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This dissertation explores emerging methods for translating academic research into public knowledge. It focuses on the site of Rosewood, Florida. This town was once home to a prosperous African American community, one which became increasingly segregated during Jim Crow. The community was shattered by a week-long episode of racial violence, culminating in the systematic burning of the entire town, commonly referred to as the Rosewood Race Riot or Rosewood Incident. This PhD examines the history, life, and community of Rosewood prior to 1923. The history of Rosewood is viewed in relation to larger social developments throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This contextualization within broader social patterns of American history demonstrates the connection between past episodes of racial violence and modern social inequality. The dissertation directly examines the potential new media technologies, such as virtual world environments and digital storytelling, hold for public archaeology and history.
CHAPTER 1
A POTENTIAL PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE 1923 ROSEWOOD RACE RIOT

The past is ubiquitous; it inhabits both time and space in specific ways. Overtures claiming the past as a foreign land (Lowenthal 1985) remind us that the uses of history are multifaceted and confusing. Communities use the past in myriad ways. This is particularly true of sites stained by pain and suffering, places where historical violence occurred. Archaeologists worldwide have increasingly turned their attention to such sites for a variety of reasons. These include revealing hidden histories, engaging (with) descendant communities, participating in social justice movements, and as historical corrective(s). Quickly vanishing are the days when archaeologists believed their work could escape the politics of the modern world. Archaeological methods, data, and interpretations are now recognized as inherently political forms of knowledge, produced in relation to modern social and cultural constraints (Gero et al 1983; Shanks and Tilley 1992; Meskell 1998; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Meskell and Preucel 2004; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; McGuire 2008).

This realization motivates archaeology to explore new theoretical, methodological, and interpretative frameworks. These increasingly aim at collaborative approaches wherein conscious decisions about the use of archaeological knowledge informs the archaeological process from pre-planning through excavation and analysis to interpretation and presentation. As archaeologists, we are reaching beyond our own discipline, embracing transdisciplinary practices. The move towards transdisciplinary work guides my own investigation of how other disciplines approach interpersonal racial violence. The realization that new theories and methods are required to decenter the archaeologist from his position of authority motivates my exploration of public
archaeology, emerging uses of the documentary record by archaeologists, and the exploration of new media.

One of the first questions I’m asked by students, reporters, community descendants, researchers, and others is why I chose Rosewood as a research site. The following section presents a personal statement answering this question and specifically addressing why I think it is important to study sites like Rosewood. Then, I provide a brief overview of previous research on Rosewood. This includes a general history of the town as well as demonstrates how little research has previously taken place regarding this place. This chapter ends with an examination of current trends in public archaeology and how they relate to my work with Rosewood. This includes developing a perspective about the various ways academics can contribute to positive social change.

**Why Study Racial Violence in the Past?**

I chose to conduct research on the historical development of Rosewood to address concerns gaining wider acceptance in historical archaeology. This includes the creation of projects aiming to connect past injustices with modern inequality. I view this kind of openly political and transformative research as the primary avenue available to archaeologists seeking ways to encourage positive social change, or at least encourage public dialogue concerning the continuation of social inequality in the modern world. Researching Rosewood also provides an excellent case study for experimenting with new information technology and media methods rarely used by historical archaeology to investigate, analyze, interpret, and share archaeological data.

My reason for studying racism in the past, particularly racially charged collective violence, joins a growing number of historical archaeologists who explore ways to relate the past to the present in direct and transformative ways. This trend is exemplified by
the appearance of several edited volumes in the last decade (Shackel and Chambers 2004; Little and Shackel 2007; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Stottman 2010) as well as themed issues of *World Archaeology* (Marshall 2002), *Archaeologies* (La Salle 2010), and *Historical Archaeology* (Shackel 2011). My goal for investigating past injustices is straightforward – make the world a better place by sharing academic research about the connection between past suffering and modern inequality to produce poignant interpretations through a mixed methods approach.

More specifically, I am interested in understanding the connection between historic forms of racially charged collective violence – particularly those face-to-face, intersubjective forms like race riots and lynchings – and modern social inequality. American society is constantly negotiating the complex relationship between past and present forms of racial inequality (Lopéz 1994) and I believe dedicated projects like the one explored in this dissertation can provide the raw material for a public discussion about the development of modern inequality. Archaeologists inhabit a powerful position in regards to this type of work. As a discipline, we examine materials which are inherently interesting and valued by the public at large (Burke and Smith 2007). Artifacts produce emotional connections with the past. Archaeological evidence, whether it exists in the form of artifacts, documents, or personal stories, attracts the public. Only projects openly identified as political from the beginning can effectively utilize these forms of evidence as a method to promote meaningful dialogue about the past.

Racism, sexism, classism, and religious intolerance promote sharp inequalities as they resist efforts to create a more democratic and inclusive society. While our ability to easily identify bigotry and hatred in American society is now restricted to publically-
identified extremist groups, only the most naïve fail to realize that America remains a country divided, racism continues, even if we cannot easily point our fingers at identifiable agents (Bonilla-Silva 2006). The institutionalization of inequality is typically ordered along lines of race or gender, and a growing list of scholars remind us that social subjugation tends to occur along lines where these identities intersect (Collins 1990; Crenshaw 1991; Collins 2003; Purdie-Vaughns and Eiback 2008; Dill and Zambrano 2009). American society continues to disenfranchise individuals and communities on the basis of race, gender, class, religion, sexuality, and the intersections of these various identities. While liberals and conservatives bicker about who is less racist or more tolerant, one has only to open a newspaper and find daily examples of racist police, anti-Muslim hate, and legislative attacks on the poor. This sad commentary on the inability of American society to cope with difference underscores the continuation of intolerance as a historical phenomenon in our country.

How can archaeologists contribute meaningful information to discussions about the historical development of modern social inequality? I see two challenges facing those attempting to connect research of the past with modern social practices. The first centers on our ability to accurately map the development of inequality through time. Researchers who engage in this aspect focus on connecting historic inequality with modern forms of discrimination. This includes looking at inequality through the lens of power and resistance (McGuire and Paynter 1991), the increasing realization that capitalist society is prone to producing unequal social relationships (Leone and Potter 1999; Delle et al 2000), calls to investigate racism as part of the larger archaeological project (Orser 1999), and numerous attempts to identify specific sites where past
injustice directly informs current social practices (Mullins 2007; Gadsby and Chidester 2007; Shackel 2011).

My approach to researching the connections between past violence and modern inequality draws on research in a number of disciplines. Chapter four presents my own thoughts on the complex ways visible forms of violence (e.g., race riots, lynchings) interact with structural and symbolic forms through time. My mapping of this interaction between the late 1800s and today identifies the time period immediately following World War I as a particularly unstable period in US race relations. This instability not only triggered never before seen levels of racially charged collective violence (Tuttle 1970), but also identifies specific locations as particularly revealing in regards to understanding how these changing forms of violence affected specific communities through time. Previous research on Jim Crow (Woodward 1955) demonstrates how the development of institutional racism became entrenched in American society during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, such as the use of overt violence to halt black political participation (Ortiz 2005).

Critical race theory (CRT) scholars have explored how racism survived and thrived following the civil rights movement. This includes calls to acknowledge that American society and its legal system are in fact not colorblind as is often assumed (Bonilla-Silva 2006), and how many of the advances made during the civil rights movement have stalled or been completely undermined (Delgado and Stefancic 2001). The inability of legislative acts to solve America’s race problem have also been widely acknowledged by CRT scholars (Johnson 1998) and I agree with sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva’s (2006) belief that America’s preoccupation and exclusion along lines of identity will only
come to an end when privileged citizens confront issues like racism as a daily practice in their daily lives. In other words, instead of assigning the responsibility of fighting racism to the minority groups experiencing it, the obligation for identifying, confronting, and healing social inequality is squarely on the shoulders of those of us who personally prosper from entrenched forms of privilege (McIntosh 1998; Jensen 2005).

The second challenge facing archaeologists seeking ways to connect past violence with modern social inequality requires identifying appropriate methods for sharing archaeological research with the wider public. Archaeologists who want to encourage critical self-evaluation among the US populace have a variety of methods at their disposal. Archaeologists focusing on public outreach have two broad methods at their disposal; the production of literature such as pamphlets guiding critical readings of the past and the creation of museum exhibits exploring painful aspects of the past. While I continue to support these methods, I have opted to use virtual archaeology and digital storytelling as new methods for moving academic research beyond the traditional confines of the university (see chapter six).

An investigation of Rosewood addresses the trends described above and presents important new contributions to the archaeological study of racial violence, particularly as it relates to addressing modern social inequality. The 1923 race riot which resulted in the complete expulsion of all African Americans from the area around Rosewood represents a historical moment resulting in communal trauma. The collective violence of this destruction continued to haunt survivors and descendants for the rest of their lives (Jones 1996). This is an immediate example of how physical violence in the past continues to affect the present. The story of Rosewood also sheds light on the ways
larger practices of intersubjective, face-to-face violence interacted with both structural and symbolic forms of violence. The 1923 Rosewood race riot represents the last major instance of collective violence at the end of a five year period beginning with the 1917 East St. Louis race riot, including the summer of 1919 when more than twenty-five riots occurred across America (Tuttle 1970), the 1920 Ocoee, Florida election riot, and the 1921 Tulsa riot where forty blocks of the city’s black district were burned to the ground. Rosewood addresses these scholarly concerns, but also comments on humanistic considerations of heritage’s value in the present.

I chose to investigate the history of Rosewood for one additional reason. The public’s imagination has been captured by the emotional descriptions of the 1923 race riots through popular books (D’Orso 1996) and films (Singleton 1997). I’ve always felt that the focus on the riot as an event has overshadowed what was truly lost in January of 1923. Yes, homes and lives were lost, and previous scholars have produced an accurate accounting of these things (Jones et al 1993). What these studies have not sufficiently presented is an accurate social history of Rosewood through time.

An accurate history of the town presents us with a complete picture of what was lost. While previous studies record approximate numbers of African Americans living in the area prior to the riot (Jones 1997:194) and present a broad review of the town’s development (Dye 1997:28-34), these studies did not construct a detailed history of the town’s development through time. Collecting this information is difficult for rural settings like Levy County, Florida where Rosewood was located. Due to the relatively remote location of the town as well as the destruction of the community in 1923, no maps exist of the town. New methods were required to explore the development of Rosewood
through time. Chapter five details my own methodology for reconstructing property boundaries from historic deeds. This approach also opens up the possibility to answer new questions through the inclusion of census records to specific properties on the landscape. Emerging information technologies like geographic information systems (GIS) can re-create Rosewood’s past social landscape and allow researchers to address this first concern. The ability to reconstruct the historic landscape provides important information about Rosewood’s development not found elsewhere. In order to understand how little is actually known about this town, it is important to review previous studies of Rosewood.
CHAPTER 2
PREVIOUS STUDIES OF ROSEWOOD'S HISTORY AND THE 1923 RACE RIOT

The former site of Rosewood is located in western Levy County, central Florida approximately nine miles east of Cedar Key on the Gulf of Mexico (Figure 1-1). This area is still referred to as the Gulf Hammock and the 1871 Florida Gazetteer describes the area around Rosewood in terms of its outstanding fertility, giving rise to a nineteenth century saying "as rich as the Gulf Hammock" (Hawks 1871:57). The town’s name was derived from the large stores of red cedar in the area, source of the town’s initial economic viability (Dye 1997: 29). The town itself was never incorporated, but business directories and railroad commission reports state that the town was settled sometime prior to the Civil War (Hawks 1871:57), probably as early as the 1850s. This would have been within ten to fifteen years after Florida became a state in 1845.

The town of Rosewood, while technically populated prior to the Civil War, was made up of a few white land owners. The area around the town experienced rapid growth following the Civil War due to the completion of the Florida Railroad in 1861. The railroad was championed by David L. Yulee, a Jewish businessman born in the West Indies in 1810 and a driving force for Florida statehood (Tebeau 1971:173). The railroad was built with slave labor and construction began on the Atlantic Coast at Fernandina Beach on August 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1856. Construction continued for five years as the railroad was brought through central Florida (including Gainesville) eventually reaching the Gulf Coast at Cedar Key on March 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1861 (Pettengill 1952:22). The railroad was partially destroyed during the Civil War by northern troops, but was completely rebuilt and usable once again by 1867 (Hildreth and Cox 1981:33). The railroad was not initially a success and ownership changed hands several times resulting in various names for the
railroad through time (Table 1-1). By 1903, it was named after a new company which increasingly managed large portions of Florida’s railroads, the Seaboard Air Line Railroad (Mohlman 2007:17). The railroad brought increased opportunity to Levy County and numerous towns sprang up along the way (Table 1-1). The area around Rosewood quickly grew with the ability to ship timber, produce, and seafood to markets inland. This brought new industrial interests to the area and the local population quickly grew (Table 1-1). The railroad was discontinued between Venables and Cedar Key sometime around 1932 (Pettengill 1998:22).

Table 2-1: Names of Florida Railroad (modified from Mohlman 2007:17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Railroad</th>
<th>Dates of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida Railroad</td>
<td>1853-1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic, Gulf &amp; West India Transit</td>
<td>1872-1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Transit and Peninsula Railroad</td>
<td>1881-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Railway &amp; Navigation Company</td>
<td>1884-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Central &amp; Peninsular Railroad</td>
<td>1888-1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaboard Air Line Railroad</td>
<td>1903-1967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The county opened a school for whites and a hotel began operating in Rosewood during the 1870s (Jones 1993:21). A white Methodist church was established in 1878 and two black churches soon following in 1883 and 1886. By 1920, while most whites had left, the town had three churches, a black masonic hall, and a black school where a privately hired schoolteacher named Mullah Brown taught local children. The town had a mix of houses including two-story homes for large families, several two-room homes for smaller families, and a number of one-room shanties scattered across the landscape probably used by workers at a sawmill in Rosewood (Jones et al 1993:23). The town also had a black baseball team, which played both black and white teams as far away
as Gainesville; the baseball team was remembered as a significant part of Rosewood’s cultural gatherings by descendants decades later (D’Orso 1996:78-79.340).

Census records show the area around Rosewood was initially settled by a small group of white land owners in the 1870s. This changed quickly and within a generation the town’s population was majority African American. The area faced an economic slump in the 1890s, but by the early twentieth century Rosewood boasted several black-owned businesses including the M. Goins and Brothers Naval Stores Company. This company also provided worker housing referred to as “Goins' Quarters” by some survivors in the 1990s (Dye 1997:29).

