the Fourth Division asserted there were many unqualified teachers without certificates and many "totally incompetent" with certificates. Superintendent Stoddard of the Second Division also complained of "machine teachers." Although competent, machine teachers according to Stoddard failed to "enthuse any spirit into their labor. . . . Such teachers when placed in the schoolroom become mere machines to open school in the morning, get through the day, and close again at night." Stoddard often threatened to invent an "automaton teacher" to dispose of their services entirely. Superintendent Williams of the First Division argued, "a teacher must understand the trade of teaching, and it must be learned, as is every other trade by experience." All

76 Minutes of the State Board, 18, 19 July 1873; Daily Picayune, 18, 20 July 1873; New Orleans Republican, 19, 20 July 1873. The board also adopted Wickersham's School Economy and E.F. Hobert's Helps to School Management for use by principals and possibly lower administration.

77 M.C. Cole, Secretary to Hon. James Brewster; New Orleans Republican, 19 July 1873; Annual Report, 1873, 371, 388; Ibid., 1875, 389-392.
division superintendents stressed the importance of state-supported normal schools in improving teacher quality.\textsuperscript{78}

The issue of teacher qualification was one of the earliest issues moved upon by the State Board of Education after Brown became superintendent. At the January 31, 1873, session, the board resolved to amend the school law and authorized Superintendent-President Brown to take legislative action on the matter. Effective February 1873, teaching vacancies were filled by a competitive written examination “open to all,” and conducted by division superintendents.\textsuperscript{79} In New Orleans, Sixth Division Superintendent Boothby relied on the assistance of a “Committee on Teachers” from the local school board.\textsuperscript{80}

Each division superintendent was responsible to compile three ranked lists of the top twenty teaching candidates and report them to the local boards. Division superintendents also issued certificates of qualification for three different grades.\textsuperscript{81} The first list or highest-grade teaching candidates received principal’s certificates. The second grade candidates received first assistant certificates. The third grade candidates received second and third assistant certificates.\textsuperscript{82}

By 1875, Superintendent Boothby felt the competitive system was still not as “well-calculated as it might be to secure good teachers.” Improvements in the election and selection of teachers were necessary owing to the failure

\textsuperscript{78}Annual Report, 1873, 376, 408, 409, 416.
\textsuperscript{79}For a copy of the examination, see Appendix C.
\textsuperscript{80}Minutes, State Board, 31 January 1873; Annual Report, 1873, 288, 289.
\textsuperscript{81}First, second, and third gradations referred to examination performance and teacher rankings.
\textsuperscript{82}Annual Report, 1873, 288, 289, 327.
of board directors in faithfully applying the system. Boothby believed school board directors were bound by too many patronage concerns and called for civil service reform in public education, specifically concerning directorates. He called for permanently employing the "worthy and just" teachers, relieving them from annual teachers' elections. Still, Boothby cited at least twenty-nine New Orleans schools, including three mixed schools for the quality of their teachers—fourteen coeducational schools, ten girls schools, and five boys schools respectively. Likewise, a statement from the New Orleans Board held that the newer teachers as a corps were better than their predecessors.

Outside of New Orleans, by 1875 Third Division schools under Superintendent Loud exhibited the greatest improvement in teacher quality, specifically the parishes of Ascension, Assumption, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberia, Iberville, St. Landry, St. Mary, and West Baton Rouge. Loud himself claimed his teachers were "as faithful, capable, and experienced a corps of educators, males and females, as can be found in the State." In the Second Division, Superintendent Stoddard commended the schools of St. Charles Parish for their overall quality, including teaching. He also cited Terrebonne Parish for the qualifications of its teachers.

---

84 Annual Report, 1875, 47, 77-79, 264.
Beyond the competitive system, the Model Schools concept and Teachers Institutes offered potential avenues for teacher improvement. A resolution passed by the State Educational Convention of 1872, endorsed model schools "as a wise and necessary means of elevating the character of our district schools as a step in the right direction toward perfecting our system . . ." Model schools acted as laboratories of practical experience, affording visiting teaching personnel the opportunity to practice their craft as well as sharpen their qualifications in classroom settings complete with pupils. Through the demonstration of sound educational practice, such schools also enabled teachers by way of direct observation to correct deficiencies in various areas such as subject matter or methodology.  

By law the state superintendent was responsible for organizing model schools. Previously, State Superintendent Conway planned the establishment of two such schools in New Orleans and others throughout the state. He also appointed a teacher as "Special Instructor" whose sole duty was to coordinate and supervise the schools. However, due to funding irregularities Conway in 1871 established only one school in the Second Division, the "Model Grammar School" in the town of Carrollton, adjacent to New Orleans. 

In 1873 Superintendent Brown directly administered the school, which had fifty-one pupils and two full-time teachers. Superintendent Stoddard considered the school a "perfect success" in filling the educational needs of

---

86 New Orleans Republican, 26 May 1872; Annual Report, 1875, 388.
Carrollton. Nevertheless Brown was not always pleased with the amount of appreciation shown by the people for the school and entertained transferring it to another location.\textsuperscript{88}

Superintendent Loud requested model high schools for the towns of Baton Rouge, Donaldsonville, and Plaquemine. In all three locales, the model high school concept would have offered viable opportunities for further training as students advanced beyond grammar school. Moreover, parents were simply too poor to send their children to the high schools or normal school in New Orleans. By 1875 two regular high schools opened in Baton Rouge and Plaquemine, located in East Baton Rouge and Iberville parishes respectively.\textsuperscript{89}

The model school concept, although rich in promise, never achieved full implementation. Proper funding was the key issue. In 1874, New Orleans annexed the town of Carrollton. After 1874, discussion of model schools ceased to appear in official reports. The ensuing budgetary cuts of 1875 definitely sealed the fate of proposed and existing institutions.\textsuperscript{90}

The provisions of the law charged division superintendents with the organization of teaching institutes. Teachers institutes were not schools but "exhibition conventions" for manifesting teaching and the best modes of application. One major objective of the teachers institute was to improve teachers in the principles and methods of the art of teaching. Another

\textsuperscript{88}Annual Report, 1873, 403, 404.
\textsuperscript{89}Annual Report, 1873, 117, 118, 160, 171, 172, 178, 281.
\textsuperscript{90}Annual Report, 1875, 10, 85; Taylor, 265; Devore and Logsdon, 70.
major objective of the institutes was to “create bonds of friendship and sympathy between teachers and parents,” thereby increasing public confidence and support for education.\(^{91}\)

Unlike former Superintendent Conway, Brown favored a narrower, association-type approach to teaching institutes. During the Brown Administration, the Second Division offered the most concrete, definitive examples of teachers institutes. Superintendent Stoddard organized five institutes at the parishes of Lafourche, Terrebonne, St. James, St. Charles, and Jefferson. The institutes ranged in size from seventeen to thirty-three members including elected officers. Superintendents Brown, Stoddard, and the local board directors were honorary members of each institute. Meetings were between two and four times per year and often included lectures and demonstrations by Stoddard among others. Second Division teachers institutes also featured reading rooms and libraries.\(^{92}\)

In 1874, Superintendent Stoddard delivered the following lectures: “The best means of securing discipline in the school,” and “The best and most approved methods of imparting primary instruction.” The lectures and discussions of the Lafourche Teachers Institute for 1875 provided an additional measure of the character of the organizations:

Ought the sexes to be educated together?
Has the state the right to establish a Free School System?
Requisites for success in a teacher of a primary school.

\(^{91}\)Proceedings of the House of Representatives, 1870; Annual Report, 1873, 389, 390; Ibid., 1875; 85-90.
\(^{92}\)Annual Report, 1875, 85-90.
If corporal punishment is necessary, should it be inflicted in the presence of the school?
Best method of teaching reading, writing, spelling, grammar, arithmetic, geography, composition, history, etc.
Object lessons, their importance and extent.
Ought Normal Schools to be supported by the State?
The duties a teacher owes to the community, and vice versa.
The Centennial celebration, and the best method of representing our educational status in it.93

The institutes proved to be most effective when focused on practical educational matters. The President of the St. James Teachers Institute proposed discussing at the next regular meeting "What plan can be adopted, under the present State constitution and laws, so as to educate all children alike, without regard to race or color?" He ultimately cancelled the meeting, due to low attendance of teachers and all concerned.94

Perhaps Superintendent Stoddard, chair of the Teachers Institute and Educational Conventions Committee, offered the best summation of teaching institutes during the Brown Administration. He credited the organizations with helping to improve school efficiency "more than one hundred percent." In addition, the institutes helped to drive away the "incompetent and unworthy," helped to promote better relations between teachers and school officers, and aroused public interest in education.95

As mentioned previously, teacher salaries during the Brown Administration were determined not by gender but by the grade occupied—first, second, or third. The New Orleans Board went further, subdividing its fifty-three

---

93Annual Report, 1874, 33; Annual Report, 1875, 85-90.
94Annual Report, 1875, 85-90.
95Annual Report, 1875, 85-90.
grammar schools and twenty primary schools into 'A' and 'B' designations. The majority of schools were Grammar A schools, which also included mixed schools.\(^96\)

Grammar A schools offered better salaries, better instruction, and better high school placement than Grammar B schools. For example, the annual salary of Grammar A principals for the years 1873, 1874, and 1875, was $1500, while Grammar B principals earned $1200. At the lowest end of the scale, all Grammar A and B teachers below second assistants earned $600.\(^97\)

Most entirely black schools were Grammar B schools. According to the school board, schools with deficient scholarship or limited student populations usually warranted a 'B' designation. Although certainly not limited to B schools, it is also clear that such schools often struggled with one or more causative factors: greater numbers of poor students, internal disorganization, frequent changes of teaching staff, disciplinary issues, and inconsistent attendance.\(^98\)

Primary schools offered the lowest salaries. At the highest end of the scale, Primary A principals annually earned $1000, while Primary B principals earned $900. At the lowest end, all Primary A and B teachers below second assistants earned $600.\(^99\)

The New Orleans Board compensated women and black teachers the same as their white male counterparts. Therefore, teachers who earned more or less did so based on the criteria discussed, not race. Within their respective

\(^96\)Annual Report, 1873, 338, 339; Ibid., 1875, 161-199; Vaughn, 89; Harlan, 668.
\(^97\)Annual Reports, 1873-1875; Vaughn, 89; Harlan, 668.
\(^98\)Annual Reports, 1873-1875; Vaughn, 89; Harlan, 668.
\(^99\)Annual Reports, 1873-1875.
categories, both grammar and primary schools exhibited greater disparity between A and B teacher salaries at the upper end of the wage scale. However, greater parity existed between such salaries at the lower end of the scale. Likewise, across grammar and primary categories, teacher salaries exhibited greater parity at the lower end of the scale, regardless of category or classification. Since most city schools were of the same classification, greater numbers of teachers--black and white, male and female earned similar salaries.  

Outside of New Orleans with few exceptions greater numbers of teachers earned substantially less. In 1875, New Orleans teachers generally earned an average annual salary of about $650, equivalent to a lower range Grammar A salary. However, outside New Orleans, where only teachers were ranked, salaries were at best far below the lowest grade Primary B salary in New Orleans. For example, in Jefferson Parish (Second Division) adjacent to New Orleans, some teachers, specifically in East Jefferson, annually earned about $370, among the higher teachers salaries in the state.  

At the opposite end of the wage scale, Jackson Parish (Fifth Division) in northern Louisiana held schools for a total of four months. Jackson Parish teachers earned an average annual salary of $80 in 1875, among the lowest salaries in the state.

---

100 Annual Reports, 1873-1875; Taylor, 463.  
101 For the year 1873, East Jefferson teachers earned the highest salaries in the state, with Orleans Parish (New Orleans) placing second.  
102 Annual Report, 1875, 131, 332, 333.
Regardless of salary, teacher compensation was often late as a result of local school board finances.\textsuperscript{103} However, Caddo Parish was a notable exception. As Superintendent Keating of the Fifth Division proudly observed, the Caddo Parish Board established a reputation for paying teachers promptly, in currency at the close of each month. Caddo Parish teachers earned an average of about $432 for 1875. Furthermore as Keating noted, this was accomplished while supporting five large schools for a term of eight months with state appropriations only. In actuality, Caddo Parish operated a total of forty-two schools in which neither the parish nor the town of Shreveport assessed local millage taxes for education.\textsuperscript{104}

* * * * * * * *

Although in 1875 two high schools opened in the Third Division towns of Baton Rouge and Plaquemine, for most of the period, Louisiana had only three public secondary schools all located in New Orleans. A look at the curriculum revealed a well-rounded selection of courses taught.

