

All Money Ain't Good Money: The Interest Convergence Principle, White Philanthropy, and Black Education of the Past and Present

ArCasia D. James-Galloway
University of Illinois

This paper uses Derrick Bell's interest convergence principle, which argues that whites will support racial justice efforts only if they believe they will see gains for themselves, to examine white philanthropic support of Black education in the postbellum South and in current school reforms. Using the concept of "bad" (or compromising) money to describe philanthropy's curtailment of Black self-determination and agency, this conceptual paper demonstrates how such philanthropy has promoted white capitalistic gain to the detriment of African American communities for decades. To build this claim, the author synthesizes key points from extant literature that address these topics. The paper links the application of the interest convergence principle to Black education issues of the past as a connection to and clarification of current market-based approaches said to remedy educational and racial inequity.

Introduction

All money is not equal, and sources of funding can contradict the endeavors said funding is intended to support, particularly in education. Although African Americans adeptly negotiated the terms of their freedom and schooling after the Civil War, the struggle between securing capital for educational goals and the contingencies white philanthropists placed on so-called donations is ongoing today. Historically, with few economic resources, newly free Black groups in the South managed to build many of their own schools by matching philanthropists' donations, mortgaging their crops and homes, offering their homes for school use, and regularly paying double in taxes because they were excluded from the universal, tax-supported system (Anderson, 1988; Walker, 1996; Williams, 2005). Despite these remarkable efforts, however, historical tensions between white funders and Black communities persist and warrant illustration of comparable assaults on Black self-determination and agency today.

Researchers have questioned contemporary schools' acceptance of funding from problematic sources in instances of urban school reform, pointing specifically to large donations from mega corporations led by whites (Anderson & Dixson, 2016; Dixson, Buras, & Jeffers, 2015; Henry & Dixson, 2016; Hursh, 2007; Kumashiro, 2013; Lipman, 2015; Saltman, 2009, 2010; Scott, 2009; Zeichner & Pena-Sandoval, 2015). In line with these critiques, this conceptual paper demonstrates that similar instances of "bad money" have promoted white capitalistic gain and plagued African American¹ communities for decades. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to analyze how white philanthropic support of Black education in the postbellum South represents a salient example of the interest convergence principle (Bell, 1972a, 1976, 1979, 1980a, 1980b),

¹ I use African American and Black interchangeably in this article. Further, I capitalize these two descriptors while choosing to maintain the lowercase form of white in reference to Americans of European descent as a counter to white supremacy and racism in scholarship and society.

which I argue mirrors recent trends in education reform today. This work has meaningful implications for making sense of philanthropy contemporarily as white donors persistently funnel financial capital into under-resourced schools that serve a disproportionate number of Black students (Anderson & Dixson, 2016; Dixson et al., 2015; Hursh, 2007; Kumashiro, 2013; Lipman, 2015; Saltman, 2009, 2010; Scott, 2009; Zeichner & Pena-Sandoval, 2015).

To illustrate how these relationships often benefited the white givers rather than the Black recipients, this article foregrounds a discussion of Black education in the postbellum South to draw connections to education reform efforts today and to illuminate instances of the interest convergence principle between white philanthropists and Black communities. The central question guiding this paper is: *How does the principle of interest convergence help explain white philanthropic assistance in Black education in the postbellum South and in education reform today?*

The principle of interest convergence is one of several tenets comprising critical race theory (CRT). Castegano and Lee (2007) describe this specific principle as “people believ[ing] and support[ing] what benefits them [, allowing] the majority group [to] tolerate advances for racial justice and greater equity only when such advances suit the self-interests of the majority group” (p. 4). Inherently, in this discussion, the interest convergence principle demonstrates another CRT tenet—the permanence of racism (Bell, 1972b, 1988, 1992a, 1992b; Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995). This tenet suggests that racism is an enduring, endemic feature of life in the U.S. that is central to most occurrences, beliefs, and practices. That is, racism is not an aberration or irregularity; rather, it is normal and characteristic of life in the United States.

Rationale, Organization, & Significance

This article uses the case of Black communities’ construction of schools in the postbellum South to clarify how the current education reform movement reflects prolonged struggles between white philanthropy and African American education. I highlight postbellum Black communities’ engagement with white philanthropy in their funding contributions to schools. I attend to how philanthropists’ monetary assistance seemed like a furthering of Black communities’ aims but mainly served philanthropists’ interests by preparing formerly enslaved African Americans to fulfill labor demands necessary for the South to operate as it did in the antebellum period (DuBois, 1910; Woodward, 1955, 1966). To make my claim, I apply the interest convergence principle (Bell, 1972a, 1976, 1979, 1980a, 1980b). Although scholars have leveled this argument before (Anderson, 1988; Watkins, 2001), I am illustrating this relationship in new terms by applying the interest convergence principle and drawing a comparison to a current, similar issue in the education reform movement. These connections illuminate how elite whites used philanthropy as an instrument to foster white, or hegemonic, supremacy and drive racial inequity in education.

This article has two major sections; the first focuses on the past (i.e., the postbellum era—1865-1930s) and the second concentrates on the present (i.e., the 21st century). First, I discuss this piece’s theoretical and conceptual underpinnings. Next, I outline the nature of Black education and philanthropy during Reconstruction and highlight how white philanthropy could be characterized as “bad” money. I substantiate these claims with two examples of white

philanthropists interceding in Black learning and elucidate interests of both racial groups and how they converged. Finally, I compare the current education reform movement to problems in the postbellum era by discussing market-based, neoliberal strategies that presently hamper Black self-determination and agency.

In discussing white philanthropy generally, I am referring specifically to organizations and individuals such as the Anna T. Jeanes Fund, The Peabody Educational Foundation, the John F. Slater Fund, the Rockefeller-inspired General Education Board, and Julius Rosenwald (Anderson, 1988). Because my examination focuses principally on applying the CRT interest convergence principle and drawing comparisons to the present, I group these individuals and organizations together while acknowledging differences between them existed (Anderson & Moss, 1999).

This article draws on two bodies of work: Black education scholarship during the late 19th century and current education reform (i.e., venture philanthropy, education privatization, charter school movement, neoliberal education). As such, I draw on broad historiographical themes and extant literature to portray how scholars have conceptualized the aims of and actors in Black education. To apply the interest convergence principle to the postbellum era, I reviewed key literature on Black education in the postbellum South. This body of work allowed me to identify the educational interests of formerly enslaved Black communities and the interests of white philanthropists who funded many of these communities' educational efforts. Next, I examined how these interests aligned, using careful analysis to pinpoint significant differences in motive. I paid close attention to the legal history of Black and white racial groups in the U.S. to better understand the social context within which the events under scrutiny, such as African American communities' efforts to establish formal education systems and white philanthropists' funding for such, occurred (Bell, 1976, 1979, 1980a, 1980b; Donnor, 2005). In framing our contemporary period, I reviewed literature on education reform, school privatization efforts, and venture philanthropy in urban, or underserved, communities. From this body of work, I identified interests of philanthropists funding these efforts and interests of the communities they claim to serve. I then analyzed the respective motives of these groups while considering their racialized histories as they pertain to education.

A contribution of this article is its application of the interest convergence principle to historical matters of the 19th and early 20th century. This principle links issues of the past to enduring struggles today in order to depict the continuation of white domination over Black education.

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

Self-determination, agency, and interest convergence showcase instances of bad money in the history of African American education. I consider bad money to be philanthropy that curtailed the self-determination and agency of Black communities to decide, oversee, or strive toward an education that met their self-assessed needs or goals. Given this paper's focus on bad money, it does not delineate instances of "good" money, which I define in opposition to bad money. Good money does not stymie the self-determination and agency of Black communities to accomplish their educational goals.

