

Civic Rights: Urban Development and Black Politics in Jim Crow Atlanta

Jay Driskell

Paper delivered at the American Association of Geographers Annual Meeting
New York City, 27 Feb 2012

“A white man once had a colored man in a buggy beside him driving. He was skillful with the whip. He could take his whip and pick a fly off a rose. As he drove along whenever he saw a fly on a rose or a bush, he would take his whip and just pick him off. Finally, he came to a hornets’ nest. The white man said, ‘Jim, there is a chance to show your skill, why not pick that fellow off the hornets’ nest?’ Jim said, ‘No sir, boss, they’s organized.’ That is what the black man has got to do – organize to protect himself and his family.”ⁱ

- Capt. Jackson McHenry, Atlanta (1919)

The Hornets’ Nest

On Saturday mornings just after World War One, subscribers to the city’s leading black newspaper, the *Atlanta Independent*, read Capt. Jackson McHenry’s weekly column. It comprised equal parts gossip, political news and opinion. Here, they would regularly encounter bits of homespun wisdom like the one you just heard.

On the surface, the meaning of this parable seems quite obvious. An organized black community will not be whipped. It stands a better chance at defending its individual members than a disorganized one. But, this was more than an inspiring fable about organized resistance to oppression. McHenry offered his readers a lesson in solidarity.

McHenry placed the whip in the hand of Jim, a black man who works for a white man rich enough to have both a buggy and a driver. When ordered to, he can whip a lone fly off a rose. Taking the lone fly on the rose as a metaphor, McHenry’s fable seems to suggest that no matter how well situated, any isolated black individual is vulnerable to the racialized violence and subjugation implied by the whip.

McHenry's narrative choices here also carry with them a class-based critique of older forms of black leadership. Just as there was no rosebush beautiful enough to protect a lone, hapless fly from the coachman's whip, there was no escape from the arbitrary violence of Jim Crow for any African American no matter how well-situated.

However, when confronted with the hornet's nest, Jim balks. An attack on the hornet's nest carried with it the threat of retaliation by the entire hive, enough to dissuade the white man's black servant from wielding his whip. The most significant decision made in this parable was not the implied threat of retribution by the hive. Rather, it was *Jim's* refusal to obey, forcing him to choose between allegiance to an organized black community or fealty to his white employer.

At the dawn of the twentieth century, nearly 90,000 people called Atlanta home. By 1920, that number had swelled to more than 200,000 residents.ⁱⁱ In order to keep up with this burgeoning population, the city had laid sidewalks and paved roads, installed streetlights and running water, planted public parks and dug swimming pools. However, decades of racially-stratified urban development had built a city in which black citizens were taxed for the construction of an electrical grid that did not illuminate their homes, running water that did not wash their bodies, and public schools from which their children were barred. As Atlanta became a thoroughly twentieth-century city, its black residents were increasingly relegated to nineteenth-century ghettos.

In April of 1919, McHenry's parable of solidarity and organized black political action had particular resonance for the black citizens of Atlanta. Two days before the fable of the hornets' nest appeared in the pages of the *Independent*, black voters had gone to the polls to defeat millions of dollars in municipal bond referenda meant to fund the modernization of the

city's fire department, waterworks and public school system. Organized by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and an organization of progressive black women called the Neighborhood Union, this vote was the latest attempt to compel the city to invest in black Atlanta.

It had been the third such vote in less than ten months. Three times the city's urban boosters had appealed to Atlanta's black voters, seeking their support for these bond referenda and three times they were defeated by a unified black electorate. Despite the 1908 imposition of legal disfranchisement that decimated the size of the black electorate, African American voters could not legally be barred from voting in municipal referenda.ⁱⁱⁱ

Together, the NAACP and the Union organized more than 3,000 African Americans to pay their poll taxes and register to vote in a bloc against the bonds until the city agreed to build a publicly funded high school for the city's black students. Ultimately, these efforts were successful – in 1924, Booker T. Washington Public High School opened its doors. For the first time, the black citizens of Atlanta could at last send their children to one of the high schools that their taxes had been supporting since Reconstruction.

This display of political unity would have been remarkable in any era, but in the context of Jim Crow Atlanta, it was astounding. The struggle for Booker T. Washington High School by the fighting grassroots of the early NAACP gave birth to a new form of black politics that directly confronted the dilemma of black progressivism. Even as black progressives – like those in the Atlanta branch of the NAACP – desired to tap the expanding powers and prerogatives of the Progressive Era state as a resource in their struggles for justice that same state sought to exclude them from the full benefits of citizenship. Their ability to successfully navigate this

contradiction depended upon the emergence of new cultural terms of black solidarity. In short, a new black protest politics was necessary.