First year students enrolled at the Boys Central High School studied English composition, general history, arithmetic review, algebra, and natural philosophy, a natural science course. Second year students studied rhetoric, ancient and modern history, geometry, and organic chemistry. Third year students studied rhetoric, mental philosophy, trigonometry and surveying, organic chemistry,

\textsuperscript{103} Local newspapers of the period frequently ran stories concerning late teacher payments.
\textsuperscript{104} Annual Report, 1875, 106.
and astronomy. Students in their final year studied moral philosophy, elements of criticism, mechanics, civil engineering, and geology. In addition, students studied the classics, French, and drawing and bookkeeping through all four years of matriculation. The entire curriculum was reviewed by means of Friday exercises.105

Both Girls High Schools--Upper and Lower Divisions were integrated schools and had three-year curriculums. Students in their first year studied English grammar and composition, rhetoric, general history, arithmetic review, algebra, botany, and physiology. Second year students studied rhetoric, general history, English literature, algebra, and natural philosophy. Students in their final year studied English literature, intellectual philosophy, geometry, chemistry, astronomy, physiology, and moral philosophy. French and music were studied throughout the three years of matriculation. Exercises featured greater emphasis on composition and speech, which for seniors included daily journals, and a student-edited literary paper. First years and juniors performed elocution and semi-monthly writing exercises.106

While no materials specifically concerned with the elementary curriculum during the Brown Administration have been located, supporting materials have been instrumental in ascertaining an idea of courses taught. For example, a list of questions for high school admissions included the disciplines of United States history, geography, arithmetic, and English grammar, including orthography.107

---

105 Annual Report, 1873, 323, 324.
106 Annual Report, 1873, 323, 324.
107 Annual Report, 1873, 313-315.
During the July 18, 1873 session, the State Board of Education adopted various textbooks geared toward the elementary curriculum such as A.S. Barnes’ United States History series and various “readers, spellers, arithmetics, grammars, geographies, botanies, writing books . . . drawing books, dictionaries, and speakers.” The types of books adopted also reflected the disciplines represented on the high school entrance examinations. Significantly, the books adopted were effective system-wide, without regards to a specific locale.\textsuperscript{108}

During the Conway Administration, a report from City Normal School before its preemption by Peabody authorities described a portion of its course of instruction as a “review of the branches taught in grammar grades.” Courses reviewed included arithmetic, algebra, English grammar, rhetoric, elocution, modern history, geography—descriptive and physical, and geometry. Considering the fact that Superintendent Brown maintained the basic features of the system implemented by Conway, the normal school curriculum displayed consistency with the previous examples.\textsuperscript{109}

As judged by the former examples, the course of studies during the Brown Administration exemplified general late nineteenth-century trends. Both curriculums facilitated self-sufficiency. They were complete and self-contained to the extent of providing a firm educational foundation and precluding a need for further studies. The secondary curriculum was geared toward the cultivation of mental discipline as the primary objective. This was reflected in what was termed by educational historian

\textsuperscript{108} Minutes, State Board, 18 July 1873; New Orleans Republican, 19 July 1873.
\textsuperscript{109} Annual Report, 1869, 74, 75.
Ellwood P. Cubberley as the “overcrowded curriculum.” As a result of the overcrowded curriculum, newer subjects especially the modern sciences increasingly augmented traditional subjects.¹¹⁰

The elementary curriculum especially revealed the influence of Swiss educationist Johann H. Pestalozzi (1746-1827), an early pioneer of active learning whose ideas were then gaining currency in the United States. Pestalozzi’s schools combined intellectual and industrial training into a single curriculum. His “object lessons” emphasized the use of objects, plants, and animals to develop a child’s sense of sight, touch, and sound. The object lesson teaching method was credited with emphasis on descriptive and physical geography, and the introduction of elementary science into the curriculum. The method represented one of the newer pedagogical approaches of the period, and was demonstrated by the 1872 Educational Convention and teaching institutes of both Conway and Brown Administrations. More specifically, Brown and the State Board adopted Marcius Wilson’s Object Teaching Charts and Alphonso Woods’ Object Lessons for the subjects of reading and botany, respectively.¹¹¹

Pestalozzi also advocated “sympathetic understanding” over harsh methods of punishment in best achieving educational objectives. The Brown Administration


¹¹¹ Minutes, State Board, 18 July 1873; New Orleans Republican, 24-26 May 1872, 19 July 1873; Cubberley, Public Education, 344-354; Zais, Curriculum, 44-48, 53; Reese, 79-89, 91-95.
discouraged teachers from using corporal punishment as a primary means of discipline. Division Superintendents C.W. Boothby and George B. Loud clearly operated under such precepts. The teaching institutes organized by Superintendent Stoddard addressed and pondered such ideas. Nonetheless, two schools, Marshall Boys of New Orleans and Wharton Union of Plaquemine, were known for having successfully dispensed with corporal punishment.\textsuperscript{112} Elsewhere, especially at the elementary level, with few exceptions the rod was not spared and corporal punishment remained an intrinsic, if not primary component in school discipline.\textsuperscript{113}

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \\

Over the course of his term, Brown expressed his philosophy of education through speaking engagements as well as through annual reports. A clearer assessment of Superintendent William G. Brown's worldview, which informed his educational philosophy, first appeared in the 1873 annual report. Brown felt that caste was the primary ill afflicting the South, not race or color. He defined caste economically as the outgrowth of the arrogance of wealth, trying to maintain over freemen the unhallowed supremacy it held over slaves.\textsuperscript{114}

Education, when allied with labor was the prescription for the ailments of caste:

\begin{quote}
In every portion of the civilized world, capital strives to oppress and control labor. The wise and good of the nations' statesmen and educators . . . ally themselves with the laborers by recognizing their
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{112}Annual Report, 1875, 127, 130, 166, 385.
\textsuperscript{113}Annual Reports, 1872-1875; Blassingame, 119, 120; Cubberley, 344-354; Zais, 44-48, 53.
\textsuperscript{114}Annual Report, 1873, 24, 25.
belligerent rights, and offer or direct them to where and how they may obtain the sinews of war, viz.: education; and this is not done because of enmity to wealth. No, no, but because of right, justice, and a desire for the greatest good to the greatest number.\textsuperscript{115}

Consequently, Brown saw direct correlation between education and productivity arguing that the usefulness of the citizen, regardless of their position in life was in proportion to education and experience:

If education renders labor more efficient, thereby increasing wealth, producing power, it is to be desired; for it enhances the value of the citizen to the nation. The more work a nation can do and the better it is done, by so much is its wealth increased.

Furthermore, concerning the usefulness of the citizen, Brown argued that education filled an important social prescription, reducing the need for criminal justice. He believed that state spending for criminal justice should not be disproportionate to education: “Every dollar which is expended for education will inevitably cause a reduction in the cost of criminal justice.”\textsuperscript{116}

Superintendent Brown harbored total and absolute faith in the ability of education to elevate and uplift all in society:

There is no force as powerful to lift mankind from a position of dependence and narrow, circumscribed life as education. It is the laborers’ faithful friend and counselor, standing sentinel to guard his liberties, to render a helping hand in the hour of perplexity and doubt, the good genius that enables him to overcome the difficulties and embarrassments of the hour, and achieve success. It brings skill to the artisan, instructs the farmer how to force the soil to yield her richest harvest of

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., 24, 25.
\textsuperscript{116}Annual Report, 1873, 26, 27; Annual Report, 1875, 5, 6.
cotton, rice, sugar and corn. It aids him at market in selling the products of his toil, teaches him to profitably exchange his products for those of his neighbor, etc., to wisely discriminate when and how to invest his surplus funds. It is the guardian of home and family, the angel of peace, whose presence ever gladdens and elevates the heart. It enables its possessor to meet the responsibilities of life in their relation to the country, State, society and family. It is of God, and true education will lead to God.\textsuperscript{117}

Brown advocated compulsory education of youth as insurance against societal decrepitude:

Wherever large masses of the ignorant (whites or blacks, the result is the same) settle down, immorality and crime dominate, capital departs, life and property are insecure, and wicked men obtain authority and pervert justice by breaking good laws or making those that work injury and oppression. Look at those communities that are controlled by the ignorant. . . . Vice, crime and sorrow are seen on every hand. . . .

The enforcement of compulsory education by the authorities of the Grand Duchy of Baden in seven years, from 1854 to 1861, reduced the number of prisoners over fifty per cent, and of thefts fifty-four per cent, and of paupers seventy-five per cent.

In those states of the Union where systems of free schools have been more perfectly developed, compulsory school laws are being enacted. How much greater the necessity for such laws in the Southern States, where there are nearly five million of illiterates.\textsuperscript{118}

The issue of superintendence was the fundamental pivot on which Brown’s educational philosophy revolved. In Brown’s view, the results attained in any field of labor were neither better nor worse than the supervision

\textsuperscript{117}Annual Report, 1873, 25.
\textsuperscript{118}Annual Report, 1874, 13, 14.
employed. He saw direct correlation between quality education and adequate superintendence:

The mere fact of places named schools where children are gathered together will not and should not satisfy the people. . . . Hence the necessity for school officials to constantly watch that they may discern, and by their authority and influence promptly counteract, all tendencies to deterioration. . . . \(^{119}\)

The overall quality of the education offered by any system centered on the quality and quantity of superintendence. Brown’s comparative evaluation of superintendence in Louisiana and other states revealed that Louisiana was not only educationally under-funded but also under-managed. Louisiana had six division superintendents, while neighboring states such as Mississippi and Texas had sixty-five and twelve superintendents respectively. \(^{120}\)

Virginia employed eighty-four superintendents, while Missouri and New York employed one hundred fourteen and one hundred thirty-two superintendents respectively. Brown’s study, which initially appeared in the 1872 report and was reprinted for 1875 asserted that “far from having too much school superintendence, Louisiana has not half so much as she actually needs to thoroughly root the public school system in this uncongenial soil.” \(^{121}\)

Superintendent Brown was a proponent of technical schooling, which was consistent with his labor perspective of education. A technical or industrial education provided pupils with technical knowledge in the areas of science, art, commerce, agriculture, mechanics and the professions. Brown felt that such training prepared students to “utilize

\(^{119}\) Annual Report, 1874, 13, 14.
\(^{120}\) Annual Report, 1872, 20-24; Ibid., 1873, 11.
the vast resources of the nation which through toil promise wealth and reputation as a reward." He argued that technical education embodied "the fundamental truths of the several departments of thought and labor." Brown further argued that in relation to Europe, too few technical schools existed in the United States and felt it the duty of the state and nation to support and nurture such schools and systems of instruction. The inherent symbolism of the former Mechanics’ Institute, once utilized as the State House only served to strengthen Brown’s convictions.\textsuperscript{122}

Brown was also a proponent for establishing a national system of education centralized under Federal authority. Along with technical education, this was a current topic among educators of the time. Organizations such as the American Missionary Association long argued for a national system. Typical proposals called for a complete federalized system covering from primary schools to state universities and topped by a National University and National Board of Education. Brown’s proposal also included an ad valorem tax on all real estate and personal property, and a compulsory attendance law. He believed that the Freedmen’s Bureau system of schools provided the best example and demonstration of the feasibility of a federally managed system. His argument for a national system centered on two major points: the increasing immigration to the United States—with the resulting increase of illiterates, and exigencies of finance in Louisiana. According to Brown, both points illustrated the need for such a system.\textsuperscript{123}

While attending the National Press Convention of Colored Journalists at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1875, Brown

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{122}Annual Report, 1873, 47, 48.}  
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{123}Annual Report, 1873, 25-31, 428; Richardson, 109.}
also expressed himself on education. As Chairman of the Business Committee, Brown drafted a number of resolutions, some of which contained his educational views. He stated that the welfare of then-present and future generations of Americans depended upon “raising the character of each citizen to the highest point of excellence.” Continued ignorance, poverty, and moral degradation of a portion of the population “must disastrously affect the interests of the whole.” Brown and the committee also expressed satisfaction with educational gains made against overwhelming odds:

Recognizing the value of the inestimable boon of education to our children, we contemplate with profound satisfaction and pride the extent to which educational facilities have been embraced throughout the South by parents for their children; the fidelity with which our teachers have performed their duties; and the fortitude with which they have endured indignity and outrage; and we pledge ourselves to exert the utmost of our ability, our energies and influence, to extend and perpetuate the benefits of common school instruction.124

Brown gave an impromptu lecture on education at the convention. The initial portion of the lecture consisted of general statistics reflected in the annual reports. Brown informed the audience of the “strong desire . . . on the part of the colored people to acquire an education.” He also stated that “young people of the colored race” through education, were “growing up to fill their places in life with credit, and hundreds of excellent teachers were being fitted for future work.” The latter portion of the lecture later entitled “Needs of the Cause of Education in the

124Louisianian, 24 August 1875.
South” went beyond general statistical information and further delineated Brown’s educational philosophy.\textsuperscript{125}

Brown thought that greater appreciation for the value of education on the part of school officers, teachers, and parents was needed. He believed it necessary that parents realize the importance of children utilizing every privilege offered. Rather than keeping their children from the schools, it would be “wise economy” for them to make sacrifices and hire help on their farms.

Similarly, Brown also thought youth should exhibit greater determination in acquiring an education. Many, “not accustomed to battle with hindrances, were induced to bend before the storm of opposition” they met. Brown further argued that in the event of violence, thousands of blacks would keep their children away from school rather than subject them to danger, or risk hurting the feelings of anyone. According to Brown, “these needed their courage brought up.”\textsuperscript{126}

Superintendent Brown also stated that cooperation among those educating youth was needed. Too much division of purpose and action existed in Louisiana among people interested in education. “It was highly important that they should be united in purpose and in action, because if they are not there was no one to push forward the work for them.” Once these needs had been met Brown argued the work of education in the South could be carried forward in the face of all opposition.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{125}\textit{Louisianian}, 24 August 1875.
\textsuperscript{126}\textit{Louisianian}, 24 August 1875.
\textsuperscript{127}\textit{Louisianian}, 24 August 1875.
CHAPTER SIX

THE POLICIES OF RACE AND EDUCATION DURING THE BROWN ADMINISTRATION

The political unrest and instability engendered by the 1872 election and resentment of Governor Kellogg continued through most of his administration. The governor was the target of at least two assassination attempts during his term. Overall, such distractions tried and severely affected the cause of education in the state. Indeed, many of Superintendent Brown’s most formidable challenges owed their origins to the political condition of the state.

After the Colfax Massacre, as the interim elections of 1874 approached, resistance to Kellogg grew more organized and structured. The organizational efforts of the resistance culminated in the April 27, 1874, formation of the White League, a decentralized paramilitary terror organization designed to rid Louisiana of the Kellogg Government. Organized at the parish level, each branch operated separately. The White League relied upon forced resignations and violence to achieve its ends.