The economic fortunes of Rosewood once again changed in the early 20th century. The Goins, one of Rosewood's most financially successful families, relocated to Gainesville in 1920. The Cummer and Sons Lumber Company built a large sawmill in Sumner a few years before the Goins left Rosewood, and several black families in Rosewood gained employment with this company after 1915 (Jones 1997:194). Also, the post office and other businesses moved from Rosewood to Sumner by 1918 (Polk & Co 1918:499-500,550-551). This was not the end of Rosewood and the now majority black town continued to survive and the community remained (Jones 1997:194). This came to an end the first week of 1923.

**The 1923 Rosewood Race Riot**

Racial violence, while not exactly a common occurrence, was no stranger to the state of Florida in the years preceding the 1923 Rosewood race riot. The KKK is credited with either participating in or organizing an attack against black voters in Ocoee, Florida in 1920 (Dabbs 1969). This attack resulted in the burning of a significant number of homes in the town’s black district. One month prior to the Rosewood riot a
group of whites lynched three black men in Perry, Florida who were suspected of killing a local white school teacher. Following the lynching, the white mob descended upon a black neighborhood and burned several homes. The story was run for weeks in newspapers across Florida, reminding local whites of the supposed danger local African Americans posed (Jones et al. 1993:17-18).

What has become known as the Rosewood Massacre or Rosewood Race Riot was in fact nearly a week long series of events beginning on New Year’s Day, 1923. Numerous accounts remember the winter as one of the coldest on record (Jones et al. 1993:23). That morning, James Taylor went to his job as machinist at the Cummer and Sons Sawmill in Sumner, where he lived with his wife Fannie and their young children. While James was at work, Fannie claimed a black man had attacked her at home. At the time, Sumner residents assumed a black man had in fact committed the crime, even though some black families suggested and most researchers today agree that the assailant was a white man with whom Fannie was having an affair (Jones et al. 1993:25-27). The fabrication of black assailants by white women represents a growing tradition in America during the late 1910s and early 1920s, as discussed in the next chapter.

Levy County Sheriff Robert “Bob” Walker organized a posse and a pack of bloodhounds were used to track the black assailant. By the evening of January 1st (a Monday) the posse had grown beyond the men initially deputized by Walker as unidentified individuals began arriving from nearby towns. Eventually, the mob agreed that the assailant must be a recently escaped black man from a nearby labor camp or road crew named Jesse Hunter, who was allegedly seen in the company of Rosewood’s
blacksmith Sam Carter a few days prior. Hunter became the prime suspect and the mob headed for Rosewood (Jones et al 1993:30).

Carter readily admitted to taking the suspected individual away from Rosewood towards Gulf Hammock, a nearby town through the swampy woods south of Rosewood. Carter led the growing mob to the spot where he’d taken the accused in his wagon sometime earlier that day. When the bloodhounds were unable to pick up the scent, and after Carter was unable to satisfactory answer the mob’s questions, his body was riddled with bullets and his corpse left on the road between Sumner and Rosewood, where it was found the next day. Carter became the first victim of mob violence (Jones et al 1993:31-32). Days later, a six-man jury found that Carter had been “shot by unknown party [or parties]” (Jones et al 1993:38).

An alternative explanation of why the mob sought Sam Carter was told by Rosewood survivor Lee Ruth Davis. Davis suggested that the white man who had actually attacked Fannie Taylor went to Sam Carter for help upon learning that a posse had formed to capture the assailant. Whether he was unaware that the group was looking for a black man or feared that they may discover the truth is not known. Davis stated Carter agreed to help the white man because both were masons. Corroboration of this story was put forth by descendant Arnett Doctor, a direct relative of Aaron Carrier. Doctor modified the story slightly and stated the white assailant first approached Aaron Carrier because they were both WWI veterans. It was Carrier who led the white fugitive to Carter’s home (Jones et al 1993:32-33). Both Davis and Doctor agree that Carter then took the white man out of Rosewood in his wagon.
After Carter’s murder, the posse approached other black homes in Rosewood including Emma Carrier’s home seeking more information. In the growing frenzy the posse nearly hanged Aaron Carrier, who was rushed out of the area either by Sherriff Walker or Cummer and Sons Sawmill foreman Edward Pillsbury. The posse also threatened to lynch a relative of Aaron’s, Sylvester Carrier. However, no further deaths occurred in Rosewood for three more days.

Then, on January 4th a “party of citizens” went to investigate unconfirmed reports that an unidentified group of blacks had taken refuge in Rosewood (Jones et al 1993: 38). What spurned these reports is unknown, and it is likely that the group simply wished to attack blacks after what they probably saw as an anti-climactic ending to the events of Monday. This group targeted Sylvester Carrier, who was unpopular with some local whites for standing his ground against everyday racism. Upon arriving at Carrier’s home, two members of the mob, Henry Andrews and C. P. “Poly” Wilkerson approached the house’s porch and attempted to enter without permission (Jones et al 1993:40). Carrier and others in his home opened fire on the whites as they attempted to break into their house, and a full scale gun battle commenced.

The battle continued into the early morning hours of Friday, January 5th. Dispatches were received in nearby communities and additional whites began arriving in Rosewood. These additional arrivals most likely included members of the KKK who’d been participating in a large New Year’s rally in Gainesville, approximately forty-five miles northeast of Rosewood. Reports of wounded white men in Rosewood roused local whites and they came for revenge and violence (Jones et al 42-44). While the white group left the area for several hours on Friday to replenish ammunition and take care of
their wounded, African Americans in Rosewood left their homes and fled into the swamps. Upon returning later that day, the white mob burned down several homes and at least one church. When they entered the now empty Carrier house they reportedly found the bodies of Sylvester Carrier and his mother, Sarah Carrier who’d apparently been shot during the previous night’s gun battle (Jones et al 1993:43-44). Lexie Gordon, a black widow of approximately fifty was also shot repeatedly in her back as she fled her burning home on Friday (Jones et al 1993:44-45). Gordon was the sixth recorded death in Rosewood after Sam Carter, Sylvester Carrier, Sarah Carrier, Henry Andrews, and C. P. “Poly” Wilkerson. The seventh death attributed to the violence occurring in Rosewood took place when Mingo Williams was shot in the head by whites as they drove through Bronson headed for Rosewood.

Hearing about the trouble in Rosewood and the African Americans hiding in the nearby swamps, two Jewish brothers who worked for the SAL railroad took their train out of Cedar Key around 4am on Saturday January 6th, 1923 and headed towards Gainesville. They stopped at several towns along the way including Rosewood, Wylly, and Otter Creek to rescue the frightened African Americans hiding in nearby swamps. The train took survivors to other cities along the railroad, cities like Archer and Gainesville, where descendants attempted to make lives for themselves, and where many remain to this day (Jones et al 1993:61).

According to some accounts, only women and children where allowed on the train. That Saturday, James Carrier, brother of Sylvester and son of Sarah, returned from the swamps to Rosewood. He was apprehended by the white mob and taken to the black cemetery. He became the eighth murder as he was lynched near the fresh graves of his
brother and mother (Jones et al 1993:50-51). On Sunday, the white mob returned to Rosewood one last time and burned the remaining African American homes and buildings. Rosewood was no more. Blacks never returned to the area and Jones et al (1993) reported that their properties were forfeited and sold for delinquent taxes to local whites.

Unsurprisingly, rumors about the event continue to circulate through Levy County and Florida. One particularly strong rumor deals with the existence of a mass grave of either black or white victims, or a mix of both. It is a powerful image and the 1997 film *Rosewood* by John Singleton ends with a dramatic portrayal of bodies being dumped into the mass grave. While numerous individuals claim to have personally witnessed a group of bodies buried in “an open mass grave in a pine grove” (Jones et al 1993:56-57), no historical evidence has surfaced supporting these accusations. A team of state and federal officers were unable to find evidence after a thorough search of the area in the early 1990s (D’Orso 1996:326-327). Throughout my own research I have constantly been asked by numerous individuals around Rosewood, Cedar Key, and elsewhere in Florida if I was ever able to find evidence or whether I personally believe if such a grave exists. Not only have I not found no evidence for a mass grave, I do not personally believe such a grave ever existed.

**Re-Capping What Is Known about the 1923 Race Riot**

The above account of Rosewood’s development and destruction summarizes the majority of research on the town and riot. While this may seem like a grandiose claim, and would be for just about any other relatively well-known riot site, it is not for Rosewood. Academic research includes one state-funded report (Jones et al 1993) and three articles (Colburn 1997; Dye 1997; Jones 1997). A popular novel by D’Orso (1996)
focused on the struggles of the survivors and descendants during their claim against the state of Florida in 1993 and 1994. D’Orso’s book became the basis for the 1997 film *Rosewood* directed by John Singleton. Also, a relative of Rosewood descendants, the grandniece of Mullah Brown has self-published a book on Rosewood (Jenkins 2003) purporting to tell the story of the *Real Rosewood*. In all, these works account for no more than a few hundred pages of text and primarily repeat the finding of Jones et al’s work from 1993. This can be summarized as follows.

While Sumner began surpassing Rosewood in many ways, the lack of racial violence in Levy County court records suggests the area was relatively peaceful prior to the 1923 riot. However, on New Year’s Day 1923, this peace was irrevocably disturbed when a white woman in Sumner fabricated a black assailant to hide her extramarital affair with a white man (D’Orso 1996:30). A white mob quickly formed and made their way towards Rosewood. They encountered the home of Sam Carter, a long-time black resident of Rosewood, and its sole remaining blacksmith. At first, they interrogated Carter by hanging him from a tree by the neck. After their questioning concluded, and when it seemed the mob might release him, a man whose identity has been lost to history leveled his gun at Carter’s face and terminated the blacksmith’s life. Initially, the violence appeared to end with Carter’s murder. However, a little over a day later, whites in Sumner heard that the mythical black assailant had returned to Rosewood with a local black resident, Sylvester Carrier. Carrier’s distrust of whites was well-known and before the night was out, at least two whites lay dead on his doorstep after attempting to set his house on fire with his family still inside. Rumor and hatred spread quickly through rural Florida, eventually reaching the Klu Klux Klan in Gainesville forty miles
away. Residents of Rosewood knew the response for killing whites would be swift and violent, black men armed themselves and headed into the woods and women and children hid with one of Rosewood’s only white residents, John Wright, to wait out the violence. However, by the sixth of January three other blacks had been brutally murdered and the white mob, now numbering in the hundreds, began the systematic burning of Rosewood. During this time a train was brought through town at four in the morning to pick up women and children, who had moved to the swamps and spent the previous couple nights hiding after John Wright was unable to guarantee their safety. The train took families to towns like Otter Creek, Archer, and Gainesville’s black district where descendants live to this day.

Today, only one documented structure dating to the period before 1923 exists (although one or two others might exist and are currently being investigated). The documented structure is the former home of Rosewood’s white storeowner, J. M. Wright. Every other structure in Rosewood was burned or has been demolished and nothing of the original town remains. Black residents of Rosewood, those who survived long enough, would have to wait for more than seven decades to receive justice. While a grand jury convened in February 1923, no convictions were made and the jury’s records have been lost. Rosewood lingered at the edges of collective memory for decades. Then, in a 1994 landmark decision, the State of Florida decided to pay compensation to survivors and descendants. This bill opened up the story of Rosewood to an international audience, and within a few years a popular book (D’Orso 1996) and a major motion picture (Singleton 1997) appeared describing the events of 1923.
Storytelling has become an important part of commemorating Rosewood’s history, and particularly the riot itself. Bus tours are operated in the area and guides give a general overview of the area’s history and the riot. I have attended several of these tours and videotaped one in its entirety. Motion pictures and documentaries are still made about the site and the riot, including a 2011 documentary funded by the State of Florida Division of Historic Resources. As the only active academic researcher currently investigating Rosewood’s history, I appear in the 2011 documentary discussing the brief archaeological work I conducted in early 2010. The goal of this work was to ground truth the location of the historic black masonic lodge as revealed by the Rosewood Historical Property GIS. Also, descendant groups have begun returning to the area and organizing commemorative events, akin to healing ceremonies, drawing heavily on the stories of survivors and descendants. Ultimately, the history being (re)told by these tours, films, and events rely primarily on the 1993 report. When I began archival and field research in 2008 it was my goal to work with each group involved in Rosewood, as well as local whites who lived in the area. Glover’s (2008) comments about the struggle between authority and authenticity increasingly became real concerns as I negotiated the complex terrain of creating an engaged project in Rosewood. I want to take this opportunity to expand upon the nature of public archaeology as a way to ground the remainder of this dissertation and my project as a whole. This includes my thoughts on the importance of academic storytelling as a legitimate research tool.

**Recent Perspectives on Public Archaeology**

Current conversations about engaged anthropology and public archaeology motivated my initial research into Rosewood’s history. I was particularly encouraged by other projects which sought to include various stakeholders in the archaeological
process, from pre-planning stages through interpretation and dissemination. The majority of perspectives and approaches in both engaged anthropology and public archaeology advocate for increasing honest and equitable relationships with those directly affected by academic research. In this section I explore the current landscape of public archaeology as well as outlining my own thoughts about the use of storytelling as an important form of engaged anthropology.

Historical archaeologists are increasingly focusing on oppressed and marginalized populations in the past. This is, in my opinion, undeniably laudable and represents a fundamental undercurrent supporting my decision to conduct research on Rosewood and work closely with descendants as well as other interested parties (e.g., researchers, community advocates). Over time, my desire to work with these various parties forced me to wrestle with my own privilege, and the potential authority that entails. My desire to engage openly with various groups resulted in a growing awareness of my own position as a researcher. How can we – as anthropologists, archaeologists, or scholars in general – begin to challenge, let alone actively dismantle, the privilege which colors our perspectives with hegemonic tropes of neutrality and objectivity? I sense reluctance on the part of other researchers to genuinely engage with such ideas. Why? Is this, as Leigh Binford (2004) suggests, a natural outcome of scholars as establishment products who remain disinterested in developing an incisive analysis of the system that supports us? The answer I arrived at over time coincides with other scholars who are advocating for the active decolonization of anthropology (Harrison 2010). Such a project requires that academics create more equitable, engaged relationships with participants. Of course, “what scholars mean by engagement, however, ranges broadly” (Lyon-Callop...
For most archaeologists, the initial step is to produce publically accessible interpretations and materials, including pamphlets and museum exhibits. Indeed, the need to craft publically accessible interpretations of archaeological research has become foundational in public archaeology (Shackel and Chambers 2004), and recent volumes suggest specific approaches using games, excavation simulations, and various performative methods (Burke and Smith 2007).