This new black politics was not created from whole cloth. The much celebrated transition from Booker T. Washington's politics of accommodation to the protest politics of W. E. B. Du Bois was not a sudden rupture. Rather, black protest politics emerged from the transformation of the ideas of class and gender driven by the social and economic upheavals of the Progressive Era. The turmoil caused by economic development, racial violence and reform profoundly reshaped the terms of racial solidarity. This formed the cultural foundation necessary for the emergence of a genuinely autonomous black politics – one that enabled black progressives to compel their erstwhile white allies to act justly towards their black fellow citizens.

This paper uses my research into the fight for Atlanta's Booker T. Washington High School to suggest three conclusions. First, even though the politics of respectability (as described by such scholars as Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, Kevin Gaines, and Glenda Gilmore) was one of the few effective ways for black middle-class leaders to exercise any power whatsoever during Jim Crow, it placed severe limitations on the black political imagination. Second, the dynamics of Progressive Era urban development unraveled the elite interracial relationships at the heart of this politics of respectability. Finally, as the politics of respectability collapses, a new autonomous black politics emerges as African Americans assert a right of equal access to the proliferation of new forms of urban space and public amenities that emerge during this era of rapid urbanization – what I shall term in this paper their civic rights.

Progressivism and the Politics of Respectability

The work done by the NAACP and the Neighborhood Union in Atlanta challenged the dominant model of black politics championed by leaders like Booker T. Washington, who advocated that black Americans accommodate themselves to Jim Crow and suspend their agitation for first-class citizenship. These accommodationists counseled black people to accumulate wealth and prove their capacity for self-government and virtue through the embrace of respectability. Eventually, white Americans would be able to see black Americans as equals. It would be upon this foundation of shared bourgeois virtue that black people could assert racial equality.

This accommodationist strategy drew heavily on a politics of respectability. In the age of Jim Crow, the embrace of respectability served several functions. Primarily, it served as a cultural form of self-defense against white assaults motivated by racist stereotypes that suggested black men and women were lazy, criminal, or unable to control their sexual urges. It was in hopes of deflecting or avoiding such attacks that many black elites sought to enforce a strict adherence to a rigid moral code among all black men and women.

However, respectability was more than just a strategy of self-defense; it also formed the basis of interracial politics in the era of Jim Crow. This politics of respectability depended upon the establishment of an alliance with sympathetic white elites who, together with black elites, would establish the basis for a joint civilizing mission to uplift the masses of both races and fit them for citizenship. By basing the qualifications for first-class citizenship on the correct performance of bourgeois respectability rather than having the right skin color, the politicians of respectability sought to replace the stratification of citizenship by race with exclusions based on gender and class.^{iv}

This tactical embrace of respectability – no matter how necessary – held serious consequences for the future of black politics, significantly limiting the political vision of black elites for decades.^v Historian Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham asserts that “the politics of respectability constituted a deliberate, highly self-conscious concession to hegemonic values.”^{vi} This ability to make a concession to hegemonic values presumes that there is a space free from hegemonic determination. This means that the politics of respectability can be understood as a mask behind which a subversive black agenda can be concealed.

However, the need to don such a mask placed severe limits upon the extent to which this masquerade could resist white supremacy. This is because the mask, the face behind the mask and the audience for whom the mask is donned all participate in a shared universe of meanings even as those meanings are contested. This makes a non-ideological, non-hegemonic space incredibly difficult to maintain. Dissemblance is of course still possible, but it only works if there is at least some shared understanding between the deceiver and the deceived of what the “mask” should look like. That is, the politicians of respectability shared too many cultural assumptions about gender, class and sometimes even race with the advocates of white supremacy to stake out a genuinely oppositional position.

This is not to say that the historic proponents of a black politics of respectability were themselves white supremacists. The economic, political and martial balance of power between black Americans and Southern white supremacists militated against any organized aggressive political action. This tactical embrace of respectability was commonly the only strategy open to those African Americans who resisted Jim Crow. Relatively powerless in the face of white supremacy, black elites were compelled to seek an alliance – however unequal – with those white elites with whom it was possible to establish some sort of common ground. Despite their

limitations, the cultivation of these elite interracial relationships was responsible for what few gains were possible in Jim Crow cities of the South.

