

SOUTHERN JEWISH HISTORY

Journal of the Southern Jewish Historical Society

Mark K. Bauman, *Editor*

MarkKBauman@aol.com

Bryan Edward Stone, *Managing Editor*

bstone@delmar.edu

Scott M. Langston, *Primary Sources Section Editor*

sclangston@charter.net

Stephen J. Whitfield, *Book Review Editor*

swhitfie@brandeis.edu

Jeremy Katz, *Exhibit and Film Review Editor*

jrkatz@thebreman.org

Shari Rabin, *Website Review Editor*

srabin@oberlin.edu

Rachel Heimovics Braun, *Founding Managing Editor*

2021

Volume 24



Southern Jewish History

Editorial Board

Ronald Bayor	Adam Meyer
Paul Finkelman	Allison Schottenstein
Karen Franklin	Lance Sussman
Joshua Furman	Marcia Synott
Jeffrey Gurock	Diane Vecchio
Adam Mendelsohn	Daniel Weinfeld

Southern Jewish History is a publication of the Southern Jewish Historical Society available by subscription and a benefit of membership in the society. The opinions and statements expressed by contributors are not necessarily those of the journal or of the Southern Jewish Historical Society.

Southern Jewish Historical Society OFFICERS: Jay Silverberg, *President*; Josh Parshall, *Vice President and President Elect*; Marni Davis, *Secretary*; David Meola, *Treasurer*; Phyllis Leffler, *Immediate Past President*. BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Sharon Fahrer, Karen Franklin, Joshua Furman, Eric Goldstein, Dana Herman, Jeremy Katz, Stephen Krause, Adam Meyer, Shari Rabin, Ellen Umansky; Bernard Wax, *Board Member Emeritus*; Rachel Reagler Schulman, *Ex-Officio Board Member*.

For submission information and author guidelines, see <http://www.jewishsouth.org/submission-information-and-guidelines-authors>. For queries and all editorial matters: Mark K. Bauman, Editor, *Southern Jewish History*, 6856 Flagstone Way, Flowery Branch, GA 30542, e-mail: MarkKBauman@aol.com. For journal subscriptions and advertising: Bryan Edward Stone, Managing Editor, PO Box 271432, Corpus Christi, TX 78427, e-mail: bstone@delmar.edu. For membership and general information about the Southern Jewish Historical Society, visit www.jewishsouth.org or write to PO Box 71601, Marietta, GA 30007-1601.

Articles appearing in *Southern Jewish History* are abstracted and/or indexed in *Historical Abstracts*; *America: History and Life*; *Index to Jewish Periodicals*; *Journal of American History*; *Journal of Southern History*; RAMBI-National Library of Israel; Immigration and Ethnic History Society *Newsletter*; and the *Berman Jewish Policy Archive* (www.bjpa.org).

Full-text content of recent issues is available to subscribing libraries on EBSCOhost Academic Search Ultimate. Full-text content of most back issues is available free on Academia.edu at <http://independent.academia.edu/SouthernJewishHistory>.

PERMISSION STATEMENT

Consent by the Southern Jewish Historical Society is given for private use of articles and images that have appeared in *Southern Jewish History*. Copying or distributing any journal, article, image, or portion thereof, for any use other than private, is forbidden without the written permission of *Southern Jewish History*. To obtain that permission, please contact the editors at journal@jewishsouth.org.

Creative Power: A Jewish Refugee in the Jim Crow South, 1939–1946

by

Andrew Sperling*

In early March 1938, Viktor Lowenfeld returned home to find a note pinned to the front door of his Vienna apartment. The note demanded that he, his wife Margaret, and their seven-year-old son, John, abandon their home and all assets within three days. Neighbors watched silently from behind peepholes as the family left with only suitcases full of clothing and, in Viktor's case, a small portion of the drawings his child pupils at the Hohe Warte Institute for the Blind had created over the past twelve years. His blind students' artwork provided the ultimate testament to his budding legacy as an art educator. His unorthodox approach to teaching art enraged colleagues who insisted on the creative incapacity of those with visual disabilities. Yet his haptic-visual theory, which posited that society's most marginalized were those most "subjectively bound up with the self" and able to produce the purest art, captured the attention of some of the world's finest intellectuals.¹ Lowenfeld's companions and occasional acquaintances included Helen Keller, Sigmund Freud, and Martin Buber, each of whom held his artistic theories in high esteem.

Lowenfeld's rising reputation mattered little in the face of the Nazi annexation of Austria. As a Jewish man and modernist artist deeply entrenched in work with those whom the Nazis viewed as other social undesirables, most facets of Lowenfeld's personal and professional persona were anathema to German fascism. Fleeing to England shortly after receiving the notice of eviction, Lowenfeld mourned the loss of the now unrecognizable land in which he had been raised and sought new opportunities for creative freedom.

* The author may be contacted at andrewdsperling@gmail.com.

After an exhausting period of moving between cities and countries and struggling to find stable employment, he wound up in the Jim Crow South, heading a new art department at the Hampton Institute, a historically Black college in Virginia founded as an agricultural school in 1868. Between 1939 and 1946, Lowenfeld and his students helped transform the traditionally conservative Hampton into an unlikely space of relatively radical Black politics. The artwork produced by students under Lowenfeld's mentorship anticipated Black Power aesthetics, resisted racist confines on Black identities, and visually expressed controversial politics during the highly sensitive war years. Inextricable from this story of Black artistry is its surprising Jewishness. For as much as Lowenfeld's history with blind communities influenced his commitment to democratize the art world, his strong Zionist convictions and experiences as an Austrian Jew most informed his teaching at Hampton. Consequently, the art created there represented a dialogical relationship between Blackness and Jewishness, one characterized by shared empathy, healing, and identity affirmation in response to an antisemitic and anti-Black world. The benefits of artistic expression at Hampton did not merely extend to its students. Against an unfamiliar rural, southern, and Christian environment totally distant from his Jewish lifestyle in Vienna, Lowenfeld sought connection to his heritage through the mentoring of anti-Nazi, antiracist artistry.