The *Louisianian* defined the White League as based “on the distinction of race and color” and regretted “such organization on the part of misguided and prejudiced Caucasians . . .” Editor Henry A. Corbin identified two major convictions behind those responsible for the League’s

---

formation. One was the honest but erroneous conviction that Republican, particularly black political empowerment, was responsible for Louisiana’s political troubles. The other, dishonest, stemming from “bitter and unreasoning prejudice against the colored people” refused “to see anything reasonable or creditable in the colored race.” According to Corbin, each position had its adherents. The White League, Corbin argued, suffered from “a misapprehension of both the causes and the remedy of our present embarrassment.” There were other more complex, underlying causes to address:

The bad government, alleged to exist, is the result, not of the dishonesty or incompetency of the voting classes, either white or colored, but at most, has come upon us, merely because the voters have failed to take due interest in the political management of the State, leaving the cliques and rings of both parties to usurp their powers in political affairs, and the remedy lies not in White or Black Leagues, but in the kindly co-operation of both parties . . . in an honest endeavor for a better condition of things, and in the immediate assumption, and exercise, by the individual citizen of each race, of his duties as a voter.  

Kellogg officials in parishes such as Natchitoches, Claiborne, Avoyelles, and others across the state were cast out of office almost immediately after the League’s inception. According to Brown, “on both sides the Red River, fierce and bitter manifestations of political hatred and sectional partisanship seemed to govern the dominant inhabitants.” School officials notified Superintendent Keating they were forced to abandon their posts for fear of personal violence. In August 1874, the town of Coushatta, seat of Red River Parish, just upriver from Colfax was the scene of a violent massacre. Red River Parish was a

3Louisianian, 4 July 1874.
Republican stronghold in north Louisiana run by Senator M.H. Twitchell, a carpetbagger from Vermont. The Twitchell family and in-laws dominated the parish.\textsuperscript{4}

While Twitchell was away in New Orleans seeking Federal troops, racial conflict ensued involving the local White League. The conflict was said to have attracted White League supporters from as far as Texas. The six-member parish government was arrested and subsequently murdered. Homer Twitchell, brother of the senator and also Treasurer of the Red River Parish Board along with two other Twitchell relatives were among those slain. R.A. Dewees, President of the nearby DeSoto Parish Board was also murdered. Governor Kellogg issued a $5000 bounty for each of the murderers. In the neighboring Fifth Division, the White League or its supporters destroyed a schoolhouse and horsewhipped a teacher. Other teachers armed themselves in preparation.\textsuperscript{5}

Before the unrest in Coushatta settled, New Orleans became the scene of a major showdown between the Kellogg Government and the White League. The old Crescent City Democratic Club then renamed the Crescent City White League consisted of two regiments of infantry and one of artillery under the command of General F.N. Ogden. Beginning in late August, the Metropolitan Police strictly regulated the movement of arms in the city. By September 14, the

\textsuperscript{4}Daily Picayune, 12, 26, August 1874; Louisianian, 5 September 1874; New York Times, 3, 4, September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 4, September 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 26, 28, 29; Rable, 133-135; Taylor, 287-291; Dawson, 156-163; Rodrigue, 166, 167; Lestage, “The White League,” 35-68; Gonzales, 36-38.

\textsuperscript{5}Daily Picayune, 2 September 1874; Louisianian, 5 September 1874; New York Times, 3, 4 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 4 September 1874; Annual Reports, 1873, 1874; Taylor, 289; Foner, 551; Vaughn, 98; Rable, 133-135; Vincent, 183-185; Dawson, 156-163; Gonzales, 38-39; Lestage, 35-68.
Metropolitans had successfully executed a number of publicized arms seizures.⁶

The September 14, 1874, decision of the Metropolitans to seize weapons stockpiles allegedly belonging to the White League precipitated the “Battle of Canal Street” also known as the “Battle of Liberty Place” among the League and its supporters. The pitched battle which commenced at the foot of Canal Street, extended to the adjacent Mississippi River. The Metropolitans were backed by Louisiana Militia creating a combined force of roughly 3,600 under the command of General James Longstreet. In addition to their regular arms, the Longstreet forces possessed a Gatling gun along with a twelve-pound cannon. Ogden commanded roughly 8,400 insurgents including the McEnery militia along with volunteers. The Ogden forces were “thoroughly armed with muskets, pistols, and swords”.⁷

The Metropolitans, who were posted on the frontline, fell back from the force of the White League offensive, which also included people firing from buildings. The insurgents having gained the advantage drove to the river, causing quick retreat then ultimate dispersal of the Longstreet forces. The battle resulted in more than fifty fatalities. Yet, the Kellogg Government was one of its greatest casualties. The Picayune carried a horizontal

⁶Daily Picayune, 1, 2, 9-11 September 1874, 1 January 1875; Louisianian, 19 September 1874; New York Times, 15-20 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 15-19 September 1874; Taylor, 284, 291-296; Rable, 137, 138; Dawson, 165, 167; Foner, 551.

⁷Daily Picayune, 15, 16 September 1874, 1 January 1875; Louisianian, 19 September 1874; New York Times, 15-20 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 15-19 September 1874; C.W. Boothby to George Boothby, 28 September 1874, Charles W. Boothby Papers, Special Collections, Louisiana State University and A&M College, Baton Rouge; Tunnell, 202-204; Dawson, 168-171; Foner, 551; Rable, 137; Taylor, 284; Vincent, 183-185; Rodrigue, 166, 167.
full-page depiction of the battle entitled “Rout of the Metropolitans/Défaite des Métropolitaines.”

By evening, insurgents had gained control of much of the city including City Hall and telegraph offices. Division Superintendent Boothby was among the officials forced out of City Hall by the insurgents. Around 2:00 am the next morning, a lone state official and the remaining Metropolitan patrol surrendered the State House to the insurgents. Later that day, D.B. Penn, McEnery’s running mate for Lieutenant Governor in 1872 was “inaugurated.” McEnery was sent out of state prior to hostilities. In McEnery’s absence, Penn who was “Acting Governor” began making appointments.

During the entire time, Governor Kellogg headquartered at the Customhouse, a place he knew well. More importantly, the Customhouse was Federal property. He refused the insurgents the demand that he resign but was otherwise powerless to effect any reversal of fortune. He also refused any appearances, remaining unseen by the public. Across the state, White Leagues empowered by the coup d’état in New Orleans, removed additional Kellogg officials.
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8Daily Picayune, 14, 15, September 1874; Louisianian, 19 September 1874; New York Times, 15-20 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 15-19 September 1874; King, 326-327; Vincent, 185; Rable, 137; Dawson, 168-171.

9C.W. Boothby to George Boothby; Daily Picayune, 15, 16, September 1874; Louisianian, 19 September 1874; New York Times, 15-20 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 15-19 September 1874; Dawson, 171, 172, 175; Rable, 137; Foner, 551.

10Kellogg was once Collector of Ports for New Orleans.

11Daily Picayune, 15 September 1874; Louisianian, 19 September 1874; New York Times, 15-20 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 15-19 September 1874; Dawson, 173, 177, 178; Tunnell, 202-204; Gonzales, 43-44.
An article in the Picayune entitled “Finished” contained the caption ‘Last Rites and Obsequies of the Kellogg Government.’ Observers such as David F. Boyd argued for a military or provisional government. However, by September 17, President Grant authorized the restoration of order, placing New Orleans under military authority, sending three naval vessels and additional federal troops. A visibly shaken McEnery surrendered the State House and the reins of government to Federal soldiers. The following day Federal authorities reinstated Kellogg, and proceeded to tour the state restoring all Kellogg officials who were removed.\(^1\)

A subsequent editorial of the Louisianian also called to account “those entrusted with the immediate control of the government of Louisiana.” Editor George T. Ruby charged many in the Kellogg Government with “temporizing with blatherskites, selecting for important positions nondescripts—men who represent no doctrine, principle, or party . . .”. Furthermore, had Kellogg utilized the “power, patronage, and ability of his administration” to substitute good men for incapable, dishonest men, he would have averted the overthrow of government. Additionally, through effectual use of power and patronage—“restraining and confining obstreperous underlings within the legitimate sphere of their duties,” Kellogg would have also avoided the general demoralization that occurred.\(^2\)

\(^1\)D.F. Boyd to Gen’l W.T. Sherman, 17 September 1874 [telegram], David F. Boyd Papers, Special Collections, Louisiana State University and A&M College, Baton Rouge; C.W. Boothby to George Boothby; Daily Picayune, 16, 18 September 1874; Louisianian 19 September 1874; New York Times, 15-20 September 1874; Chicago Tribune, 15-19 September 1874; Rable, 139, 140; King, 328, 329; Taylor, 295, 296; Dawson, 173, 177, 178; Tunnell, 202-204.

\(^2\)Louisianian, 26 September 1874.
The troubled political climate of 1874 compounded what was perhaps one of William G. Brown’s toughest challenges as superintendent, enforcement of the mixed (integrated) school provisions of the Constitution of 1868. Conway initiated mixed schools and the torment he suffered in enforcing the law was well known. In many ways, during the Brown Administration, the issue had matured in the minds of Louisiana’s population. Those in favor as well as against integrated schooling had solidified their positions. They became more steadfast in either furthering or sabotaging efforts.

The December 1874 annual examinations for admission to one of New Orleans’ three public high schools set the spark for the integrated schooling issue to explode like never before and ensured prolonged strife. The Crescent City White League used this opportunity to enact a plan to destroy integrated schooling. They urged white students to boycott schools where blacks were admitted and to forcibly remove them from classrooms.\(^{14}\)

According to regulation, Superintendent Charles W. Boothby sent out notices instructing elementary principals to submit a list of students to be examined to principals of prospective high schools. Boothby designated December 13, the day preceding the first examination day as the deadline for submission.\(^{15}\)

Allegedly some teachers previously expressed to Boothby concerns that blacks might attempt entry into schools that had yet to be integrated. Consequently Boothby allegedly assuaged their fears that in the event of such

\(^{14}\)Fischer, 123, 124; Blassingame, 116, 117.

\(^{15}\)Annual Report, 1874, 51.
developments, satisfactory arrangements would be taken not to “disturb the harmony of the schools.”

On the morning of December 14, a contingent of eleven young ladies from the Coliseum School accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Wood, all of whom were black, sought admission into the integrated Girls High School—Upper Division or “Upper Girls High School.” Wood presented Mrs. M.E. McDonald, principal of the school her list of candidates eligible for the admission examination. McDonald denied admission to the students on the basis of Wood not following proper procedure concerning submission of the examination roster. Wood allegedly responded indignantly stating that she was as good as anyone, and insulted McDonald, her assistant, and her students, who witnessed the exchange.

McDonald, who had been administering final examinations to the senior class, dismissed the students. Following their dismissal, the senior class forwarded a written protest to the New Orleans Board of School Directors:

We, the seniors of Upper Girls’ High School, having passed creditable examinations, in order to graduate, do hereby most emphatically decline to receive our diplomas unless the question brought up to this day, the fourteenth of December, 1874, with regard to our schools being mixed is decided before the appointed time for our graduation, December 23, 1874.

Wood and students adjourned when informed that Superintendent Boothby had been called. However, by this

---

16Ibid., 53.
17Daily Picayune 15 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 53, 54; Blassingame, 119; Fischer, 123, 124.
18Daily Picayune, 15 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 53, 54; Vaughn, 94; Fischer, 123, 124; Blassingame, 119.
time both junior and first year classes forwarded a similar letter to the school board resolving not to attend school until the issue was decided. These pupils were dismissed. When Boothby arrived he allegedly gave a “short speech” to admissions candidates apologizing for the intrusion and offered to take measures averting a possible recurrence.¹⁹

By the following day, the situation began to spiral downward. The students of the integrated Girls’ High School—Lower Division (“Lower Girls High School”) which had accepted for examination their black registrants, now submitted an additional remonstrance to the school board, withdrawing from school pending a decision. Superintendent Boothby while on his way to visit Upper Girls’ High School was accosted and assaulted by a mob of fifteen men. A rumor circulated that on the previous day he insulted both the ladies and students of the school.²⁰

Boothby was taken to the school and made to apologize. He declared that he had not insulted anyone, and was opposed to mixed schools. He was forced to sign a declaration stating that in the future he would “exert himself” to prevent the recurrence of a similar event:

This is to certify that I will exert myself to prevent the occurrence of any event similar to that occurring in the Girls’ High School, Upper District, or in any school in this city, having reference to the mixture of white and colored pupils in the public schools.²¹

The entire incident caused much excitement among the teachers and principal of Upper Girls’ High School who interceded on Boothby’s behalf and corroborated his

¹⁹Daily Picayune 15 December 1874; Fischer, 123, 124; Vaughn, 94.
²⁰Daily Picayune 16 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 55, 61-65; Fischer, 123, 124; Vaughn, 94; Blassingame, 119.
²¹Daily Picayune 16 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 55, 61-65.
innocence to the men. The ladies identified the culprit as one A.E. Adams, attaché of the Republican office. Later that evening, Adams was located and cowhided by one of the parties who had assaulted Boothby.  

   Meanwhile, the conservative newspapers helped fan the flames of opposition. They held the “Republican Congress,” Superintendent Brown, and the New Orleans Board as responsible for the conflict. Some of the most disparaging and inflammatory remarks emanated from the New Orleans Bulletin, voice of the White League. The Bulletin referred to Radical management of public schools as “a stench in the nostrils of decent people” and stated that white children should have been withdrawn from schools the moment “the drunken and incapable negro Brown was appointed as Superintendent of Education.” They accused Brown of “steadily and persistently” laboring to make social equality of the races an accomplished fact:

   At first he moved cautiously, and only put in light-colored mulattoes; then he tried children of a darker hue, until finally he succeeded, in a few instances, in placing negro girls as black as ebony side by side with the fairest Caucasians.  