As you can imagine, this was a tenuous strategy at best, based as it was upon reputation rather than the ability to muster political power at the polls. White elites were under no obligation to treat their erstwhile black allies as equals. Should it become necessary for them to sacrifice the needs of black Americans, an interracial relationship that had been painstakingly cultivated was simply discarded. This was a common occurrence given the economic chaos that accompanied Progressive Era urban development throughout the South. Frequently, white city leaders faced the choice between expanding public services such as schools, sewers and police protection to white citizens only or not at all. In these cases, black citizens were frequently excluded.

The social and economic upheavals caused by rapid urban development and Progressive Era reforms made these interracial alliances very unstable, challenging the very basis of this politics of respectability. As the famed black intellectual W. E. B. Du Bois put it, the modernization of Southern cities at the end of the nineteenth century left black Americans, “a poor race in a land of dollars ... the very bottom of hardships.”^{vii} Rapidly accelerating urban development had begun to line Atlanta’s streets with sidewalks, to place sewers under those streets and to establish systems of public transportation, education and recreation. This process created a broad array of public goods, access to which African Americans began to assert as a fundamental right of citizenship. In effect, urbanization created a brand new set of rights that only emerge alongside the modern city. In contrast to an older understanding of basic *civil rights* such as the right to vote or the right to a jury trial, let’s call these *civic rights*, a term I will use to

describe the right to enjoy access to the amenities of modern urban life and the benefits of development more generally.

In reaction to this black fight for their civic rights, former white allies increasingly sought to restrict the prerogatives of modern urban life to whites only. In Atlanta, the tensions generated by this racial tug of war over urban development culminated in the ratification of the state's disfranchising amendment and a three day racial pogrom in the summer of 1906 that killed dozens of African Americans – targeting those from the respectable middle-class. In the eyes of one prescient observer, these measures were meant “to humiliate the progressive Negro.” Bourgeois respectability had done little to protect African Americans from indiscriminate violence, disfranchisement and segregation. In McHenry's parable: no rose, regardless of its beauty, would offer protection against the arbitrary violence of the coachman's whip-hand.

The trauma of these events unsettled the understandings of class and gender that had informed the politics of respectability, allowing the emergence of a new form of politics. As black men – regardless of their class-standing – were driven by violence and disfranchisement from the public sphere, women moved to the forefront of race leadership. In Atlanta, the most important of these leaders was famed community organizer Luggenia Burns Hope, one of the founders of the Neighborhood Union.

Established in 1908, the Union pressured white progressive leaders to extend the boundaries of the modern city to include the city's black residents. However, lacking the power to demand equal access to public goods such as running water or streetlights as a matter of simple justice – or even a fair return on the taxes they had paid – these women used respectability as a basis for the extension of these city services into black neighborhoods. As skilled practitioners of the politics of respectability, the women of the Union argued that white

elites needed to ally themselves with black elites, invest in the city's black neighborhoods and uplift the race in order to prevent black criminality.

However, their embrace of this politics of respectability was deeply influenced by different understandings of gender drawn from the settlement house movement and its notions of “municipal housekeeping.” This allowed the women reformers in the Neighborhood Union to articulate as political issues that had formerly been relegated to the private sphere, such as children’s health and education. Placing these concerns at the forefront (especially when agitation against disfranchisement was still quite dangerous) altered the politics of respectability and changed what black Atlantans thought progress could look like.

Whereas an earlier generation of black organizers and activists, who were predominantly men, focused on the preservation of traditional *civil rights* – such as the right to vote – the women of the Neighborhood Union grounded their activism in the expansion of the new array of *civic rights* available to those living in Atlanta. As part of this new activism, the Neighborhood Union launched a six month investigation in 1913 into the city’s public schools that revealed critical shortages of classroom space, teaching materials as well as qualified teachers.

What they discovered is that, for the 6,163 black children enrolled in Atlanta’s public schools, there were only 4,102 desks available. And, in order to accommodate all the students, two-thirds of the black student population attended “double sessions,” in which the same teacher daily taught two full classes – one in the morning and one in the evening.^{viii}

The Union also found the schools to be in wretched physical condition with poor lighting, sanitation and playground facilities. In essence, the learning conditions of black students in Atlanta’s public schools were a microcosm of the living conditions of black citizens in the city more generally. Just as black neighborhoods were denied sewers, paved sidewalks, and other

Progressive Era infrastructural improvements that black taxpayers had supported, so also were black parents barred from sending their children to quality public schools, despite their contribution to the construction and maintenance of the city's public education system.^{ix}