Based on my definition, the following benchmarks exemplify how philanthropy supporting charter schools, for example, can be assessed as “good money.” These particular benchmarks are examined by scholars (Heilig, 2017; Heilig & Clark, 2018) in the following way: “[1] Charter schools should only be authorized locally by a democratically accountable authorizing entity... [2] empirical assessment [should be made] of the initial location of a charter in a community and [3] a justification [should be provided] specifically explaining how the school will serve to improve the local public system” (Heilig & Clark, 2018, p. 6). Although rarely used, these criteria illustrate how philanthropies could help further local communities’ self-determination and agency by collaborating with them as regarded partners, respecting and incorporating their perspectives, valuing their experiential knowledge and abilities, remaining accountable to them, and drawing on their assets to reach their educational goals (Delpit, 1988; Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005).

Self-Determination and Agency

Understanding Black self-determination and agency helps contextualize the forces compelling formerly enslaved African Americans in the postbellum South. Franklin (1984) observed how Black agency and self-determination underscored African Americans’ penchant and fortitude for educational institution building. Specifically, Franklin pinpoints “traditions, value systems, and institutional forms” (p. 6) that sustained Black communities, viewing Black self-determination as a “cultural value” rather than a “political objective” (p. 8). Underlining agency as the ability to practice self-reliance and proactive mobilization toward desired goals (i.e., ending or resisting racial oppression), Franklin joins other historians of education (Anderson, 1988; Danna, 2003; Savage, 2001; Watkins, 2001; Williamson, 2003) in describing how said agency manifested in the history of Black education in the U.S. Further, Franklin’s (1984) focus on “freedom, resistance, education, and self-determination” as the “core values of Afro-American life, culture, and advancement” (p. 5) speak to broader themes during this era; they also help operationalize agency and self-determination as integral in the Black freedom struggle. Working toward “survival with dignity and resistance against oppression” (p. 182), African Americans confronted great uncertainty as free people, yet they knew education would help solidify their rightful place in a newly reformed democracy.

In addition to historians, critical race theorists in education have also explored Black self-determination as it relates to democracy, school choice, and the sociopolitical terrain Black communities navigated in working to secure excellent educational opportunities. Dixson (2011a) underlines

the notion of Black self-determination as a prerequisite for the full participation of Black people in the United States. I define Black self-determination as the ability for African Americans to exercise free choice as it pertains to political and social opportunities. In many respects, for African Americans, the opportunity or right to exercise free choice in any domain has always been wrought with contradictions. That is, from voting to school assignment, African Americans, in large measure, have been given a forced choice. (p. 813)

The notions of free and forced choice are key in understanding how the interest convergence principle operates in this context because after Reconstruction, social, political, and economic improvements prioritized advancement for whites that inadvertently gave Black people “better” choices. Critical race theory helps make apparent why racism is an enduring feature of U.S. society that constricts African Americans’ education and freedom.

Critical Race Theory and The Interest Convergence Principle

To address frustrations with inadequate approaches to understanding race and racism in the legal sphere, a cadre of critical legal scholars developed CRT in the 1970s (Crenshaw et al., 1995). This paradigm sought to clarify how racial oppression transpires contextually and works to challenge racial domination and power’s misdistribution. Its overarching premise asserts that racism is an enduring, pervasive feature of the U.S. and as such is engrained into the very fabric of the country and its institutions and systemic structures (Bell, 1988, 1992a, 1992b). Beyond this core tenet, CRT also promotes centering the experiential knowledge of racially oppressed peoples of Color while considering the historical and social factors that have enabled their oppression. Further, it critiques (neo)liberal, incremental approaches to racial redress; counters claims of neutrality, meritocracy, and objectivity; requires an intersectional understanding of multiple, overlapping social identities; and relies on interdisciplinary engagement from various fields such as ethnic studies, women and gender studies, law, history, cultural studies, and education.

In the field of education, scholars Ladson-Billings and Tate’s (1995) search for more instructive means to theorize race motivated them to bring CRT into education in the 1990s. Since then, this framework has grown in use and popularity in educational research (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Lynn & Dixson, 2013). However, with few exceptions (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 1999; Morris & Parker, 2019; Taylor, 1999), the history of education field seldom engages this lens.

As one of the founding CRT legal scholars, Derrick Bell posited the interest convergence principle (1972b, 1976, 1979, 1980a, 1980b). Scholars have since used this principle to explain various aspects of educational praxis and the competing demands of oppressed groups, as well as the white supremacist power structure (Aleman & Aleman, 2010; Castagano & Lee, 2007; DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Donnor, 2005; Gillborn, 2010; Millner, 2008; Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas, 1999). In his original conception, Bell looked at school desegregation’s legal history through the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, which overturned the longstanding “separate but equal” doctrine from the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case of 1896. Essentially, Bell argued that the seeming gains Black communities acquired in school desegregation post-*Brown* worked foremost to benefit whites, who were trying to disprove international accusations of poor treatment of African Americans amidst Cold War fury after World War II. Eliminating dual (i.e., Black and white) schooling systems, Bell contended, ensured U.S. dominance, preserved its international reputation, and hindered violent uprisings due to Black Americans’ systemic mistreatment. These understated, motivating factors ultimately led to the failure of school desegregation to enhance Black students’ schooling experiences and achievement (Bell, 1980a, 1980b, 2004).

Donnor (2005) defines the interest convergence principle as “a mode of explanation” and “an

analytical construct that considers the motivating factors for laws and social policies established to eradicate racial discrimination or provide remedies for racial injustice on the basis of 'merit' and 'colour-blindness'" (p. 57). He argues that "this analytical viewpoint suggests that terms such as merit and colourblindness serve as code words for laws and policies that secure and advance the political and economic interests of upper class whites," (p. 57) such as the philanthropists and reformers of focus here. "Judicial relief for racism only occurs when it directly or indirectly furthers the best interest of the nation rather than the group that suffered the injustice," as in the case of the formerly enslaved and their education (Donnor, 2005, pp. 57-58). Ultimately, as DeCuir and Dixson (2004) assert, any movement toward social or racial justice cannot usher in a "major disruption to the 'normal' way of life for the majority of Whites" (p. 28). The major disruption in the case of postbellum Black education and white philanthropy was whites' loss of control over and profit from Black labor and education, an ongoing theme in African Americans' fight for educational equity.

Thus, the interest convergence principle is of use for theorizing white involvement in Black education because this concept clarifies why white philanthropy hampered Black self-determination and agency under the pretext of social and racial justice. Viewing these relationships through this lens proves suitable because white philanthropists involved in establishing Black schools acted in service of their own goals for continued economic prosperity (Anderson, 1988; Watkins, 2001). Their interests converged with those of underserved African American communities, seemingly enabling both groups to work toward establishing schools and improving education, albeit for disparate purposes. To begin clarifying these connections, I explain the Reconstruction era of Black education and white philanthropy next.

Education and Philanthropy in the Reconstruction Context

After the Civil War, formerly enslaved African Americans established formal schooling systems in the South, setting out to take back the centuries of learning white society had denied them (Anderson, 1988; DuBois, 1910; Williams, 2005). However, localities seldom implemented rights guaranteed by the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, as was the case after the Compromise of 1877 which effectively rolled back gains for African Americans after the Civil War. This Compromise disappeared federal troops from the South, ushering in Jim Crow policies and Black Codes that sought to reassert the white South's political power (DuBois, 1910; Woodward, 1955, 1966).

In this context, scholars have shown how contentious white philanthropic giving to Black schools was after the Civil War (Anderson, 1978, 1988; Butchart, 1980, 1988; Finkenbine, 1986, 2003; Jones, 1980; McPherson, 1970; Spivey, 1987; Watkins, 2001). Whites exerted control over Black schools to ensure African Americans fit into the roles philanthropists and their colluders decided they should fit into. It is not my aim to recount the individual arguments emerging from this body of work, but to build on them by applying Bell's (1972b, 1976, 1979, 1980a, 1980b) interest convergence principle to explain how the relationship between Black education and white philanthropy maps onto this concept currently.