   A subsequent issue of the Bulletin informed the young ladies of public schools that diplomas issued by the current New Orleans Board of the time and “signed by Brown and Boothby,” were not worth the “paper or parchment” upon which they were written:

   They are not worth the keeping, and so far from being documents which they might exhibit with pride in the future, they will be ashamed that they accepted

---

22Daily Picayune 16 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 61-62, 64, 65; Vaughn, 95, 96; Fischer, 123, 124; Blassingame, 119.
23Annual Report, 1874, 56-67; Porter, 764.
them from men who are incapable of judging of merit or capacity. . . .

In the same issue the editors thought it appropriate to demonstrate their historical aptitude:

The Radicals seem never to have read history, or to have learned that it is only within a narrow range of latitude that great men have been born. We defy any one to name a great man who has appeared in the Southern Hemisphere.

The science of archaeology has taught us that the negro has never advanced, morally or intellectually, from the first stone laid in the foundation of the first pyramid to the present time. . . . the African, and all other races not of the white, have not so far progressed. It matters not with them whether Venus flirts with the sun yearly or only in a century or two. . . . No nation can prosper which permits heterogeneous mixtures of races that are physiologically apart. . . . The grand and haughty companions of Cortez, by blood admixture with the negro and Indian, has become what we all know, the present Mexican race.24

Constant Bulletin provocation, including asking “the young gentlemen of our high schools” to respond, led to a campaign to cleanse any schools perceived to be racially integrated. After some twelve black males were repelled in their attempt to take the entrance examination for Boys’ Central High School, a self-styled “committee” made up of youths from the school and directed by the White League, determined to eject those blacks already attending schools with whites. While the conservative papers used such terms as “gentlemen” to refer to these individuals, Harper’s Weekly rightfully called them “a disorderly band of boys.”25

---

25 Daily Picayune, 17 December 1874; Chicago Tribune, 17-19 December 1874; Harper’s Weekly, 13 February 1875, 147; Annual Report, 1874, 63; Fischer, 125-127; Vaughn, 95; Harlan, 671, 672.
The high school youths acted as fronts for mobs of men and boys not attending school. Between the sixteenth and nineteenth of December, they visited at least eight schools, mostly elementary schools. As the gangs visited the schools they began attracting a boisterous crowd of supporters and the curious. Disregarding school faculty and administration they proceeded to throw out students perceived or known to be black.\footnote{\textit{New York Times}, 18 December 1874; \textit{Louisianian}, 19 December 1874; \textit{Chicago Tribune}, 17–19 December 1874; \textit{Annual Report}, 1874, 63; Vaughn, 95; Blassingame, 119; Harlan, 671, 672.}

The enormity, if not idiocy of their task soon became apparent. On their first visit, Lower Girls’ High School, the gangs overlooked six students. On being informed of their oversight, they returned the next day. By the end of their crusade, they had not only succeeded in dismissing and insulting blacks, but also a number of whites, some from prominent families. After the sister and daughter of D.B. Penn, McEnery’s running mate and one of the recent “heroes” of “Liberty Place”, were insulted and ejected from the Webster School, the mob reported in \textit{Harper’s} “gave up their crusade in shame.” Conversely, numerous blacks were never detected or bothered by the delinquents. One of the pupils ejected from Lower Girls’ High later identified at least twelve black schoolmates who were considered “unadulterated” and “pure” and evaded detection.\footnote{\textit{Louisianian}, 26 December 1874; \textit{New York Times}, 18 December 1874; \textit{Chicago Tribune}, 17–19 December 1874; \textit{Harper’s Weekly}, 13 February 1875; \textit{Annual Report}, 1874, 77.}

In most cases, principals and teachers allowed the gangs to carry out their designs. Some were probably sincerely concerned about possible trouble from the crowds gathered outside schools. However in at least one case, a male teacher with the assistance of his pupil’s friends...
fought off and expelled the intruders. At Beauregard School, a crowd of blacks outside the school fired upon the mob.\[^{28}\]

On another occasion, a contingent of males from the St. Andrew Street School, a black school confronted the miscreants en masse. The “Central High gang” had just ejected two black pupils from the nearby Keller School. The St. Andrew youths were under the impression the gangs were coming to cleanse their school and resolved to prevent it from occurring. In addition, a crowd of supporters many of whom were concerned parents, backed the St. Andrew youths. A furious altercation ensued in which some of the youths from Central High School were injured.

The Central High gang fled but returned a short time later with reinforcements to renew the fight. During the ensuing conflict, two police officers were severely injured and one participant, an adult black male, Eugene Ducloslange was killed. Supposedly Ducloslange had been struck in the neck during the brawl. As word of his death spread throughout the area, the battle intensified. According to the *Daily Picayune*, the excitement continued until after dark before the crowd dispersed.\[^{29}\]

In the meantime, the New Orleans Board of School Directors met on December 18 and decided to close the schools a week earlier for the Christmas holidays. General Ogden directed the gang to discontinue their visitations. The *Picayune* urged them to cease their activities “in a field which must be entered by statesmen.” By the end of the rampage, two lives were lost and 350 windows broken. Of

\[^{28}\text{Harper’s, 13 February 1875; Annual Report, 1874, 79; Vaughn, 95.}\]
\[^{29}\text{Daily Picayune, 18 December 1874; New York Times, 18 December 1874; Chicago Tribune, 17-19 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 80-84; Fischer, 125-127; Vaughn, 95; Blassingame, 119.}\]
major significance, the New Orleans Board voted on January 9 to uphold desegregation. When classes resumed some twenty young ladies ejected from Lower Girls’ High returned. They and others continued attending mixed schools through 1877.\footnote{Louisianian, 26 December 1874; Chicago Tribune, 17–19 December 1874; Annual Report, 1874, 85; Annual Report, 1875, 151–152; George W. Cable, The Negro Question: A Selection of Writings on Civil Rights in the South, ed., Arlin Turner (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 28; Baker, 23–24; Devore and Logdon, 81; Vaughn, 97; Fischer, 125–127; Arlin Turner, “George W. Cable’s Beginning as a Reformer,” Journal of Southern History 17 (May 1951): 146; Harlan, 671, 672.}

Superintendent Brown reserved his public outrage over the foregoing events for his 1874 annual report, in which he included a number of the most inflammatory editorials concerning the conflict. Under a heading entitled “The Conservative (?) Press of New Orleans,” Brown claimed that in modern history, a similar example of “intense caste prejudice, bitter sectional hatred, and fierce political antagonism” as exhibited by the Picayune and Bulletin, would be difficult to find:

The responsibility for much, if not all of the outrages committed at that time, must attach forever to, and sully the record of, the New Orleans conservative press. . . . No one will be at a loss, how to account for the rapid development of the plans to execute, which unruly boys and idle, vicious men, were encouraged to invade the public schools and to demand that little girls, young ladies and boys, should leave. And for what? God, in the exercise of His divine prerogatives, had seen fit to give them colored skins.

No one that has not felt the iron of proscription and hate forced down into his soul can for one moment realize the agony endured by those that have. . . . To Him who had said “Vengeance is mine, I will repay,” have the sufferers of to-day committed their cause; and in the future when the history of these outrages are re-written in connection with the deliverance
afforded, then will the full measure of the infamy of the conservative press be recognized.  

Brown further argued that a “prophet’s power” was not necessary to predict a time when the recognition of manhood, “so long withheld from the colored man, will be fully accorded.”

In another section of his report, Brown remarked upon the residual effects and consequences of the press’ efforts:

The influence for evil, which the papers named have exerted upon the young of this city, can never be effaced; to the third and fourth generations will it extend, warping and cursing their lives. Law, order, virtue and pure society are not the products of such teachings. The day will come when the children of the city will curse these papers for the evil influences exerted upon them, but the cursing will not restore their innocence. The seed sown will bring forth a plentiful harvest of sorrow to the State, to parents and the children.

Superintendent Brown as a result of the school conflict gained national attention. Harper’s Weekly referred to him as “a colored man of unusual attainments, energy, and refinement.” The White League also received national attention of a different sort:

If there is anything particularly noticeable in this whole affair of the White League in Louisiana, both of the young and old, it is the total want of
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32Annual Report, 1874, 49, 50.
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intelligence shown by its leaders. Such dull and half-stupefied intellects, such extreme mental weakness, could only have been brought into public notice by its extraordinary wickedness. The "platform" of the White League of New Orleans, which it has published to defend its useless cruelty and bloodshed, reads like the drivel of idiots. . . .  

By January 10, 1875, Division Superintendent Stoddard could express relief that the worst of the unrest of the previous four months had dissipated:

For the first time since the memorable 14\textsuperscript{th} of September have I lain down to rest at night without apprehensions or stepped out of my house after dark without my hand in close proximity to my revolver. . . .  

However, the issue of integrated schools continued into the following year. The New Orleans Board revisited the issue during its February 3, 1875, meeting. By 1875, the focus had clearly shifted to Boys’ Central High School. The board carried a motion introduced by member, Senator James Ingraham, offering a re-examination of black pupils who scored below the required percentile for acceptance into the school. Apparently, the youths took an entrance examination shortly after the situation quieted down. Ingraham argued that the hostile environment at the school could have contributed to low performances on the examination.  

---

\textsuperscript{34}\textsuperscript{Harper’s, 13 February 1875, 148.}\n
\textsuperscript{35}\textsuperscript{E.S. Stoddard to H.R. Stoddard, 10 January 1875, Ephraim Samuel Stoddard Collection, Archives, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans.}\n
\textsuperscript{36}\textsuperscript{Daily Picayune, 19 February 1875.}
By February 18, Boys' Central High School certainly contained black students in the lower grades. In addition, the New Orleans Board ordered school authorities not to exclude qualified black youth who applied for admission. However, the admittance of a student into the all-white senior class led to the momentary departure of the white members of the class. In this way, the struggle continued between the New Orleans Board and its opponents.37

On September 16, 1875, as New Orleans and coastal Louisiana braced for a possible hurricane strike, a hurricane of a different sort materialized. In New Orleans, the appointment of mathematician E.J. Edmunds to the faculty of Central High School unleashed a storm of opposition to Edmunds and the school board. Edmunds was formerly principal of the Sumner Boys School. Being of gens de coleur background, Edmunds was the first black elected to the faculty of Central High. He brought superb academic credentials to the post. A native of New Orleans, Edmunds attended the prestigious Ecole Polytechnique in Paris where he ranked fifth in his graduating class. He also compiled a distinguished record of service as an officer in the French army.38

At the September 15 meeting of the school board, Pinchback denied that the election of Edmunds originated with him or any other black member of the board. However,

37Daily Picayune, 19 February 1875; Fischer, 128, 129; Vaughn, 97; Harlan, 667.
38Daily Picayune, 16 September 1875; Annual Report, 1875, 167; Rodolphe Lucien Desdunes, Our People and Our History, trans. Dorothea McGants (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1973), 72, 73; Blassingame, 117, 118; Devore and Logsdon, 81; Vaughn, 97; Harlan, 667.
he and other board members relied upon the Fourteenth Amendment to justify their actions. Pinchback affirmed that the board supported the election unanimously to “test the sincerity of the Southern people in their oft repeated assertions . . . that they accepted the civil and political equality of all men before the law.” He further asserted that if Edmunds was driven from his post, such professions and acceptance of the “new order of things” by white fellow-citizens was merely “sounding brass and tinkling cymbals.”

Subsequent editorials in the Picayune named Pinchback the arch-conspirator in the matter and accused him of “devilish machinations.” The newspaper also pointed out that notwithstanding the mixed school provisions of the state constitution, nothing in that document called on the school board “to force a negro teacher upon white pupils.” The Picayune cited Congress’ recent rejection of the mixed school provisions of the Civil Rights Bill of 1875, a counterargument to Pinchback’s previous citing of the Fourteenth Amendment.

After reviewing possible motives of the school board’s decision, the Picayune credited the board’s action to official incompetence, insolence of office, and ignorant and unscrupulous demagogues. Such actions were components
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39Daily Picayune, 16 September 1875; Blassingame, 117, 118.
40Daily Picayune, 17 September 1875. Congressional elections in 1874 produced a Democratic victory in the House. As Reconstruction reached a high-water mark and Republican control of Congress waned, the 1875 Civil Rights Bill became the last, best effort to protect the remaining achievements of Reconstruction. The bill, which had passed through the Senate mostly intact, was steered through the House by Massachusetts Representative and former General Benjamin Butler. Butler omitted the bill’s controversial mixed school provision to facilitate passage. See Foner, Short History of Reconstruction, 233, 234; Taylor, 436; Devore and Logsdon, 76.
in a larger design to “Africanize the schools” and “gall the white community to open resistance, for political effect.” Regardless of the editor’s hostility to the board, the newspaper acknowledged that the school board created a “well-laid” and tempting “trap.”

Also during this time, the Bulletin made “grave allegations” against a black member of the board. The Bulletin claimed that the board director, who was not named, regularly accepted money from a certain white female teacher. The teacher allegedly made the payments to remain employed. Finally, the director fired the teacher. The teacher’s attempt to discover the reason why she was fired allegedly ended in a “very gross and profane insult to the lady,” who then was ordered to leave the director’s office. Another allegation made by the Bulletin charged the entire school board with corruption and also stated that women of improper character had been employed as teachers.

