When William Hooper Councill spoke at the 1902 commencement of the Carlisle Indian School, he asserted that “no three hundred years of human history have presented such wonderful evolution as the three hundred years of Negro American history.” In a history that included both slavery and juridical emancipation, Councill, the Black President of the State Colored Normal School at Huntsville, Alabama, framed slavery as a particularly transformative, even educative, institution, claiming that “four millions of Industrious Christians were evolved in the South from four million savages.”¹ The “evolution” continued, he asserted, because “old slave plantations have been turned into industrial schools for the old slaves. Masters’ old mansions turned into colleges for slaves, and old slaves are presidents of these colleges.”² Councill was one such man: a former slave who had become a teacher and then a school administrator of a Black industrial school that would later be chartered as a Black land-grant college, Alabama A&M.³ Indeed, the transformation of physical plantation space into schools was widespread in the post-emancipation era. Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee Institute was built on purchased plantation land, as were many other Black colleges in the South, such as Florida A&M, Alcorn State, and Prairie View A&M.⁴ The conversions that Councill describes from slave to citizen, plantation to school, and former slave to teacher suggest an intimacy between slavery and schooling, with the plantation functioning as a space of both learning and immense violence.⁵

Councill’s assertions were meant to serve as examples to his mostly Indigenous audience at Carlisle, an institution that had been created, in the words of its founder Richard Henry Pratt, to “kill the Indian to save the man.”⁶ In addition to this oft-cited phrase, which has come to signify
the violence of boarding school education for Native peoples Pratt was fond of the adage, “the contact of peoples is the best education.” Pratt was fond of the adage, “the contact of peoples is the best education.” Here, the term *contact* indexes colonialism yet attempts to transpose its violence into benevolence by framing colonialism as educative. In other words, Pratt, like Councill, retold white supremacist violence as a story with a redemptive arc in which colonization and slavery become processes of benevolence, striving, and learning. These men were by no means alone; they were carrying forward assertions that apologists for slavery and colonization had long been making. Additionally, though slavery was over as a matter of the law, the plantation was not. At Carlisle, the Colored Normal School, and a host of other institutions, Black and Indigenous students were instructed in what I argue is a form of plantation pedagogy, a form of teaching that draws on human-space relations in an attempt to transform Black and Indigenous peoples as well as land.

**THE BEGINNINGS OF PLANTATION PEDAGOGY: THE HAMPTON INSTITUTE**

After the Civil War, the landscape of schooling changed significantly in the Southern United States due to the push for schools by formerly enslaved Black communities who sought the education that they had been largely denied in slavery. The Hampton Institute was founded in 1868 as a result of this shift. Although it was established to educate Black students, it was not aimed towards the goals articulated by Black communities, who grounded their desires for education in opposition to slavery and towards freedom. Hampton’s educational program was founded on an industrial education model meant to train former slaves in habits of work and industry and accustom them to second-class-citizenship status. This form of education was attractive to the white Southern elite who wanted to maintain a subordinated workforce as well as to Northern philanthropists who operated under assimilatory forms of racist educational thought.

Additionally, the history of the Hampton Institute is one that geographically connects colonial and racialized space across oceans and continents. The founder of Hampton, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, was born in Hawai‘i in 1839. He experienced the colonial schooling system of Hawai‘i as a member of the elite white missionary class. His father, Richard Armstrong, was a prominent missionary educator and, later, superintendent of the schools for
the Hawaiian monarchy, a situation that demonstrates the imperialist influence on the monarchy prior to the illegal overthrow and annexation of Hawaiʻi. In his youth, Samuel Armstrong toured industrial schools in Hawaiʻi, which were overseen by his father and were meant to educate the Indigenous population. These schools served as a model for the Hampton Institute insofar as they used a curriculum that required students to work as laborers, particularly in agriculture. They also employed Christian-based moral teachings as key to civilizing Indigenous Hawaiian people. For example, at the Hilo Boarding School, students labored to construct school buildings, cultivate food gardens, and grow sugar cane for sale as a cash crop. The school claimed that student labor was part of their education; it was also integral to keeping the school solvent. Hampton’s involvement in Hawaiian education continued for many decades. Armstrong had ongoing relationships with schools like the Hilo Boarding School and the Kamehameha School, and he assisted in founding schools on the islands, like the Kauai Industrial School. Many former Hampton teachers moved to Hawaiʻi, and some became public intellectuals who wrote editorials in Hawaiian newspapers about Hawaiian education, as did Armstrong and his relatives. Indigenous Hawaiian students would come to attend Hampton and other Indian boarding schools as well.