By the end of the 1860s, formerly enslaved African Americans were beginning to establish themselves as free citizens, eager to create formal education systems for themselves (Darling-

Hammond, Williamson, & Hyler, 2007; Span, 2005; Williams, 2005). In the U.S., lawmakers banned slave education, literacy in particular, in all southern states, save Kentucky and Maryland, underlining the permanently racist nature of the U.S. They did so both to prevent successful rebellions like the 1791 uprising in Haiti and out of fear that enslaved people would coordinate revolts like those led by Denmark Vessey and Nat Turner (Gabrial, 2013; Paulus, 2017). As an immense task, the establishment of schooling systems could not be charged to former enslavers, so formerly enslaved communities across the South set out to construct their own education systems guided by their own vision, self-determination, and agency.

Understanding Reconstruction as a demonstration of Black self-determination and agency (DuBois, 1935) challenges majoritarian narratives about Black education as a problem best solved by whites (Bullock, 1967; Harlan, 1958; Swint, 1941). Centering African Americans in the history of Black education, scholars have examined the role of white philanthropists who financially backed Black schools in an effort to help rehabilitate the South and secure a labor force to support their capitalistic enterprises (Anderson, 1988; Foner, 2006; Richardson, 2005; Watkins, 2001). Southern states in the U.S., defined by agricultural economies and a strong dependence on enslaved labor, needed substantive help rebuilding after the North's victory in the Civil War (Richardson, 2005). Thus, to exert control over the South and "[re]establish its political and economic supremacy" (Watkins, 2001, p. 14), northern white capitalists took advantage of Blacks' demands for education and formed a concerted response. This reply was part of philanthropists' efforts to work toward extending "the ideology of black inferiority... as a cornerstone for the moral justification of slavery" (Hollis, 2009, p. 21). Although slavery was no longer legal, its shadow "intervened in virtually every decision about land and labor in the South" because "the doctrine of white supremacy" fostered "the South's culture of violence [and] made the region's form of white supremacy more oppressive than elsewhere" (Hollis, 2009, pp. 21-22).

Enslavement left most African Americans lacking financial capital, but this deficit did not stop them from finding creative ways to construct schools. From donating parts of their homes for classroom use (Leak & Reid, 2010; Walker, 1996), to securing the raw materials for building schools (Anderson, 1988; Walker, 1996; Williams, 2005), to paying double taxes (once as citizens and again to fund the Black schools their governments would not) (Anderson, 1988), to donation matching (Gasman, 2012; Simpson & Hull, 2007), formerly enslaved communities resisted victimhood. Moreover, Black communities furnished the infrastructure for formal education in the South (DuBois, 1910; Tyack & Lowe, 1986). It was newly free Black communities that demanded schooling and sought support. Whites enjoying institutional power and privilege turned these demands back on Black folks by investing in a formal schooling system that afforded whites its best resources.

These background details are vital for understanding how interests converged. In the discussion that follows, I highlight two notable areas in which white philanthropists interceded in Black learning—focusing on curricula and school personnel—to demonstrate whites' interests in Black education and how these converged with African Americans' objectives.

White Giving as Bad Money

The following subsections present school personnel and curricula as separate entities. I acknowledge that this split is slippery and at times overlaps. Nevertheless, I highlight key features of both to make clear Black communities' aspirations and white philanthropists' intentions.

Curricula

Religious and northern white philanthropic organizations worked to shape Black schools in the South during the postbellum era. As J. Peeps (1981) underlines,

northern white philanthropy did indeed exert influence but...it sometimes ran a course contrary to what we would expect from their good intentions. The history of post-bellum southern education, particularly as it relates to America's new freedmen, provides more than enough evidence to pay that more sinister possibility some close attention. (p. 252)

Such efforts are evident in the organizational structure of Black schools, which African-Americans rarely led and which were funded by white money (Anderson, 1988; Darling-Hammond, Williamson, & Hyler, 2007). It was unusual for these funders to release administrative or financial control so that Black people could decide the material their students learned or which teachers taught.

In cases where African Americans were able to lead schools, Richardson (1979) shows how white philanthropists routinely curbed Black principals' power by pointing to Francis Cardozo, a Black South Carolina school leader. He explained that "although Cardozo was the principal, he was not permitted to choose his own teachers. As with other AMA [American Missionary Association] schools, the Association's officials in New York made the selection" (p. 80). Indeed, philanthropists excluded Black school personnel from controlling central features of the schools they helped build and lead. In refusing to allow Cardozo the ability to choose the teachers who would work in his school, the AMA signaled fear of Black school personnel garnering too much power, which might pose a threat to the "natural" order of society where Black people were inferior to whites and white money, religious or not, made it so.

Curricular issues plagued southern Black schools in the postbellum era as well. Disagreements over industrial and classical education comprised the well-known debate between Booker T. Washington, the formerly enslaved leader of the Tuskegee Institute, and W. E. B. DuBois, an activist and scholar of African American history and sociology. Scholars (Anderson, 1978, 1988; Spivey, 1978) have argued that industrial education prioritized unintellectual activities that sought to maintain white supremacy and Black subjugation. Such instruction is often associated with Booker T. Washington, as the schools he founded utilized this approach and he publicly endorsed it (Norrell, 2009). Conversely, these scholars (Anderson, 1978, 1988; Spivey, 1978) have lauded classical education, and DuBois because he advocated it, as they perceived it to emphasize intellectual rigor and analysis of abstract concepts as well as require extensive formal education. These two educators, Washington and DuBois, represented opposing ideologies that many understood to embody the educational plight facing African Americans.

A robust body of literature details industrial education and how it was a key tool whites wielded to re-enslave Black people (Anderson, 1988; Butchart, 1980; Curruthers, 1977; Darling-Hammond, Williamson, & Hyler, 2007; Finkenbine, 2003; Lamon, 1982; Simpson & Hill, 2007; Spivey, 1978; Watkins, 2001; Williams, 2005); it was no coincidence that this model of education was a popular method that proliferated throughout the South. This scholarly position on industrial education marks a prominent one; however, the debate over the appropriateness of industrial education proves relevant for discussions about the nature of Black education in the postbellum South. For example, Lamon (1982) argued that a Black school leader's endorsement of industrial education was malicious and detrimental to the Black cause. Curruthers (1977) chided the actions of white philanthropists in an examination of the ways their influence over Black education conveyed a legacy of destruction—one she argues must be corrected with education *for* African Americans created *by* African Americans.

Ideologies about industrial education require careful thought and consideration with regard to their place in curricula in Black schools and the role philanthropists hoped it would fill. A number of white philanthropic organizations pushed for industrial education in Black schools. Finkenbine (2003) argues this emphasis demonstrates how philanthropists viewed African Americans as workers rather than thinkers (p. 166). These philanthropists, Simpson and Hill (2007) claim, perpetuated stereotypes of Black people as incompetent, helpless, and in need of paternalistic care. Based on reports from the Slater Fund, a white philanthropic organization which exclusively donated to Black schools and made the implementation of industrial curricula mandatory, Finkenbine (2003) shows how the organization systematically refused to provide African American students the option to learn classical curricula. Referring to Black resistance, the Fund's director, "Haygood[,] noted extensive opposition to industrial education in his report to the board in 1883" (p. 170). Not only does this account challenge historical interpretations that cast African Americans as uncritical recipients of assistance, it also illustrates how goal oriented Black communities were; they rejected educational experiences that would not equip them with the skills needed for social mobility.