In fact, the commitment to producing publically consumable interpretations has been a part of public archaeology for a long time. The term public archaeology entered the archaeological vernacular with McGimsey’s 1972 volume *Public Archaeology*, which focused on the practice of development-led archaeology (Merriman 2004:3). This volume and the growth of cultural resource management (CRM) in the United States highlighted the increasing professionalization of archaeological practice in this country, and subsequently around the world (Byrne 2004; Funari 2004; Jameson 2004). Public archaeology as McGimsey envisioned it recognizes heritage as an exhaustible resource and states that archaeologists have an ethical obligation to help preserve and interpret these resources for the general public. Indeed, the ethical responsibility of archaeologists to the public trust is now a common theme in public archaeology (Ascherson 2000).

For McGimsey and others (Lucas 2004), creating public interpretations became a primary responsibility as archaeology was predominantly funded by the public. Public archaeology has continued to grow and increasingly focuses upon public engagement throughout the archaeological process (Jameson 2004). This is an engagement increasingly concerned with empowering subordinated groups (Shackel and Chambers
2004, Shackel 2011). This trend calls upon archaeologists to consult with interested parties during planning stages so that archaeology can better answer the questions asked by the public.

The term “public” is complicated because it can refer to either the state or groups within a state, such as indigenous peoples and descendant communities (Merriman 2004:1-2). Public archaeology attempts to serve both state and citizen interests, giving rise to conflict as such interests are sometimes at odds (Merriman 2004:5-8). Archaeologists seeking to create inclusive interpretations where alternative points of view are situated alongside one another maintain that archaeology has strong arguments to make about the past (Thomas 1995; Joyce 2002; Schadla-Hall 2004).

In recent years public archaeology has drawn inspiration from a broad array of disciplines and approaches, often resulting in new forms of archaeological practice. Collaborative archaeology, as outlined by Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2007) involves four basic steps. The first establishes a group of co-researchers, which includes professional (e.g., archaeologists) as well as various stakeholders. The second step involves creating a nurturing environment for group learning, usually accomplished through formal and informal group meetings. Third, questions are collaboratively explored and mutually put forth as project goals. Finally, appropriate methods for answering these questions are finalized and put into action. This approach closely mirrors participatory action research (PAR) (Whyte 1991) and as such is concerned with so-called “real world problems” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2007:10). I drew on a modified version of this model when I began research into Rosewood’s past. I made contact with other researchers and descendants during this time, including some
of the historians who had worked on the 1993 report to the Florida legislature. I became involved with long-time researchers as well as the last two remaining survivors, Robie Mortin and Mary Hall Daniels (both of whom I conducted in-depth interviews with during the summer of 2009). I endeavored to create relationships between myself and others which supported collaboration and the sharing of knowledge. Conversations with long-time researchers and the descendant community guided my decision to create a digital story (see chapter six) for use on educational bus tours to the area around Rosewood. I quickly realized that Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson's model represents a best case scenario and that engagement with a wide array of researchers, descendants, and their advocates complicated the research process.

The interaction of various personalities, many of whom had personal stakes in Rosewood’s history through familial ties, necessitated a long-term approach to facilitate trust between myself and others. This sentiment is captured cogently by Little’s discussion of civically engaged archaeology, which derives its inspiration specifically from the civic renewal movement and is “committed to a long-term sustained relationship with communities” (Little 2007:5). My own growth as an engaged archaeologist taught me valuable lessons about the importance transparency and accountability regarding archaeological research (Agbe-Davis 2010:2). Such experiences eventually guided my decision to develop a publically-accessible data warehouse on the internet where other researchers and the public could access the same data I used during my research project. This included transcriptions of oral histories and census records available at the Virtual Rosewood Research Project website (http://www.virtualrosewood.com).
The importance of including multiple narratives within archaeological work has become a mainstay of public archaeology (Silverman’s 2011). Multivocality as I use it is the integration of numerous, sometimes contradictory viewpoints about past into the archaeological research process. This is a political act aiming to, among other things, empower subordinated groups (Shackel 2004). However, as Rosemary Joyce (2002) expertly demonstrated, simply including quotes and excerpts from interviews and conversation is not enough to qualify as multivocal. Instead, a multivocal archaeology is one which captures the spirit of conversations about archaeology through time. This includes but is not limited to the dialectical nature of planning research projects between academics and the public, and the use of new media to document such conversations (McDavid 2002). Public archaeology now includes honest depictions of the complex processes of public engagement (Meskell 2005; Castaneda and Matthews 2008).

The key to successful archaeological engagement is sustainability, the creation of long-term projects between researchers and the public. Instead of spending mere weeks with a site and its associated stakeholders, effective public archaeology requires a prolonged engagement (Little and Shackel 2007), moving archaeology closer to ethnography. Increasing the length of engagement provides the opportunity to better understand the goals of various groups, which may be at odds with one another as well as archaeologists (Shackel 2011:1). Long-term engagement allows archaeologists to develop a critical awareness of preexisting dynamics between potential collaborators, a necessary step when dealing with sites that have complicated histories or where communities disagree about the meaning of a place’s heritage. Such dynamics, if not properly understood, can jeopardize research, and scholars ignoring complex
interpersonal dynamics may create or exacerbate existing tensions between parties. Furthermore, questions which interest academics are not necessarily valued by members of the public. Alternative questions posed by the public, while clearly valued by public archaeology, are not always immediately forthcoming. Dedication to spending longer periods of time discussing the methods and abilities of archaeology is equally important. Doing so allows members of the public to better understand what archaeology can and cannot do, and provides potential collaborators the means to evaluate archaeology's potential and develop questions which they value.

The above discussion neatly summarizes my own thoughts on public archaeology as they intersect the work of other scholars. I was particularly interested in the discussions of grounded methodologies for encouraging and maintaining collaboration over time. The majority of scholars agree open discussions and face-to-face meetings with the public are important, and in terms of specific methodologies the common wisdom now states that a “sooner rather than later” approach represents best practice. As mentioned above, the importance of engaging the public early on is important to understand interpersonal relationships as well as identify important research questions of particular interest to a range of parties. I valued the importance of engaging the public early on, but I was more interested in the use of genuinely new methods and technologies as they might be used throughout the process.

Several authors have now discussed the importance of the internet as a delivery vehicle for archaeological interpretation (Lopiparo 2002; McDavid 2002). The internet is increasingly utilized by archaeologists to share their research, and even their data (Fennell 2010). For instance, the Digital Archaeological Archive of Comparative Slavery
(DAACS – www.daacs.org) houses a growing collection of artifact databases, sites maps, and archaeological reports (Galle and Neiman 2002). A project like DAACS underscores modern archaeology’s ability to warehouse data and encourages alternative interpretations. The ability of additional scholars and the public at large to explore archaeological materials opens up the possibility for independent corroboration of interpretations, a *litmus test* for archaeological interpretation. While these trends motivated me to create an online data warehouse for my Rosewood research, placing raw data online does little to motivate the general public to explore archaeological research. I began searching for a more engaging method of sharing archaeological research with the wider public. This motivates my exploration of storytelling.

**Archaeology, Counterstorytelling, and Applied Visual Anthropology**

My use of new media methods for an engaged archaeology seeking to participate in social justice education draws inspiration from academic storytelling and applied visual anthropology (see chapter six). This starts with the classic use of storytelling to create emotional narratives. Emotional stories connect audiences with the past experiences of groups in ways that traditional academic writing fails to do. I see the creation of an emotional connection between the public and my research as the paramount issue for transforming traditional academic research into effective social justice education. Recent scholarship in visual anthropology, particularly the work of Sara Pink (2006), repeatedly demonstrates the utility of video as a tool of social transformation. My own work with the history of Rosewood draws on *counterstorytelling* – the creation of narratives specifically aimed at confronting elite ideology – as a form of politically-motivated action encouraging critical reflection on the unequal treatment of minorities in America’s past, present, and future.
Rosemary Joyce (2002:17) reminds us that archaeology “is a storytelling discipline” and every stage of the archaeological research process is communicated through accepted traditions of storytelling internal to the broader discipline of anthropology. A handful of archaeologists have relied on storytelling to question disciplinary practices (Flannery 1982), expose interpretive biases (Praetzellis and Praetzellis 1998), and share archaeological interpretations with the public (Iseminger 1997). It is this last form of archaeological storytelling which specifically interests me. A significant aspect of the project described in this dissertation utilizes emerging new media approaches to convey the process and results of archaeology to the public. As I indicated above, creating transparency about archaeology is a political act.

The use of storytelling as a transformative act is recognized by many disciplines. For instance, critical race theory (CRT) scholars have advocated for the importance of storytelling since the 1980s. Modern CRT storytellers like Derrick Bell (Bell 1987; Bell et al 2005) and Richard Delgado (1989) draw on a long tradition of storytelling by minority groups, including slave narratives. Stories are used by scholars like Bell and Delgado to communicate to America’s dominant racial groups what life as a minority individual is like in this country. The underlining belief is that members of America’s racially dominant group (e.g., Anglo American) do not understand what living as a minority entails. Specific inspiration comes from historical figures and their ideas. This includes W.E.B. DuBois’ development of “double consciousness”, and the intense mental and physical toll often experienced by minority groups living in America. CRT scholars maintain that race “may be America’s single most confounding problem, but the confounding problem of race is that few people seem to know what race is” or the
effects it still has for minority populations in the modern US (Lopéz 1996:5-6). CRT storytelling is also used to counter stereotypes by providing more complete explanation of the complex situations minorities have to navigate on a daily basis (Delgado 1994); something whites rarely think about (McIntosh 1998). Therefore, a tradition of counterstorytelling has developed to specifically address misconceptions – negative tropes – about the lives of minorities. The ability of stories to evoke an emotional response in listeners is more powerful than the recitation of cold facts and impersonal statistics about the continuation of inequality (Delgado and Stefancic 2001:37-46). Stories are useful in addressing silences; this is as true for the present as it is for the past. Stories are also useful for confronting what Jean-Francois Lyotard (1988) termed the differend, the confusion arising when differing, sometimes conflicting, meanings are ascribed to the same term or idea. Narratives can bridge these misunderstandings, and when their emotional potential is realized stories can shape understanding about important issues. This remained my intention while exploring the potential of digital storytelling as a new media method for engaged archaeology in Rosewood. I employed a mixed media approach (e.g., images, oral history, 3D modeling) to discuss the archaeological process with my audience while also crafting an emotional story around the lives of those who survived the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot.

A similar movement to use storytelling for social change is emerging within visual anthropology. The move to use visual methods for social transformation represents a well-articulated praxis. Applied visual anthropology involves “using visual anthropological theory, methodology and practice to achieve applied non-academic ends” (Pink 2006). This approach differs from ethnographic film in that it seeks to create
a collaborative practice where researchers and participants are involved to varying degrees. Much like recent directions in public archaeology, applied visual anthropology seeks to involve stakeholders in the overall process of producing visual materials. These materials, similar in spirit to the tradition of counterstorytelling in CRT, seek to tell a group’s story that is either misunderstood or hidden from society.

The mix of storytelling and historical research has immense potential for storytelling. However, historical researchers employing storytelling have to remain watchful of not dismissing previous views of the past. For example, numerous survivors remembered the winter of 1923 as one of the coldest in history (Jones 1993:23). When Jones and her team investigated the history of Rosewood in 1993 they did not have access to the same data researchers have today. This includes digital copies of climatological observation forms warehoused online at the National Climatic Data Center (http://www7.ncdc.noaa.gov/IPS/coop/coop.html). These forms provide daily weather information. A review of the daily and monthly weather data for Cedar Key shows that the winter of 1923 was in fact one of the warmest between 1908 and 1923, the fifteen years prior to the race riot (Figure 1-2). Used unsympathetically, such data simply contradicts the experiences of the African Americans who spent at least one night hiding in the swamps. A more respectful use of this information demonstrates how trauma and violence affect our memory of events, everything becomes more severe, even the very weather we experience. These forms also document that 1.5 inches of rain fell on Wednesday January 3rd, 1923 – potentially explaining why violence ceased during that time. The availability of records like these is growing every day, and researchers have a responsibility to identify and use them.
The availability of technologies for combining the interests of public archaeology, counterstorytelling, and applied visual anthropology are becoming increasingly available, intuitive, and affordable. Their costs have dramatically declined meaning that for relatively little cost researchers and groups can utilize methods and techniques which were financially out of reach just one decade earlier. The expansion and increasing affordability of digital technology, the development of the interactive internet (a.k.a. Web2.0), and free and open source software (FOSS) provide the tools for creating engaged visual projects. Archaeologists are expanding their methodological toolkits to include 3d modeling, computer mapping, and video editing. The reorientation of these emerging archaeological trends towards openly political and transformative projects means that we can realize new forms of engagement. The creation of what I term **engaged visual archaeology** (EVA) is possible to an ever expanding number of groups and communities. The underlying goal of EVA is to utilize emerging technologies as a way to reconfigure the practice(s) of public archaeology, specifically realizing the goals of counterstorytelling as academic praxis. EVA is also the use of emotional stories delivered through digital videos on the internet as a way to present the experiences of lost or hidden groups from the past. When these stories intersect modern issues they provide commentary on past oppression and engender open discussion about the connection(s) between historical and modern social inequality.

This is the goal of my dissertation. I use historical evidence to provide the raw material informing digital content (delivered online) which explores the connections between past and present inequality as revealed at the site of a 1923 race riot in Levy County, Florida. As such, this dissertation discusses the results of an experimental
project. I draw on recent theoretical discussions linking face-to-face violence in the past with modern structural and symbolic forms still producing modern inequality (chapter four). This discussion builds on previous studies of race riots (chapter three) and sets the stage for an in-depth investigation of Rosewood's social history, including the spatial layout and landscape, as an African American community in the Deep South (chapter five). The use of GIS to determine the spatial layout of Rosewood also provides a template for virtually reconstructing the lost community. This allows me to explore the emerging practices of virtual archaeology and digital storytelling as relatively inexpensive methods for public engagement and social justice education (chapter six). I conclude that the most effective use of these new technologies involves a mixed media approach, only in this way can we effectively reach the most people possible.
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Figure 2-1. Location of Rosewood, Florida

Figure 2-2. Mean monthly temperatures between 1918 and 1923.
CHAPTER 3
HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RACE RIOT AND LYNCHING STUDIES

This chapter presents an in-depth introduction to my views on the study of racial violence in American history. The focus is on scholarly works attempting to understand and explain why intersubjective violence occurs. The goal is to delineate the historical background for the following chapter’s theorization of a new explanatory framework describing; 1) why race riots and lynchings should be interpreted together as expressions of larger social processes; and 2) how historic, face-to-face violence contributes to widespread structural inequalities present in American society today.