After his early years observing missionary imperial education in Hawaiʻi, Armstrong attended college in the United States and served in the Union Army during the Civil War, which eventually led to his employment at the Freedman’s Bureau in the area of Hampton, Virginia. He founded the Hampton Institute in this assigned area. Armstrong framed the mission of Hampton around providing industrial training for those who had been formerly enslaved. His stated goal for the Hampton school was to educate “the head, the heart, and the hand,” and to provide “cultural uplift” through moral and manual training. He drew this language from the European pedagogue Pestalozzi, who described educating the head, hand, and heart in his framing of industrial education for former serfs in Europe.

Hampton started a smaller program to educate Native peoples in 1877 called the Hampton Indian Program. Once this program was created, the education of Native students was often discussed in comparison to the Institute’s larger Black student population. The Hampton Indian program, which lasted for over fifty years and was a key part of the assimilation era of US Indian policy, was typified by the rise of federal Indian boarding schools, which many scholars argue began with the Carlisle Indian School in 1879.
The first Native students at Hampton were “recruited” from the prisoners of war held by Pratt at Fort Marion in St. Augustine, Florida. While they were supposedly given a choice between returning home in the custody of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) or attending Hampton, the choice was likely not free of coercion as they already had been kept at Fort Marion for over two years.16

The Carlisle Indian School was founded in many ways as a direct result of Pratt’s involvement in the founding of the Indian Program, and educational programs for the formerly enslaved and Indigenous peoples were also linked in other ways.17 Estelle Reel, who authored the curriculum for federal Indian boarding schools in 1901, toured Hampton and used its curriculum as inspiration in creating hers. Many Indian boarding schools were interconnected, sharing ideas and transferring students between them. Hampton publications would often write reports on various schools in areas of Indian Country and their progress educating the “savages.” Hampton was also integrally connected to US policymaking for Indigenous peoples. Alice Fletcher, a white anthropologist who helped draft and pass the allotment legislation that subdivided reservation lands to be privately owned instead of collectively held by tribes, was involved in recruiting students and creating programs for the school. Associations like the Woman’s National Indian Association, the American Missionary Association, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and the organizers of the Lake Mohonk conferences, where “friends of the Indian” gathered to discuss Indian policy, all had deep connections to Hampton and its Indian program. The board members, funders, invited speakers, consultants, and friends of these organizations overlapped and interacted frequently. As the concentrated involvement of Hampton and its affiliates in various projects aimed at Indigenous peoples reveals, an institution founded to educate former slaves was promoted as ideally situated for the work of “killing the Indian to save the man.”18

Hampton also inspired the creation of many other educational institutions, including, in 1881, Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee Institute, and the “Hampton model” would become a force across the South, influencing the creation of many more institutions and educational policies.19 Networks of philanthropists such as the Rockefellers, the Peabody Fund, Anson Phelps Stokes, Julius Rosenwald, and the Slater Fund spread the model by funding various schooling programs and social services throughout the South. This funding contributed to founding new Black schools and training teachers in industrial education; it also pushed out other school models by withholding
comparable financial resources. Well-known programs like the Rosenwald Schools and the Jeanes Supervisory Teachers were funded by philanthropists with connections to Hampton, Tuskegee, and the many reformers who supported their projects.