Teachers and Principals

This contingency goes hand-in-hand with whites' interests in personnel selection in Black schools. Specifically, teachers and principals played a significant part in Black education in the postbellum South, something white philanthropists knew well (Anderson, 1988; Butchart, 1980, 1988; Finkenbine, 1986, 2003, 2005; Jones, 1980; Watkins, 2001). White philanthropists recognized the meaning African American teachers, in particular, held for Black communities and exploited their reverence of educators (Anderson, 1988). These philanthropists then focused on building normal schools to train Black teachers, and thus their students, to embrace their subordinate racial status in society. This tactic was especially effective because a sizeable African American teacher shortage at the beginning of the 20th century in the South enticed philanthropists to remedy the problem by constructing normal schools for Black education in particular (Butchart, 1980; 1988). Anderson (1988) writes:

those interested in shaping the beliefs and behavior of southern black children through formal schooling viewed the great teacher shortage as an opportunity to influence significantly the form and content of black teacher training and thereby contribute

directly to the socialization of black children. All groups understood that no system of beliefs could be transmitted to the millions of black schoolchildren except through the ideas and behavior of black teachers. (p. 111)

Anderson's analysis proves both strong and cautionary; it reveals the intent of white philanthropists and their allies, while also highlighting the significance of teachers to Black communities.

Black teachers regularly pushed back on attempts to subjugate their classroom or school sovereignty, actions at times disavowed by white funders who sought to maintain tight control over Black schools and curricula. These actions often came about because "the philanthropists. . . placed heavy emphasis on industrial education so as to reconcile hostile southern whites to tolerate even limited Negro education" (Anderson, 1988, p. 121). It was not uncommon for white funding agencies to dismiss non-compliant educators on grounds that they did not satisfy the industrial education terms of the accepted philanthropy (Anderson, 1978, 1988). Interestingly, many northern teachers and administrators, including Black educators, who traveled to the South for work learned through a classical education model and many were inspired by religious zeal (Anderson, 1988; Jones, 1980; Swint, 1940). Therefore, their educational background was misaligned with the industrial education central to their positions as southern educators in Black schools, and some teachers refused to train their Black students exclusively as manual laborers. As a result, white philanthropists terminated many due to their defiance, sometimes firing their principals as well. For example, philanthropists fired Black principal John Davison from Fort Valley High and Industrial School "because of his failure to model [his school] on the Hampton-Tuskegee curriculum . . . [which]. . . placed heavy emphasis on industrial education" (Anderson, 1988, p. 121).

Debates around academic and industrial education persisted throughout the South and related directly to Black teachers. Many members of the African American elite class argued that industrial education was a tool intended to keep African Americans in inferior positions reminiscent of slavery (Du Bois, 1935). Supporters of industrial education, also referred to as the Hampton-Tuskegee model, insisted that this strategy would enable African Americans to become economically independent, at which point they could assert themselves as equal to whites (Norrell, 2009). However, Anderson (1988) shows that most, if not all, private schools for African Americans used a classical curriculum rather than an industrial one, and this upset Hampton-Tuskegee advocates who "considered even the teacher training courses in southern state-supported normal schools too academically oriented" (p. 114).

The extent to which white philanthropists tried to manipulate Black teacher training illustrates their interest in indoctrinating African Americans as willing second-class citizens (Anderson, 1978, 1988; Spivey, 1978; Watkins, 2001). "The struggle to control and shape black teacher training institutions rested on the assumption that those who shaped the beliefs and behavior of the teachers would also influence heavily the minds and hearts of black school children" (Anderson, 1988, p. 115). Similarly, Spivey (1978) identifies that not only were white philanthropists aware of the threat an academically trained African American populace posed; they were also aware of how determined the formerly enslaved were to attain an education to liberate themselves.

Interests and Convergences

Black communities that were acclimating to freedom in the South demanded education—a formal, universal, tax-supported schooling system (Anderson, 1988; DuBois, 1910). Many did so because they were keenly aware of the power such a system held, a power that was represented by the extent to which enslavers went to withhold it. As such, African Americans were interested in learning as an instrument to access greater dimensions of their freedom. Such liberation necessitated both agency and self-determination. The learning Black communities aspired to gain would help establish them as controllers of their own destinies. Because they wanted to be able to think critically and independently, to be able to make their own decisions and build their own legacies, many desired an education that would provide the necessary tools to do so. Although these tools did not have to come exclusively from a classical education, many did. Therefore, systematic preclusion from a classical education reflected a hierarchy of curricula for Black learners—another structural denial of education similar to that which transpired during enslavement.

Many white philanthropists offered their financial help with the understanding that Black schools would use industrial curricula, partly because obstinate southern whites refused to allow anything else. Aware that public education generally and classical curricula specifically “would inflate the economy and political aspirations of their workers and thereby spoil good field hands” (Anderson, 1988, pp. 80-81), philanthropists worked strategically to keep such learning from newly free communities. Wanting to reunite the country after the Civil War, white northern philanthropists saw great opportunity in controlling the material newly free groups learned and thus the jobs for which they received training. This action also disclosed their motivating interest as maintaining an antebellum social order and solving the race problem with under-education. Hence, these individuals and their business interests often relied on an efficient, stratified economic system contingent upon African Americans continuing to serve many of the same roles they did during enslavement.

Further, anti-Blackness, which Dumas (2016) describes as the “cultural disregard for and disgust with blackness,” (p. 12) shaped white philanthropists’ interactions with Black schools in the South. Most northern white philanthropists did not view African Americans as full or equal persons; their actions suggest they held considerable disdain for Black people and saw them as objects requiring control (Anderson, 1988; Butchart, 1980; DuBois, 1910; Finkenbine, 2003; Watkins, 2001). Even philanthropists with the best of intentions enacted a condescending, paternalistic form of engagement that demonstrated the low esteem they held for African Americans.

Previously enslaved communities viewed Black teachers in the highest regard. These purveyors of knowledge represented aspiration, mobility, power, strength, and hope to many African Americans across the South because of their ability to facilitate racial uplift (Anderson, 1988; Fultz, 1995; Walker, 1996). This observation of deep respect and admiration for Black teachers lends itself to the larger claim that formerly enslaved groups in the South valued education. Teachers were those with the sharable gift of knowledge, and formerly enslaved peoples often took teachers’ racial identity as a sign of their trustworthiness. Black teachers were the bearers of tools that enabled social mobility, independence, economic stability, and self-sufficiency, goals

that required the activation of self-determination and agency. Therefore, African American communities' interest in Black teachers centered on retrieving and applying the education they knew would help advance their lot in society.

Philanthropists were interested in controlling the Black teaching force in the South in large part because they knew how important these teachers were to formerly enslaved communities (Anderson, 1988). They knew newly free Black groups would listen to and abide by virtually anything Black teachers told them. This observation inspired philanthropists to use Black teachers as instruments to further their interests in establishing a self-sufficient, low-cost workforce to solve the "Negro problem" (Gilman 1908; Myrdal, 1944; Washington et al., 1903). This problem was embodied in four million (formerly enslaved) Black citizens, who posed a threat to the new national economy—an economy predicated on stolen Black labor. Getting Black teachers to sow seeds of docility, submission, and acceptance of second-class citizenship and Black subordination did much of this work, so philanthropists and propertied white southerners did not have to do much themselves. Education in this sense served "to prepare Blacks for subordinate roles in the southern economy" (Anderson, 1988, p. 92). This played a key role in the socialization of African Americans that allowed philanthropists to infiltrate and shape Black schools and curricula in deeply consequential ways.

Securing a subservient, cheap workforce served as philanthropists' ultimate goal, and this interest motivated much of the support they offered Black schools. They were interested in this investment because they saw segregation as a way to stabilize and modernize the South and its economy (Butchart, 1980; Spivey, 1978; Watkins, 2001). Working with wealthy white southerners to unite the country by quelling class warfare, white philanthropists worked to ensure newly-free African Americans did not enjoy training and education for jobs above their assumed station. By drawing on the interest formerly enslaved communities expressed in education, white philanthropists helped orchestrate the systematic denial of quality education for African Americans in the South. This common goal of education between these groups converged to overwhelmingly benefit whites, specifically those with business interests that benefited from cheap and easily-controllable labor. Applying these corporate practices to social problems sought to "reproduce [the formerly enslaved] as contented common laborers in the South's caste economy" (Anderson, 1988, p. 145).