I have chosen to divide this discussion of the last 120 years into four periods. The first period included a handful of riot studies produced by various government agencies, but the vast majority of work prior to 1930 focused on lynchings. The second period between 1930 and 1960 is best characterized by the development of sociological approaches to both race riots and lynchings. Studies of the latter predominated as lynchings continued into the 1950s. The third period between 1960 and 1980 was dominated by various types of race riot studies. The interest in riots during this time directly reflected the massive urban riots occurring across America during the 1960s and 1970s. The fourth period between 1980 and 2010 is much more difficult to classify as studies, particularly of historic lynchings, flourished across a wide range of academic disciplines. While the study of these two forms of violence received attention from an ever-widening set of disciplines, scholars continued to treat them as unrelated social phenomena. I question this separation in the following chapter by analyzing these two forms of violence as part of a broader social trend where white America retained its
educational, economic, and political domination through structural and symbolic means, at the cost of minority access to these same spheres of social advancement.

1890s-1930s: Activism to End Lynchings and Municipal Studies of Race Riots

The tradition of analyzing and writing about American lynching began in the 1890s when Ida B. Wells used her position as a journalist to combat lynching in the southern States. Wells’ journalistic activism was launched into national prominence after documenting a particularly heinous 1892 lynching of three black men in Memphis. Not only were the three men well-respected members of the city’s African American community, Wells knew them personally, and the event deeply disturbed her on a personal level. In several editorials condemning the lynching, she urged blacks to leave Memphis as soon as possible, spoke out against the officers who allowed the lynchings to occur, and encouraged African Americans to boycott the streetcar system. Wells was aware that such activity was dangerous and her condemnation engendered strong resentment from southern whites, who openly threatened her in print. One such editorial stated that the “black wretch who had written that foul lie should be tied to a stake at the corner of Main and Madison Streets, a pair of tailors shears used on him and he should then be burned at the stake” (Wells 1970:66), demonstrating that at first most whites believed Wells to be a man. Wells spent the next ten years writing and speaking out against lynching, including two tours to the British Isles. Her largest pamphlet (1895) began with a review of common justifications whites cited for lynching. The most commonly cited reason was to defend white women from what whites claimed was a constant threat of black sexual assault.

Walter White continued Wells’ work in his role as an undercover researcher for the NAACP. He investigated more than thirty lynchings and eight race riots, which
became the basis for his influential book, *Rope and Faggot: A Biography of Judge Lynch* (2001[1929]). His study found that less than thirty percent of African American men lynched were accused of rape and concluded that lynching was mostly used as a tool of intimidation. White used his fair skin, blonde hair, and blue eyes (White 1948) to conduct research as a white man across the south. This included a trip to investigate the 1919 riot in Elaine, Arkansas where he barely escaped after his identity was discovered by local whites. In risking his own life to expose the lies which fueled lynchings in the Deep South, he followed Wells and used newspapers and books to expose the brutality of lynching and sway popular opinion against the practice.

A handful of white researchers also began analyzing lynchings during the first years of the twentieth century. Several ignored racism as the cause of extralegal murder. This included an early president of Trinity College (Duke University) named John Carlisle Kilgo (1902). He credited the influence of French and Spanish culture on southern states with inscribing a feudal attitude among whites in the region. His analysis credited a chivalrous impulse among southern white men as the primary motivation behind lynchings. Ultimately, he dismissed the idea that lynchings were racially motivated and that such outbursts were simply the temporary social insanity of an openly chivalrous southern society. Writings like Kilgo’s represented the type of attitudes Wells and White worked tirelessly to undermine.

Other whites admitted that race prejudice was significant, but not sufficient to fully explain lynchings. James Cutler (1907) believed a frontier spirit in America animated and explained the mob’s willingness to participate in lynching activities. Cutler’s believed a combination of social difference and racial prejudice resulted in a lynching
only when blacks actually committed crimes. He never questioned whether lynched blacks were guilty or not, but did wish to see the practice of lynching end and supported passing anti-lynching laws. The call for anti-lynching legislation appeared during this time (Watson 1916); but only a few states outside of the Deep South passed laws relating to lynching and no such law ever materialized at the federal level.

Other writers continued to openly support lynchings during this time. The most famous was Thomas Dixon’s emotional novel *The Klansman: A Historical Romance of the Klu Klux Klan* (1905). As the basis for D. W. Griffith’s 1915 film *The Birth of a Nation*, it ignited southern fears about a perceived threat of African American political and social advancement and contained explicit scenes such as the gang rape of a white mother and daughter by three black men. While less exaggerated, Winfield Collins 1918 *The Truth about Lynching and the Negro in the South* played upon similar fears. This 163 page pamphlet places much of the blame for lynchings on abolitionists and a demoralizing radical carpetbag régime. Collins couched his rhetoric in rational tones and suggested that African Americans were racially predisposed to crime. Collins, like the growing eugenics movement of the Deep South (Larson 1995), credited this predisposition to crime as a consequence of biological race. He recommended segregation and forced relocation as the only viable strategy for improving the lives of African Americans.

While numbers of lynchings decreased after the 1890s, when as many as one hundred or more individuals were lynched per year (Tolnay and Beck 1995), the frequency and intensity of race riots grew in the early twentieth century. There were at least twenty-five documented urban race riots during the summer months of 1919.
(Tuttle 1972) and the majority of these occurred outside the southern states. One of the first in-depth studies of a race riot was the 800+ page 1922 report by the Chicago Commission on Race Relations. The study found that the riot began following the murder of a fourteen-year-old African American boy who was swimming in Lake Michigan with friends. When Eugene Williams and his friends crossed the invisible line demarcating the white and black sections of the beach, a white man threw rocks at the friends and hit Williams in the head, resulting in his drowning. After the friends returned to the black section of the beach, they found a black police officer and reported the crime. However, racial tensions exploded into several days of rioting after a white policeman refused to arrest the offender. The Chicago Commission on Race Relations (1922: 596) credited increasing racial intolerance “to the migration of Negroes from the South” and stated that the subsequent housing crisis also contributed to additional friction between poor whites and blacks. The report concluded with a series of recommendations for avoiding future riots. These included calls for the police to develop a riot response plan and exercise increased vigilance in black neighborhoods, increased numbers of schools in the black districts, promotion of racial harmony by social and civic organizations and the general public, programs to develop racial pride among African Americans, promotion of racial harmony by employers and labor organizations, support for equal access to public places, and a stern warning that the media should endeavor to report facts and not exaggerations when referring to riots and race relations (1922: 641-651).

Ultimately, the developing trends of this first period (1890-1930) were expanded upon during the next period. The majority of work had an openly political goal of ending
lynnings or preventing race riots by raising public awareness. This included work by Wells and White to undermine the justification of lynching as a deterrent for rape and the Chicago Commission on Race Relations to explain the causes of riots as social in nature.

1930-1960: Sociological Studies Develop

Growing numbers of social scientists conducted research and produced works focused on racial violence between 1930 and 1960. One of the most significant was a two-year study conducted by Arthur F. Raper – a white graduate student at the University of North Carolina. His work remains remarkable in its scope, methodological approach, and commitment to detail. The book presents an in-depth analysis of the twenty-one lynchings in 1930, and identifies a host of social inequalities as responsible for preconditioning lynchings. These included unequal access for African Americans to education, jobs, and politics. Raper (1933:30-32) was also the first to posit a direct relationship between the price of cotton and lynchings, a relationship which stated that when the price of cotton dropped, the resulting economic hardship increased the likelihood of racial violence. He described in gruesome detail the brutality of lynch mobs, such as the lynching of James Irwin in Ocilla, Georgia, where the victim was jabbed in his mouth with a sharp pole, his fingers and toes removed joint by joint, teeth extracted with pliers, and his still living body dosed in gasoline and set on fire. While earlier writers described such mobs as insane, Raper highlighted their ability to make rational decisions. For instance, whites in Sherman, Texas targeted black homes and businesses with fire while saving and even dosing the flames on nearby white dwellings.

Raper's study went beyond the immediate event and focused on the participants and aftermath of lynchings. He found most perpetrators had little formal education and
did not own property, and extended his research to include those individuals who made up the secondary and much larger portion of each mob, the audience. Women became particularly empowered during these episodes and fed directly into and derived power from the spread of rumors. Increasingly, whites were able to instigate mob violence towards African Americans by simply hinting at a criminal offense. This occurred when a white woman in Norfolk, Virginia accused a black man of assault who initially received a death sentence, but was later acquitted when it was determined the women’s claim was fabricated to hid her “illicit association with a white man” (Raper 1933:37). Raper then turned his attention towards the legal establishment and wrote about police brutality towards blacks and how of the thousands who participated in these mobs during 1930, only forty-nine where brought to court, and only four were convicted (Raper 1933:16).

Ultimately, Raper produced far-reaching recommendations. He called for additional laws to protect prisoners and facilitate the conviction of lynchers. He urged police to take seriously their past complacency and stressed the importance of educating the next generation of southerners with studies of mob violence. Finally, he called on the press to further racial tolerance instead of racial prejudice.

While Raper developed the first substantial method for the sociological study of lynching, Chadbourn (1933) examined repeated attempts to institute a federal anti-lynch law by US Representative Leonidas C. Dyer, the NAACP, and others. His recommendations for stopping lynchings agreed with Raper on a number of points. Chadbourn’s study found that “only about eight-tenths of one per cent (sic) of the lynchings since 1900 have been followed by conviction of the lynchers” (1933:13). Chadbourn showed many characteristics of later critical legal studies and implicated the
legal machinery of America (e.g., lawyers, judges, state and federal courts) as remaining complicit and allowing lynchers to go unpunished. While other lawyers and legislators quibbled over an exact definition of lynching, Chadbourn developed a simple and concise definition as “the killing or aggravated injury of a human being by the act or procurement of a mob” (1933:47). While an anti-lynching law was never passed in America, Chadbourn’s study remained important for future researchers because of the honest picture it painted of the complacency of the legal establishment in regards to allowing lynchers to escape prosecution.

Research by social scientists on a wide range of race issues continued to grow during the 1940s (Myrdal 1944). Myrdal believed racial inequality in America was caused by white America’s refusal to share power with their black neighbors. In regards to lynchings, Myrdal framed the problem basically as a psychosexual one and believed whites lynched blacks for one of two reasons; the guilt they felt for raping black women, or because they feared the sexual prowess of black men (Myrdal 1944: 191,563-564), an idea first proposed two decades earlier by Berkeley-Hill’s (1924) discussion of white male sexual jealousy of black men.

The search for explanations concerning the psychological aspects of lynching culture continued throughout this period. Psychoanalyst John Dollard (1937) believed lynchings satisfied a psychological need for southern whites to regain social control over blacks following Reconstruction. He represented southern society as a caste system; whites were high, middle, or low caste while blacks were either low or middle. Dollard believed caste surfaced as the primary mechanism replacing slavery in the Deep South. While his use of caste as a metaphor quickly fell out of favor (Myrdal 1944), his analysis
clearly pointed out the social vulnerability of African Americans in the Deep South. His discussion included observations about occupational stratification and the commonality of sexual endogamy – except for high caste whites who were allowed to force sexual contact between themselves and black females. His use of caste allowed him to frame white privilege in terms of disproportionate rewards and discussed the omnipresent disadvantages forced upon blacks in the areas of education, politics, and personal gains. His representation of lynchings as a form of social control drove his conclusion that southern whites did not in fact hate blacks, but feared them. This fear provided the impetus for the brutal suppression of African Americans regardless of any actual violence being committed.

Early pioneers of African American anthropology, such as W. Allison Davis, also examined the caste system of the Deep South. His analysis acknowledged the psychological urge to punish African Americans present in the white mind, and viewed such acts of punishment as proof of the slow economic advancement African Americans were making in the twentieth century. In his view, anti-black violence indicated that African Americans were “beginning to compete more effectively with whites” (Davis 1945:7). Davis presented an important analysis concerning those areas where whites and blacks labored in poverty alongside one another, places like the Mississippi Delta. His anthropological work demonstrated the power of culture to explain the appearance of racial violence. His saw poor whites resorting to violence as a way to physically maintain the social distance between black and white required in the Deep South.

A number of scholars, while not specifically investigating lynching, spoke to the problem as part of their larger research programs. This included journalist Wilbur J.
Cash’s *The Mind of the South* (1941) which sought to delineate the social landscape of the entire South as extrapolated from the author’s work in the Carolinas. The book was well received by both black and white readers, partially because of its openness in laying part of the blame for racial violence at the feet of the established land-owning aristocracy of the Deep South. Cash like Raper and others represented a growing group of progressive southern modernists who sought to employ their specific fields of research in the service of social justice and transformation.

In addition to these academic studies, activism to end lynchings continued as well. Jesse Daniel Ames rose to national prominence when she formed the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching in 1930 (Hall 1979: 164). This group formed in part as a response to the call that “when Southern white women get ready to stop lynching, it will be stopped and not before” (Hall 1979:167). This new group took as its primary role the rejection that black men should be lynched as one way to protect white women. Like Wells and White before her, Ames analyzed lynching as a primary method for combating it. She produced numerous reports during the 1930s and early 1940s describing the characteristics of lynch mobs. Much of this work was aimed at demonstrating that lynching had firmly become a southern problem (Ames 1942:4). She also described how mobs had grown smaller, dropped the pretense of chivalry, targeted small offenses, and increased their brutality (Ames 1942:5-9). Ultimately, Ames agreed with her contemporaries by stating that lynching occurred because of two factors; the feeling of superiority whites possessed, and the role of economics in relation to lynching rates. She saw economic crises as the key trigger affecting the rise and fall of lynchings (Ames 1942:1). Accordingly, she described increases in the number of lynchings in
relation to national economic crisis as well as local factors like annual changes in agricultural productivity (Ames 1942:14-15). Ames also realized that lynchings were sometimes used to disenfranchise African American political participation and she believed that only when blacks were accorded the same rights and privileges as their white neighbors would they be free from random acts of racial violence (Hall 1979:225). Ames chose to focus her group’s actions locally and felt a federal lynching law would do nothing as public opinion already allowed lynchers to avoid legal action (Ames 1942).