Thus, proponents of the Hampton Industrial School model were integral to the establishment of Black education in the South, including the many Black land-grant schools that have become present-day HBCUs. As the founders of these programs like Armstrong, Pratt, and Washington died or were replaced, new administrators took over and became influential voices in educational policy. These include Hollis Burke Frissell, the former chaplain and second president of Hampton; Robert Moton, Booker T. Washington’s successor at Tuskegee and a Hampton graduate; George Washington Carver, the director of Tuskegee’s agricultural experiment station; and Jackson Davis, the Virginia Supervisor of Negro schools and a board member of a number of institutions supported by the Rockefeller charities and Phelps-Stokes Fund in the South.

At the turn of the century, the Hampton model expanded beyond Indian Country, Hawai‘i, and the Black South, becoming influential in US imperial projects across the Pacific and the Atlantic. For example, the first US director of education for the Philippines (1901–1903), Frederick Atkinson, toured Hampton and many of its associated institutions, citing them as models for a proposed Filipino education system. During his tenure as director of education, Atkinson oversaw the arrival of the first US teachers to the territory, the Thomasites, named after their arrival on the vessel USS Thomas. These teachers were meant to teach English, US civilization, and democracy to Filipinos. Atkinson also oversaw the establishment of the Manila Trade School in 1901. Atkinson was succeeded by David Barrows whose educational programming changed the rhetoric of schooling in the Philippines without significantly changing the industrial focus of the programs themselves. The interaction between Hampton, other US institutions, and institutions in the Philippines was multidirectional, with teachers from US schools teaching in the Philippines and Filipino students attending schools such as Hampton and Carlisle. This created a system of exchange that entrenched plantation pedagogy as a part of the US imperial project in the Pacific.

The Hampton model was also influential in establishing educational institutions in the African state of Liberia, which many scholars have described as a US colony in all but name. The Phelps-Stokes Fund and the American Colonization Society helped fund the Booker Washington Institute of
Liberia in 1929 and looked for staff connected to Hampton and Tuskegee. In fact, US educational reformers sought to incorporate the Hampton model of industrial schooling into education in countries and colonies across Africa through the influence of philanthropic organizations like the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Rockefeller International Education Board. Thomas Jesse Jones, a former Hampton employee and prolific writer about both Black and Native education in the United States, toured Africa as part of a committee funded by the Phelps-Stokes Fund and authored multiple reports on education in Africa suggesting that colonial governments implement industrial schooling models. He was connected to school reformers across Africa, including men like Charles T. Loram, who argued for the implementation of industrial schooling in segregated South Africa. Across both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, plantation pedagogy was central to imperial education programs. Thus, imperialism was fundamentally connected to earlier histories of slavery and settlement across these geographies.

**EDUCATION FOR SLAVERY AND SETTLEMENT**

The discourse of industrial education relies on a conception of education as uplifting and even liberatory (albeit to a limited degree). Yet, as numerous scholars have made clear, educational institutions enmeshed within systems of colonial control, segregation, incarceration, and inequality have long functioned to maintain an unjust status quo. At the same time, as other scholars point out, Indigenous and Black communities have co-opted and reframed education for their own purposes. My focus is on how education, the formal institutions that encompass it as well as hegemonic notions of education in “America,” is integrally tied to enslavement and settlement and their inherent violence towards land and people, which I call *teaching slavery and settlement*. Consequently, I do not theorize about how to create forms of emancipatory education. Instead, I show that the framing and institutionalization of education for Black and Indigenous peoples has been tied to the assertions that contact with the white race, enslavement, and the settlement of Native lands are, in and of themselves, educational activities. To that end, I begin my analysis when slavery was putatively ended in the United States and a post-emancipation educational system was created. By starting at this moment, I am able to trace how logics of slavery are interwoven with the establishment of post-emancipation schooling.
I draw on archival material from post-emancipation schooling institutions like Hampton, Tuskegee, and Carlisle that demonstrates what educational reformers, teachers, philanthropists, and administrators did in schools during this era, as well as what they said about teaching, schooling, and Black and Native peoples as learners. I use these archives to tell a history not just of what happened in post-emancipation schooling, but also of how education for Black and Native peoples was framed and the material consequences of that framing. Education is a symbolic, ideological, and material process in which symbolic and ideological violence is connected to material violence. Thus, teaching slavery and settlement is a symbolic and ideological project as much as it is a material one.