Superintendent Brown made the first response to the Bulletin charges. He forwarded a request to the editor of the newspaper asking for evidence of the allegations made against the board director:

Sir—Please furnish me at your earliest convenience the evidence upon which you based the grave allegations made against one of the city school directors in your issue of yesterday under the caption of the “Public School Shame.”

The second response came from the New Orleans Board, which formed two committees, one to investigate the allegations, and the other to request evidence of the same. The latter committee, which included Pinchback, made a personal visit

---

41Daily Picayune, 17, 19, 25 September 1875.
42Annual Report, 1875, 40-42.
43Annual Report, 40-42.
to the Bulletin office. No evidence was ever supplied to Brown or the school board.\textsuperscript{44}

On September 25, The Picayune and Bulletin, which had appealed for organized resistance, published the call for an open air mass meeting of “all the citizens in New Orleans who take an interest in the Public Schools.” A long list of names of concerned citizens followed. The meeting, which was rescheduled due to inclement weather, was held at Lafayette Square on Wednesday evening September 29. Former State Superintendent of Public Education Alexander Dimitry was among the featured speakers.\textsuperscript{45}

The meeting adopted a preamble which cited the school board for removal of competent and experienced teachers, using personal preference or immoral and base motives in selecting teachers, appointing “a colored man as professor of mathematics” to Central High School, forcing the race issue, and for being illegally constituted. The attendees of the meeting subsequently passed resolutions demanding the reorganization of the board, calling for the resignation of board members in light of “moral unfitness” and educational qualifications, and declared their intention to test the legality of the school tax. The final resolution designated a committee of five to apprise the school board of the meeting’s decisions and to expedite the meeting’s intent.\textsuperscript{46}

The committee on October 6 forwarded their communication to the school board, which responded one week later. The main points of the board’s reply pled innocence

\textsuperscript{44}Daily Picayune, 16 September 1875; Annual Report, 1875, 40-42.
\textsuperscript{45}Daily Picayune, 25, 30 September 1875; Fischer, 128, 129; Vaughn, 97.
\textsuperscript{46}Daily Picayune, 30 September 1875; Fischer, 128, 129; Vaughn, 97.
to the charges and also informed the committee that only the State Board of Education had jurisdiction to remove board members. The New Orleans Board asserted that under the present administration the corps of teachers improved from year to year and New Orleans had the best schools in the South. They also demanded a trial to answer the charges levied against the board.\textsuperscript{47}

The committee sent a more detailed record of complaints to Superintendent Brown. Board directors were additionally charged with failing to visit schools as stipulated by the law. The protest contained demands that specific directors such as General James Longstreet, Judge H.C. Dibble, and Pinchback be removed for holding other offices. More specifically, the committee demanded the removal of Pinchback and other black board directors by reason of being "illiterate politicians, wholly unfit for the honorable position of School Director." According to the committee they lacked the "necessary fitness and capacity" such as "literary, scientific, and scholastic attainment." At least one of the board members in question, Senator Jules A. Masicot, was college-educated.\textsuperscript{48}

Brown’s reply offered the committee an opportunity for a full hearing:

I duly received your communication of the thirteenth instant, and in reply beg to say that I fully recognize my duty to listen to complaints either of individuals or assembled citizens aggrieved by any act, direct or indirect, of mine, or of those associated with me in our educational work, and for whose conduct I may be justly responsible.

Considering the importance of relieving the cause of public education from embarrassment and depressing influences of adverse criticism, whether from just

\textsuperscript{47}Annual Report, 1875, 45, 46; Vaughn, 98.
\textsuperscript{48}Annual Report, 1875, 48, 49; Vincent, 51.
causes or unreasoning hostility, I waive the many technical objections which, if observed, would preclude a hearing of your complaint. The law requires a notice of “ten days” to assemble the State Board of Education in special session; this, and the fact that the division Superintendents are engaged in preparing the annual reports peremptorily required by law and the examination of data in their respective divisions, make it impracticable to convene the State Board before November 4, proximo.

Hoping this will meet the reasonable requirements of all parties, I shall communicate your complaints to the members of the city School Board. You will thus be furnished with an opportunity for a full hearing and an impartial decision.\textsuperscript{49}

Subsequently, Brown submitted official notice to the State Board of Education and unofficial notices to each member notifying them of a November 4 special session. He notified the complaining committee of the session and served each member of the New Orleans Board with copies of specific charges alleged against them and summons to be present at the State Board meeting.\textsuperscript{50}

The State Board assembled November 4 at Brown’s office with New Orleans Board members present. The committee responded to Superintendent Brown’s notification with a reply dated November 4. The response stated that evidence of the charges was within Brown’s reach and “too notorious to need proof.” Brown rejected this statement saying, “He knew of none.” The State Board convened over three days during which time no complainant appeared or made intentions to appear. Superintendent Brown personally held the complainants in contempt.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{49}Annual Report, 1875, 49-51.  
\textsuperscript{50}Annual Report, 1875, 49-51; Vaughn, 98.  
\textsuperscript{51}Annual Report, 1875, 52, 53; Vaughn, 98.
Although the State Board and the New Orleans Board called the bluff of the committee, Brown was disgusted with the commotion and disruption caused by the entire affair. As division superintendents, State Board members were busy compiling annual reports and could “ill afford to take the time from their work” to attend the session. Teachers and students feared a repeat of December 1874. Brown labeled the entire affair the “shameless proceedings of a class of disturbers that would ruin because they could not rule.” In the 1875 annual report, he concluded there was “no manhood nor shame in the managers of the so-called Conservative press of New Orleans.”  

Through the entire matter, Edmunds suffered insult, and the usual withdrawal of the senior class at Central High School. The junior class, on the other hand, recognized his abilities. At one point, Edmunds made a public challenge to any white mathematician to defeat him in a contest of abilities. At another point he barely avoided an altercation with a student outside of the high school. However, he was steadfast and remained faithful to his post through the end of the Brown Administration. After Reconstruction, in 1877 Edmunds became principal of the newly established public high school for blacks in New Orleans. He was also employed as mathematics professor at the Peabody Normal School for Colored Students, which opened December 1877.

* * * * * * * *

---

52Annual Report, 1875, 52, 53.
53Annual Report of the State Superintendent of Public Education, Robert M. Lusher, to the General Assembly of Louisiana, For the Year 1877 (Office of the Democrat, 1878), 303; Desdunes, Our People and Our History, 72; Fay, 113; Devore and Logsdon, 81; Vaughn, 97; Fischer, 125-127; Blassingame, 117, 118.
Superintendent Brown was also affiliated with both city and higher education administration during his tenure. He served as assistant secretary to the New Orleans Park Board of Commissioners. The five-member board, excluding Brown, was responsible for organization and further development of City Park.54

Brown was a member of the boards of four higher education institutions during his superintendency, Vice President of the New Orleans University Board of Trustees; member, Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors; member, University of Louisiana Board of Administrators; and a Vice President of the Louisiana State Agricultural and Mechanical College Board of Control. In the realm of public higher education, Superintendent Brown encountered issues similar to those in public elementary and secondary education. The establishment of the State A&M College instead of being a cause for celebration became one more cause for consternation in the politics of the period.55

As demonstrated in a previous chapter, Superintendent Conway’s determination to establish a state normal school created a wedge issue with an uncanny ability to expose possible areas of division or resistance in public education. The establishment of an additional state institute of higher education was another such example. Resulting from the Morill Act of 1862, Congress offered Federal land grants to states for establishment of agricultural colleges.

54 First Annual Report of the Commissioners of the New Orleans Park to the General Assembly of Louisiana, Session of 1873 (New Orleans: Republican Office, 1873), 3, 5-17; Report of the Commissioners of the New Orleans Park to the General Assembly of Louisiana, For the Year 1873 (New Orleans: Republican Office, 1874), 7.
55 Louisianian 4 May 1872; Annual Report, 1873, 423, 464; Ibid., 1874, 86, 87; Blassingame, 125.
Conway and Colonel David F. Boyd, Superintendent of Louisiana State Seminary and Military Academy (changed in 1870 to Louisiana State University) expressed interest in the fund as early as 1868. Conway desired use of the agricultural fund to establish a combined State Normal School and A&M College. Boyd, like Conway had also been refused Peabody funds by Lusher. Boyd wanted the A&M fund to expand the Seminary into a true university. He expressed this position in reports to Governor Kellogg and Superintendent Brown in 1873.\textsuperscript{56}

The unwillingness of Louisiana State University to implement the mixed school provisions of the law, however, led to increased antagonisms with Superintendent Conway. On at least three occasions, Conway attempted unsuccessfully to bring the University under State Board of Education control. Unable to gain control of Louisiana State University Conway remained adamant against any combination with the A&M College.\textsuperscript{57}

The A&M College funds ultimately became available to the state in 1873 during the Kellogg Administration. As a result of Boyd's refusal to change university policies, the legislature ceased appropriations and supported an independent Louisiana A&M College. The State Board of Education passed a resolution during the 1873 July session authorizing Superintendent Brown to solicit proposals for

\textsuperscript{56}Report of the State Superintendent for 1867 and 1868, 21, 22, 30-31; Annual Report, 1869, 91-93; Annual Report, 1871, 27, 29; Annual Report, 1873, 427-429; Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Louisiana State University transmitted through Governor Wm. Pitt Kellogg (Republican Office: New Orleans, 1874), 3-7, 29; Germaine M. Reed, David French Boyd: Founder of Louisiana State University (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1977), 72.

\textsuperscript{57}Annual Report, 1871, 28; Fleming, 154, 193, 195-197; Fischer 106-109.
the location of the college. Brown also informed Governor Kellogg of the State Board’s position that the fund should be utilized as intended, not distributed among the “several sectarian schools in the city and state.” By January 1874, as the deadline for establishment approached, Brown recommended the extension or re-enactment of the original Congressional Act providing for the college. The proposed extension according to Brown would allow the state legislature to give mature consideration to the college.\textsuperscript{58}

The twelve-member Board of Control was organized in early April and consisted of Governor Kellogg, President; Alfred Shaw and William G. Brown, Vice-Presidents; H.C. Clarke, Secretary; and Daniel Edwards, Treasurer. Other members of the Board included Lieutenant Governor C.C. Antoine, Chief Justice J.T. Ludeling, Senators George Y. Kelso and John R. Lynch, and Honorable Seymour Straight, founder of Straight University. The Board established three standing committees of which Superintendent Brown was a member of ‘Education and Discipline’. Beginning in 1875, Board meetings convened at the State Superintendent’s office.\textsuperscript{59}

The Louisiana State Agricultural & Mechanical College opened its doors in summer 1874 and represented a crowning achievement in public higher education for Superintendent William G. Brown and the entire Kellogg Administration.


\textsuperscript{59}New Orleans Republican 27 April 1875; Annual Report, 1874, 86-94.
Based on the nature of the institution, the A&M College also represented a major triumph in technical education for the state. Classes met during the initial phase of existence in New Orleans at the suspended University of Louisiana. The permanent location of the college was to be in St. Bernard Parish, adjacent to New Orleans. J.L. Cross was President of the institution and Professor of Mathematics, Civil Engineering, and Military Tactics. Consistent with the Constitution of 1868, the A&M College enrolled male students without distinction of race or color.60

The curriculum was four-years and truly polytechnic in scope. It consisted of traditional core classes augmented by such courses as mineralogy, agricultural chemistry, farm building construction, surveying and leveling, and chemistry of metals. Other courses included mechanical drawing, civil engineering, zoology, landscape gardening, meteorology, ore analysis and smelting, and “machines and machine shop practice.” Classes at the College employed military discipline, and were also conducted in the evening. During Brown’s tenure, enrollment ranged from fifty to roughly one hundred sixty students per session.61

The creation of the State A&M College illustrated how the mixed schooling issue also manifested itself in public higher education of the period. One state institution was being strangled and weakened by the issue, while another institution was created and nurtured. In correspondence of March 1874 to Superintendent Brown, Superintendent Boyd of the State University admitted the hardship and difficulties endured by the University. Although he was not optimistic

60Annual Report, 1874, 86-94; Fleming, 283-289; Franklin, 112.
61Annual Report, 1874, 86-94; Fleming, 283-289.
of the institution surviving the year, he expressed
determination to “struggle on for this university.”

During the following academic year, 1874-1875, the
situation worsened. The faculty at Louisiana State
University dwindled to three professors including Boyd.
Such was the state of public higher education in Louisiana
for the remainder of the Kellogg Administration and
Reconstruction. Ultimately in 1877, Governor Kellogg
allowed the passage of a bill into law incorporating the
State University and State A&M College. Henceforth the new
institution became Louisiana State University and
Agricultural & Mechanical College, located at Baton Rouge.

* * * * * * * *

The year 1876 opened on a note of celebration, the
Centennial of the United States. The Centennial Exposition
held at Philadelphia’s Fairmount Park, from May through
September 1876, was meant to symbolize the “Progress of the
Age” and proudly showcased such new developments as the
telephone, typewriter, electric lighting, linoleum
flooring, the internal combustion engine, and the 700-ton
Corliss steam engine, which served as the power plant for
the entire exposition.