Large urban race riots continued to increase as the overall rate of lynchings decreased during this period, and a handful of academic studies began to appear throughout the 1940s and 1950s. This included one of the first book-length treatments aimed at academic, public, and government readers. Lee and Humphrey (1943) chronicled the events of the 1943 Detroit race riot and found a mix of conditions explained why groups riot. This included increasing racist attitudes of low and middle class whites, the desire to hurt others as a way to feel self-important and powerful, the portrayal of blacks as scapegoats by demagogues, and the growing tension spreading across America due to the nation’s involvement in World War II. The authors also credited more specific reasons as responsible for the Detroit riot; first, segregation of blacks in the war effort, including the refusal to mix blood from black and white Americans by the Red Cross in its blood banks (Lee and Humphrey 1943: 90-91); second, the Great Migration of African Americans contributed to labor problems; third, poor housing conditions and overcrowding in Detroit’s ghetto provided additional social strain; fourth, the resulting crime and delinquency of overcrowding in slum conditions;
fifth, the race prejudice resulting from the previous factors and a general movement
towards racism in American society at large.

The authors chart a general pattern of race riots in America drawing on riots in
Harlem and Los Angeles. It is useful to review this pattern as it provides a template
routinely drawn upon by later studies. This eight-fold pattern begins with; an event
which dramatized already poor race relations (e.g., murder across the color line);
formation of a crowd which focuses attention on the event; mills about not dispersing
but growing in energy; creating an atmosphere conducive for the communication of
excitement as members of the crowd contact others and invite them to participate; the
mob reaches a frenzied point through accumulation of additional members resulting in
loss of critical self-consciousness and the connection to personal responsibility retreats
form the participants’ minds; quickly followed by the visitation of brutalized violence on
one or more targets; directed by a self-appointed leadership of the “most excited and
violent or from the most clear-eyed and depraved” (Lee and Humphrey 1943:103); all of
which motivates the mob to move towards new targets and locations. The book
concludes with a list of recommendations on avoiding future riots. The primary
recommendation suggested communities form bi-racial committees to integrate black
and white citizens in creative ways.

Another article appeared a year later foreshadowing future movements in race riot
studies. Schuler’s (1944) examination of the 1917 Houston race riot interpreted the
rioting of black soldiers as a response to police brutality towards local African
Americans. Schuler derived four conclusions from his in-depth review of newspaper and
eyewitness accounts. First, the resentment felt by blacks who were unable to freely use
public transportation contributed to a growing tension between races. Second, the mistreatment of African American women by white police was particularly offensive to the black community. Third, the disrespect of black soldiers by local white police further fueled tensions. Fourth, rumors of black and white violence provoked these tensions and directly contributed to the riot.

A comparative approach to the study of race riots across national boundaries also appeared during this time. Dahlke (1952) is often credited as the father of modern race riot studies (Rucker 2007: 863-865). His brief study of racial violence juxtaposed the 1903 Kishinew, Russia riot with the 1943 Detroit riot. Dahlke saw many similarities between the Jews in Russia and Detroit’s African American population; both groups lived in ghettos fashioned by larger social practices, and race prejudice against both groups was particularly strong prior to the riots. Like Schuler and Lee and Humphrey before him, Dahlke acknowledged that the police in Detroit and elsewhere were often more of a problem than a solution – of the 34 African Americans killed in Detroit, 17 of them were murdered by police officers. Dahlke believed riots occurred primarily due to the interaction of six factors. The role of historical context. This increased prejudiced attitudes and supported the creation of racist stereotypes. The role played by authorities, normally exacerbating the situation. Also, the escalation and advocating of increased violence. This was further supported by racist propaganda by the press and mass communication outlets (e.g., radio, newspapers). Finally, he stressed the importance that rumors as a form of social support from the upper classes played in these contexts.
By the end of the 1950s, the role of industrial capital in fueling racial violence was increasingly recognized. For example, Victor Hicken’s 1959 article recounts the tragic episode of violence in the towns of Virden and Pana, Illinois, in 1898, where a conflict between striking miners and coal companies where blacks were literally caught in the crossfire. This article creates a historic narrative describing the escalation between capitalism and labor increasingly common in the US labor movement during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The coal companies, as a way to break the strikes, first threatened to bring in Chinese labor, and then transported several trainloads of African American laborers. White miners fired on these trains and company stores during several days of violence, ultimately suppressed by the National Guard. This form of inquiry regarding race riots represents a developing descriptive tradition, which does little to further sociological understanding, yet provides the raw material for others to do so.

The thirty year period between 1930 and 1960 saw a refinement in the way racially charged collective violence was studied and interpreted. A causal relationship between economics and racial violence was posited for lynchings (Raper 1933; Hovland and Sears 1940). Similarly, the role of economic factors was seen as an important predecessor for race riots (Lee and Humphrey 1943; Dahlke 1952; Hicken 1959). A number of studies began looking at the characteristics of lynchers and rioters (Raper 1933; Lee and Humphrey 1943). Psychological interpretations of racial violence looked to psychosexual (Myrdal 1944) and caste (Dollard 1937; Davis 1945) explanations while activists continued their work to combat what was seen as a possible return to lynchings following the Great Depression. Lynchings, for the most part, ceased during the 1950s
while the 1960s became typified by the appearance of hundreds of race riots. As such, whereas lynchings dominated writings prior to 1960, this trend is sharply reversed during the next period.

**1960s-1970s: Race Riots Become Central Focus**

The lynching of Emmett Till in 1955 has been doubly represented as the end of the lynching era and the beginning of the modern Civil Rights Movement (Whitfield 1988). The decision by Till’s mother to allow public viewing of her son’s open casket forced the nation to witness and confront the true brutality of Emmett’s murderers, Roy Bryant and J. W. Milam. While numerous magazines and newspapers covered the story, including the infamous photograph of Till’s mutilated body and face in *Jet* magazine, academic analysis of the murder was not undertaken until more than three decades later.

Researchers developed numerous ideas and theories about the violent conflicts which spread across the US during the 1960s. While the Civil Rights Movement continued to grow during this period, numerous riots once again gripped large cities around the nation. This forced scholars, government officials, and the American public at large to realize that race hatred was not solely a “southern problem” anymore, if indeed it ever had been.

The largest and most visible publication during this time was the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (United States National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders 1968), which became known as the Kerner Report after the commission’s chair, Illinois Governor Otto Kerner. This study was commissioned by President Lyndon B. Johnson and represented (white) America’s inability to understand the racial conditions which had grown steadily worse during the previous generation in America’s inner cities (Ritchie 1969). The report became a national bestseller and set
the tone of discussion in regards to both race riots and the larger conversation on civil rights for African Americans for years to come. The commission’s findings summarized the US as a “nation is moving toward two societies, one black and one white – separate and unequal” (Kerner Report 1968: 1). The commission was charged by President Johnson to answer three questions: what happened, why did it happen, and what can be done in the future? The first question was answered during the first three chapters which provide descriptive histories of 23 major and minor race riots in 1967. The second question was addressed in the following five chapters (4-9) which found that riots occurred from a mix of racial prejudice, poverty, labor exploitation, and a lack of political participation. The third question was answered in the final eight chapters (10-17) and called for increased integration of blacks into American society at all levels, including housing, education, employment, politics, health care, and anywhere unequal access existed between races.

Many studies during this period largely agreed with the Kerner Commission, but by the late 1970s a number of authors began to question the viability of riot commission reports because of their membership of businessmen, politicians, and social scientists who were seen by the public as disconnected from the everyday experiences of Americans (Lipsky and Olson 1977). Indeed, the role of the government at various levels became an important aspect of riot scholarship during the 1960s and 1970s. Numerous studies found police brutality represented an important precipitant for riots in New York in 1900 (Osofsky 1963), East St. Louis in 1917 (Rudwick 1964), Philadelphia in 1918 (Franklin 1975), and the 1965 Watts riot in Los Angeles (Oberschall 1968). However, while local law enforcement was seen as either allowing or contributing to
riots, a historical review of riots suggested that the American military typically responded quickly and effectively when arriving in areas experiencing race riots (Grimshaw 1963). The notable exception to this pattern was the 1917 East St. Louis riot where National Guardsmen were seen burning and looting black residences (Asher 1972). In addition to outlining the ways in which local law enforcement contributed to mob violence, solutions were proposed by many authors during this time. These suggestions echoed those made four decades earlier in Chicago and called upon municipalities to create dedicated riot response plans, especially since many had failed to do so again and again throughout the twentieth century (Grimshaw 1963; Shogan and Craig 1964). This suggestion gained support when a study found that training local law enforcement to respond to riots either reduced or averted violence altogether (Hahn 1970).

As with earlier periods, a number of catalysts, typically referred to as precipitants by authors at this time, were cited by scholars. These can be divided into two types: long-term structural precipitants and specific trigger events. The goal of such studies was to determine what mix of precipitants resulted in overt violence (Lieberson and Silverman 1965). Specific studies again credited the migration of blacks from the southern states to urban areas as a precipitating cause in Springfield, Illinois in 1908 (Crouthamel 1960), Philadelphia in 1918 (Franklin 1975), Chicago in 1919 (Tuttle 1970), and Detroit in 1943 (Shogan and Craig 1964; Sitkoff 1969). The extra strain on housing and labor from the Great Migration of blacks out of the southern states between WWI and WWII was seen as exacerbating other conditions in these cities. Additional justifications for mob violence against blacks included blocking black political
participation (Hennessey 1979), stopping black labor from organizing (Rogers 1960), and punishing blacks who testified against whites (Williamson 1967).

Of course, authors remained aware of the central role racism played as riot precipitant and several studies reviewed the role media played in contributing to riots. This included newspapers running stories of black crimes in gruesome detail while ignoring white crimes (Crouthamel 1960:168) and the growing trend of sensational journalism reproducing racist stereotypes held by white America. Knopf’s work (1974, 1975) is particularly important in understanding how newspapers contributed to rising racial fears. Her findings demonstrate an alarming trend by reporters throughout the twentieth century to publish unverified reports, unwarranted attacks on black communities, use of racializing phrases and words, and supporting white version of events (Knopf 1974: 320-323).

Researchers during this time increasingly explored the characteristics of rioters and the behavior of mobs. A number of these studies arose in specific response to the McCone Commission Report on the 1965 Watts Riot in Los Angeles. McCone, a conservative business leader, oversaw a riot commission which produced a report alleging that riots were perpetrated by poor, unemployed, and undereducated “riff-raff”. While this may have been true for the 1930 lynchings investigated by Raper (1933), several studies attacked this report and its “riff-raff theory” of mob participation by demonstrating that riot participants came from a mix of educational and economic backgrounds (Fogelson 1967; Oberschall 1968). Numerous theories about the behavior and background of rioters emerged during this time, including relationships between participants and the spatial distribution of resources within cities (Lieberman and Silver
1965; Berkowitz 1969), feelings of isolation from political powerlessness as justification for rioting (Ransford 1968), and the idea that riots represented a form of political protest by the economically and politically disenfranchised (Lang and Lang 1968; Feagan 1973).

Several historical scholars extended this type of analysis further back in time by looking at the socioeconomic background of mob participants in the nineteenth century. For example, Jacksonian-era, anti-abolition mobs were often led by rich and powerful families (Richards 1970). These studies repeatedly demonstrated that mob action was rarely irrational or chaotic with riot participants actually organized themselves into reasoning collective agents mobilized towards rational – as well as violent and extreme – goals. During the 1960s these ends increasingly took the form of attacking visible symbols of economic and political power, namely police officers and public buildings. As such, white America and the black middle class were forced to confront the fact that the so-called ghetto revolts which swept black neighborhoods across America during the 1960s and 1970s were in fact responses to the Civil Rights Movement. Specifically, inner city blacks felt they were left out of the national conversation on rights and were destined to reap little or no benefits (Oberschall 1968; to a lesser extent see Waskow 1966). The result was a “politics of violence” presenting a violent counterpoint to the popular nonviolent protest taking place elsewhere across America (Feagan 1973:42-46).

One extension of the drive to explain collective violence at this time was the move to classify riots. These efforts to typologize mob violence included the differentiation between southern and northern-style riots (Grimshaw 1969:105-115).
This classification found significant differences between precipitating events, resistance of victims, and after effects of riots. Southern-style riots (e.g., Tulsa 1921) began with an event transgressing a sacred boundary, such as the rape of a white woman by a black man. Northern-style riots (e.g., Chicago 1919) began from secular transgressions, such as blacks attempting to use ‘white-only’ areas of a city. Black resistance was minimal in southern-style riots and quickly disappeared when it did appear, while northern-style riots saw large and sustained black resistance to white violence. Following the racial violence, locations of southern-style riots saw the reestablishment of an accommodative pattern of race relations. The accommodative pattern resulted in whites retaining the same (or greater) levels of economic, social, and political power as prior to the riot. Northern-style riots, according to Grimshaw (1969), saw ongoing violence resulting primarily from the fact that blacks fought back confounding the reestablishment of an accommodative pattern. A mixed-style riot was also proposed which combined elements of these patterns (e.g., East St. Louis 1917). Grimshaw believed the rise in black militancy between WWI and the 1960s meant that only northern-style riots would continue in the 1960s and 1970s.

Janowitz (1979) proposed another classificatory schema for riots and divided them between communal and commodity forms. Communal riots were those dominated by attacks upon individuals, while commodity riots refer to episodes where attacks against property predominate. Capeci (1977) used a similar typology in his study of the 1943 Harlem riot. He interpreted this event as a form of protest by explaining how commodity riots represented the frustration of communities who targeted property as a way to symbolically attack the uneven power structure in America. It should be noted that
Capeci argued for dropping the term race riot in regards to the 1943 Harlem riot, preferring to call it a commodity riot. Studies like these motivated some researchers to explore looting as political action (Dynes and Quarantelli 1968).

The aftermath of riots continued to attract interest, and a handful of researchers turned their attention to the effects riots had on individuals and communities through time. For instance, the 1908 Springfield race riot was seen as directly influencing the formation of the NAACP, as well as the mass exodus of this northern town’s African American population (Crouthamel 1960). Riots were also seen as reactions to a growing divide in Black America’s leadership, including the 1903 Boston riot which erupted after local blacks reacted negatively to Booker T. Washington’s visit and what they saw as his accommodative rhetoric (Rudwick 1962).