While only a slice of the Jewish refugee experience, Lowenfeld's story at Hampton resonates as an example of the resilience and adaptability of Jewish identity. Lowenfeld's ideas were originally inculcated in an antisemitic Austro-German culture and later repurposed in the racially stratified South.² The interchange between Zionism and Black self-expression emerging from Hampton suggests not only a transference of ideas, but the inherent value of seeking Jewish presence in predominantly Black sources. The artwork and oral histories of Hampton students placed into conversation with Lowenfeld's words suggest that his Jewish background and status as a refugee scholar galvanized his challenges to racial boundaries. Far from "paralyzed by fear," a term sometimes associated with southern Jewry's historical position, Lowenfeld purposely fused Jewish and Black history together as a means of producing provocative art.³ However tempted he might have been to chase the comforts of Whiteness, especially as a Jewish foreigner in the South, Lowenfeld's idealistic opposition to intolerance mandated that he view Hampton as a unique

opportunity. In early 1939, Lowenfeld's new American acquaintance, the noted psychologist Gordon Allport, found him a stint as an art therapist at the Perkins School for the Blind in Watertown, Massachusetts, building on his prior experience. The appointment was only temporary, and after an otherwise fruitless search for a permanent position, Allport reached an agreement with Hampton administrators. "I would be most fascinated in [teaching art] in a Negro institution," Lowenfeld recalled of his fortuitous job offer. For him it signaled an "entirely new phase," not the "double handicap" some refugee advocates assumed Jews teaching at Black institutions would face.⁴

As an Austrian Jew, Lowenfeld understood the stifling constraints of Nazism's "sameness of expression" that skewered abstract, modernist art and promoted antisemitic imagery recalling centuries of dehumanizing tropes in its propaganda.⁵ The same "regimentation of stereotypes" existed at Hampton, where White Christian patrons had long been interested in exoticized depictions of Black people through the institute's collection of African arts and crafts. As such, before Lowenfeld's art department, the prevalent examples of artistry at Hampton reinforced stereotypes of primitivity and enabled White Christian benefactors to imagine themselves as uplifting the Black race through agricultural and industrial education. Lowenfeld's classes provided a very different sort of education, one that allowed participants cathartic relief from society's injustices, rooted in the confluence of Black and Jewish experiences.

*Viktor Lowenfeld while on the faculty at
 Pennsylvania State University.
 (Used with permission of the
 Eberly Family Special Collections
 Library, Penn State University
 Libraries.)*

This essay establishes connections between Lowenfeld's earlier experiences as a modernist Jewish art educator in Vienna and his later activities as a teacher and department head at Hampton Institute. Considering both Black and Jewish sources as well as extending the analysis to artwork, it examines how Lowenfeld's Zionist politics and his exposure to European antisemitism and Nazism influenced his teaching practices in the Jim Crow South.

Historical and contemporary notions of Black and Jewish kinship in the United States have been attributed to shared histories of persecution and common enemies in the modern era. Yet few studies have examined how Jewish refugees to America—and particularly to the South—reckoned with their escape from one racist, authoritarian system and then confronted another. Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb's *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee Scholars at Black Colleges*, which assembles the stories of a number of refugees, stands almost alone in its attempt to juxtapose the persecutions in Nazi Europe with anti-Black racism in the Jim Crow South through the biographies of Jewish exiles. Nonetheless, Edgcomb's work only briefly considers Lowenfeld's place at Hampton, although his pedagogy and relationship to students complicates her idea that refugees were largely silent about Nazi persecutions while teaching at Black institutions. She has explained their silence as the assumption that strangers would not understand the "other" world, leaving Jewish refugees to internalize their suffering or limit it to their immediate Jewish or White communities.⁶

Refugees might have been reluctant to discuss their pain, but Edgcomb fails to fully consider how they could communicate such perspectives through their teaching practices and, particularly in Lowenfeld's case, through politically charged art. The story of Viktor Lowenfeld at the Hampton Institute therefore demonstrates a transference of ideas not always openly discussed but deeply felt in the work he and his students produced together. Accordingly, this essay articulates how European Jewish identities could converge with Black southern identities in ways that were mutually beneficial. Several scholars have pushed back against romanticization of midcentury Black and Jewish relations in the United States, arguing that, among other contentions, Jewish experiences with antisemitism do not naturally produce a kinship or even sympathy with people of color afflicted by racism. This is certainly true, but Lowenfeld's time at Hampton is one instance where his Jewish identity and the history

attached to it greatly mattered to all parties involved. The astonishing artwork and the liberating politics they represent reveal the potential, albeit not the inevitability, of the personal empowerment and reclamations that can rise out of conversation and union between these two marginalized groups. Although this narrative ends in Hampton, Virginia, its origins can be traced to Vienna at the close of World War I, when a teenage Lowenfeld nurtured his Zionist and artistic impulses.

Lowenfeld in Vienna

In 1914, Viktor Lowenfeld's father was drafted into the Austro-Hungarian army. Thereafter Viktor, his mother, and three siblings suffered from financial strife and hunger throughout the war years. When his father returned in 1918, embittered by the war's outcome, he dismissed his son's interest in art as a trivial distraction and waste of financial resources.⁷ The war had disrupted Lowenfeld's adolescence as it had for every Austrian, and his forced estrangement from art contributed to his adoption of pacifism. At age fifteen, he found that the most appealing strategy to prevent further war and devastation was participation in the Zionist youth movement. Through the Austrian branch of the Blue-White movement, which had originated in Germany partly in response to the antisemitic nationalism of other youth groups, Lowenfeld discovered the value of Jewish self-esteem. He joined others in farming for a period of time, romanced by the idea of "making soil produce something," and ultimately formed the basis of much of his later pedagogy.⁸

These processes were part of a broader, particularly central European Zionist movement—muscular Judaism—conceptualized by Max Nordau at the Second Zionist Congress in 1898. According to the logic of muscular Judaism, regeneration of the land amounted to the revitalized Jewish body, and the symbolic figure of the "muscle Jew" recalled the idols of Jewish antiquity.⁹ The chance to affirm one's Jewish identity while taking refuge from antisemitic attacks against it was psychologically satisfying and instrumental in protecting Jewish culture. The peaceful pastoralism inherent in Lowenfeld's experience with this form of Zionism additionally fostered his commitment to preserving the innocence of youth against the hawkish inclinations of adults.

By 1920, these sentiments strengthened through his close friendship with Zionist philosopher Martin Buber, who lamented the lack of Jewish

artists during the period of their relationship. Buber, a famed art historian and a founder of cultural Zionism, had argued in favor of a Jewish national art at the Fifth Zionist Congress in 1901. He problematized antisemitic claims such as Richard Wagner's notion that Jewish artists could only be imitative rather than capable of producing exemplary, original art. In response, Buber called for "consciously Jewish" public art that would portray its easily identifiable national characteristics.¹⁰

Lowenfeld's resurgence as an artist coincided with his conversations with Buber, as well as larger Zionist cultural trends within Austro-German society. Consequently, while teaching art to Jewish pupils in the 1920s and 1930s at the Chajes Realgymnasium, a Zionist school in Vienna, Lowenfeld had students produce art that more closely expressed Jewish identities than it did Austrian national pride. Students drew sketches of rabbinical figures, Hebrew lessons between teachers and students, and even biblical scenes. Former student Avram Kampf, for instance, depicted the binding of Isaac with its titular character prominently displayed. The approach to Jewish pedagogy was based on the beliefs of its founder, Rabbi Zwi Peres Chajes, and combined "observance of Jewish tradition, a Zionist outlook, and a comprehensive, culturally open-minded curriculum."¹¹ This mixture of traditional religious teachings and Zionism meant that in Lowenfeld's art classes, students could freely depict biblical events without fear of offense, despite the complicated dynamic between visual arts and Jewish tradition. In the opinions of some scholars such as Kaufmann Kohler and Salo W. Baron, visual representations of Jewish figures from the Bible were prohibited by the Second Commandment, which forbade images, but many Zionist leaders in the modern era rejected these beliefs and expressed the need to overcome them.¹² Buber was one of them. His vision of Jewish national art included reclaiming biblical figures as part of Zionism's regenerative process.¹³ Lowenfeld carried these ideas into his classroom, honoring Jewish tradition and ultimately reclaiming it from an increasingly hostile culture.