Earlier, in 1875 the National Press Convention of
Colored Journalists, which Superintendent Brown attended as
a delegate, formed a Centennial Committee and commissioned
noted sculptress Edmonia Lewis to produce a Centennial work

---

62 D.F. Boyd to Hon. W. G. Brown, Superintendent of Public
Education, 19 March 1874, David F. Boyd Papers, Special Collections,
Louisiana State University and A&M College, Baton Rouge.
63 Fleming, 251, 252; 290-302.
64 New York Times, May-September 1876; Chicago Tribune, May-
September 1876; Foner, 564, 565.
symbolizing black progress. Lewis contributed two works, "Death of Cleopatra," and a monument to Richard Allen, founder of the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church. Lewis' work was actually one of few black contributions in the entire Centennial.\textsuperscript{65}

The \textit{Louisianian} named local Renaissance man Paul Trevigne, to create a work representative of Louisiana blacks for the Centennial. Trevigne's 'Centennial History of the Louisiana Negro,' chronicled the literary, artistic, and scientific achievements of Louisiana's black populace. Trevigne's history was a local edition of a larger eighteen-volume 'Centennial Tribute to the Negro,' envisioned by the Colored Press Convention but never realized.\textsuperscript{66}

However, 1876 was also an election year and would close on an ominous note. At the Exposition, a July 4 address given by Reverend J.W. Jenifer of the St. John AME Church of Pine Bluff, Arkansas, accused the federal government of weakness in responding to the "outrages and murders" committed against blacks in the South by the "Ku Klux Klans and White Leagues." Jenifer, who was invited to commemorate the laying of the base of the Richard Allen Monument, also called upon the federal government to spend as much money on providing education to the freedmen as was spent on internal improvements and military appropriations.\textsuperscript{67}

In Louisiana, both Lieutenant Governor Antoine and Division Superintendent Boothby cancelled plans to travel

\textsuperscript{66}Louisianian, 14, 21 August 1875; Blassingame, 134; P. Foner, "Black Participation," 285, 286, 289.
\textsuperscript{67}P. Foner, 289, 290.
north for the Centennial. At the state and federal levels both Republicans and Democrats were active mobilizing for the upcoming 1876 elections. William G. Brown along with Kellogg, U.S. Marshal S.B. Packard, and Pinchback as delegates at large attended the National Republican Convention held in June at Cincinnati, Ohio. The Convention nominated Rutherford B. Hayes for President of the United States.68

The state Republican ticket nominated Maine carpetbagger and U.S. Marshal Stephen B. Packard for governor. The ticket also carried three black candidates for administrative offices. Once again C.C. Antoine and Brown secured the nominations for Lieutenant Governor and State Superintendent of Education respectively, while Emile Honoré, a former legislator was nominated for Secretary of State.69

Samuel J. Tilden received the Democratic nomination for President of the United States. At the state level, Francis T. Nicholls and Louis A. Wiltz were nominated for Governor and Lieutenant Governor respectively. Once again Robert M. Lusher was nominated for State Superintendent of Education.70

The results of the election held November 7, 1876, were disputed as previously. Both sides claimed victory, however, the Returning Board decided in favor of the Republican ticket. In the election of 1876, Louisiana’s disputed votes along with the disputed votes of Florida and

68C.C. Antoine, Lieutenant Governor to Secretary of the Centennial Commission, 5 May 1876, Honorable C.C. Antoine Scrapbook, Archives, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge; Celia Boothby to mother, 1 July 1876, Charles W. Boothby Papers; Vincent, 213, 214; Gonzales, 93.
69Taylor, 482; Dawson, 227, 228; Vincent, 213, 214.
70Vincent, 214, 215; Taylor, 482, 483; Dawson, 227, 228.
South Carolina, complicated the national election, which was also disputed.\textsuperscript{71}

In Louisiana both parties commenced to establish governments, thus replicating the political environment of 1872-1873. Both Packard and Nicholls were inaugurated on January 8, 1877. Packard, however, was inaugurated in the State House, which had been closed and occupied by the Metropolitans, Louisiana Militia, and Federal troops on the orders of Governor Kellogg and President Grant.\textsuperscript{72}

The settlement of the national dispute had profound implications for Reconstruction. In return for the inauguration of Hayes, the national Republican party granted several concessions to the Democrats which included returning the South to local management. The Packard Administration which included William G. Brown came to an end on April 24 and 25 as President Hayes withdrew Federal troops from Louisiana. Two days later, Nicholls took possession of the State House. Thus, a bargain brokered at the Federal level—the Compromise of 1877, ended in no uncertain terms the turbulent period of American history known as Reconstruction and the Republican administrations associated therewith.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{71}\textit{Daily Picayune}, November-December 1876; \textit{New York Times}, November-December 1876; King, 331; DuBois, 483; McPherson, 599, 600; Rable, 176-183; Foner, 575, 576; Vaughn, 99; Dawson, 240, 241; Vincent, 214, 215.

\textsuperscript{72}\textit{Daily Picayune}, 31 December 1876, 9 January 1877; \textit{New York Times}, 9 January 1877; Dawson, 241, 243, 244, 249; Vincent, 216, 217; Taylor, 493; DuBois, 483; McPherson, 599, 600; Rable, 176-183; Vaughn, 99; Gonzales, 97-99.

\textsuperscript{73}\textit{Daily Picayune}, 25, 26 April 1877; \textit{Chicago Tribune}, 24-27 April 1877; \textit{New York Times}, 25-28 April 1877; Franklin, 203-207, 211; Stampp, 187, 210; McPherson, 600-604; Foner, 577-582, 587; Dawson, 251-254, 257-260; Rodrigue, 168, 173, 177; Taylor, 504, 505; Fischer, 133, 134; DuBois, 484; Tunnell, 210; Devore and Logsdon, 81; Baker, 24; Rable, 176-183; King, 331; Vincent, 216, 217; Vaughn, 99; P. Foner, 294; Gonzales, 97-99.
Superintendent Brown and State Board members were keenly aware of the passing of a significant era and opportunity in the life of the nation. Earlier, in 1874, Brown and the State Board as an expression of the magnitude and historic import of their work formed a special committee:

For the commemoration of the era in the history of the State of Louisiana when by constitution, legislative enactment and fact, a system of public education for all of her children was provided, without regard to race, color or previous condition. . . . 74

The Commemoration Medal Committee chaired by Superintendent Loud, submitted its proposal at the February 24, 1874 State Board session:

Premising the Issue with the remark that the practice of commemorating important events and the perpetuation of great achievements which have marked the lives of men and nations, antedated the Christian era. Some of the most interesting features of Egyptian life and history have been gathered from the medals of that nation. In the hands of those skilled in numismatology they have been the means of lifting the veil of mystery with which the cycles of time had draped the history of the people that made them.

The Grecian and Roman medals are pregnant with meaning, and in their rich and delicate designs are marvels of exquisite taste and simple beauty. These medals, with which rulers and kings awarded the meritorious deeds of faithful citizens or commemorated important national events, are treasured souvenirs.

The crosses of the Legion of Honor of France and the iron cross of Germany, the war medals of our own country, the prize medals of our universities, establish precedents which warrant the State Board in

---

74 Minutes, State Board, 3 March 1874.
commemorating this, one of the grandest events in the history of our state.

The committee followed the introduction with a heraldry-inspired description of the proposed medal. The proposal concluded with the presentation of a prototype gold commemoration medal for the Board’s examination and approval. The report was later adopted during the March 3, 1874 session.75

Neither Superintendent’s reports nor State Board minutes indicated the quantity of medals commissioned, if any. However, Superintendent Brown incorporated aspects of the medal’s design on Office of State Superintendent stationery and State Board certificates. In particular, the image formed the seal of State Board certificates. Both stationery and certificate seals featured a representation of the Goddess of Liberty and a banner proclaiming, “Education the Guardian of Liberty,” thus affording insight into how Superintendent Brown in particular, perceived of the era.76

---

75Minutes, State Board, 3 March 1874. For a full description of the Commemoration Medal, see Appendix D.
76State Board of Education Certificate, May 12, 1875, C.C. Antoine Scrapbook; State Superintendent of Public Education stationery, March 14, 1874, C.W. Boothby Papers.
The annual report of Superintendent William G. Brown for 1876 was to be published and presented in January 1877. However, due to the intense political crisis at the time neither occurred. In addition, the New Orleans Republican, publisher of all Brown Administration reports and the last two Conway reports, soon ceased publication as the Packard Government struggled to maintain itself. Although the report was not published, Superintendent Brown “carefully prepared” a manuscript version, which was subsequently examined by legislative investigation.¹

The annual report of Superintendent Robert M. Lusher for 1877 claimed some 53,000 enrolled for 1876-1877, comprising the final term of the Brown Administration. Compared to the previous year, 1875-1876, student enrollment suddenly declined by more than 20,000. Such a calculation seemed highly dubious and should have been credited to politics rather than accuracy.²

As the Compromise of 1877 signaled the return of government-sanctioned white supremacy, Lusher’s return signaled the compromise of the mixed schooling policy. However, the policy went unaffected for the remaining 1876-1877 school year. During the summer of 1877 the New Orleans Board voted for segregated schools. At the start of the school year in September, 300 black pupils still attended desegregated schools. William O. Rogers, returning Superintendent of New Orleans schools resorted to a school-by-school policy of re-segregating mixed schools. During

¹Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 39.
²Annual Report, 1877, 315.
the Christmas holidays, Rogers assigned remaining pupils to
black schools. Certainly by the summer of 1878, schools in
New Orleans were completely segregated.³

The events of 1877 also marked the resurgence of
Creole activism. Established leaders such as Dr. Roudanez,
Paul Trevigne, Aristide Mary, E. Arnold Bertonneau, and
C.C. Antoine joined with younger protégés such as Rodolphe
Desdunes and Louis Martinet. They initially mobilized to
challenge school segregation policies in the late 1870s. In
time, members of this group, before the close of the
century, would challenge the whole of segregation itself.⁴

* * * * * * * *

Following the end of Reconstruction, the state
legislature organized a five-member committee to
investigate the Department of Education during the Conway
and Brown Administrations. The Reverend M.C. Cole was
employed by the committee as much for his secretarial skill
as for his knowledge of both administrations. The Joint
Committee of Investigation cited William G. Brown for
complete and “faithfully kept” records for the years 1873,
1874, 1875, and 1876; and praised the annual report of 1875
as “the best one made since 1867.” Finally, the Committee
accorded Brown “a faithful performance of his duties.”⁵

On previous occasions, other unlikely sources also
vindicated Superintendent Brown’s qualities and abilities.
David F. Boyd, a Virginia native and Superintendent of

³Vaughn, 99-101; Fischer, 137-139; Blassingame, 122; Baker, 24,
25; Devore and Logsdon, 81; Harlan, 672.
⁴Fischer, 139-141; Logsdon and Bell, 251-261; Baker, 25-42.
⁵Report of Joint Committee, 1878, 7, 39.
Louisiana State University, self-described as “a Democrat, a southerner, and a secessionist,” considered Brown and Antoine Dubuclet, the best officers in the state government and “a credit to their race.” The Picayune in 1874 praised Brown’s impartiality and transparency:

The report just published shows that no disposition exists to conceal or excuse the misconduct of those thus exposed, and a critical examination will show that in all cases the defaulting Republican officials are as severely handled as the Democratic; no partiality is shown.

We approve of such frankness as Mr. Brown’s . . .

If he can develop the good alleged to be inherent in our existing school system, we don’t think the blindest prejudices of race, color, politics or anything else will stand between him and undying fame.6

Appreciation for Brown also radiated from other, friendlier sources. In 1873, Superintendent Keating expressed his assessment of Brown as such:

The course adopted by our worthy State Superintendent in the management of the educational department of the State during the past twelve months, has won the confidence of the entire people. . . .7

On at least two additional occasions, the entire State Board of Education expressed its gratitude to Superintendent Brown. The first occasion occurred in session, April 14, 1875. By motion of Superintendent Loud, the Board thanked Superintendent Brown for the kind consideration exhibited to each member and the wise and impartial judgment rendered. Furthermore, they credited their individual successes as superintendents to the

6Daily Picayune, 4 March 1874; Reed, David French Boyd, 119, 147, 148.
7Annual Report, 1873, 378.
maturity, wisdom, and advice of Superintendent Brown and expressed admiration for his integrity of character.\textsuperscript{8}

The second occasion occurred three days later, Saturday, April 17, 1875. After adjournment, State Board members treated Superintendent Brown to a surprise afternoon feast at his residence. Others present included Mrs. William G. Brown, Lieutenant Governor Antoine and wife, Senator-elect Pinchback, Dr. James Newman of Straight University, J. Sella Martin, P.M. Williams, Henry A. Corbin, George Ruby, editor of the \textit{Louisianian}, state senators, the assistant superintendent of New Orleans schools, and members of the New Orleans school board.

On this occasion friends and well-wishers presented Brown with a “noble steed” as a token of appreciation. On a previous occasion Brown won a fancy carriage and harness at a fair given by the Central Congregational Church.\textsuperscript{9} Superintendent George Loud, in one of six speeches, captured the sincerity of all present:

Though arduous and often vexatious, educational work is a delightful and highly honorable calling, and those of us who are co-workers with you in the sacred cause are proud of you as our distinguished and worthy chief.

We think it meet and proper . . . to express our unbounded confidence in you as a prudent, wise, and efficient administrator of a remarkably tender and important trust. . . . No man in our humble opinion could have discharged the delicate and complicated duties . . . with a more consummate tact and wiser judgment than you have exhibited from first to last. We congratulate you upon the improvement and increased efficiency everywhere manifested in our noble work,

\textsuperscript{8}\textit{Louisianian}, 24 April 1875.

\textsuperscript{9}Central Congregational, whose maxim was “A Christian Church with Community Ideals,” was officially affiliated with the AMA and Straight University. Reverend C.H. Thompson, D.D. served initially as pastor at Central. See \textit{Louisianian}, 18 May 1872; C.C. Antoine Scrapbook; Richardson, 149.
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and which are due chiefly to your wise counsels, untiring zeal, and steady hand.