Ultimately, the concentration on race riots during this time period reflected America’s growing realization that race relations had continued to deteriorate after WWII, and the realization that racial segregation was harming both black and white Americans. Research illustrated how Americans who mixed with members of other races not only avoided violence, but had a more complete understanding of the social factors affecting minority communities, regardless of their own ethnic background (Jeffries and Ransford 1969). Studies of race riots accounted for the majority of research into collective violence during this time period. A handful of scholars did continue to research lynchings, but they were certainly in the minority in regards to academic studies of racial violence. These studies took two broad forms. First, sociologists continued to posit explanatory models for the rates of historic lynchings in various locations. Theories were put forward showing a correlation between a higher
percentages of black population with higher percentages of lynchings (Reed 1972) and interpreting lynchings as a form of repressive social control, what Inverarity refers to as repressive justice, appearing in areas where blacks tested social boundaries in efforts to gain economic or political power (Inverarity 1976),

Second, researchers began to look at the effectiveness of historical anti-lynching campaigns. This was motivated by the nearly complete disappearance of lynchings following the 1950s. Several researchers attributed this drop to the work of Jesse Daniel Ames’ grassroots work during the 1930s and 1940s (Reed 1968; Barber 1973). Historical studies on the failure to secure a federal anti-lynching law posited that such efforts assisted in raising public awareness about the growing brutality of lynchings, but would have been more successful had a federal law been passed (Grant 1975).

While never thoroughly analyzed, the similarity of precipitating events of both race riots and lynchings was commented upon for the first time during this era (Lieberson and Silverman 1965:888). In the end though, no theory of collective violence emerged which explained the ebb and flow of racially charged collective violence in relation to both race riots and lynchings. These forms of violence have remained sharply demarcated until the present.

1980-2010: Race Riot and Lynching Studies Flourish

The last thirty years have seen a proliferation of studies dealing with historical episodes of racial violence. Many scholars continued to draw on earlier studies, while others developed wholly new approaches and perspectives. Several trends stand out during this time period including a multi-year conversation on the relationship between economics and lynchings, ongoing discussions about structural preconditions, assessment of riot commissions and anti-lynching activists, and studies into the
characteristics of mob participants. New research directions included gendered and ritual analyses of historical lynchings, attempts to understand how various communities represented mob violence as a form of moral action, characteristics of the victims instead of the perpetrators, intersections between riot studies and the redress movement, identification of new precondition social trends and lynchings (e.g., capital punishment), and studies discussing the ethics of viewing lynching photographs in the past and present.

The exploration of a causal relationship between economics and lynchings reached its zenith during the late 1980s and mid-1990s. While Raper (1933) noted a correlation between cotton prices and lynchings, this idea was not fully explored until the late 1980s (Tolnay et al 1989). These authors began with a critique of Blalock’s power threat hypothesis, a position explaining collective violence as a response from those with social power towards those attempting to gain it. Whether explicitly stated or not, the majority of previous sociological studies of lynchings posited some form of the power threat hypothesis when they explored preconditioning factors for mob violence. Tolnay et al believed economic factors were the determining factor in explaining the various rates of lynchings between counties in the Deep South. A number of responses accompanied this piece (Blalock 1989; Creech et al 1989; Reed 1989) and leveled critiques concerning the lack of sufficient lynching records and the difficulty of predicting an average lynching rate for counties in the history South.

The use of time-series data continuously demonstrated a sharp correlation between economics and lynchings. Other researchers arrived at similar conclusions (Olzack 1990) and over the next few years a specific economic indicator continued to
stand out. An inverse relationship between the rise and fall of the constant dollar price of cotton and lynching rates continued to stand out (Beck and Tolnay 1990). The basic premise of this research focused on the fact that lynchings concentrated in poor counties with higher percentages of black population and whose principal economic livelihood was cotton production. Poor whites, who increasingly came to psychologically identify with landed whites along lines of race, responded to increased economic competition with blacks through violence. The use of time-series data as well as various forms of content analysis (e.g., narrative, event-structure) was taken to its causal extreme by some sociologists, who sought to trace historical events through time in an effort to pinpoint the precise combination of preconditions required for mob violence (Griffin 1993). Other studies (Stovel 2001) continued to refine such sequential approaches and focused on constructing causal chains crystalizing human activity into a series of events. Ultimately, these frameworks look increasingly like predictive models compiling trait lists through time.

Historians also began tracing a wider set of precipitants for mob violence, including the role of weather events like a 1926 Florida hurricane that destroyed Florida’s economy (Shofner 1981), attempts to halt black economic advancement (Menard 1987; Wright 1990), as retribution for the killing of whites by blacks (Downey and Hyser 1991), standard justifications to protect white women (Capeci 1998), and efforts to stop black political participation (Capeci 1986; Ortiz 2005). The relationship between politics and lynching included realizations that past political orientation affected future race relations, and counties supporting populist politicians following the Civil War had fewer lynchings in later generations (Soule 1992).
Brundage’s (1993) historical studies of lynchings explored intraregional differences of lynching rates in Georgia and Virginia between 1880 and 1930 in an attempt to explain the significant differences between these two states: Virginia had 86 while Georgia had 460. His study suggested local differences in race prejudice, sharecropping rates, economic stresses, percentages of white and black population, and methods for maintaining white political dominance explained such variation. He concluded that no single precondition sufficiently explained how, when, and why lynchings occurred. In regards to the eventual disappearance of lynching, Brundage credited permanent economic changes protecting the southern economy and anti-lynching activism by blacks and whites as the main reasons.

The publication of Tolnay and Beck’s (1995) *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882-1930* remains the standard for sociological work on the relationship between larger social trends and lynchings. Their multi-year project not only produced the first reliable database of lynching victims, although acknowledged as incomplete, but also demonstrated the undeniable link between cotton prices and lynching rates. In regards to the end of lynchings, these authors disagreed with Brundage and credited out-migration of blacks and the subsequent relaxation of concerns over labor shortages as the primary reason.

Other scholars identified different relationships between lynchings and various social practices. An inverse relationship between falling lynching rates and the rise of capital punishment in America was first posited by Cutler in 1907; however, case studies investigating this connection in greater detail did not surface until eighty years later. This included specific studies connecting the use of capital punishment to satiate
race prejudice as in the execution of Maurice Mays following the 1919 Knoxville race riot (Egerton 1991). In this case, a jury of twelve white men convicted Mays of murder
ing Bertie Lindsey, a 23-year old white woman. The trial was poorly organized and the prosecution “failed to establish a motive, failed to show that Mays was ever at the scene, failed to prove that his gun had been fired” (Egerton 1991:60), and perhaps most tragic of all, five years later a white women confessed to committing the murder after suspecting that her husband was having an affair with Lindsey (Egerton 1991:64).

Capeci (1986) found that an increase in middle class values brought with it increasing demands for due process, and he suggested that this growing demand drove down the rates of lynchings in certain areas experiencing economic growth. He noted a correlation between the increase in middle class jobs and a decrease in lynching rates. Similarly, Webb (2002) interpreted the declining rates of lynchings of Sicilians in the American South with the slow movement of this minority away from minority status and the acceptance of Italians by Anglo Americans as white, and the increased access to due process it afforded them. Clarke (1998) credited a subculture of violence in America for allowing capital punishment to satiate the desire for violence against minorities. Barrow (2005) examined the lynchings of African and Italian Americans in the Mid-Atlantic States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland; she found lower rates of lynchings in states like New York where a visible criminal system executed larger numbers of minorities, and higher rates in states like Maryland which employed state execution more sparingly. Her findings demonstrate how racist calls for justice (read: violence) against stereotyped minorities found expression at the hands of
ordinary citizens if state governments were seen as failing in their responsibility of administering punishment.

Michael Pfeifer has explored this relationship more than others. This includes a fine-scale study of Louisiana between 1878 and 1930 demonstrating the substitution of capital punishment for lynchings as popular justice (Pfeifer 1999). He expanded these ideas and posited a “substitution theory” explaining how a blue-collar desire for hands-on violence was translated into the death penalty (Pfeifer 2004). He also noted how this desire differed between middle and working class whites in Wisconsin, where he saw reluctance by the working class to embrace due process in part because of their own desire for hands-on justice, but also as a way to distance themselves from recent New England middle class migrants who supported due process for whites and minorities (Pfeifer 2005). Increasing numbers of authors are picking up on this thread of research, and have noted how areas with high numbers of lynchings predict high modern homicide rates (Messner et al 2005). These types of studies demonstrate how intersubjective violence interacted with structural violence, an idea which I return to in greater detail in the next chapter.

While some authors interpreted the relationship between lynchings and capital punishment as substitutive, Phillips’ (1987) review of lynchings of blacks in North Carolina between 1889 and 1918 found that official forms of social control (e.g., courts, capital punishment) worked in tandem with the unofficial forms like lynch mobs. Phillips encouraged others to see capital punishment and lynchings as complementary, not as substitute. Arriving at similar conclusions, Vandiver (2006) explored the relationship between extralegal and legal executions through a dedicated study of counties around
Memphis and Ocala, Florida. Her findings agreed with those above and supported the assertion that the threat of lynchings interacted with local legal machinery, and if local whites felt their justice system was ineffective, they felt fully justified in trying criminals in the court of public opinion.

As Vandiver (2006) noted, media played a significant role in supporting lynchings. Probably the most grievous example of media’s promotion of lynching occurred in Florida the week prior to 1934 murder of Claude Neal, when the Associated Press (AP) provided advanced notice of the lynching (McGovern 1982:59-60, 102). Studies began using newspaper archives to ask questions about the representation of lynchings between areas and across time; supporting previous findings that newspapers generally upheld white stereotypes and versions of events by supporting, defining, or hiding lynchings from public record (Perloff 2000; Jean 2005). This practice was visible in regards to Rosewood as local papers in north Florida ran stories prior to and following the riot about the dangerous threat posed by African Americans (see chapter one).

Newspapers were also used to combat lynchings. While the work of authors like Ida B. Wells and Walter White were well-documented, the use of media by whites to combat lynchings has only recently received attention. Waldrep’s (2005) study of newspaper owner John G. Cashman found ample evidence that some white editors joined black activists and only sensationalized lynchings in an effort to raise awareness and end the practice. Cashman’s sympathy for Mississippi’s black communities and a sincere belief in due process motivated him to write numerous editorials against lynchings between 1883 and 1904. Unfortunately, the use of media to combat lynchings faced numerous problems and did not always make sense to readers. For instance,
Armstrong (2008) reviewed how the lynching of a nineteen-year-old girl, also eight months pregnant, in Georgia in 1918 had little impact on local and national sentiment towards lynching. While this lynching was particularly brutal, including the violent removal of the unborn fetus by the mob, because the lynching involved a young girl, readers were unable to rationalize the event because it did not conform to the social logic justifying lynchings; namely, the use of mob violence to deliver justice when black men attacked innocent white women.

These dedicated investigations into the role media played were part of a growing tradition of historical studies assessing how other social institutions interacted with the tradition of lynching. Other scholars documented how courts refused to convict lynchers in 1926 in Florida (Shofner 1981), 1911 in Pennsylvania (Ziglar 1982), 1959 in Mississippi (Smead 1986) while a handful of states actually passed anti-lynching laws. This included a 1928 Virginia ordinance outlawing the practice (Brundage 1993) and a 1912 Illinois law making police officers culpable if they refused to stop mob violence (McDermott 1999).

As in earlier periods, the assessment of historical anti-lynching campaigns continued during this time as well. Zangrando (1980) explored how the NAACP’s anti-lynching campaigns brought national attention and increased membership during the early and mid-twentieth century. While the NAACP’s repeated attempts at a federal anti-lynching bill in 1922, 1937, and 1940 were ultimately unsuccessful, Zangrando traced the sharp decreases in lynchings following each attempt as evidence that such efforts were still successful to some degree. Ida B. Wells and women in general (Brown 2003) received increasing attention during this time. A developing trend of identifying specific
events as important milestones for the NAACP included the 1916 lynching of Jesse Washington, a seventeen-year-old mentally handicapped African American, in Waco, Texas (Bernstein 2005), the 1899 lynching of Sam Hose in Atlanta (Capeci and Knight 1996), and many others (White 1948, 2001[1929]). Others extended their investigations of black resistance to the everyday level, and some stated that simply living as a black man in some areas during the nineteenth and twentieth century constituted a form of resistance (Brundage 1997). Patterson (1998) interpreted the fact that most lynchings took place because black men were accused of violence represented a growing defiance by African Americans to the increasingly racially segregated Jim Crow south of the twentieth century.

A growing desire to understand lynchings outside the dominant narrative justifying mob violence against offending black men motivated some to investigate atypical lynchings during this time. Such studies concentrated on cases like Armstrong’s (2008) study that examined events which contradicted the recognizable pattern of a white mob murdering a black man accused of various crimes (typically murder, rape, or both). The lynching of a Norwegian immigrant by his wife and son in Wisconsin in the 1890s demonstrated that some lynchings were seen as moral actions by white minority populations (Pederson 1993). Such studies expand our understanding of both victims and perpetrators to include battered women and children. Pederson (1993:81) interpreted the subsequent conviction of the victim’s wife (also of Norwegian birth) by a jury of local white men as a form of symbolic violence against women discouraging them from standing up to a patriarchal society. Probably the most famous atypical lynching was that of Jewish businessman Leo Frank in Atlanta in 1915. Nancy MacLean
(1997:160) suggested this murder represented a “reactionary populism” expressing white frustration over changing gender roles and class resentment and anti-Semitism. Of course, atypical lynchings occurred when blacks lynched whites or other blacks (Baker 2005). Baker believed one reason the rates of lynching were so high during the 1890s was because many African American communities still viewed popular justice as a legitimate and moral method for punishing offenders. His study of the lynching of a white man, who raped a black girl, by a mob of black men in South Carolina is particularly illuminating: while the black men were taken to court and tried for murder, the court acquitted them and defended their actions as moral. Others expanded the geography of lynchings with research on lynchings in Maryland (Williams 2001), Colorado (Leonard 2002), Nebraska and Kansas (McKanna 2003), Montana (Allen 2004), Texas (Carrigan 2004), Wisconsin (Pfeifer 2005), the Mid-Atlantic States (Barrow 2005).

As researchers increasingly realized that lynchings were indeed a national problem, regardless of the fact that it concentrated in the Deep South, a handful of studies continued questioning the popular assumption that mobs were chaotic and irrational. Patterson (1998) interpreted the motivation of mobs as a rationalized response to efforts by African Americans to improve their access to education, economic advancement, and political participation. Ingalls (1987) found evidence that rational choice repeatedly drove mob behavior in Tampa between 1858 and 1935. As part of this, he also noted the development of a lynching ritual in the area.