The way white reformers framed industrial education and the results of that education were often contradictory. These contradictions occur because of a complex set of discourses that support an ideology of education that justifies the violent past and present of colonialization and antiblackness. Throughout this book, I read for concordances and discordances in the assertions of educational reformers about what schooling does. For example, many of these teachers and school leaders stated that education was a means of preparing Black and Indigenous peoples for citizenship, yet they rarely supported enactments of that citizenship such as the right to vote or political participation. Slavery and settlement were so instrumental to this educational discourse that I argue that this form of schooling cannot and will never produce liberation.

There is, of course, an imprecision in using terms like *schooling* or *education* because the ways people learn and the places in which they do so take many forms. I use the term *education* or *educational* to mean a process in which something is *framed* as being learned. This definition may seem overly broad since people learn from all experiences in life. However, I am keenly focused on the framing of what is educational, and by whom, in order to demonstrate what those in power value as learning. Of course, the ideas Black and Indigenous peoples had about what is educational were often, though not always, markedly different from what white reformers valued. There was always contestation over what was and was not deemed educational, especially when forms of schooling were co-opted in order to shift their use for radical ends. The term *teaching*, like the term *education*, can be described in a variety of ways that encompass both formal and informal notions of education. I use the terms *teaching* and *teaches* to indicate what people, spaces, or experiences are described as doing and how those actions...
are framed as aiding in the process of learning. Thus, what is described by those in power as “teaching” also demonstrates what is structurally valued as part of systems of schooling.

These contested understandings of education and teaching demonstrate why the term *pedagogy*, as “the method or practice of teaching,” is also contested. Scholars have engaged in defining which forms of pedagogy entrench inequality and which can facilitate emancipation and liberation. This has led to a great debate amongst scholars as to whether pedagogy can create social change. For example, Khalil Johnson Jr. has noted that the word *pedagogy* is derived from a Greek term for the slave that led children to school and acted as a tutor, which demonstrates that pedagogy is tied to slavery in fundamental ways and thus may not be a liberatory term at all. I use the term *pedagogy* to indicate how teaching is enacted within matrices of power such that the material effects of pedagogy do not always align with what is supposedly taught. When I use the term *power*, I draw from scholars like Antonio Gramsci who have theorized hegemony as power constituted through ideology and scholars like Foucault who have demonstrated that power is also diffuse such that the constitution of the “regime of truth” is always a negotiated process. I draw from this scholarship because, while it may be easy to identify loci of power, it is hard to identify all of power’s technologies in their complexity. I trace the material ways that power operates in relation to those who seek to enact power over others through education.

Educational reforms driven by ideologies of dispossession, genocide, and slavery as educational were not unique to the post-emancipation era. For example, European missionaries often framed their encroachment into Native lands and subsequent settlement as necessary for the education of the savage. In fact, schools established by missionaries prior to emancipation share many similarities with the schools examined in this text. Additionally, historians of slavery have noted that slavery was characterized as an educative process in an effort to cast slavery as a benevolent institution. Of particular note is Ulrich Bonnell Phillips’s *Life and Labor in the South*, which describes the many spatial iterations of slavery as educative. Donald Warren summarizes as follows: “At its center stood the plantation, a multipurpose institution. It was ‘a school’ (198), with intentional training and socialization programs for slaves,” in which the “‘civilizing of the Negroes’ was ‘a fruit of plantation life itself’ (199).” In addition, Phillips situates the plantation as a “homestead,” which hints at the fact that the plantation was one of many spatial iterations of European settlement and Indigenous dispossession.
Phillips normalizes the violence of the plantation as everyday life when he describes the plantation’s many integrated functions, such as factory, parish, pageant, matrimonial bureau, and boarding house. Therefore, I use the term slavery not just to encompass the specific time period of enslavement but also its afterlife, which continues to reverberate in everyday life after what Hartman calls the “nonevent of emancipation.”