Historian Michael Brenner has shown that this postwar period of the "Jewish renaissance," a term coined by Buber, demonstrated a quest for community through which Jewish heritage could be preserved.¹⁴ Antisemitic forces had failed to revere Jewish war service and prevented Jewish immersion into the predominant culture, leading Lowenfeld, the son of a Jewish veteran, to feel intense detachment from his country. Art

was a process through which Jewish cultural pride could be maintained, and, in this same way, other people excluded from the nation's self-image—including the visually impaired in Austria—could find meaningful liberation. Lowenfeld's transition into viewing art as a liberating force shaped his subsequent approach to teaching blind students. After attending the University of Vienna, he favored a modernist, abstract style, finding art to be an inexact flowing of one's inward feelings. His preferred aesthetic led him to consider that "blind people, because they are deprived of the sense of sight," could likely produce emotionally pure art free from the threat of bland, uninspired imitation.¹⁵

Yet his insistence on the "refined sensibility" of the blind was problematic to many of his contemporaries. His superior at the Hohe Warte Institute for the Blind furiously argued that the blind "cannot create," since creative activity depended on the ability to visually organize the surrounding world.¹⁶ Lowenfeld nevertheless engaged his blind students in sculpting, drawing, and painting activities and, in the process, developed his haptic-visual theory, which he later taught to Black students at Hampton Institute. Lowenfeld's theory of haptic artistry maintained that art could emerge in different ways according to one's social conditioning. Individuals could either be haptic-minded, as in emotionally and "subjectively bound up with the self," or visually minded, "objective" observers who become acquainted with their physical environment through their eyes. Haptics, by way of their social marginalization, are more likely to visually depict restrictions and limited spatial perspectives, intensely displaying their inner, emotive selves.¹⁷

Lowenfeld eventually viewed his Black students as possessing the same inclinations as his blind students as a result of their oppression. His theories about artistic proclivities might be overly schematic, but the larger point is that his subsequent teaching practices in segregated Virginia were formed after years of experience in Vienna, where fascist undercurrents had long brewed. His approach to pedagogy emerged through interaction with a system that denigrated social outliers. Likewise, his perspective on the transformative power of art was shaped by European antisemitism and spiritual Zionism that defended a stigmatized identity and honored Jewish heritage. The social developments that defined Lowenfeld's life in Vienna—its illiberal constraints on artistry, racist stigmatization, and pride in Jewish identity—have certain parallels in the

societal structure of the Jim Crow South and at the institution where he soon taught.

Hampton Institute's Transformation and the Black Press

Prior to Lowenfeld's arrival at Hampton, Black students had spent decades advocating for a richer curriculum that would liberalize the school beyond its agricultural and industrial origins. The conditions that allowed for this transformation to occur can mainly be traced back to a 1927 student strike, when students rallied for liberalization, and the subsequent Depression era in which economic conditions shifted White attitudes toward labor. The 1927 Hampton student strike was informed by years of outrage at White administrators and their strict rules and expectations. Racist practices during a film screening in Ogden Hall were the final straw, leading to organized student protests that were widely publicized across the nation. Students were shown the silent film *Chang*, which depicts a Lao tribesman whose livelihood flounders when he attempts to integrate into urban society.¹⁸ The racist characterizations evident in the film did not prompt the protests but were entirely consistent with Hamptonian trends of propagating racial stereotypes, particularly those which involved ethnic primitivism.

According to W. E. B. Du Bois's written report for the *Nation*, the film began to play without the expected dimming of the lights, a sign that White supervisors of the event did not trust students to conduct themselves appropriately in a darkened room.¹⁹ A commotion ensued and persisted for several days. Students refused to participate in the singing of plantation songs, an enduring staple of the school's multiracial church services that helped preserve nostalgic fantasies of the Old South. In a statement to his friend Du Bois, L. F. Coles pointed to White paternalistic traditions as the primary catalysts behind the student strikes following the lighting incident. He remarked sharply, "The great trouble with the school generally, as I [see] it, is that they are trying to handle students as if they were little children. . . . [Faculty] have spent more time trying to teach the Negroes their places and a certain definite kind of education for them than they have spent trying to give them an education that would make them men and women capable of saving the world and [solving] its great [problems]." ²⁰ White administrators had failed to meet the spirit of higher education and, instead, guarded the school as a space through which the

Baltimore Sun, *October 15, 1927.*
(*Newspapers.com.*)

South's racial order could be safely maintained. The refusal to dim the lights also suggested gendered stereotypes of oversexed, aggressive Black men and sexually loose Black women. This was why, in the "Petition of the Hampton Students" drafted during the strike, students expressed discomfort with rules regarding dress code and social dancing between men and women. Among other demands, the petition called for "the educational system [to be] especially improved," including the ability to take electives and the addition of qualified faculty members, because many students believed that some teachers had inadequate educational bona fides.²¹ Lowenfeld, who had earned the equivalent of a doctoral degree in Vienna, eventually fulfilled such hiring requirements. Under his art program, students could seek their desired electives while engaging in artistry that challenged the racial and gender stereotypes that had prompted the student strike.

Earlier in the decade of Lowenfeld's arrival at Hampton, the economic hardships of the Great Depression had additionally motivated Hampton officials to alter the school's curriculum. As Whites increasingly sought work opportunities, financiers of institutions such as Hampton questioned the validity of training Black people exclusively for jobs that could be performed by desperate White laborers. Depression-era unemployment especially enticed the White working class to "accept any grade of work and almost any rate of pay," making the displacement of Black workers in industrial and agricultural fields inevitable.²²

Hampton Institute's educational model was rendered futile as a result, enabling its partial transition into liberal arts. The efforts of student protesters and larger Black movements, which included Black war veterans and Harlem artists advocating for improved curricula, bolstered these developments. These improvements created the conditions necessary for an artist such as Lowenfeld to teach at Hampton, but the school was still deeply embedded in a culture of White paternalism. The collapse of industrial training prompted White officials and financiers to refocus their efforts toward building racial coalitions that still assumed Black subordination. The new platform was intended to "influence more directly the training of Black leaders," thereby recognizing the rising frequency of prominent Black voices, many of which were considered too radical.²³ To those who supported or accepted segregation and racism, these influential and growing voices seen through intellectual movements such as the Harlem Renaissance needed to be tempered and controlled in spaces of higher education, where they were likely to foment as students embraced the arts and humanities.