CRT makes evident the racist motivations philanthropists employed to manufacture a docile, low-wage workforce for their economic prosperity. By outlining the Black communities' interests in curricula and school personnel alongside philanthropists' interests in controlling these factors, it becomes apparent that Black communities faced extreme and prolonged exploitation in struggling to assert their self-determination and agency. Obstacles keeping formerly enslaved African Americans from actualizing their hard-earned liberation served the greater purposes of preserving white supremacy and promoting Black inferiority. Similar practices reach into contemporary times.

From Formers to Reformers

It is possible to draw parallels between past and current education reforms and today's philanthropists' role in enacting reform through market-based policies. These "incorporate

elements of capitalism into their design. These include charter schools, vouchers, merit pay for teachers and students, mayoral control, contracting, school closures, and the use of high-stakes standardized assessments to judge student learning and school and system quality (Scott & Holme, 2016, p. 251).

By highlighting education reform as a site of Black students' exploitation and overrepresentation (Heilig, Holme, LeClair, Redd, & Ward, 2016; Heilig, Williams, McNeil, & Lee, 2011; White, 2018), I show how contemporary education reform works in ways similar to white philanthropists' interference in African American education in the past. I discuss both philanthropists and reformers who advance similar goals by colluding to overturn traditional, democratic public education in the U.S. (Henry & Dixson, 2016; Saltman, 2010; Scott & Homle, 2016).

A main feature of this current movement is charter schools, which

are public schools of choice operated under contract with an authorizing agency (districts, management organizations, non-profits, or universities). Charters are granted freedom from many of the regulations governing traditional public schools (such as staffing, calendar, class size, etc.), and they are given greater authority over budget decisions. In exchange for this increased flexibility, charters are supposed to be held more accountable for outcomes than traditional public schools. If charters fail to produce results, the schools will (in theory) either lose students and thus funding, and/or face the revocation of their charter by their authorizing agency. (Heilig et al., 2016, p. 254)

These present-day groups operate like white philanthropists of the past in (re)forming the education of marginalized communities of Color by enforcing market-based reform strategies. Their reformation project runs parallel to that of the original formers, or white architects (Watkins, 2001), of Black education. The interests of both groups appear to be served by working toward social justice and educational equity, which are thought to further “goals for empowerment and equality of opportunity [, leading] . . . a number of advocates of color...[and] tens of thousands of parents [to] enrolled their children in charter and voucher schools” (Pattillo, 2015; Pedroni, 2007; Scott, 2011b, as cited in Scott & Holme, 2016, p. 253). Stipulating compliance with market-based reforms, a core group of philanthropies have invested millions of dollars into districts serving marginalized students (Reckhow, 2013; Scott 2009; Scott, 2011a, 2011b; Scott & Holme, 2016; Zeichner & Pena-Sandoval, 2015). Thus, advocates use philanthropic dollars to further white supremacist ideology in underserved schools, often filled with Black children, by revoking school control from local communities (Dixson et al., 2015; Henry & Dixson, 2016).

Connections to the Past and Appearances of Good Money

As some of the wealthiest billionaires in America give substantial sums of money to underserved schools, their actions raise pressing questions regarding the motives and consequences of their giving. Some of these well-known donors include Bill and Melinda Gates, the Walton family, Eli and Edythe Broad, and the Dell family (Ferrare & Setari, 2017; Saltman, 2009, 2010). Their multi-million dollar giving raises concerns around the level of agency and self-determination

Black and underserved communities can practice in schools.

Recent scholarship has pointed to historical connections between current neoliberal trends in education that ultimately work to exclude underserved communities of Color from helping shape the education of their children, a process that effectively denies them the ability to practice self-determination and agency. For example, Zeichner and Peña-Sandoval (2015) draw on Katz (2013) to argue:

in the early part of the 20th century, philanthropists such as Carnegie and Rockefeller encountered a severe backlash for what was perceived to be their efforts to subvert democratic policy making. This same concern now exists as major foundations such as The Walton Family Foundation, The Broad Foundation, and The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and groups like the NSVF² employ an aggressive stance and actions in efforts to shape public policy with regard to education and teacher education. (p. 6)

More specifically, Ferrare and Reynolds (2016) identify that between 1920 and 1940, a group of major philanthropic foundations steered an organized effort to impose structural changes in education. These foundations, including the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, tried to implement “a corporate model of governance” to transform education, and “today these types of coalitions remain actively involved in shaping all levels of education policy” (p. 138). These examples are compelling, and I argue their roots reach back farther in the past than the 1920s to immediately following the Civil War. This era helped give rise to philanthropy in education as a form of

material sponsorship [which] often carries symbolic power. . . The philanthropic foundations are seen as doing good, the wealthy individuals are seen as contributing positively to society, and the organizations receiving philanthropic funding both gain the prestige associated with their foundation supporters and give the prestige of being nonprofit organizations that appear to be more closely aligned with grassroots communities. (Au & Ferrare, 2014, p. 18)

These trends persist today, as Au and Ferrare (2014) posit “symbolic sponsorship . . . serves the wealthy and their foundations . . . [by] reflect[ing] directly back into the public sphere and contribut[ing] to the creation of a public image of goodness and caring for others” (Au & Ferrare, 2014, p. 18). Philanthropists’ attempts to seem as though they are doing “good” by offering help to underserved communities of Color mask their underlying interest to maintain control of education and amass profit in the process. Like the interests of philanthropists after the Civil War, donors of today locate vulnerable communities into which they can infuse their capital and ultimately steer the course of learning. This “neoliberal deluge” (Johnson, 2011), where contrived notions of African American school choice persist (Dixson, 2011b; Scott, 2011b), reveals how the interests of communities and philanthropists seemingly converge around improving education. This improvement is supposed to help advance, for instance, Black children whose education has suffered because of public school bureaucracy and the inability of local Black educators to meet their learning needs (Buras, 2016; Dixson et al., 2015). However,

² New Schools Venture Fund

with a closer look, it becomes apparent “there is potentially a lot of money to be made by . . . market advocates [who] sometimes show unembarrassed excitement as public education is privatized” (Zeichner & Peña-Sandoval, 2015, p. 5). This guise of racial justice is revealed to be yet another ploy to deregulate education and undermine the self-determination and agency of Black communities (Buras, 2016; Cook & Dixon, 2013).

Education Reform as Bad Money

The recent proliferation of charter schools and privatization in education exhibit strong neoliberal mechanisms of schooling in the U.S. Scholars have shown how these trends subvert the democratic process in public schools (Anderson & Dixon, 2016; Au & Ferrare, 2014, 2015; Buras, 2013; Dixon et al., 2015; Saltman, 2010; Scott, 2009; Watkins, 2012). As I have attempted to demonstrate, the control wealthy white funders exert over many underserved schools has historical roots. Accepting financial support from white philanthropists continues to place many Black and underserved schools in precarious situations where their curriculum and personnel reflect the interests of their donors, as was the case during Reconstruction. Eager for capital, many of these schools comply with market-based reforms that privilege the interests of white philanthropists, interests that seem to converge on the surface, but work against the long-term well-being of marginalized communities.

A number of school districts in urban cities across the North and South are enacting neoliberal reforms (Dixon, Royal, & Henry, 2014). Looking to the South specifically, New Orleans is slated to become the first U.S. city without traditional public schools due to the explosion of charter schools after Hurricane Katrina (Hasselle, 2018). Dixon, et al. (2015) use this case to exemplify how education reformers have normalized white supremacist ideology in U.S. public education. They highlight the race of education reformers in New Orleans by noting that after Hurricane Katrina in 2005, these reformers replaced the city’s majority Black teaching force with “young and predominately white transplants . . . [from] ‘non-profits’ that were founded and staffed mostly by young white transplants” (p. 289). Astutely, the authors link this issue to history by noting the similarity to white philanthropists working to “conscribe the education of African Americans to domestic labor and industrial education” at the beginning of the 20th century (p. 289). The familiar conditions of these processes display white philanthropy’s steady presence in and control of Black education today.