As a second object of our meeting, last but not least, your friends thought it would be proper to express our mutual regards by some more tangible testimony than mere words, and to this end we have selected as appropriate to our purpose this noble steed, to draw the beautiful buggy your deserved popularity won on a memorable trial, that you may ride on prosperously and at ease.

In the name of these friends I hereby present you this proud and noble animal, and beg you to accept him as a token of the heartfelt regard we cherish for you as a man, a friend, a co-worker and our superior officer.

Following the presentations, all present toasted Superintendent Brown, who addressed his admirers and returned his thanks and sincere appreciation.  

Although black elected officials receded from the political stage with the end of Reconstruction, a few managed to salvage and sustain their political careers during the Nicholls Administration and after. Others found opportunity as leaders in the state Republican Party, which continued in existence despite the loss of power. However, William G. Brown was a quintessential public servant. He utilized politics as a tool to further education. Educational leadership helped facilitate his political goals. Once such opportunities ended, Brown took a respite from politics and simply disappeared from the public eye.

In 1877 Brown became a partner in the brokerage firm of C.C. Antoine & Company located at 114 Carondelet. The company proffered rent and bounty collection services and offered “liberal advances” for consignment of crops, moss,  

10Louisianian, 14 March 1874, 24 April 1875; Blassingame, 132.
fuel, lumber, or “any merchantable article.” Company sales literature featured the names of both Antoine and Brown and promised “prompt attention to consignments, obedience of orders of shippers, immediate sales and payment of net proceeds, except otherwise ordered, moderate charges and small commissions.” Antoine & Company offered potential clients the advantage of past experience, local connections, and “acquaintance with local peculiarities.”

The 1878 yellow fever epidemic in New Orleans briefly returned Brown to the public eye. The epidemic claimed the lives of Henry A. Corbin and his younger brother John H. Corbin. Henry was a former editor and current business manager of the Louisianian. As editor, he was Brown’s immediate successor. During Brown’s superintendency, he was elected secretary of the New Orleans Board. John was a teacher who at the time of his death was principal of a McDonogh school. Brown’s letter of condolence to the family was mentioned in the Louisianian.

In 1879, Brown appeared in the New Orleans City Directory as a clerk. From 1880 through 1883, Brown served as Liquidating Clerk in the federal Customhouse. The year 1882 marked a resumption of Brown’s political activities. He was corresponding secretary of the Crescent City Arthur Republican Central Club. Also in 1882, after a twelve-year run, the Louisianian suspended publication for the final time.

---

13Louisianian, 2 May 1874, 30 November 1878; Annual Report, 1875, 36, 37; Blassingame, 132.
14The namesake of the club was U.S. President Chester A. Arthur (1881–1885).
15Soards’ New Orleans Directory for 1879 (L. Soards and Co., 1879); Soards’ New Orleans Directories for 1880–1883; Louisianian, 17
Brown in 1882 became treasurer and C.C. Antoine, president of the Cosmopolitan Insurance Association. Capitalized at $25,000, Cosmopolitan Insurance was located on the second floor at 2 Carondelet, room number 10. Cosmopolitan officially opened August 1, and was legally incorporated August 8, 1882. Besides Brown and Antoine, John B. Gaudet was vice-president and Aristide Dejoie was secretary. Members of the Board of Directors included Alfred Shaw and Jacques A. Gla. Cosmopolitan promotional literature contained the phrase “Sans Peur et sans Reproche.”

A newspaper article described Cosmopolitan’s services as “specially adapted to the needs of the thrifty poor and in the provisions to aid in sickness and relieve, at death compensation is made to each insurer for the trifling sum he is invited to invest in the business.” The article also lauded the proprietors of Cosmopolitan Insurance: “the character of the organizers and the undoubted ability and integrity of the Board of Directors are guarantees that the business of the association will be conducted with economy, honesty, and success.”

Brown died at his residence on May 14, 1883, after an illness of approximately one week. He was fifty years of age. His obituary listed the cause of death as inflammation

June 1882; Daily Picayune, 15 May 1883; Davis, 162. During and after the superintendency, Brown appeared in the Louisiana as a person of interest and remained within the close circle of proprietors, editors, and staff. However, he no longer appeared to have any significant role in the journal's operation.


Sans Peur et sans Reproche: Without Fear and beyond Reproach.

Unnamed, undated article, C.C. Antoine Scrapbook.
of the bowels, while the certificate of death stated congestion of the brain. At least once as superintendent, Brown was seriously ill, incapacitated from an attack of ague, which stemmed from malaria contracted during his travels around the state.\textsuperscript{18}

Both Superintendents Brown and Conway were seriously ill during their administrations, not only highlighting general health concerns of the day but also the physical requirements of the office. By law, state superintendents were required to annually tour all the school districts of the state. Even division superintendents had difficulty traversing their entire districts. Superintendent Brown’s travels were arduous and in most divisions hazardous and involved physical hardship, even had there been no political antagonisms.\textsuperscript{19}

Fourth and Fifth Divisions, the largest divisions in the state both required at least 2,000 miles of travel and constant time in the saddle, each occupying some 2 months or more, according to their superintendents. The Third Division comprised the southwestern swamps, bayous, gulf coastal parishes and the Mississippi River. This division included Cameron Parish located on the Gulf of Mexico, some 400 miles from the local superintendent who utilized telegraph transmittal of reports. The First and Second Divisions included traversing the southeastern swamps, bayous, gulf coastal parishes, and the Mississippi River. The Second Division for example, exhausted all available means of transport: steamboat, pirogue, rail, horse, mule, mule.

\textsuperscript{18}Orleans Parish Death Certificate, 16 May 1883, Louisiana State Archives, Baton Rouge; \textit{Daily Picayune}, 15 May 1883; \textit{Louisianian}, 4 September 1875.
\textsuperscript{19}Louisianian, 4 September 1875; \textit{Annual Report}, 1872, 7, 20; Vaughn, 91; Beasley, 156, 157.
and foot. The local superintendent once crossed the Mississippi River sixteen times in a skiff.\textsuperscript{20}

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Brown’s funeral was held the afternoon of Tuesday, May 15 at the Central Congregational Church. Gadane Casanave, a prominent black businessman and civic leader who regularly advertised in the \textit{Louisianian} was the mortician. The Masonic Fraternity presided over the ceremonies. Brown was Deputy Grand Master of the Eureka Grand Lodge of the State of Louisiana, and Treasurer of Berry Lodge No. 2. William G. Brown left his wife and countless friends and admirers to survive him.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{20}Annual Reports, 1871-1875. One particular Second Division district located eighteen miles down Bayou Lafourche was only reached by dugout canoe. The return trip usually involved a night excursion upstream accompanied by alligators.

\textsuperscript{21}Louisianian, 17 June 1882; Daily Picayune, 15 May 1883; Vincent, 151, 215. During the election of 1876, Casanave was a member of the Kellogg Returning Board. The \textit{Louisianian} in 1879 listed Mrs. Brown as a convert and new member of Central Congregational.
CONCLUSION

To some extent, the administration of William G. Brown was bound by Louisiana’s political and educational history. Previous administrations contended with not only budgetary deficits but corruption—legislative, governmental, as well as corruption in education. Nearly all of Brown’s predecessors were in accord for the return of parish superintendence. The liquidation of the office dealt a major blow to both parish and system level management. By 1858, the free school fund had also become a victim of legislative interference and was ultimately liquidated in 1872. As a result, the Brown Administration would not benefit from parish-level management nor apportion any monies derived from the free school fund.

The Civil War and Reconstruction however, brought changes and challenges not faced by most previous administrations. While not enforced, universal education became a de jure reality with the Constitution of 1864. Still, black youth remained outside of the halls of state public education.

Beginning with the Constitutional Convention of 1867-1868, politics exerted an even greater role as race manifested itself in education. The subsequent reorganization of the school system also heightened budgetary concerns as the number of students increased with the addition of black pupils. Such developments peaked during the Brown Administration.

During his time as editor of the Louisianian, Brown utilized the press as a tool to present, discuss, and underscore education issues. The topic of mixed schooling regularly appeared in the pages of the Louisianian during
Brown’s editorial tenure. Consequently as superintendent, Brown maintained interest in and commitment to such schools. For example, soon after the school riots of 1874, Brown and the New Orleans school board not only upheld desegregation, but also began pushing its extension into high school faculty.

The labor-driven educational philosophy of Superintendent Brown, however, viewed Louisiana’s troubles from an economic, not racial standpoint. He believed education allied with labor was the solution for the problems of caste, a belief that ran counter to traditional Victorian educational and social ideals.¹ Brown envisioned an educational system with proper managerial resources offering all of its pupils the tools for combating economic oppression, thus guarding their liberties while also facilitating self-elevation and contributing to the nation’s greater prosperity. As a facet of his educational philosophy, Brown was a proponent of industrial education, which was furthered with the 1874 establishment of the Louisiana State A&M College.

In retrospect, William G. Brown presided over a critical juncture in Louisiana’s political and educational history, the excruciating and dramatic close of Reconstruction. For the executive of the State Department of Education this was a time when education was almost completely prostrated by more than the traditional educational issues of concern. Superintendent Brown’s difficult responsibilities were vastly increased by political instability, bitter political rivalries and

antagonisms, violence, insurgency, and the overthrow of government.

Yet through these years, the Brown Administration often cited increases in student enrollment. To a large extent, the masses tacitly accepted public schools and recognized Superintendent Brown’s leadership. Not once during the turbulent period of his superintendency did the school system cease to exist. Moreover there was a fully functional system of schools at the close of Reconstruction in 1877. The same arguments could not be applied to general government in Louisiana.

William G. Brown combined rare personal integrity with an “evangelical sense of purpose” characteristic of Victorian-era superintendents and educational administrators. Such traits could not be ignored or obscured despite attempts by the conservative press and political adversaries to do so. With an eye toward the future, Superintendent Brown recognized the critical relationship between excellent, well-run schools and attracting residents to the state. He took on school boards, a superintendent, and others as necessary to implement an honest, responsible, and competent system. In the process, he added to that personal integrity which was already evident and significant to his ability to lead.

The issue of mixed schools remained controversial during the Brown Administration. Despite the turmoil, evidence of greater acceptance seemed present and within reach. However, the efforts of the conservative press along with terror organizations such as the White League kept passions inflamed and guaranteed the deferral of reasonable

---

2Tyack, “Pilgrim’s Progress,” 261.
toleration. Still, as far as can be determined, Brown maintained the number of mixed schools existing in 1872 throughout the disruption and turmoil of his administration. While not attaining the realization of full implementation, the existence of such schools represented an important precedent for future trends in education.

As seen with the free school fund and teacher compensation, budgetary concerns did not abate during the Brown Administration. The two-mill tax remained the standard in public educational funding throughout the period. However, Superintendent Brown’s fiscal management, along with increased legislative appropriations actually fostered system growth in 1874, despite an ongoing depression.

Considering the extreme pressures attendant upon public education and state superintendence during the period, William G. Brown’s achievements were truly remarkable. He increased student enrollment and cultivated greater acceptance for public education. Brown presided over a period of school system growth and guided the system through the “stormy days” of Reconstruction’s end. More specifically, William G. Brown’s integrity, leadership, and fiscal management facilitated the maintenance of an entire system of schools beset by governmental bankruptcy and dysfunction.

As a Constitutional Convention delegate and later Superintendent of Public Education, Brown was among the

---

3Looking back from a vantage point of some thirty years, E.S. Stoddard recalled “for thirty odd years I have been a resident of this city, and have seen times that it tried men’s souls for a white man to be identified as a republican . . .” Unknown, undated address in connection with the William McKinley presidential campaign, New Orleans, 1896 or 1900, Ephraim Samuel Stoddard Collection, Archives, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans.
first wave of African-American elected officials in Louisiana and the nation. Such major accomplishments represented Brown’s exceptionality. His inclusive vision of education, not as a means of social control, but as a tool to liberate, along with his proven abilities and achievements stood out in the context of the times and transcended the limits of race, class, and nationality. As a result, William G. Brown’s superintendency contributed a unique chapter to the educational history of not just Louisiana, but the nation.⁴

⁴In 1972, the Louisiana Education Association presented an oil painting of Brown to the Department of Education. The portrait was rightfully displayed among portraits of other state superintendents in the Education Department building in Baton Rouge. Roscoe Reddick, a graduate of Southern University Baton Rouge and faculty member at Southern University New Orleans painted the portrait. State-Times (Baton Rouge), 3 March 1972.
APPENDIX A

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF LOUISIANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1868-1877

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE SUPERINTENDENT:
Department executive, member and President of State Board

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION:
System administrative policy and management, composed of State Superintendent and Division Superintendents

DIVISION SUPERINTENDENTS (6):
School Division management, members, officers of State Board

LOCAL BOARDS OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS:
Direct management and supervision of schools--appointed by State Board

LOCAL SCHOOLS
APPENDIX B

REPORT OF EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Your committee appointed to take into consideration the propriety and practicability of establishing a monthly State educational journal, respectfully recommend, after having carefully canvassed the subject, that they are fully persuaded that such an enterprise is not only practicable but very desirable, and will advance the interests entrusted to our care. A careful inquiry as to the cost of publication and the sources of patronage within our reach, relieves the enterprise from all hazard, providing each superintendent gives it his hearty support. It is of the utmost importance that the people of our commonwealth be made fully acquainted with the official action of the board in all its minutia, and brought within touching distance of ourselves, and in no way can this so speedily be accomplished as by the publication of a journal advocating the cause of education as a specialty and marking its advanced steps in our midst. The advantage to ourselves and subordinate officials in the constant information furnished from the respective departments of our work, can not be too highly estimated, and without which our efficiency must be largely crippled. To the official journals of this State we are greatly indebted for aid rendered; but however willing, the multiplicity of interests claiming their attention renders them powerless to give that aid to this department that its magnitude and importance demand. For the reasons enumerated, you are respectfully requested to take such action as will enable this enterprise to be immediately organized: and your committee suggests that the honorable president of the board be made editor and publisher, with authority to select his assistant, and that the several superintendents be designated and so recognized as associate editors of the journal, named by the president of the board the Louisiana Guardian.