Hampton's institutional history highlights the South's clinging to antebellum social conditions and the political consciousness of students who resisted the boundaries White administrators attempted to place on them. The institution's initial purpose and dynamic, rooted in notions of White Christian supremacy and the primitive nature of non-Whites, made the eventual teaching appointment of a modernist, Austrian Jewish artist seem nearly revolutionary. In the era of Lowenfeld's immigration, predominantly White institutions held elitist sensibilities that often stemmed the hiring of Jewish faculty, and, although Black institutions were less selective, White Christian administrators at Hampton still questioned the hiring of a Jew. Dr. Arthur Howe, the president of the institute at the time

of Lowenfeld's hiring, inquired whether "Mr. Lowenfeld would be happy in an institution placing much emphasis upon the Christian religion through its services and ideals."²⁴ Gordon Allport, Lowenfeld's acquaintance and now advocate, responded with the reassurance that Lowenfeld "is not particularly Jewish in appearance."²⁵ Lowenfeld saw no potential conflicts and was enthused to start an "entirely new phase" in his pedagogical career, finding the challenge of building an art department at a Black institution similar to what he had accomplished with the Institute for the Blind. "Nothing had been done there," he recalled. Soon his Jewish heritage served as the basis for an authentic teacher-student dynamic rather than the hindrance administrators feared.²⁶

It would be too simplistic a narrative, however, to suggest that Lowenfeld's social position as a Jewish refugee escaping racial oppression immediately endeared him to all Black students. With his thick Austrian accent and cultural habits, Lowenfeld carried a distinct air of foreignness and cosmopolitanism that reinforced certain stereotypes about Jews. In the *Washington Tribune*, Black journalist Kelly Miller posited the differences between anti-Black racism in the South and antisemitism in Europe: "Georgia fears the Negro will lower the level of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Hitler fears the Jews will raise it too high."²⁷ Miller's analysis creates a parallel of racial oppression, but his impression of antisemitism is superficial and demonstrative of some American perceptions about Jews. European antisemitism was indeed fueled by anxieties that Jews were overly dominant, but Jews were also stigmatized as harbingers of regressive culture. Central European Jews, often through their association with African American cultural trends such as jazz music, were viewed as social pollutants. East European Jews were regarded as filthy, uncivilized, and primitive, making antisemitism an irrational current in which Jews were simultaneously too wealthy and urbane but also too poor and uncouth. Yet as Miller and other voices attest, a key image of European Jewry that cemented itself in American culture was the Jewish debonair.

Other Black publications illuminate varied responses toward the evolving Jewish crisis under Nazism and demonstrate the perceptions Hampton students might have held when first encountering Lowenfeld, whose background and heritage were no secret. Some opinion pieces were antisemitic, defending Hitler's politics as a rational response to the Jewish "international thinking element."²⁸ One article makes the case that in both

Europe and the United States, “Jews use all of the tricks of the Jewish faith” to financially exploit people, including Black consumers and tenants.²⁹ These lines of thought in response to Nazism were unusual but sufficiently prevalent to suggest that some antisemitic ideas had infiltrated Black communal and intellectual discourse. For the most part, Black newspapers sympathized with the plight of European Jews and drew connections to American racism. In 1936, the *Afro-American*, the longest-running and one of the most influential Black papers, labeled the South and Nazi Germany as “mental brothers.”³⁰ Writers such as the Reverend Adam Clayton Powell used the press to advocate direct action. Powell’s editorial argued that Jewish suffering in Europe signaled the potential for racial intolerance everywhere: “Apathy spells our own doom. Our only success is to stop fascism. . . . We must aid the Jew in Germany.”³¹

Hampton students, as youth especially attuned to political discourse, were familiar with the Jewish crisis and its relevance to African Americans. They understood the circumstances behind Lowenfeld’s arrival, and, even if impressions of Jewish people were regularly marred by stereotypes, his experiences in a toxic culture of racial intolerance enabled in them an early openness to trusting an otherwise strange and alien figure. The skepticism of previous Hampton students toward White professors persisted into the 1930s and 1940s, but Lowenfeld’s unique status as a Jewish refugee was compelling and offered a rare, intellectually stimulating experience. Samella Lewis, one of Lowenfeld’s star students, had originally enrolled at Dillard University, a New Orleans-based, historically Black institution, where she studied under artist Elizabeth Catlett. Lewis recalled that early in her college education, Catlett suggested she transfer to Hampton to study in the intriguing new program under Viktor Lowenfeld.³² Lewis’s decision to leave a Black mentor she had admired and valued for a Jewish foreigner indicates the exciting appeal teachers and students saw in Lowenfeld’s approach. Lewis surmised that she could learn not only about artistry, but about the world in general through contact with a teacher whose circumstances were so exceptional.

Lowenfeld’s Teaching Practices

When Lowenfeld began his teaching career at Hampton in the fall semester of 1939, the artistic and pedagogical theories he had cultivated

Samella Lewis.
(Courtesy of Scripps College,
Claremont, CA.)

in Austria found a new home in the Jim Crow South. Antisemitism impelled Lowenfeld to develop artistry that affirmed his Jewish identity and stirred within him an intense resistance to intolerant societies and rigid artistic schemas. Understanding the reality of American anti-Black racism, he encouraged his Hampton students to produce art that represented their authentic selves, chipping away at the stifling omnipresence of Eurocentric styles. This approach entailed forging connections to ancestral and cultural pasts, whereas many students were predisposed to mimic European and White imagery in their work. Lewis, who had nurtured her interest in painting from an early age, recalled a schoolteacher's gift to her, a "history of art" book that in hindsight she could only identify as entirely Eurocentric.³³ Lewis and other students, informed by White hegemonic standards in books and popular media, believed such aesthetics to be the only representations of legitimate artistry.

Lowenfeld observed that students appeared self-conscious, ashamed of African art, and had "by no means freed [themselves] from the influences which were partly superimposed upon [them]." ³⁴ He further took issue with the architectural aesthetics of Hampton's campus, problematizing colonial styles that were at odds with the thoroughly modernist art he wanted his students to produce. Hampton's built environment, in his view, represented a continued colonial dominance over Blackness. His protestations amounted to nothing more than material for a short essay, but importantly, these early impressions of Hampton's

*Virginia Hall at Hampton Institute, designed by Richard Morris Hunt, 1874.
The building is still in use. (Wikimedia Commons.)*

students and spaces betrayed his specifically Jewish and modernist roots in Austria. His rejection of outdated or historicist architecture – that which had imitated and recreated historical aesthetics – emerged from his position in the Viennese Secession, a segment of Austro-German culture that celebrated multiple artistic styles against the rising “sameness of expression” regimented by many elites and, eventually, fascists. Lowenfeld reviled aesthetics that dangerously appropriated traditional, monumental architectural styles the likes of which would characterize the physicality of Nazism and its purported redemption of “the city” from corrupting forces, such as Jews, that were accused of contributing to its degradation. Modernism was the necessary key for a democratic lifestyle free from the grandiosity of totalitarian movements.