Many scholars now recognize the symbolic nature of lynchings designed to intimidate local blacks (Hall 1983; Howard 1988). Hall was one of the first researchers
to note that while lynchings declined following the 1890s, they became increasingly severe celebrations of brutality. A carnival atmosphere increasingly surrounded lynching events as mobs began targeting black bodies and particularly genitals in particularly barbaric and heinous ways. This included accounts of white mobs nailing penises to tree stumps and carving them into pieces for distribution among participants as souvenirs. The development of these mutilating rituals was also interpreted as homoerotic encounters between sexually repressed white men who expanded sexualized violence outside their marriages and into the public arena with the goal of concretizing white, male racial hierarchy (Wiegman 1993). Hodes (1997) interpreted the rise of spectacle lynching in relation to developing views of miscegenation; beginning with a period of weak acceptance during the rigid patriarchal society of the antebellum south, through increasing intolerance following Reconstruction, until the thought of consensual sexual contact between the races became unthinkable to white men after the turn of the century.

The most cogent outline of the lynching ritual was presented by Fuoss (1999), who divided the performative aspect of lynchings into three phases. The preliminary phase could include the use of blackface by whites, a claim of rape by a white women (real or not), recounting the crime publicly, displays designed to rouse anger, a manhunt, and the use of performance to capture accused blacks. The second phase involved embedded performances during the lynching itself and could include mock trials, oratorical performance, exhibiting or parading the victim, and torture. The final phase occurred after the victim was murdered and might include dragging of the victim’s body,
performing the lynching itself, and displays of performance traces (e.g., display of dead body and parts, gathering of body parts as souvenirs).

One of the most engaging, and anthropologically-informed analysis of the ritual of lynching interprets these events as a form of blood sacrifice. Mathews (2008) viewed the demand for the death of black men accused of rape as the primary method for re-establishing the boundary between pure/white and impure/black. The collection body parts by lynchers became increasingly common throughout the twentieth century, and probably began much earlier. Young (2005) interpreted this practice by drawing upon anthropological ideas concerning fetishes, and suggested the black body became imbued with special powers drawing on white stereotypes (e.g., hypersexual). As these perceptions grew, the performative aspect of spectacle lynchings resulted in whites wanting to capture the moment of brutality through the collection of fetish objects. These objects most commonly took the form of fingers, pieces of roasted internal organs, the aforementioned bits of penises divided among lynchers, and so forth. Young, who identifies himself as a black scholar in the article, is interested in discussing the black body as souvenir for two reasons. First, examining this practice highlights the motives of whites to halt the rise of African Americans economically, socially, and politically. Second, as a way to reconstruct the body of historic men and women in an effort to remember and commemorate the intense violence and hardships African Americans have faced throughout American history. This was not restricted to the threat of physical violence against black men, but also included the threat and reality of sexual violence against African American women.
Hall (1983) compared lynching with rape as an oppressive tool utilized by society’s racial elites, white men. The use of rape by elite men against minority women became an important topic of discussion during the past thirty years. Research concerning the migration of African Americans during the early and mid-twentieth century began to reveal the true extent of sexual threats and violence against black women. Hine (1989) drew on documentary and oral history research to offer a new explanation of why African Americans, particularly black women, were so eager to leave the Deep South. Hine acknowledged earlier research about the role of economics and the desire to earn a better living as important factors (Painter 1977). Her analysis went beyond this earlier work and proposed a reading of black migration that equally credited sexual violence as a motivation for seeking a better life outside of the Deep South.

Increasingly, scholars are investigating lynchings and collective memory for both black and white communities. This includes investigations into the role lynchings played in driving African Americans out of an area (Loewen 2005), as in the case of Washington Parish, Louisiana when several land-owning black families fled the area following the lynching of one of their kin (Fairclough 1997). While such consequences were probably both intentional and unintentional depending on the areas, specific explorations of unintended consequences of lynchings included the belief that a particularly gruesome lynching and subsequent 1893 Roanoke riot so disturbed the citizens of Virginia that they committed the fewest lynchings of all southern states. Alexander (1992) believed that the national coverage of these events created a communal shame in Virginia’s citizenry affecting the state for generations.
The effects of lynchings on black literary artists became a research topic during the mid-1980s, and realizations that numerous black writers drew on actual lynchings in their surroundings motivated a number of literary scholars to discuss this as one aspect of lynchings on black America (Harris 1984; Miller 2010). The newly recovered lynching dramas by playwright Georgia Douglas Johnson demonstrates the influence these events had on literary artists in direct and revealing ways (Stephens 1999a, 1999b). Not only do such works demonstrate how artists interpreted these events within the wider African American experience (e.g., ritualistic nature of white violence, sites of stereotypical representation, interrogating race relations); they remind us that the history of lynching is a part of American history and to erase it diminishes African American experiences – no matter how painful and brutal it is to remember.

Several studies demonstrate that local communities have many ways of either remembering or forgetting mob violence and its dominant themes of transgressing racial boundaries and the resulting punishment. These events have been preserved through folklore and ballads in some areas (Baker 2005). Other locations draw on a mix of silencing strategies to erase such events (Downey and Hyser 1991). Such strategies include not reporting events in local papers (Jean 2005; Metress 2008) or silencing events in family histories (Read 2008).

The story of James Cameron, sole survivor of the 1930 lynching in Duluth where two other blacks were killed, presents a powerful story of memory-making (Madison 2001; Read 2008) and survival (Cameron 1982). Cameron himself has written an account of his experiences during 1930 and his efforts to create a Black Holocaust Museum. Madison’s book explores how the legacy of the 1930 lynching haunted Duluth.
for generations. Read’s book explains his own struggles to come to terms with the
discovery that his grandparents were intimately involved in the 1930 lynchings, and his
subsequent public apology to African Americans in Duluth and beyond for the actions of
his ancestors. Duluth stands out as one of the few American cities to confront its tragic
past with a public ceremony apologizing for the violence and a permanent memorial
marking the event and its location in the city’s geography and history.

Recently, a handful of researchers are exploring how the meanings behind
lynchings – as a quintessential American metaphor (e.g., frontier justice) – continue to
influence the modern world. Markowitz (2004) views present stereotypical
representations of African Americans as directly related to tropes developed during the
heyday of lynchings and points to the use of such stereotypes by white women to blame
black men for recent crimes. For instance, the South Carolina case where Susan Smith
claimed that a black man stole her car with her children inside when in fact she had
locked her children in the car and pushed it into a nearby lake drowning them herself.
Markowitz’ suggestion that lynchings contributed to a public consciousness still affecting
today’s world is resonating with a growing number of scholars and supports continued
research into the aftermath of historic racial violence.

Nevels (2007) posits an explanation for the reasons some white minorities, such
as Italian, Irish, and Jewish immigrant communities, used the lynchings of African
Americans to perform their affinity with the dominant Anglo-American population. This
idea is supported by the fact that numerous foreign language papers published for
recent immigrants to the US portrayed lynchings in the same way Anglo American
papers did (Zecker 2009).
As communities begin exploring the specter of mob violence, scholars are reviewing commemorative events and making suggestions on how to proceed should a city decide to apologize and atone publicly. Ifill (2007) views the present disenfranchisement of African Americans as a direct output of the symbolic dimension of past racial violence, and calls for communities with histories of mob violence to be proactive in facing this legacy today. Her research draws on South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and explores a number of techniques for restorative justice. These concrete ideas are designed to help communities combat the lingering trauma of racial violence; and include placing gravestones at unmarked burial sites of the victims of lynchings, issuing public apologies, establishing school programs, financially compensating the survivors and descendants of past violence, and creating commemorative public spaces. Ultimately, her suggestions seek to bring together white and minority groups for dialogue about the legacy of racial violence in the past and present.

Perhaps one of the most provocative developments in regards to studying lynchings is the growing conversation concerning the appropriateness of viewing historic lynching photographs. The conversation began following the 2000 exhibition of the James Allen-John Littlefield lynching photographs in New York (Allen 2000). Authors have noted how the simple act of viewing these images intersects with other lynching studies. For instance, viewers are forced to confront the fact that many lynchers appear to be ordinary, middle class citizens. Dora Apel (2004, 2005, 2008) has emerged as the leading proponent for viewing these images and argues that doing so is important for a number of reasons. These include the influence of past lynchings on America’s present
which, if we accept that lynchings were at least partially the result of whites maintaining social, economic, class, and educational superiority; then these photographs document one method by which whites maintained their dominance. Apel (2005) and Henniger (2008) have also noted the similarity between these historical photographs and the recent images from Abu Ghraib – the US military prison in Iraq. Such studies connect the representational aspects of lynching to present practices, not to mention the symbolic nature of torture, and highlight how such brutality is condoned in various ways by the larger society, whether that is the military, a segment of the US populace, or racist groups worldwide. Henniger forces another question: are such practices and the images they produce an atrocity or a form of nation-building in the US? The answer, sadly and unsurprisingly, is a mixture of both.

Kidada Williams (2005) explored the paradox of viewing lynching photographs in her analysis of conversations about bringing the Allen-Littlefield collection to Michigan. While attending planning meetings at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History in Detroit, she encountered the quandary of how to reclaim the agency of historic African American communities while showing pictures of them as victims. Her solution was to contextualize lynching as just one form of violence wrought against blacks throughout US history. She argues that only through this contextualization can lynchings be appropriately situated within the continuum of violence endured by African Americans. This act of contextualization provides the justification for viewing these photographs and recognizes the agency of blacks by further elaborating a range of historical topics still not openly addressed by a wider
American public, such as the continuing importance of race to modern America and the ongoing struggles of minorities in the US.

Amy Louise Wood (2005, 2009) interprets the rise of spectacle lynching and the photographic accounts it spawned as a direct attempt by southerners to regain and concretize white supremacy. She finds that as long as photographs circulated locally, they fulfilled this purpose and local whites were able to relate to the photographs with pride. This pride is evidenced in the comments written on the back of such photographs, especially after they were turned into postcards as was so often the case. Others have noted how lynching photographs in context allowed landless whites to psychologically identify with white elites and feel power over local African Americans (Alexandre 2008). However, Wood notes that as photographs circulated outside their local and regional contexts, viewers lost the direct connection and such images began to work against lynchings and in fact support anti-lynching campaigns across the nation.

Questions of representation also appeared in regards to race riots. Researchers increasingly identified direct connections between race riots and the development of Jim Crow America, such as the exclusion of African Americans from jobs and educational opportunities (Cecelski and Tyson 1998), as well as restricting where blacks could live (Loewen 2005). A new appreciation of the intent of race riots to halt black advancement led some (Lumpkins 2008) to represent the 1917 East St. Louis race riot as a program where whites attempted to destroy the local black community. Lumpkins work is important because it highlights the methodical nature anti-black riot took in the pre WWII years, when race riots were almost exclusively attempts to exterminate local black populations. This program of extermination in cities like East St. Louis, Tulsa, and even
Rosewood was not satisfied until large numbers of African Americans were dead or at least run out of town. Lumpkins interpreted the continued presence of blacks in East St. Louis following the 1917 riot as testimony to the agency of African Americans.

Historical studies of pre-twentieth century riots grew during this period, and studies continued to demonstrate how the heterogeneity of rioters in terms of education, economic status, and even gender remained an aspect of mobs throughout American history (Bernstein 1990; Gilje 1996; Tager 2001). These studies demonstrated that a range of riots (e.g., communal, commodity, Northern and Southern-style) characterized American history (Upton 1984; Gilje 1996; Grimstead 1998). However, studies of riot typologies began to disappear during this time because they failed to explain the causes of riots.

Study of precipitating events continued to identify specific events which sparked mob violence as well as larger social preconditions setting the stage for riots. Specific events included the use of firearms by blacks to protect a black prisoner from being lynched in Tulsa in 1921 (Ellsworth 1982), accusations (true or not) of black men raping and murdering white women in Springfield, Illinois in 1908 (Senechal 1990), the elimination of social capital granted black soldiers following the Civil War in the 1866 Memphis riot (Hardwick 1993), and black representation on local school boards (Cobb 1981). Larger social conditions were expressed through the expelling of black laborers (Prather 1984), widespread race prejudice (Barnes 1984), as political action by elite whites to dislodge politicians who were sympathetic to blacks (Waller 1984; Hollandsworth 2001), increased economic competition between white minorities (e.g., Polish) and blacks following migration (Capeci 1984), increased economic competition
between African American and other visible minorities like Asians and Hispanics in the 1992 Los Angeles riots (Bergesen and Herman 1998), and the mobilization of white minorities (e.g., Irish) against blacks to serve elite white political interests (Waller 1984; Bernstein 1990).

As the local arm of the legal establishment, the actions of police were also scrutinized and many instances found that police allowed whites to riot uninterrupted (D’Orso 1996: Brophy 2002) and even fired into crowds without warning and under no direct threat (Cobb 1981). Some studies during this time period read more like reports to the police on how to handle future riots (e.g., Porter and Dunn’s 1984 study of the 1980 Miami race riot).

Increasingly, the knowledge that structural conditions continued to disadvantage minorities throughout the twentieth century motivated scholars to evaluate the effectiveness of riot commissions, and programs to combat racial inequality. Gale (1996) reviewed riots, the commissions which formed in response to them, and the programs based upon commission recommendations between the 1960s and early 1990s (e.g., 1992 Los Angeles riot). He noted how federal initiatives developed in response to the Kerner Commission report had targeted specific neighborhoods, and the solution consisted of spending money on community programs in those individual places. No country-wide or systemic changes had been made and Gale believed this approach was not only ineffective but put the blame on black neighborhoods. The targeting of poor black areas represented a superficial response echoing color-blind assumptions that African Americans were living in ghettos because they were lazy and undisciplined.
Historical studies continued to demonstrate how white leaders used riots to restrict minority advancement and even identity. For instance, following the 1943 Zoot Suit riot in Los Angeles local political leaders outlawed the wearing of zoot suits altogether (Daniels 1997). Studies also looked at the ways in which race riots were represented in communities through time. As with lynchings, it took a community to forget a race riot. Godshalk (2005) examined how whites in Atlanta mobilized their increased social power following the 1906 riot to maintain a culture of superiority while increasingly condemning blacks as violent and restricting them from participation in the city’s government and society. Whites in Tulsa refused to take ownership of their brutality following the riot; and the combination of city ordinances blocking the rebuilding of the black district (the area became marked for industrial development), real estate agents attempts to buy out black property, and city aid organizations refusal of aid contributed to a lasting legacy which demoralized and economically paralyzed the city’s black community (Ellsworth 1982). Ideas concerning the return to accommodative patterns following riots received further attention during this period when Gordon (1983) expanded on Grimshaw’s (1969) earlier work. Gordon interviewed black and white community leaders following the 1967 Detroit riot and found that communities progressed through three stages following race riots. While Grimshaw differentiated between the reestablishment of white supremacy or power concessions, Gordon’s work suggested that all communities eventually returned to a state of white supremacy after progressing through three stages; (1) the polarization of blacks and whites on community issues immediately following the riot, (2) followed by a period of depolarization accompanied by increasing apathy, eventually leading to a (3) pragmatic accommodation during which minor
concessions might be granted to the minority community but power dynamics in the community roughly returned to pre-riot conditions. This idea was expanded upon by Fine’s (1989) investigation of Detroit, billed in the 1960s as a model city in terms of race relations, a representation proved wholly false during the 1967 riot. Fine explored the legacy of the 1967 riot, ending his book with a sobering observation by one of his informants (a Detroit reporter), who remarked that it was “as if the riot had never ended, but goes on in slow motion. Instead of a single, stupendous explosion, there is a steady, relentless corrosion” (Fine 1989:463).