The Louisiana example (Buras, 2011, 2016; Cook & Dixon, 2013; Dixon et al., 2015) speaks to myriad others in U.S. states with marginalized, urban communities, such as Texas and California (Heilig, Khalifa, & Tillman, 2014; Oluwole & Green, 2018). Scholars (Buras, 2011, 2016; Dixon, et al., 2015) have underscored education reformers’ exclusion of local communities from decision-making processes. In the case of New Orleans specifically, these excluded communities are largely Black, many being poor or working-class. This vulnerable population can be compared to formerly enslaved communities who had little capital to leverage in working to construct and finance schools after 1865. Underlining the crux of the interest convergence principle, Dixon, et al. (2015) uncover the veneer of “education reform as . . . promot[ing] educational equity [which actually] provides the means for White entrepreneurs to raid the public school treasury and create new markets at the expense of poor and working-class students of color in urban schools” (p. 290). Providing evidence from various high school

takeovers in the city, the authors “illuminate the anti-democratic dynamics at work . . . where [education reformers] chartered [new schools] against the wishes and will of the community” (p. 290). Unfortunately, education reformers and philanthropists, whose roles are often complementary, have ignored the wishes and will of Black New Orleans educators to construct a (false) narrative of social and racial justice. Such revision paints a picture of compliant African Americans who are enthused about educational improvement. In the South today, issues of white philanthropic control persist; however, other regions are subject to similar struggles.

An example from the North showcases the ubiquity of white philanthropic forces unconstrained by geographic boundaries. Namely, White’s (2018) investigation of teachers of Color in New York urban charter schools demonstrated how many charter schools’ repudiation of holistic curricula and teacher autonomy, among other issues, leads to “chronic high turnover among teachers of color” (p. 37). White highlighted significant sociocultural conditions of turnover that produced conflicts of race, culture, and knowledge, underlining “bullying tactics” used by charter school managers to compel teachers to “implement scripted curriculum” (p. 35). The teacher of Color who leveled these charges credited the broader charter management organization for which she worked with carrying out these demands and forms of manipulation. Following scripted curricula is reminiscent of the curricular control philanthropists exerted over Black teachers and principals after the Civil War. Even today, it seems some Black school personnel persist in their careers without professional autonomy and respect.

The culpability of philanthropists is clear given the “abundance of resources available, particularly in charter schools with affluent private donors, . . . significant private investments . . . [and] infusions of private capital” (White, 2018, p. 34) into these schools. Such assets enable some “schools [to have] great reputation[s] [because] many of the . . . board members [are] famous millionaires and billionaires, [who] operate from a business standpoint” (p. 34). These market-based strategies reflect white philanthropic control over the education of students of Color.

From New York to Chicago, education reform issues afflict marginalized communities. For instance, a 2015 hunger strike in Chicago protested Chicago Public Schools’ closure and takeover of “the only remaining comprehensive high school on the South Side of Chicago” (Scott & Holme, 2016, p. 250). These Black community members were challenging the sweeping changes brought on by market-based reforms, namely “takeover, closure, . . . and conversion [of Dyett High School] to a charter school operated by a private charter management organization” (p. 250). Claiming to want to establish higher quality schools for the benefit of historically underserved communities like those on the South Side of Chicago, philanthropic dollars sought to prevent local communities from making educational decisions and from maintaining traditional public schools, hallmarks of their communities and U.S. democracy. The private charter management organizations that back such closures and takeovers represent privatization efforts akin to white philanthropists fashioning Black education during the postbellum era.

Charter schools (along with the larger charter management organizations of which many are a part) have been shown to undermine Black self-determination and agency, effectively destabilizing the teaching force by playing to the interests of wealthy donors who escape public

scrutiny (Buras, 2016; Dixson et al., 2015; Scott & Holme, 2016). Scott (2009) highlights valid concerns related to these educational trends through popular education reform strategies:

Wealth that comes largely from favorable public policies is now directed into mostly tax-exempt foundations, where trustees and philanthropists directly shape public policy for the poor, without the public deliberative process that might have been invoked over school reform policies were that money in the public coffers. (p. 128)

Her analysis spotlights enduring issues with Black education in the 21st century that mirror earlier problems formerly enslaved communities faced. Obstinate refusal to consider or meaningfully respond to community interests is often masked as benevolent assistance in the form of school choice, which reformers argue allows consumers (i.e., parents and students) to “vote with their feet” (Cook, 2018; Zeichner & Peña-Sandoval, 2015). That is, school choice is thought to expand options for students because they are not obligated to attend one specific neighborhood school, allowing them to leave a school that is not meeting their needs to find one that will.

Despite challenges to this positive interpretation (Dixson, 2011b; Heilig et al., 2011; Scott, 2011a) and requests for charter school moratoriums from groups such as the NAACP (Heilig & Clark, 2018), school choice continues to grow. In light of this trend, some Black communities have tried to open community-centered and culturally relevant charter schools that prioritize Black students’ needs (Henry & Dixson, 2016). However, these attempts have been curbed by “the charter authorization and application process [because it functions as] a racialized site that reproduces White dominance” (Dixson & Henry, 2016, p. 221). Like philanthropists after the Civil War who offered the previously enslaved an education while excluding them from the process of deciding what that education would entail, today’s education reformers evade collaboration with local communities to independently decide what kind of education best suits Black folks and other underserved groups. Education reformers tout this exclusion of local Black communities as the best way forward because as “premised on white supremacist notions that African Americans are unfit not only to govern but also to teach Black children,” there allegedly is no other viable option (Dixson, et al., 2015, p. 289).

African American communities cannot be held responsible for the damage white philanthropists did to Black schools. Lacking institutional power, Black people in the U.S. have too often had to contend with severely limited resources and choices by accepting so-called support. CRT helps make evident how constrained newly free groups’ efforts were in mobilizing their agency and self-determination to demand a universal, tax-supported public-school system in the South. The interest convergence principle also underlines how education reform falls along similar lines today. Such constraints reflect how control was and, in many ways, remains disproportionately allocated to whites, diminishing the impact African Americans have over their own lives.

Conclusion

Although the historic relationship between Black education and white philanthropy has been the focus of a robust body of scholarship, scholars have not yet considered the significance of this connection through a CRT lens. Thus, one of the contributions of this project is its framing of

this relationship in terms that clarify not only racism's permanence, but also how interests converged to ultimately subjugate both newly free Black communities and Black communities today. Looking at the historical chain of events through this theoretical frame extends the utility of CRT and helps shed light on how education and race are often bound up in competing and sometimes contradictory terms. Scrutinizing history through a CRT lens challenges scholars to consider whose interests are being privileged and how racism has been an integral characteristic of the U.S. since its founding (Bell, 1972b, 1992b; Crenshaw, et al., 1995). Future work should examine different parties' goals, motivations, benefits, and risks by analyzing how these factors unfolded within particular historical contexts alongside racism and its enduring vestiges.

This paper has demonstrated how the relationship between white philanthropy and Black education represents a lucid example of the interest convergence principle by drawing parallels to education reform today. I strive to show how Black and white interests in education had dramatically different meanings by underlining how philanthropists' aims created significant barriers to quality education for Black and underserved communities. Quality education, marginalized communities believed, would provide them social mobility and economic stability (Anderson, 1988). Armed with self-determination and agency, communities of the formerly enslaved struggled against incredible opposition to establish schooling systems that aligned with the promising future they envisioned for themselves. A similar struggle continues today in the school reform movement, one eerily comparable to the Black struggle for education after the Civil War.