Finding apparent traces of colonialism on Hampton’s campus and in the artistic mentalities of the students, Lowenfeld developed a pedagogy of self-determination. His recognition of Black shame and his belief in producing dignified self-expressions originated in his and his wife Margaret’s interactions with Jewish youth in Vienna. Having both taught at

the Chajes Realgymnasium, they attempted to foster communal bonding coincidentally with efforts to promote fulfilling and positive Jewish identities. As a physical education teacher, Margaret conducted nature activities that emphasized the productive exploitation of the land, instilling group cooperation and survival skills in children in accordance with tenets of muscular Judaism. These inclinations toward group survival and solidarity persisted at Hampton, where students noted his interest in their personal lives and friendships and his occasional interventions to settle disputes. Lewis, typically quiet and solitary although not unfriendly, recalled how Lowenfeld meddled in her social relationships. As a light-skinned woman from New Orleans, a city with a reputation for color caste, Lowenfeld questioned whether Lewis was an ostracized victim or the one ostracizing others. He quickly caught on to internalized racism and worked tirelessly – sometimes, to the point of irritation – to dismantle its presence in his classroom, seeking racial unity as a means of communal prosperity. Lewis had also initially rejected portraying Blackness in her paintings, later recalling that she “wouldn’t associate with certain people” in art because she was ashamed. Lowenfeld challenged what she called her “weaknesses,” and, although it led to moments of conflict, she believed that his pedagogy allowed her to truthfully examine her social position. Throughout the rest of her career as artist and art educator, Lewis viewed the invocation of African symbols and aesthetics – respectfully depicted, in contrast to White artists who portrayed Black “buffoons” – as an opportunity for reclamation and cultural reconnection to the Black ancestral past.³⁵

As previously detailed, Lowenfeld’s desire to procure artwork free from self-conscious confines predated his teaching position at Hampton. His pedagogy in Vienna similarly embraced “authentic” heritages that honored Jewish history, traditions, and people, while simultaneously resisting antisemitic impositions on Jewish identities. When Jewish students at the Chajes Realgymnasium recreated scenes from the Bible or drew tranquil sketches of Jewish communities, they fostered intimate connections to Judaism but also reclaimed Jewishness against a society that often visually caricatured Jews through propaganda imagery. As with group solidarity, these affirmations that engendered positive views of Jewishness mirrored a clear equivalent at Hampton. To find the “true self,” one liberated from the proliferation of stereotypes or the seeming superiority

of European culture, Lowenfeld urged students to freely and consciously accept their African heritages. To this end, Hampton artists began sketching Black figures with “authentic” emotions accumulated over centuries of oppression. Sculptures, watercolor paintings, and charcoal drawings of fatigued Black faces stood out as particularly challenging to southern idealizations of Blackness, in which happy-go-lucky “mammies” and other forms of minstrelsy disguised true historical conditions. The artistic styles encapsulated in these works were not only notable for the figures within them, but for their positioning on the canvas or page, which wholly reflected Lowenfeld’s theory of haptic artistry. Lowenfeld had continued to theorize haptic artistry – the idea that the underprivileged had a uniquely subjective perspective that could be dependent on senses other than seeing – through the Black and southern experience.

In his essay “Negro Art Expression in America,” Lowenfeld proclaimed that “the horizon of the sharecropper is his cornfield,” just as “the horizon of the laundry-woman is her tub,” recalling common Black social and economic positions. These were perspectives that only disadvantaged people could understand: visually limited to the immediate task or struggle at hand, yet highly specific and emotive when transformed into art. In Lowenfeld’s words, when one’s “freedom is restricted . . . we become self-centered like the prisoner whose only outlook is the walls of his prison or the bars of his cell.” This theorized subjectivity was as Jewish as it was Black. In the same essay, Lowenfeld remembered “very well how my whole thinking and doing became paralyzed when Hitler marched into Vienna, the city in which I lived, and the only thought I was capable of was centered around the idea of how to get out of this hell.”³⁶ Much of the artwork produced at Hampton affirmed Lowenfeld’s theory of the haptic artist, depicting close-ups of Black faces, detached from surroundings and even their bodies, emphasizing only that which is immediately present or concerning to the observer. One untitled sketch by student Ivy Babb depicts a woman seemingly floating in space; her expression is pained or tired, in contrast to racist depictions of Black women domestics as overly jovial servants to White families. The sketch follows the tenets of haptic artistry but is also implicitly political for its subtle charge of Black discontent and its contradiction to White southern fantasies of Black womanhood. These reconceptualizations of Black bodies in art at Hampton were informed by Lowenfeld’s earlier practices with Jewish youth,

*Ivy Babb, untitled sketch, c. 1943-45.
(Viktor Lowenfeld Papers, Pennsylvania State
University Archives, Special Collections Library.)*

suggesting a profound interplay between his European Jewish experience, Zionist ideas of Jewish self-empowerment, and the politics of Blackness in the South.

Provocative Politics

As an adolescent Lowenfeld had imagined a Zionist fantasyland. His idea was to establish a Jewish youth settlement, *Wyckfohr*, on a desolate island in the North Sea, in which a Youth Republic could govern itself free from the constraints of adults. The vision was born from frustration and disillusionment with the politics of the era. After the older generation's warmongering led to such great destruction in World War I, a pacifistic space in which young people could think for themselves without oppressive structures sounded most ideal.³⁷ These imaginings represented early indications of Lowenfeld's resistance to the political

structures of his day, and his belief in unencumbered self-discovery in young people found transnational significance with the Black art emanating from Hampton.

He urged students to produce art styles that not only reclaimed a dignified heritage but directly confronted the characteristics of anti-Black racism, leaving little doubt as to whose art and voice was being presented. This “consciously Black” art proved especially provocative given that its production was simultaneous with the American war effort to defeat fascism in the name of democracy. While many Black Americans viewed the campaign against Nazi intolerance as an opportunity to secure the same democratic principles at home, the work of Hampton artists was hardly genial or patriotic. John Biggers, Lowenfeld’s most famous student, appreciated Lowenfeld’s emphasis on producing art that revealed the artist’s internalized emotions even when they were deeply critical of social structures. In his earliest art lessons with Lowenfeld, Biggers, who was born in rural North Carolina in 1924, recalled his distressing childhood memories, growing up impoverished in a matriarchal household. Biggers reflected that he could not quite “get over the treatment of women,” and that “the

*Viktor Lowenfeld with Hampton Institute students including
John Biggers (seated) with his painting Mother and Child, 1944.
(Courtesy of Hampton University Archives.)*

Viktor Lowenfeld, right, in front of John Biggers's painting Dying Soldier at the "Young Negro Art" exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1943.