The Union presented their results to “every influential white woman in the city that could be visited,” and sought their assistance in the fight to improve school conditions for Atlanta's black and white children. They met with the mayor and every member of the city council. With the assistance of the city's black and white clergy, they held several mass meetings and were able to get considerable press coverage of the condition of the city's schools. In August of 1913, they formally petitioned the Board of Education to address the deplorable state of the city's black public schools as well as to build two additional schools for use by black students.^x

The exposé sparked a city-wide movement for school reform. The *Atlanta Constitution* ran its own investigation into the condition of the schools, revealing that – even in the white schools – some classrooms with as many as eighty and ninety students. They demanded the city act to correct this “barbarous” injustice.

Unfortunately, the historically stingy city council was not forthcoming with the funds necessary. A month later, the Board of Education responded with a recommendation for the construction of eight new grammar schools and four high schools for white students as well as five new grammar schools for black students. However, to fund these expansions, they called for the elimination of the 7th and 8th grades from all black grammar schools.

The Union's reaction was fierce. In an open letter to the *Atlanta Constitution*, they condemned the plan as both “morally and economically” damaging to black children as well as “fundamentally undemocratic and unjust.”^{xi} Although they embedded this condemnation in an appeal “to the fair-minded citizens of Atlanta,” this protest nonetheless marked a drastic shift

away from the politics of respectability. As the city was making preparations to expand the white school system, the Union demanded that

“Negro public schools should be given more facilities rather than less ... [F]or Atlanta to limit the school facilities of the children of Negro citizens to ... six grades, and to allow the children of white citizens a course of eight grades and a high school course at public expense, cannot in the ‘opinion of mankind’ be anything but unjust ... In this matter, we are sure that we express the sentiments of the great majority of Negro citizens, and we cannot believe that our friends of the white race will think us unreasonable in our appeal.”^{xii}

Although the Union may have felt secure enough in its alliance with the city’s progressive white leadership to make such bold statements, they nonetheless grounded their “appeal” in their standing as taxpaying citizens, rather than just in their relationship with the better class of white Atlanta. Their open letter concluded that “the public schools are supported by the taxes of all the people and to confine the Negro population to a peculiar type of education against their will would evidently not be a fair deal and no fair-minded citizens wish to be a party to such discriminations.”^{xiii}

This choice to assert their right to a quality publicly-funded education for their children based in their status as tax-paying citizens marked a shift in Atlanta’s black political discourse. This break with the language and the politics of respectability made it easier to challenge the stratification of citizenship by class as well as race. It was following their rejection of their proposal to improve the black schools that the Union began to more aggressively reframe respectability as a community goal for which every family was responsible and which the city was obliged to support. The Union’s response transformed respectability from a language that

stratified African Americans by class into a language capable of unifying the black men and women of Atlanta behind a campaign of active engagement with the city's development. In other words, when framed as a question of access to *civic rights*, respectability became a *unifying discourse* rather than a *stratifying discourse*.

This left black Atlanta better able to establish racial solidarity across class lines and to publicly embrace once again an idea of universal suffrage that had been difficult for black political leaders to demand since the collapse of Reconstruction. The transformation of the meaning of respectability during the Progressive Era created a much sounder basis for black political solidarity; one capable of sustaining the unity of a powerful black voting block that could at least partially dictate the terms of its relationship to the power of reform-minded white elites; and one powerful enough to finally force the city in 1919 to build Booker T. Washington High School, the city's first publicly funded high school for black students.

“So Vast a Prejudice” – Fighting Jim Crow – IF THERE IS TIME

W. E. B. Du Bois described the segregation of African Americans from the fruits of economic development as a prejudice “so vast ... [it] could not but bring the inevitable self-questioning, self-disparagement and lowering of ideals which ever accompany repression.”^{xiv} When confronted with the enormity of the oppression African Americans faced at the turn of the twentieth century, it can be difficult to understand how black people ever fought and, at times, even defeated the white supremacist juggernaut known as Jim Crow. Traditionally, the term Jim Crow has been used to describe the entire series of changes in Southern politics and culture that sought to relegate African Americans to an inferior caste, ranging from lynching to disfranchisement and segregation. Without dismissing the role that each of these played in the

lived experience of African Americans during the period, I suggest a history of Jim Crow that is keyed closely to the racial exclusions built into the Progressive Era expansion of city services. This makes it possible to more accurately trace the mechanisms through which African American neighborhoods were denied access to modern urban infrastructure such as paved streets, modern sanitation and public schools.^{xv} It also permits the construction of a detailed timeline of local black resistance to segregated development in cities like Atlanta, revealing the oft-hidden contours of organized black resistance.