Moreover, in addition to the term colonialism, I use the term settlement rather than settler colonialism here and throughout the text. Settlement is a process of dispossession, genocide, and the replacement of peoples and transformation of land that exists across geographic locations and governmental configurations; therefore, settlement does not exist solely in settler colonial states but across colonized spaces globally. Accordingly, I use the term settlement to describe a process in addition to a structure that defines nation-state configurations, and I argue that settlement-as-process can exist in tandem and apart from extractive-colonialism-as-process.

While many scholars have noted that either settlement or slavery has been connected to the schooling of Black and Native peoples, fewer have examined how closely intertwined settlement and slavery were. One striking example of this is how Pratt discusses slavery, contact, and education: “The Negro, I argued, is from as a low a state of savagery as the Indian, and in 200 years’ association with Anglo-Saxons he has lost his languages and gained theirs; has laid aside the characteristics of his former savage life, and, to a great extent, adopted those of the most advanced and highest civilized nation in the world, and has thus become fitted as fellow citizens among them.”

Citizenship for Black people becomes possible with the end of slavery, but only because, according to Pratt, slavery, which forced contact with European civilization, prepared them for the role. In relation to Indigenous peoples, Pratt often asserted the importance of “mingling Indians with whites” as part of the educational project of the US state. In this way, settlement (and its inherent violence and genocidal intent to destroy Native populations and communities) was a cornerstone of Pratt’s pedagogical outlook, which might explain why he called his memoir “Battlefield and Classroom.” Pratt’s pedagogy for Indigenous peoples draws from an ideology of slavery as an institution of teaching. “Contact,” as used by Pratt, is a term that both encompasses the incredible violence of slavery and colonization and elides the full impact of that violence through the mundaneness of the term.

Based on readings of reformers like Pratt, Councill, and many others who discussed the education of Black and Indigenous peoples, slavery, and
settlement, I contend that slavery and settlement as educational processes must be examined in intimate connection. I propose that this history of discussing the “contact of peoples” through slavery and colonialism as educational can best be understood as plantation pedagogy, in other words, the teaching of slavery and settlement. Plantation pedagogy was the mechanism through which slavery as an educational project was enacted materially through the spatial formation of the plantation. Additionally, as a spatial unit of settlement, the plantation’s existence is impossible without the dispossession of Native peoples. The plantation exists on stolen Indigenous lands for the explicit purpose of transforming the land for capitalist production. Thus, plantation pedagogy privileges space as necessary for teaching slavery and settlement because this form of teaching sought to change not only Black and Native peoples but also their relations to land and the land itself. Through plantation pedagogy, education as the “contact of peoples” was operationalized within a context of primitive accumulation, settlement, and chattel slavery.

CONVERSATIONAL CURRENTS WITHIN, BETWEEN, AND ACROSS BLACK STUDIES AND NATIVE STUDIES

In analyzing the teaching of slavery and settlement, this work is positioned at a meeting point where Black and Native studies engage each other in order to understand our interconnected histories and theorize our political struggles and our futures. At this meeting point, there has been antagonism and disagreement as well as cohesion and comradery. The various tensions that permeate this conversation stem from many factors, including the erasure of Black-Indigenous peoples, histories of Native slaveholding, antiblackness in Indigenous communities, Black educators’ roles in teaching and disciplining Native people, Black people settling on Native lands, and Black critiques of Indigenous sovereignty struggles. One example of some of these tensions is Councill’s speech at the Carlisle Indian School commencement, which could be read variously as capitulation to white supremacist schooling structures, complicity in the assimilation and genocide of Native peoples, coerced compliance within the larger context of antiblack violence, or a surface-level practice that obscures fugitivity not recorded in the archive. I do not draw out this example to demonize Councill or to argue for his redemption. Instead, I see this speech as an important grounding point for the discussions that