Also pictured (left to right): Dr. Ralph Bridgeman, Hampton Institute president-elect; Ludlow Werner, son of the editor of the New York Age;

Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, oldest trustee of Hampton Institute;

Flemmie P. Kittrell, Hampton Institute Dean of Women.

(Charles W. White Papers, Smithsonian Institution.)

image of a mule in harness with blinders on kept coming to mind." Accordingly, his earliest drawings were unpolished sketches of working Black women. He ultimately found the exercises profound enough to pursue art seriously, regardless of his initial plan "to learn to become a plumber, [because] the economic urge was always present."³⁸ Biggers's sketches were sympathetic to their subjects but innately critical of the conditions facing the underprivileged. He answered Lowenfeld's call for defiant artwork through these engagements with his cultural memories and the social critiques that underpinned them.

In 1942, Biggers gained national attention for his politically incisive mural *Dying Soldier*, a scathing depiction of a Black soldier trapped in barbed wire. The mural displays the soldier's thoughts during his final

*Museum of Modern Art press release announcing the opening of "Young Negro Art: Work of Students at Hampton Institute," September 30, 1943.
(Courtesy of the Museum of Modern Art, New York.)*

moments of life, including fleeting moments of joy but also legacies of racial oppression. Above all, it is a critique of American hypocrisy, of a nation that can sacrifice Black bodies for an anti-Nazi cause while still upholding racial discrimination. Biggers's critique of the American war system resonated with Lowenfeld's wartime sorrows and the realization that Austrian Jewish patriots, including his father, had faced antisemitism. Biggers recalled that Lowenfeld leaned on his persecution as a Jew to familiarize himself with "the Negro's problem in this country," and his enthusiasm for free expression inspired politically combative art such as *Dying Soldier*.³⁹ Moreover, the mural shares similarities with surrealist work by German Jewish artists known to Lowenfeld, including Otto Dix and Georg Grosz, both of whom depicted chaotic despair at the hands of German nationalism. Felix Nussbaum's 1944 painting *The Triumph of Death*, completed months before his murder in Auschwitz, exudes further similarities, suggesting inescapable horror for Europe's Jews. These German Jewish artists, employing the same stylistic devices as Lowenfeld, developed a visual language to explore themes of anti-Nazism and Jewish hopelessness that worked just as well to depict Black suffering.

Despite his concerns about the possible financial limitations of a career in art, the draw of emotional catharsis that had been achieved through creating works such as *Dying Soldier*, a masterpiece of social surrealism, convinced Biggers to pursue the profession.⁴⁰ Lowenfeld praised the mural's eclectic appearance and its political audacity, but its reception among a wider White audience was expectedly fraught. Lowenfeld's art department had attracted enough national attention to secure him and select students an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art (MOMA) in New York. Critics blasted *Dying Soldier* as "screaming propaganda" that was unsubtle and tacky, and only praised Lowenfeld for a "commendable" but unfulfilled effort to teach Black people artistic prowess.⁴¹ The resistance of artistic elites to Hampton artists was less important than the authentic emotionalism that Lowenfeld and his students felt they had created. In his remarks at the exhibition, Lowenfeld noted that students had "developed rapidly" their abilities to avoid imitating classical, White, and European styles, instead successfully engaging in art that was consciously and meaningfully Black. The earliest creations of Hampton art showed the immense influence of White beauty standards, regimented in part by American fashion magazines, but by the early 1940s, students resisted

Whiteness in their artistic inclinations and depicted beautiful figures with consistently “Negro features.”⁴²

Equally striking was the interplay between Black and Jewish histories that emerged from these collaborative processes. Although its significance was lost on many of their artistic contemporaries, the Hampton dynamic between Lowenfeld and his students demonstrates the adaptable lessons of the European Jewish experience and its potential uses in a highly racialized society such as that which prevailed in the Jim Crow South. Lowenfeld benefited from this dynamic, as directing politically inspired art in the South helped sustain consciousness of his Jewishness and the forces that had threatened to destroy it. He often began lectures referencing his plight as an Austrian Jew, and this openness allowed him and his students to collectively process the tragedy of the Nazi genocide.

Biggers recalled that one evening Lowenfeld had invited him to dinner with his family following an abnormally long day working in the studio. On the way, the teacher stopped to collect mail at the post office and returned to his car a “ghostly white.” After driving for minutes in uncomfortable silence, Lowenfeld abruptly pulled over to read aloud the contents of a letter that shocked Biggers and permanently altered their relationship. “In this letter, they were telling him of some of his folks that they had discovered were burned in those camps,” Biggers recollected. Devastated, Lowenfeld lamented the difference between the Nazism that had claimed the lives of his family and former students and the southern prejudices that afflicted Black people. “They aren’t killing you,” he said, “they segregate you, they discriminate, but they aren’t killing you for being Black.”⁴³

Although lynchings in the United States were routine and ritualized, Lowenfeld was stunned by the extent of Nazi atrocities that had reinforced his otherness as a Jew, disrupting the comfort he might have been acquiring in his new life. The emotionally draining exchange enhanced the personal and professional bonds between Lowenfeld and Biggers, whose understanding of Jewish suffering helped transcend whatever “racial barriers” might have previously existed. The trauma of the Holocaust strengthened Lowenfeld’s resolve to produce politically meaningful art at Hampton that could effectively combat Nazi or White supremacist tendencies. Rather than internalize his pain out of fear of inconveniencing others with a specifically Jewish hardship, Lowenfeld repurposed the

events in Europe to make a difference in southern society. The consequent artwork seamlessly blended Jewish and Black experiences together in visual critiques of intolerant societies while also honoring the persistence and singularity of each community.

Black and Jewish Convergences

The immense destruction brought about by Nazi ingenuity emboldened Lowenfeld's view that creative expression should only be harnessed for just causes. Reflecting on the destruction of Europe's Jews, he condemned how "creativity could be misused," urging students to be purposeful and morally sound in all that they produced.⁴⁴ The lessons of the Jewish experience were visually evident in Hampton artwork created at the war's close and in the years after. Ivy Babb depicted striped figures in an ambiguous space struggling to carry a corpse, recalling horrors of both the Holocaust and the war, implicitly critiquing a relentlessly violent world. Another student sketched miserable, bald figures in cramped conditions, their sunken eyes and emaciated faces mirroring the common

Ivy Babb, untitled sketch, 1944.
(Viktor Lowenfeld Papers, Pennsylvania State
University Archives, Special Collections Library.)

Charles White in his studio.
 (Wikimedia Commons.)

imagery emanating from death camps. The figures have European features, and the timing, combined with Lowenfeld's presence, suggests the Holocaust as a probable influence. The art also resonates with Black experiences, recalling historical scenes of Black oppression such as the Middle Passage and implying the connectivity of Black and Jewish persecution and the establishment of shared empathy at Hampton.