Many discussions of Jim Crow focus on the exclusion of African Americans from public space and benefits of citizenship without linking that exclusion to the Progressive Era expansion of *civic rights* resulting from the rapid economic development following the Civil War. Not only does this tend to homogenize the history of the black South between disfranchisement in the 1890s and the emergence of civil rights movement in the later 1950s, it also robs organized African Americans of their agency as historical actors.^{xvi} Without a clear chronology of the history of black exclusion from the benefits of progress, it is hard to fathom how African Americans both fought and accommodated themselves to Jim Crow.^{xvii}

It was this particular historical juxtaposition of Jim Crow alongside Progressive Era reform and economic development that forced a dilemma upon the black progressives in the NAACP and the Neighborhood Union. At the same time they sought to enlist the state as an ally in reform, that state was inscribing into its laws a second-class status for black Americans.^{xviii} It was this tension between black and white citizens over access to Progressive Era urban amenities that created both the impetus for segregation and disfranchisement as well as its antithesis, the movement to democratize access to the pleasures and prerogatives of urban life under the banner of “first-class citizenship.”

ⁱ *Atlanta Independent*, “McHenry’s Weekly Letter,” 26 April 1919, p. 1.

ⁱⁱ In 1900, 89,872 people lived in Atlanta. By 1920, Atlanta’s population had grown to 200,616. See Michael R. Hanes, “Population of cities with at least 100,000 population in 1990: 1790–1990.” Table Aa832-1033 in Historical Statistics of the United States, Earliest Times to the Present: Millennial Edition, edited by Susan B. Carter, et. al. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

ⁱⁱⁱ In 1908, Georgia voters approved an amendment to the state constitution that augmented the \$1 cumulative poll tax requirement that had been in place since 1877. The new disfranchising amendment also required each registrant to demonstrate his ability to read or write a paragraph of the state or US constitution, own 40 acres of land and reside on it, or own at least \$500 of tax-assessed property. For those unable to meet any one of these requirements, the new amendment offered three loopholes. If the registrant had a grandfather who fought in the Civil War, could demonstrate an understanding of any section of the state constitution or could demonstrate “good character” to the satisfaction of the registrar. These disfranchising mechanisms were incredibly effective at reducing the size of the black vote in Georgia. In 1904, roughly 68,000 black men were registered to vote (28.3% of the eligible adult male population). By 1910, that number fell to 11,285 (4.3% of the eligible population.) Meanwhile the loopholes offered allowed white voters to continue to register, though in somewhat smaller numbers. Between 1904 and 1910, the total white registration only fell 12,000 from a total of 273,000. See Michael Perman, Struggle for Mastery: Disfranchisement in the South, 1888-1908 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), pp. 281-298.

^{iv} Historians of respectability such as Victoria Wolcott, Tera Hunter and Kevin Gaines demonstrate the ways in which respectability was a crucial discursive strategy that black men and women employed to combat the racialized sexual and moral stereotypes within which white people sought to box African Americans. While these understandings of respectability do play a role in this book, my focus here is on how respectability is used to negotiate racial solidarity. Some, most notably Glenda Gilmore and Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, make an effort to emphasize the role that respectability played in establishing the basis for both intraracial and interracial solidarity. Higginbotham’s path-breaking Righteous Discontent shows how black women in the Baptist Church employed the politics of respectability to define and advance an ambitious reform agenda, which included the establishment of settlement houses, kindergartens, job training centers and other institutions in the black community. Glenda Gilmore’s Gender and Jim Crow demonstrates how black women used the language of respectability to build alliances with white progressives in order to deliver crucial social services to the black community. These strategies were crucial in carving out a space for political action for both black men and women during the “nadir” of black history. As Gilmore puts it, “black women were given straw and they made bricks. Outward cooperation with an agenda designed to oppress them masked a subversive twist.” (Gilmore, p. 175)

For more on the topic of respectability see: Victoria Wolcott, Remaking Respectability: African American Women in Interwar Detroit (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Tera Hunter, To ‘Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women’s Lives and Labor After the Civil War (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), esp. pp.130-186; Kevin K. Gaines, Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Deborah Gray White, Too Heavy Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves, 1894-1994 (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999), esp. pp. 21-109; Darlene Clark Hine, “Rape and the Inner Lives of Black Women in the Middle West,” *Signs*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Summer, 1989), pp. 912-920; Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, Righteous Discontent: The Women’s Movement in the Black Baptist Church, 1880-1920 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), esp. pp. 185-211; and Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896-1920 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 147-202.