By investigating how white philanthropy sought to control Black education during Reconstruction, I have used this historical moment to emphasized connections between the past and the present. Evaluating this interplay within the theoretical framework of CRT's interest convergence principle helps demystify how common interests often work in favor of those with the most power. Therefore, another contribution of this article is to furnish an example of CRT's relevance to the past and provide an example of how such analyses offer a clearer understanding of the present.

The implications of this connection thrive today as white philanthropy's presence pervades many charter schools and educational privatization efforts around the country. History teaches that those with the greatest power rarely work to make the playing field more equitable, even in cases where oppressed groups seek education as an enactment of their freedom. Thus, it behooves communities and schools of Color to look to the past as a reminder that all money ain't good money. Bringing together CRT, history, and education policy makes evident that agency and self-determination alone fare poorly in a permanently racist society where Black subordination constitutes the very fabric of U.S. institutions (Bell, 1972b, 1980a, 1980b, 1992a, 1992b, 2004).

Author Notes

ArCasia D. James-Gallaway is a doctoral candidate at the University of Illinois.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to ArCasia D. James-Gallaway at adjames3@illinois.edu.

The author would like to thank Drs. Krystal Strong and Rita Harvey for their generous guidance and feedback in the development of an early version of this manuscript, which grew out of a master's paper done at the University of Pennsylvania. Constructive comments from anonymous reviewers, Francena Turner, and Chaddrick James-Gallaway also helped strengthen this paper.

References

- Alemán, Jr, E., & Alemán, S. M. (2010). 'Do Latin@ interests always have to “converge” with White interests?': (Re)claiming racial realism and interest-convergence in critical race theory praxis. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(1), 1-21.
- Anderson, J. (1978). Northern foundations and the shaping of southern black rural education, 1902-1935. *History of Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 371-396.
- Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, C. R., & Dixon, A. D. (2016). Down by the riverside: A CRT perspective on education reform in two river cities. *Urban Education*, 51(4), 363-389.
- Anderson, E., & Moss, A. (1999). *Dangerous donations: Northern philanthropy and southern black education, 1902-1930*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Au, W., & Ferrare, J. J. (2014). Sponsors of policy: A network analysis of wealthy elites, their affiliated philanthropies, and charter school reform in Washington State. *Teachers College Record*, 116(8), 1-24.
- Au, W., & Ferrare, J. J. (Eds.). (2015). *Mapping corporate education reform: Power and policy networks in the neoliberal state*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bell, D. (1972a). Integration: A no-win policy for Blacks? *Integrated Education*, September-October, 10(5), 32-45.
- Bell, D. (1972b). *Race, racism and American law* (1st ed.). Boston, MA: Little, Brown, & Company.
- Bell, D. A. (1976). Serving two masters: Integration ideals and client interests in school desegregation litigation. *The Yale Law Journal*, 85(4), 470-516.
- Bell, D. (1979). Bakke, minority admissions, and the usual price of racial remedies. *California Law Review*, 67(1), 3-19.
- Bell, D. (1980a). Brown v. Board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518-533.
- Bell, D. (1980b). The dialectics of school desegregation. *Alabama Law Review*, 32, 281-297.
- Bell, D. (1988). White superiority in America: It's legal legacy, its economic costs. *Villanova Law Review*, 33, 767-780.

- Bell, D. (1992a). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (1992b). Racial realism. *Connecticut Law Review*, 24(2), 363-379.
- Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Bullock, H. A. (1967). *A history of Negro education in the South: From 1619 to the present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buras, K. (2011). Race, charter schools, and conscious capitalism: On the spatial politics of whiteness as property (and the unconscionable assault on black New Orleans). *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(2), 296-331.
- Buras, K. L. (2013). New Orleans education reform: A guide for cities or a warning for communities? (Grassroots Lessons Learned, 2005-2012). *Berkeley Review of Education*, 4(1), 123-160.
- Buras, K. L. (2016). The mass termination of Black veteran teachers in New Orleans: Cultural politics, the education market, and its consequences. *Educational Forum*, 80(2), 154-170.
- Butchart, R. E. (1980). *Northern schools, southern Blacks, and Reconstruction: Freedmen's education, 1862-1875*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Butchart, R. E. (1988). "Outthinking and outflanking the owners of the world": A historiography of the African American struggle for education. *History of Education Quarterly*, 28(3), 333-366.
- Butchart, R. E., & Rolleri, A. F. (2004). Secondary education and emancipation: Secondary schools for freed slaves in the American South, 1862-1875, *Paedagogica Historica*, 40(1-2), 157-181.
- Carruthers, I. (1977). Centennials of black miseducation: A study of white educational management. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 46(3), 291-304.
- Castagno, A. E., & Lee, S. J. (2007). Native mascots and ethnic fraud in higher education: Using tribal critical race theory and the interest convergence principle as an analytic tool. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(1), 3-13.
- Cook, D. A. (2018). In the spirit of Ella: Race, community & education reform in New Orleans post-Katrina. *The High School Journal*, 101(2), 90-99.

- Cook, D. A., & Dixon, A. D. (2013). Writing critical race theory and method: A composite counterstory on the experiences of black teachers in New Orleans post-Katrina. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(10), 1238-1258.
- Crenshaw, K. W., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Danns, D. (2003). *Something better for our children: Black organizing in Chicago Public Schools, 1963–1971*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Williamson, J. A., & Hyler, M. E. (2007). Securing the right to learn: The quest for an empowering curriculum for African Americans. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 76(3), 281-296.
- DeCuir, J. T., & Dixon, A. D. (2004). “So when it comes out, they aren’t that surprised that it is there”: Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), 26-31.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people’s children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-299.
- Dixon, A. D. (2011a). Democracy now? Race, education and Black self-determination. *Teachers College Record*, 113(4), 811-830.
- Dixon, A. D. (2011b). Whose choice? A critical race perspective on charter schools in New Orleans. In C. Johnson (Ed.), *The neoliberal deluge: Hurricane Katrina, late capitalism, and the remaking of New Orleans* (pp. 130-151). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dixon, A. D., Buras, K., & Jeffers, E. (2015). The color of reform: Race, education reform, and charter schools in post-Katrina New Orleans. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 21(3), 288-299.
- Dixon, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (Eds.). (2006). *Critical race theory in education: All God’s children got a song*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dixon, A. D., Royal, C., & Henry, K. L. (2014). School reform and school choice in Philadelphia, Chicago and New Orleans. In H. R. Milner IV & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *Handbook of urban education* (pp. 474-503). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Donnor, J. K. (2005). Towards an interest-convergence in the education of African-American football student athletes in major college sports. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 8(1), 45-67.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1910). Reconstruction and its benefits. *The American Historical Review*, 15(4), 781-799.

- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). *Black Reconstruction in America*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace.
- Dumas, M. J. (2016). Against the dark: Antiblackness in education policy and discourse. *Theory into Practice*, 55(1), 11-19.
- Ferrare, J. J., & Reynolds, K. (2016). Has the elite foundation agenda spread beyond the Gates? An organizational network analysis of nonmajor philanthropic giving in K–12 education. *American Journal of Education*, 123(1), 137-169.
- Ferrare, J. J., & Setari, R. R. (2018). Converging on choice: The interstate flow of foundation dollars to charter school organizations. *Educational Researcher*, 47(1), 34-45.
- Finkenbine, R. (1986). 'Our little circle': Benevolent reformers, the Slater fund, and the argument for black industrial education. *Hayes Historical Journal*, 6(1), 6-22.
- Finkenbine, R. (2003). Law, reconstruction, and African American education in the Post-emancipation South. In L. Friedman & M. Mcgarvie (Eds.), *Charity, philanthropy and civility in American history* (pp. 161-178). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Foner, E. (2006). Black history and the Reconstruction era, *Souls*, 8(3), 197-203.
- Franklin, V. P. (1984). *Black self-determination: A cultural history of the faith of our fathers*. Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill.
- Freeman, T. M. (2010). Beyond Hegemony: Reappraising the history of education and African-American higher education in the nineteenth century. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 10(3), 148-165.
- Fultz, M. (1995). African American teachers in the South, 1890–1940: Powerlessness and the ironies of expectations and protest. *History of Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 401-422.
- Gabrial, B. (2013). From Haiti to Nat Turner: Racial panic discourse during the nineteenth century partisan press era. *American Journalism*, 30(3), 336-364.
- Gasman, M. (2012). What's new is old? Philanthropic influence on education. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(8), 8-11.
- Gasman, M., & Sedgwick, K. V. (2005). *Uplifting a people: African American philanthropy and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Gillborn, D. (2010). The white working class, racism and respectability: Victims, degenerates and interest-convergence. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58(1), 2–25.
- Gilman, C. P. (1908). A suggestion on the Negro problem. *American Journal of Sociology*, 14(1), 78-85.

- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C. & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hasselle, D. (2018, December 20). After McDonogh 35 vote, New Orleans will be 1st in US without traditionally run public schools. *The Advocate*. Retrieved from https://www.nola.com/news/education/article_a05b2a6b-0c36-519c-9f55-cefa1b5744b1.html
- Harlan, L. R. (1957). Southern Education Board and the race issue in public education. *The Journal of Southern History*, 23(2), 189-202.
- Harper, S. R., Patton, L. D., & Wooden, O. S. (2009). Access and equity for African American students in higher education: A critical race historical analysis of policy efforts. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(4), 389-414.
- Heilig, J. V. (2017, July 7). An insider's view of charter schools: Who is working together to improve them? *The Progressive*. Retrieved from <http://progressive.org/public-school-shakedown/an-insider-s-view-of-charter-schools-who-isworking-together/>
- Heilig, J. V., & Clark Jr., B. (2018). New insights and directions: Considering the impact of charter school attributes on communities of color. *Journal of Transformative Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(1), 3-9.
- Heilig, J. V., Holme, J. J., LeClair, A. V., Redd, L. D., & Ward, D. (2016). Separate and unequal? The problematic segregation of special populations in charter schools relative to traditional public schools. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*, 27, 251-293.
- Heilig, J. V., Khalifa, M., & Tillman, L. C. (2014). High-stake reforms and urban education. In H. R. Milner & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *Handbook of urban education* (pp. 523-537). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hollis, S. (2009). Neither slave nor free: The ideology of capitalism and the failure of radical reform in the American South. *Critical Sociology*, 35(1), 9-27.
- Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 493-518.
- Johnson, C. (Ed.). (2011). *The neoliberal deluge: Hurricane Katrina, late capitalism, and the remaking of New Orleans*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jones, J. (1980). *Soldiers of light and love: Northern teachers and Georgia Blacks, 1865-1873*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Katz, S. N. (2013). Reshaping U.S. public education policy. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/reshaping_u.s._public_education_policy

- Kumashiro, K. K. (2012). When billionaires become educational experts. *ACADEME*, 98(3), 10–16.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68
- Lamon, L. (1982). Black public education in the South: 1861- 1920: By whom, for whom and under whose control? *Journal of Thought*, 18(3), 76-90.
- Lipman, P. (2015). Capitalizing on crisis: Venture philanthropy's colonial project to remake urban education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(2), 241-258.
- Lynn, M., & Dixson, A. D. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of critical race theory in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McPherson, J. M. (1970). White liberals, Black power in Negro education, 1865-1915. *The American Historical Review*, 75(5), 1357-1386.
- Morris, J. E., & Parker, B. D. (2019). CRT in education: Historical/archival analyses. In J. T. DeCuir-Gunby, T. K. Chapman, & P. A. Schutz (Eds.). *Understanding critical race research methods and methodologies: Lessons from the field* (pp. 24-33). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Milner IV, H. R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 332-346.
- Myrdal, G., (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and American democracy*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Norrell, R. (2009). *Up from history: The life of Booker T. Washington*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Oluwole, J., & Green, P. (2018). Are California's charter schools the new separate-but-equal 'schools of excellence,' or are they worse than Plessy? *Journal of Transformative Leadership and Policy Studies*, 7(1), 43-52.
- Parker, L., Deyhle, D., & Villenas, S. (1999). *Race is . . . race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Paulus, C. L. (2017). *The slaveholding crisis: Fear of insurrection and the coming of the Civil War*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Persson, J. (2015, September 22). CMD publishes full list of 2,500 closed charter schools (with interactive map). Retrieved from <http://www.prwatch.org/news/2015/09/12936/cmd-publishes-full-list-2500-closed-charter-schools>

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 550 (1896).

Reckhow, S. (2013). *Follow the money: How foundation dollars change public school politics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, H. C. (2005). A Marshall plan for the South? *The failure of Reconstruction and democratic ideology during Reconstruction*, 51(4), 378-387.

Richardson, J. (1979). Francis L. Cardozo: Black educator during Reconstruction. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 48(1), 73-83.

Saltman, K. (2009). The rise of venture philanthropy and the ongoing neoliberal assault on public education: The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, 16, 53–72.

Saltman, K. (2010). *The gift of education: Public education and venture philanthropy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Savage, J. C. (2001). “Because we did more with less”: The agency of African American teachers in Franklin, Tennessee: 1890–1967. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(2), 170–203.

Scott, J. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy*, 23(1), 106-136.

Scott, J. (2011a). Market-driven education reform and the racial politics of advocacy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(5), 580–599.

Scott, J. (2011b). School choice as a civil right: The political construction of a claim and implications for school desegregation. In E. Frankenberg & E. DeBray-Pelot (Eds.), *Integrating schools in a changing society: New policies and legal options for a multiracial generation* (pp. 32–51). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Scott, J., & Holme, J. J. (2016). The political economy of market-based educational policies: Race and reform in urban school districts, 1915 to 2016. *Review of Research in Education*, 40(1), 250-297.

Simpson, D. J., & Hull, W. J. (2007). Educational philanthropy: An instrument of qualified change. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 76(3), 230-236.

Span, C. M. (2005). Learning in spite of opposition: African Americans and their history of educational exclusion in antebellum America. *Counterpoints*, 131, 26-53.

Spivey, D. (1978). *Schooling for the new slavery: Black industrial education, 1868-1915*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Swint, H. L. (1941). *Northern teachers in the South, 1865–1870*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Taylor, E. (1999). Critical race theory and interest convergence in the desegregation of higher education. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is . . . race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 181-204). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Tyack, D., & Lowe, R. (1986). The constitutional moment: Reconstruction and Black education in the South. *American Journal of Education*, 94(2), 236-256.
- Walker, E. V. S. (1996). *Their highest potential: An African American school community in the segregated South*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Washington, B. T., DuBois, W. E. B., Chesnut, C. W., Smith, W., Kealing, H. T., Dunbar, P. L., & Fortune, T. T. (1903). *The Negro problem: A series of articles by representative American Negroes of today*. New York, NY: J. Pott & Company.
- Watkins, W. (2001). *The White architects of Black education: Ideology and power in America, 1865-1954*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Watkins, W. H. (2012). *The assault on public education: Confronting the politics of corporate school reform*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Williams, H. A. (2005). *Self-taught: African American education in slavery and freedom*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Williamson, J. A. (2003). *Black power on campus: The University of Illinois, 1965-75*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- White, T. (2018). Teachers of color and urban charter schools: Race, school culture, and teacher turnover in the charter sector. *Journal of Transformative Leadership & Policy Studies*, 7(1), 27-42.
- Woodward, C. V. (1955). *The strange career of Jim Crow*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Woodward, C. V. (1966). *Reunion and reaction, the Compromise of 1877, and the end of Reconstruction*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Zeichner, K., & Pena-Sandoval, C. (2015). Venture philanthropy and teacher education policy in the US: The role of the New Schools Venture Fund. *Teachers College Record*, 117(6), 1-44.