Artist Charles White related antisemitism to anti-Black racism more explicitly, as is demonstrated in his 1944 drawing *Headlines*, which features an anxious man surrounded by a collage of newspapers reporting various atrocities. The bottom portion of the work includes a headline about Nazism's attack on communism, while another reads "Speakers Link Anti-Semitism, Anti-Negroism." White had been the recipient of a Rosenwald Fellowship and chose to complete his project at Hampton in 1943, wanting to immerse himself in Black southern culture but also enticed by the school's highly reputed art department. Lowenfeld advised him during the completion of his mural, *The Contribution of the Negro to Democracy in America*, which celebrated "Black beauty."⁴⁵ The student's efforts to visually promote Black self-esteem and the subsequent invocation of antisemitism in his work indicate Lowenfeld's likely impact.

Lowenfeld's artistry was also shaped by his interactions with Black artists at Hampton. Given his intensive teaching and writing responsibilities, he painted less than in his youth, but between 1943 and 1945 created *The Negro's Burden*. The oil-on-canvas portrays a Black male struggling under the weight of an overwhelming mass that forms shackles around his wrist. The piece may be interpreted as a statement on Black perseverance against hardship and evinces some of the lessons Lowenfeld learned while living in the South. He formed these impressions from interactions with students and faculty alike, having initially shared a home with Moses Williams, a Black professor from Hampton. Williams recalled that he and his family regarded the Lowenfelds as "people that we had known all our lives, who were completely sympathetic."⁴⁶ Rather than buy their first home in a predominantly White neighborhood, the Lowenfelds settled in the all-Black area of Phoebus, Virginia, and Viktor opted to use Black drinking fountains and toilets instead of segregated White facilities.⁴⁷

Lowenfeld remained close to the Black community throughout his tenure at Hampton and also occasionally participated in Jewish communal activities in Newport News. While no records illuminate his and Margaret's belonging to any particular congregation, he delivered lectures on art theory at Temple Rodef Sholem and hosted concerts for another Jewish refugee and Hampton colleague, the musician Hans Mahler, on behalf of the Jewish Welfare Board.⁴⁸ His public lectures typically discussed "visual and non-visual" applications of art, simplifying his haptic theory into layman's terms, and were presented with slideshows showcasing the work of both his blind and Black students. Through these regular addresses to the public, Lowenfeld championed artwork that implicitly defied intolerant beliefs. The social commentary of his lectures was not lost on audiences, as is exemplified in an article written by Marion L. Starkey, a White colleague from Hampton. She praised Lowenfeld's method of guiding students toward "an unconscious release from their own emotional conflicts," including physical or racial "handicaps." Like Starkey, other White faculty at Hampton approved of Lowenfeld's teaching methods, and several attended his lectures concerning art appreciation.⁴⁹

His ascendant popularity with students, colleagues, and the general public eventually fueled his exit as Hampton administrators grew skeptical. According to Lewis, "[Lowenfeld] became too popular for Hampton

and the administration forced him out." Frequent visits from New York art elites and voluminous press attention surrounding his publications and lectures turned Lowenfeld into an unwanted celebrity. Lewis surmised that administrators feared "if he were famous, then maybe he wouldn't be subservient." Lowenfeld consequently began teaching at Pennsylvania State University in 1946, and some Hampton students including John Biggers followed him for graduate studies. "He was not happy there," Lewis recalled, for White students "had too much" and were not as receptive to his pedagogy as Hampton artists were.⁵⁰

Lowenfeld's theories as an artist and art educator were widely respected but were most meaningful to marginalized groups such as Jews, the blind, and African Americans. In this sense, he and his students at Hampton imagined a form of creative exchange that depended on mutual compassion and recognition of the structures that bound them together. Lowenfeld's unhappiness following his departure from Hampton suggests that he was most fulfilled while assisting other social undesirables in their pursuits of dignity and self-acceptance. Hampton offered the key to actualizing the political fantasies he imagined in Vienna, and his discovery of passionate liberalism while there became the basis of his newly established American Jewish identity.

These instances of connection through art contain broader implications about Black and Jewish historical relations, a dynamic studied through abundant literature but one that remains heavily debated. The traditional narrative locates the 1950s as the golden age of Black and Jewish allegiance, before the rise of Black Power dismantled these working relationships. Marc Dollinger has complicated the notion that Black Power alienated Jews, arguing instead that it represented a model of identity politics useful to Jewish activists and was always an anticipated outcome of the fight for equality.⁵¹ Lowenfeld's existence at Hampton supports this claim, as he encouraged proud aesthetics in Black art while relying on Black and Jewish commonalities. Through relatively radical Black art, Lowenfeld grieved what would later be termed "the Holocaust," and the Nazi assault on modernism, finding immediate purpose in the afflictions of his life in an entirely new social environment.

In 1960, at the age of fifty-seven, Lowenfeld passed away from a heart attack during a faculty meeting. He missed the peak years of civil rights activism, but his teachings at Hampton contributed to Black self-

expression especially in the politically provocative works of John Biggers, Samella Lewis, Charles White, and Elizabeth Catlett, all of whom became influential teachers and theorists in later years. Biggers's stated goals as a professor at Texas Southern University best encapsulate Lowenfeld's spirit. "I hoped to help the young Blacks," he suggested, "substitute a feeling of self-respect for their then-current feelings of self-contempt by developing an appreciation for their own art and heritage."⁵²

Though only a fragment of the southern Jewish experience, Lowenfeld's career is informative in several ways. His time at Hampton is noteworthy not merely because he was a Jew, but because the culture that emerged in the art department was understood to be Jewish in its origins and outcomes even in an overwhelmingly Christian setting. These convergences are not natural products of Black and Jewish interaction or collaboration, but, for the actors involved in Hampton's early art department, such identities mattered and added emotional heft to the artistic proceedings. In the practices and artistry at Hampton, the confluence between spiritually Zionist principles and Jewish oppression with Blackness in the South and Black artistic expression was unmistakable.

These cultural transferences demonstrate the inherent value and often untapped potential of locating Jewish voices through Black sources, such as the vital testimonies of Hampton students, as well as the visual art they produced, works that speak to Black and Jewish legacies of oppression, struggle, and survival. These works additionally indicate the potential to resist racist confines and mediate the effects of trauma through art, teaching, and unity among socially marginalized groups. The experiences of Jewish refugee scholars at historically Black colleges and universities, particularly in the Jim Crow South, have been relatively unexplored—in part because the Jewish refugee scholars somewhat surprisingly did not leave memoirs. Yet through reconstructing such narratives, the profound significance of their teachings and their lives can be discovered.

 NOTES

¹ Viktor Lowenfeld, teaching materials, n.d., box 1, folder 62, Viktor Lowenfeld Papers (587), Pennsylvania State University Archives, Special Collections Library, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA (hereafter cited as Lowenfeld Papers).

² Viktor Lowenfeld is one of many Jewish refugee scholars featured in the documentary film *From Swastika to Jim Crow*, directed by Lori Cheatle and Martin D. Toub (Brooklyn: Pacific Street Films, 2000).