^v For another approach to the same problem, see Nikhil Pal Singh, Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 47. Singh notes the strong anti-democratic cast of this sort of politics: “[E]arly black public activism under Du Bois’s leadership was built on the idea of substituting hierarchies of gender and education for those of race and accumulated wealth (‘a dictatorship of character and intelligence across the color line.’).”

^{vi} Higginbotham, Righteous Discontent, p. 193.

^{vii} See W. E. B. Du Bois, The Souls of Black Folk (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 1997 - *originally published 1903*), p. 41. A few pages later, he identifies the United States as "a dusty desert of dollars and smartness." (p. 43)

^{viii} Louie Delphia Davis Shivery, "The History of Organized Social Work Among Negroes, 1890-1935," (Atlanta University: Unpublished M.A. Thesis, 1936), pp. 97-98.

^{ix} A 1909 study by Charles S. Coon, a white North Carolina school superintendent, examined school expenditures in each of the states of the former Confederacy. He started with the premise that the school expenditures by race should be reflective of their proportion in the population. In 1900, the total black population in these states was around 40%. This would mean that out of the roughly \$32 Million spent on public education, \$12.8 Million ought to have gone towards funding black schools. The study found that black education received only \$4.7 Million (or 14.8% of the total). So, African Americans in the South with 40% of the children to educate received only 15% of the public school funds. The remaining 85% went to build and maintain schools meant for the education of white children only.

Coon also determined that black tax dollars subsidized white schools. In 1907, the state education budget for Georgia was a little over \$3 Million. If allocated strictly on the basis of race, this would mean that the 46.7% of Georgians who were African American would have received \$1.4 Million in school funds. However, they only received \$500,000 – despite the fact that African American tax dollars contributed approximately \$650,000 to the school fund that year. In other words, to the tune of \$150,000 annually, black taxpayers in Georgia were subsidizing the maintenance of a public school system from which their children were excluded. See Charles Lee Coon, Public Taxation and Negro Schools; Paper Read Before the Twelfth Annual Conference for Education in the South held in Atlanta, Georgia, April 14, 15, and 16, 1909 (Cheyney, PA: Committee of Twelve for the Advancement of the Interests of the Negro Race, 1909).

^x Shivery, "The History of Organized Social Work Among Negroes," pp. 98-99.

^{xi} Shivery, "The History of Organized Social Work Among Negroes," p. 104.

^{xii} Ibid., pp. 104-105.

^{xiii} Ibid., p. 105.

^{xiv} Du Bois, W. E. B., The Souls of Black Folk, p. 42.

^{xv} Adapting a phrase from labor historian David Roediger, Nikhil Singh describes how, in the aftermath of Reconstruction's collapse, African Americans were defined as "anti-citizens ... enemies rather than members of the social compact." While Roediger uses this term in the context of the northern labor movement of the 1830s and Singh uses it to describe how the white protagonists in periods of democratic upheaval built their movements from the discourses of white supremacy, I find it equally useful to apply it to the expansion of the rights of citizenship during the Progressive Era. Indeed, one could argue that as the rights of citizenship expanded for whites, so also did the disabilities of anti-citizenship expand for African Americans. See Singh, Black is a Country, p. 23 and David Roediger, The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class (London: Verso, 1991), pp. 57-60.

^{xvi} This echoes a similar critique made in Glenda Gilmore's review essay, "Dating Jim Crow: Chronology as a Tool of Analysis," in *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 83, No. 1, Spring, 1999), pp. 58-72.

^{xvii} There are several excellent examples of newer scholarship that are sensitive to both the broader contours of Jim Crow and local black resistance to white supremacy. See David Fort Godshalk, Veiled Visions: The 1906 Atlanta Race Riot and the Reshaping of American Race Relations (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Paul Ortiz, Emancipation Betrayed: The Hidden History of Black Organizing and White Violence in Florida from

Reconstruction to the Bloody Election of 1920 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); and Blair L. M. Kelley, Right to Ride: Streetcar Boycotts and African American Citizenship in Era of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).

^{xviii} For more on Atlanta's racially-stratified urban development after Civil War, see Tera Hunter, To 'Joy My Freedom, pp. 21-73. See also Howard N. Rabinowitz, Race Relations in the Urban South, 1865-1890 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978).