The various division superintendents are respectfully requested to render what pecuniary aid they may be able to obtain in their respective divisions by way of

---

1As presented by Chairman Charles W. Boothby July 18 and accepted in session, July 19, 1873, Louisiana State Board of Education.
subscriptions from teachers and friends of education generally.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{2}The State Board designated September 1873 for the premiere edition of the \textit{Louisiana Guardian} whose title reflected Brown’s educational credo. The author has not found any evidence of the journal’s existence. Similar to the case of the Commemoration Medal, neither State Board minutes nor Superintendent’s reports indicated whether or not the journal was published. If published, the \textit{Guardian} would have provided a unique forum as the organ of the state’s top educational officers, thus enabling State Board members to express their individual and collective outlooks on education. As described in the report, the board would have also generated the funding for the proposed journal. Brown previously criticized Conway’s journal for containing more advertisements and politics than education. Perhaps because of questions of integrity and objectivity connected with funding, the journal never achieved publication. Whether or not it was published, the \textit{Louisiana Guardian} was another clear illustration of Brown and the State Board’s goals and objectives.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS FOR COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION OF APPLICANTS FOR
TEACHERSHIPS, MAY, 1873

ARITHMETIC.

1. Find the Greatest Common Divisor of 135, 225 and 414.
   Find the Least Common Multiple of 8, 9, 10, 12, 16 and 18.

2. Find the value of $42 \frac{2}{3} - 3 \frac{1}{4} \div (7 19-20 - 2 \frac{3}{4}) + 2 \frac{1}{2} \times 4 1-5 + \frac{3 5-9}{51/3}$

3. Find the value of $15.234 - 6.4 \frac{2}{3} + (7.2 \div .018) + 5.24$.

4. A man gave to A 2-9 of all his money; to B 3-14 of the remainder; to C what then remained. C received $240 more than B. What did A receive?

5. Required the value of 3 tons, 2cwt., 5lbs., 6 oz., 8 drs. of Sugar at 20c. per lb.

6. How shall I mark cloth that cost $1 60 a yard so as to gain 25 per cent.; and what per cent. shall I lose if I sell it at $1 55 a yard?

7. Required the bank discount of a 90-day note for $8342 75 at 6 per cent.

8. Divide $1292 into parts proportional to $3 \frac{2}{3}$, 4 1-7 and 2 4-9.

9. If 500 men in 40 days consume 2 tons of flour, how many men in 3 weeks will consume 420 lbs?


GRAMMAR.

1. What is the rule for spelling words ending in a single consonant when a termination beginning with a vowel is added? Write the rules for the use of capitals.
2. Define a participial noun; write a sentence containing a participial and an abstract noun; write the plural of portico, elf, staff, distaff, colloquy, genius, handful, court-martial, talisman, index, and the letter t when used as a noun.

3. In how many ways is the distinction of gender denoted and what are they? Write the declension of the compound noun son-in-law, and the feminine of beau, testator, sir, swain, wizard, czar, and hero.

4. Write a sentence showing the classification of that. Tell what part of speech it is in each case and why.

5. How are verbs distinguished as to their signification and their form? How many participles in each voice and what are they? When should we use the past (imperfect) tense, and when the present perfect (perfect) tense, to denote action or state that is past?

6. Write the preterite (perfect) tenses, indicative mood of the verb to lie, to utter an untruth; the preterite tenses, potential mood, of the verb to lie, to recline; and the infinitive mood and participles, passive voice, of the verb to lay.

7. When should the relative that be used in preference to who or which? Correct the following: I have no apprehensions but what he will succeed. Two nouns, when they come together and do not signify the same thing, the former should be in the possessive case.

8. To what are conjunctive adverbs equivalent? Give an example. Correct the following and give the reasons for the correction: Nero was more wicked than any of the Roman emperors. Another old veteran of the cross has fallen and departed this life.

9. Analyze the following extract and parse the words italicized:

   "For me, when I forget the darling theme,
   Whether the blossom blows, the summer ray
   Russets the plain, inspiring autumn gleams,
   Or winter rises in the blackening east,
   Be my tongue mute, my fancy paint no more
   And, dead to joy, forget my heart to beat!"
HISTORY.

1. Give an account of the uprising under Leisler. How did it terminate?

2. Give a short account of Bacon’s Rebellion.

3. Relate the events connected with the Charter Oak. When and from whom did New England receive its name?


5. To what war did the conflicting claims of England and France to the basin of the Mississippi Valley lead? Give a short account of the last great event of that war.

6. When and where was the first Continental Congress held? What was the Bill of Rights, or the declaration there drawn up?

7. What was the Stamp Act? What eminent British statesman effected its repeal?

8. What battles of the Revolution can you remember in which the Americans were victorious? Who commanded the Americans in these engagements?

9. What led to the War of 1812? Name the principal naval victories gained by the Americans.

10. State what you know of the acquisition of Louisiana by the United States, and of its extent at that time. What States have been formed out of its territory?

Geography.

1. Define Geography, Geology, Physical Geography, and Mathematical Geography. Name the Zones, and give their boundaries and the number of degrees contained in each.

2. What causes the change of seasons? On what portion of the earth’s surface do the rays of the sun shine vertically? Why are the tropics so called, and where are they situated? What is meant by the summer and winter solstice? At what time of the year are we nearest to the sun, and why is it the coldest season of the year?
3. Name the different races of men and the countries they inhabit.

4. Which is the most north-western parish of Louisiana, and which is its principal town? In what parish and on what river is Alexandria?

5. Over what waters would you pass in a voyage from Stockholm to Vienna?

6. Over what bodies of water would you pass in going, by way of the Atlantic, from Nashville, Tenn., to Chicago?

7. Locate the following islands, and tell by what waters they are surrounded: Joannes, Jersey, Isle of Man, Malta, Minores, Nantucket, Porto Rico, Formosa, St. Helena and Luzon.

8. Name the bays, gulfs, sounds and seas that indent the eastern coast of the United States, and the southern and eastern coast of Asia.

9. Where are the following mountain ranges, and in what direction do they extend: Adirondack, Cumberland, Green, Carpathian, Apennines, Alps, Grampian Hills, Altai, Himalaya, and the Snow Mountains?

10. Bound the following: Pennsylvania, Peru, Turkey in Europe, Algeria, and Liberia.

ARITHMETIC.

1. The sum of two numbers is 10; their difference is 1.5. What are the numbers? Find the four smallest numbers such that when each is divided successively by 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, the remainder shall in each case be 1.

2. Find the value of the following expression: \[((3-70 + 1-28) \div 1-21 - 3-8) \times 1-3 - .05\].

3. If 50 £ in 5-12 of a year gain £2 5s. 1d. 22/3 qr., in what time will 131/3 £ gain 1 1-12 £, and at what rate per cent. per annum?

4. Paid $40 apiece for stoves, what must I ask that I may take off 20 per cent. and yet make twenty per cent. on the cost?
5. What sum must a father invest at 6 per cent. for a son 19 years old so that he may have $1000 when he is 21?

6. Find the difference between the interest and discount of $6000 for 1 year at 6 per cent.

7. What must be the face of a note on four months that when discounted at bank at 7 per cent. the proceeds may be $750?

8. A and B trade upon equal capitals; A gains a sum equal to 2-5 of his capital, and B a sum equal to 1-4 of his. B’s gain was $100 less than A’s. What was the capital of each?

9. A note of $10,000, given January 1, 1840, has received the following indorsements: January 1, 1841, indorsed $2952 28; January 1, 1842, $2952 28; January 1, 1843, $2952 28. How much remained due January 1, 1844, interest being computed at 7 per cent.? 

10. A certain square block of marble contains 72,515,625 solid feet. What is the area of one of its sides?

**ENGLISH GRAMMAR.**

1. How may the infinitive mood be used? Give examples. What is a particle?

2. What is the difference between simple, complex and compound sentences? Give examples. Name and define the different classes of pronouns.

3. Punctuate the following:
   
   Did ye hear it No ‘twas but the wind  
   Or the car rattling o’er the stony street  
   On with the dance let joy be unconfined  
   No sleep till morn when youth and pleasure meet  
   To chase the glowing hours with flying feet

4. Write sentences using the word *what* as a relative pronoun, an interjection, an interrogative pronoun, an adjective, and an adverb. Also a sentence containing a noun used as an adjective.

5. Correct the following where correction is needed, and give reasons for corrections: He deserves punishment as much, or more than his companion. I have not, nor shall not consent to such a proposal. Every man can not afford to
keep a watch. The side A, with the sides B and C, constitute the triangle. If the steamer leave to-morrow evening, I shall go to St. Louis.

6. Define parsing and analysis. How is the conjunction of English verbs effected?

7. Why is the subjunctive mood so called, and what is denoted by its use? What does the present tense of this mood always imply? May the conjunctions if, though, unless, etc., be used before other moods?

8. What is the different force of the auxiliaries shall and will, and what do they respectively denote? Decline the compound relative whoever.

9. Analyze and parse the following:
   Where is to-morrow? In another world.
   For numbers this is certain; the reverse
   Is sure to none; and yet on this perhaps
   This peradventure, infamous for lies,
   As on a rock of adamant, we build
   Our mountain hopes; spin out eternal schemes
   As we the fatal sisters could out-spin
   And, big with life’s futurities, expire.

10. Orthography by dictation.

HISTORY.

1. Who settled America? What do you know of its antiquities? When and where did Columbus discover the mainland?

2. Who was Balboa? Who was John Ribaut? Who was Sir Francis Drake? Where was the first permanent settlement on this continent?

3. When and where was the first settlement in Louisiana? Who was the first Territorial and who the first State governor of Louisiana?

4. What was the navigation act? Who commanded the Americans at Great Meadows? What were the terms of the "Peace of Paris" in 1763?
5. What was the Shays’ rebellion? What were the political parties in 1812? What do you know of the battle of Lundy’s Lane? Of New Orleans?

6. What was the Missouri compromise? What led to the war with Mexico? What is the thirteenth amendment? What territory was added to the United States in 1867?

7. What was the Magna Charta, and what act of the same nature preceded it?

8. What literary celebrities flourished, and under whose reign was the Augustan age of English literature?

9. Who commanded the respective armies at Thermopylae? What do you know of the Crusaders? What of Marston-Moor?

10. Mention several of the important battles of Napoleon, and what you know of them; (the answers to this to occupy not more than one page).

GEOGRAPHY.

1. Name and locate the political divisions of South America, Asia and Africa, and such natural divisions of the same as are given in text books.

2. Name the six largest cities of the world. Also, in order and the number of inhabitants of each, the six largest cities of the United States, and the population of the States in which they are located.

3. Name the original thirteen States and the change that has taken place in territorial limits. Give the principal rivers and mountains of each.

4. Make a voyage by water from Washington to the capitals of the five leading European powers. Give the names and titles of their rulers and their present political form of government.

5. Indicate some point in North America that is in the same latitude as London. What is the longitude of St. Louis and the latitude of San Francisco? What do you understand by an isothermal line?
6. If you should go in direct line from New Orleans to Boston, through what States would you pass? Returning via Cairo what railroads would you pass over?

7. Where are the America Islands? Yeso? Trinidad? Santa Rosa? Name two of the Sandwich Islands.

8. Bound Burmah, Moldavia, Wales, Uruguay, Tehuantepec, Oregon.

9. What causes the tides? What are the trade winds? What are monsoons? What is the distance in geographical miles from the North Pole to Antarctic Circle?

10. Where is Cape Corrientes? What sea separates Italy from Turkey and Austria? Where is Lena Gulf? How is Nubia bounded? In what zones is Oceanica? Where is Cape Flattery? Where is Spirit Lake?
APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF COMMEMORATION MEDAL

The medal submitted for your action embodies the following named characteristics: A Maltese Cross, a medallion in bas relief resting with centre pelican and young on the upright of the cross; crescent and rays of the Sun.

The cross, a symbol of Christianity, marks the agency which, above all others, has produced the event we wish to commemorate. Christ knew no difference in men. His teachings 1800 years ago are now culminating. He blotted out the lines that divided the races of men. Today we gather their children in the same school.

On the area of the obverse of the medallion the Goddess of Wisdom with burnished shield uplifted, polished shaft in hand stands guarding the Goddess of Liberty who sits in perfect security. At her side a cornucopia significantly indicates abundance of blessings. The emblem of civilizations, plow, globe and scrolls, are grouped on her right. On the exergue of the medallion the legend, "Education, the Guardian of Liberty," "State of Louisiana" is singularly expressive and appropriate. The pelican feeding her young is suggestive and in harmony with the event we commemorate. The sun and the crescent are to nature what Christianity and Education are to humanity. The latter, like the former, should be universal. Our State motto, "Justice, Union and Confidence," is no longer a myth, on the contrary a glorious reality, and will under the new regime inaugurated in this State, prove a blessed trinity that will bind the hearts of our people to her with cords of devotion and affection that nothing can sever.

On the reverse of the medal, engraved on the arms of the cross, will be the following: "Constitution of 1868, Acts of 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872 and 1873."

On the reverse of the medallion the name, rank and service of such officer is to be inscribed or engraved as the State Board may designate.

Your committee also forward, with this report, a medal in gold of which the above is a description.

1As presented in session, March 3, 1874, Louisiana State Board of Education.
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