³ Clive Webb, *Fight Against Fear: Southern Jews and Black Civil Rights* (Athens, GA, 2001): xvii.

⁴ Viktor Lowenfeld, audio of recorded lecture at Pennsylvania State University (1958), box 77, reel 113, Lowenfeld Papers; Kathleen Hemby Hanstein to Thomas Jones, March 6, 1944, box 1, item 17, Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb Collection (1999.A.0037.31), digitized materials, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, DC (hereafter cited as Edgcomb Collection).

⁵ Viktor Lowenfeld, "Art and Society: A Dilemma," c.1950, box 1, folder 56, Lowenfeld Papers.

⁶ Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb, *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee Scholars at Black Colleges* (Malabar, FL, 1993), 78. Stephen J. Whitfield discusses a variety of reactions of refugee scholars at Black Mountain College to racism in the South and at their institutions in "Black Mountain and Brandeis: Two Experiments in Higher Education," *Southern Jewish History* 16 (2013): 127–68.

⁷ Viktor Lowenfeld, "Autobiographical Lectures," in *The Autobiographical Lectures of Some Prominent Art Educators*, ed. Ralph Raunft (Reston, VA, 2001), 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁹ Todd Presner, *Muscular Judaism: The Jewish Body and the Politics of Regeneration* (New York, 2007), 4.

¹⁰ Martin Buber, *The First Buber: Youthful Zionist Writings of Martin Buber*, ed. Gilya G. Schmidt (Syracuse, NY, 1999), 100.

¹¹ Susan K. Leshnoff, "Viktor Lowenfeld: Portrait of a Young Art Teacher in Vienna in the 1930s," *Studies in Art Education* 54 (2013): 160.

¹² For discussion of aniconism, the presumed Jewish aversion to art stemming from biblical doctrine, see Kalman P. Bland, *The Artless Jew: Medieval and Modern Affirmations and Denials of the Visual* (Princeton, 2000). Challengers to these traditions included Martin Buber, Moses Hess, and Alfred Nossig, as discussed in Martin Buber, *Juedische Kuenstler* (Berlin, 1903).

¹³ Presner, *Muscular Judaism*, 71.

¹⁴ Michael Brenner, *The Renaissance of Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany* (New Haven, 1996), 24.

¹⁵ Lowenfeld, "Autobiographical Lectures," 7.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Viktor Lowenfeld, teaching materials, n.d., box 1, folder 62, Lowenfeld Papers.

¹⁸ Edward K. Graham, "The Hampton Institute Strike of 1927: A Case Study in Student Protest," *American Scholar* 38 (Autumn 1969): 668–83.

¹⁹ W. E. B. Du Bois, article draft, "The Hampton Strike, ca. November 2, 1927," W. E. B. Du Bois Papers (MS 312), Special Collections and University Archives, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries.

²⁰ L. F. Coles, "Hampton students strike article, ca. October 1927," 5–6, W. E. B. Du Bois Papers (MS 312), Special Collections and University Archives, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries.

²¹ Edward Graham, "Hampton Institute Strike," 675.

²² James D. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935* (Chapel Hill, 1988), 235.

²³ Hoda M. Zaki, *Civil Rights and Politics at Hampton Institute: The Legacy of Alonzo G. Moron* (Urbana, IL, 2007), 18, 263.

²⁴ Arthur Howe to Gordon Allport, May 23, 1939, box 1, folder 9, item 58, Edgcomb Collection.

²⁵ Gordon Allport to Arthur Howe, May 29, 1939, box 1, folder 9, item 60, Edgcomb Collection.

²⁶ Lowenfeld PSU lecture.

²⁷ Kelly Miller, quoted in Lunabelle Wedlock, "The Reaction of Negro Publications and Organizations to German Antisemitism," *The Howard University Studies in the Social Sciences* 3 (1942): 49.

²⁸ J. A. Rogers, quoted in Wedlock, "Reaction of Negro Publications," 87.

²⁹ Quoted in *ibid.*, 133.

³⁰ Quoted in *ibid.*, 111.

³¹ Adam C. Powell, quoted in *ibid.*, 53.

³² Transcript, "Interview with Samella Lewis, Tape #1," 15, box 66, folder 7, Samella S. Lewis Papers (Manuscript Collection No. 1132), Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University, Atlanta.

³³ *Ibid.*, 8.

³⁴ Viktor Lowenfeld, "Negro Art Expression in America," 1945, 5, box 19, folder 12, Lowenfeld Papers.

³⁵ Lewis interview, 21.

³⁶ Lowenfeld, "Negro Art Expression in America," 6.

³⁷ Lowenfeld, "Autobiographical Lectures," 5.

³⁸ Transcript, "Artists Series: An interview with John Biggers," 4, 1983, box 59, folder 4, John Biggers Papers (Manuscript Collection No. 1179), Stuart A. Rose Manuscript, Archives and Rare Book Library, Emory University, Atlanta (hereafter cited as Biggers Papers).

³⁹ John Biggers, quoted in "I've Hit My High: Dr. John Biggers moves in giant strides through classroom and museum," *Houston Press*, November 17, 1968, box 32, folder 5, Biggers Papers.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Newspaper clippings, *Art News*, 1943, box 1, folder 41, Lowenfeld Papers.

⁴² Press Release, "Museum of Modern Art," 1943, box 1, folder 41, Lowenfeld Papers.

⁴³ Transcript, John Biggers interview with Christia Adair, n.d., box 60, folder 5, Biggers Papers.

⁴⁴ Viktor Lowenfeld, "Basic Aspects of Creative Teaching," n.d., 3, box 1, folder 41, Lowenfeld Papers.

⁴⁵ Charles White, "Autobiographical Essay," c. 1950s, box 4, folder 64, Charles White Papers, 1933–1987, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

⁴⁶ Transcript, William Moses interview, c. 1960s, box 3, folder 9, Lowenfeld Papers.

⁴⁷ Peter Smith, "Lowenfeld Teaching Art: A European Theory and American Experience at Hampton Institute," *Studies in Art Education* 29 (1987): 30–36.

⁴⁸ "Sisterhood Books Lowenfeld For Lecture On Art," *Daily Press* (Newport News, VA), January 26, 1941; "JWB Institutes Musical Hours," *Daily Press*, July 30, 1941.

⁴⁹ Marion L. Starkey, "Viennese Artist Propounds Self-Expression In Art As Therapy For Mental Illness," *Daily Press*, December 10, 1939.

⁵⁰ Lewis interview, 37.

⁵¹ Marc Dollinger, *Black Power, Jewish Politics: Reinventing the Alliance in the 1960s* (Walham, MA, 2018).

⁵² John Biggers, quoted in Olive Jensen Theisen, *Walls That Speak: The Murals of John Thomas Biggers* (Denton, TX, 2010), 28.