The effects of race riots on black leaders proved to be just as profound as the impact of lynchings upon African Americans artists. Capeci and Knight (1996) relate how Du Bois’ time in Atlanta deeply affected his writing style, political stance, and personal commitment to bettering the lives of African Americans. Capeci and Knight located two events between 1897 and 1906 which profoundly affected Du Bois. The first was the 1899 lynching of Sam Hose, an important day for Du Bois who wrote that “something died in me” after learning that Hose’s knuckles were on display in a nearby grocery store (Capeci and Knight 1996:732). The authors also charted Du Bois’ writings following the 1906 Atlanta race riot as they veered away from other black leaders (e.g., Washington), including a sympathetic biography of John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry – which Du Bois considered one of his own best books, but which received negative reviews across the country. The Du Bois who arrived in Atlanta in 1897 was a very different person than the one who helped organized the NAACP a decade later.

Connecting race riots with the fight for redress over historical wrongs represents a largely unrealized potential for riot scholars, but a handful have either reported on the
process (D’Orso 1996) or made it part of their engaged scholarship (Brophy 2002; Hirsh 2002). In this regard, Rosewood still stands out as the sole case where significant compensation has been awarded to the survivors and descendants of a riot, even though ample evidence for similar settlements exist elsewhere. Indeed, Tulsa now represents the dominant pattern of race riot redress in America, where cities form commissions and admit the wrongs which occurred, even apologizing sometimes, but no monetary compensation or structural change materializes (Hirsh 2002).

**What Can Anthropology Contribute to Race Riot and Lynching Studies**

This review of lynching and race riot studies has several goals; first, to provide readers a full introduction to the main authors, topics, and trends. As my discussion demonstrates, researchers typically argue for one mix of previous events or another as explaining the appearance of racial violence. Socioeconomic explanations tend to dominate both race riot and lynchings studies, suggesting at least one deep connection between these two forms of violence.

The second goal is to demonstrate that previous research continues to treat lynchings and race riots as separate analytical domains. A handful of researchers have commented on a possible relationship between these events. For instance, Dahlke remarked that race riots may present a possible substitute for lynchings in American society as the later declined. I do not find Dahlke’s comments particularly useful or explanatory. The idea that lynchings declined following the 1950s because race riots replaced them ignores the changing nature of riots in the 1960s. Riots prior to WWII were little more than anti-black pogroms (Lumpkins 2008). Riots in the 1960s were more complicated events and were increasingly seen as a legitimate form of protest by African American communities (Feagan 1973).
The vast majority of researchers past and present still consider race riots and lynchings as separate domains of social action, although no specific theoretical discussion has justified this disconnect. Instead, it appears that implicit assumptions are responsible for maintaining this sharp divide in the literature (for authors supporting this divide see McDermott 1999; Brundage 2005; Wood and Donaldson 2008).

A third goal guides my inclusion of studies which were not specifically focused on determining the causes of racial violence, namely, research on social activism to either end racial violence in the past or deal with its legacy in the present. I return to many of these issues in the following chapters as I explore how research into the history of Rosewood can support social justice education through the use of new media.

In the next chapter I explicitly argue that separating lynchings and race riots into discrete scholarly domains creates an uneven and incomplete picture of American history and society. I then reinterpret how race riots and lynchings, as intersubjective violence, relate to changing forms of structural and symbolic violence during the past century of American history.
CHAPTER 4
THE CHANGING NATURE OF RACIAL VIOLENCE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Violence is ubiquitous. It lurks at the edges of the everyday and is felt everywhere. Fear of violence motivates individuals, communities, and nations to respond in kind and perpetuate cycles of suffering. Images of violence include parents drunkenly striking their children, soldiers killing civilians, and the mobilization of state bureaucracies to exterminate a culturally-defined people. More common, everyday forms of violence include the exclusion of job applicants based on identity, increased rates of minority convictions in courts of law, and unfair immigration laws targeting specific nationalities and races. Even the off-hand comments towards those visibly marked as different (e.g., racial minorities, mentally handicapped) are a form of violence, the gendered language of a society privileging one perspective over all others, and the representation of dominant political ideologies as the natural outcome of history. Worst of all, violence is all of these things and more, its true threat lies in our repeated inability to accurately account for its appearance and timing, except in hindsight.

The previous chapter reviewed how research into race riots and lynchings continues to treat these forms of violence as separate domains. Hundreds of authors poured over thousands of accounts of racial violence. The vast majority concerned themselves with articulating the precise blend of precipitating causes and explored events which transgress social boundaries such as threats of miscegenation as well as long-term social developments concerning labor competition, access to housing and education, struggles for equal rights, and overt racism. They tend to draw out or favor one catalyst as the primary reason for racial violence. Researchers, having thusly identified their primary factor, whether it was migration, labor competition, or the
transgression of some social boundary, go on to describe how the delicate balance of racial harmony (actually, the absence of racially charged collective violence) is toppled into violent disarray and turmoil. This represents the tradition of investigating racial violence dating back to scholars like Raper and Myrdal, who attributed the appearance of racial violence to the combination of these identifiable and quantifiable prerequisite social conditions and inequalities. My intention is not to suggest their approach is without significance. Quite the contrary, it provides the impetus for conversations about inequality as well as attempts at addressing disenfranchisement. As the previous chapter showed, these attempts have yielded some success, but much work remains. In addition to exploring theoretical calls to recognize violence in its various guises, this chapter explores the changing nature of racial violence in America through time. I view the history and changing nature of racial violence in US history as the product of the interaction – the intersection – of intersubjective, structural, and symbolic forms of violence. The undercurrent of this entire chapter centers on producing a broader contextualization of the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot within the history of American racial violence, in forms both recognizable and unseen.

A Call to Recognize Violence in all its Forms

My discussion of intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence takes its initial inspiration from the works of Slavoj Žižek, Hannah Arendt, and Walter Benjamin. In Violence: Six Sideways Reflections (2008), Žižek continues his general project (1989, 1999, 2006) of exploring the world from new vantage points which reveal hidden relationships between seemingly disconnected or opposing ideas. For instance, in The Parallax View (2006) he explores the gaps between experience, measurement, and perspective in regards to ontology, science, and politics. A parallax refers to the
unexplored area of hidden relationships between seemingly opposite positions. Žižek demonstrates that many apparently opposing positions inhabited by thinkers, scientists, and pundits are in fact shallow reflections of one another. These differences of position appear separate but are actually closely related, a realization which only becomes clear if we can shift our frame of reference to outside the petty arguments between actors whose primary goal is the ideological justification of their position over any other. This act of shifting reveals previously unseen relationships opening new possibilities for understanding. For Žižek, these new forms of understanding are the first step towards praxis, the translation of knowledge about the world into action to change it. Thus, his goal is to reorient popular standpoints on popular issues towards a fuller understanding of the role perception and situation play in narrowing the field of discussion.

Always a controversial figure, I nonetheless find Žižek’s treatment of violence fascinating and he demonstrates a critical awareness of the public’s perception of violence. He critiques the growing plea by humanitarian groups to end intersubjective violence and calls such work short-sighted as it often fails to recognize deeper patterns of structural and symbolic violence. He argues for the need to move beyond the “desperate humanitarian SOS call to stop violence to the analysis of that other SOS, the complex interaction of the three modes of violence; subjective, objective, and symbolic” (Žižek 2008:11). Žižek substitutes the terms subjective and objective for the more familiar terms – at least to social scientists – intersubjective/interpersonal and structural as a form of wordplay so that he can highlight what he views as a primary reason face-to-face violence continues in the modern world. His goal is to demonstrate that solely abhorring intersubjective violence is an ideological move; it achieves the naturalization
of the structural and symbolic systems which condition its appearance in our world. Žižek’s emphasis is on the primacy of economic relations which sustain structural and symbolic violence allowing for the widespread continuation of intersubjective violence. His views on this topic are not entirely unique and other philosophers have long realized the connection between these various forces.

Hannah Arendt’s work analyzed the ways in which hegemony and ideology, acting through modern bureaucracies, supported the appearance of totalitarianism (Arendt 1994[1951]:460-479). Her portrayal of Eichmann as an opportunistic bureaucrat represents a powerful metaphor for understanding the nihilistic denial of responsibility (Nietzsche 1993) among today’s social elites, particularly the refusal to understand how patterns of everyday life support the installation of harmful society-wide practices. Benjamin’s discussion concerning the representation of violence as either legitimate or illegitimate also underscores the ideological apparatuses (Althusser 1972) at work in public discussions and perceptions of violence. He defines legitimate violence as the socially-justified use of intersubjective violence by the state (e.g., police, military) and illegitimate forms as those represented by the states as radical or revolutionary and have as their central goal the resistance of state violence. Benjamin (1986:277-300) ends his discussion of violence by stating that only through a dedicated review of the ways in which various forms of violence interact can the scholar truly comprehend the role and magnitude of violence across time and within societies.

These scholars inspire my own discussion concerning the changing relationship between intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence. These are potent terms and as such are potentially full of contradictory or confusing concepts. While I explore these
terms throughout the chapter, allow me to briefly unpack their meanings here.

Intersubjective violence represents the physical manifestation of violence. This is the face-to-face violence which is identifiable and results from the physical confrontation between recognizable actors. Intersubjective violence is hitting, cutting, shooting, killing. It is the use of hands and weapons to harm another.

Structural violence, what Žižek calls objective violence, is often difficult to identify, and there is seldom recognizable actors or agents. Structural violence refers to social inequality embedded in the structures of society (e.g., economic, educational, governmental) and the disenfranchisement of minorities from full participation in a democratic society. It is the use of privilege and social position to harm others without physically assaulting them.

Symbolic violence as I explore it in this dissertation is the form of violence contributing to the naturalization of racial inequality within society. By using the term naturalization, I am referring to the representation of socially constructed ideas (e.g. race, class, science) as immutable, objective ‘facts’ in the world which are seen as the natural outcome of history. Historically speaking, symbolic violence in 20th century America was supported by a wide range of practices. For instance, the eugenics movement used pseudoscience to support racial prejudice across America and around the world in the early twentieth century. Symbolic violence affects the imagination and like structural violence, contributes to social practices which harm others without physically assaulting them.

While I am interested in treating these forms of violence as specific concepts, they should not be seen as existing independently of one another. In fact, my true goal is to
explore how they intersect through time. This intersection provides a framework for examining race riots and lynchings as interrelated forms of violence. I will return to an in-depth discussion of the interaction of these various forms of violence through time, but first I will briefly explore the broader continuum of racial violence in American history, of which race riots and lynchings are but a part.

A Continuum of Racial Violence in American History

The history of America is seen by many as a history of violent confrontation between groups based on race, religion, class, and national background (Waldrep and Bellesiles 2006:3-10). While certain forms of state violence (e.g., international war) – what Roger Lane (1999:192) calls “sanctioned homicide” – have interested historians for decades, the focus on non-state, domestic violence between groups is a much smaller facet of historical research. This includes the recent explosion of lynching and riot studies since 1980 as demonstrated in the previous chapter and by Rucker and Upton’s review of race riot studies (2007:863-867).

Race riots and lynchings underscore the social construction of race and racism in the US as well as illuminating race and class relations in terms of which groups possess power at the expense of others (Ortiz 2008:435). For instance, some of the worst race riots took place between 1917 and 1923, including the Red Summer of 1919 when sixty plus people were lynched, eleven African American men were burned alive at the stake, and at least twenty-five race riots broke out across the nation. America’s economic instability following WWI is seen by many researchers as the primary precipitant for the appearance of racial violence at this time. The adjustment of the US economy to peacetime faltered as factories re-tooled their production lines, soldiers returned to domestic jobs, and large-scale labor unrest surfaced. The practice of spectacle lynching
also reached a zenith at this time. This form of lynching, which gave public lynching a
carnival-like atmosphere, became dominant in the years between 1915 and 1930. The
impunity of whites to lynch blacks publically powerfully demonstrates the stark
differences between social elites and disenfranchised minorities in American society.

However, the period between 1917 and 1923 is part of a much longer history of
American racial violence dating to seventeenth century tidewater Virginia. European
settlers began nearly two centuries of ruthless suppression of Native Americans; a
struggle reaching its apex with the massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890 and continuing
through a variety of structural inequalities today. White on black violence developed in
the context of merciless defeats of slave uprisings in the 1700s and 1800s. Other
groups including Eastern Europeans, Asians, Latinos, and people of African descent
remain targets of racial violence in America.

This continuum of American racial violence focuses on interpersonal violence.
Also known as intersubjective violence, this is the easiest form to identify. It produces a
visible reaction and is use of aggressive force between identifiable actors.
Intersubjective violence is only one type in a continuum including structural and
symbolic forms. Researchers must recognize the relationship between these forms of
violence if they wish to comprehend the broader historical relationships between racism
and other aspects of society. Cultural anthropologists and anthropological
archaeologists have increasingly examined the intersection of various forms of violence
as a way to explain the appearance of suffering and intersubjective violence in the
world. The next section provides a brief review of this literature. Such a review is
important for understanding the present terrain of thinking regarding the interaction
between various forms of violence and grounds my own views on this relationship in regards to contextualizing the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot within broader social structures and trends America.

**Anthropological and Archaeological Approaches to Violence**

The study of violence has concerned anthropologists for a long time. Early approaches tended to view violence as inherent to human nature. Anthropologists saw violence as endemic in so-called ‘primitive’ societies. Chagnon cited sociobiological justifications to explain violence among the Yanomami as indicative of human nature (Borofsky 2005). The weak position of conceptualizing violence as part of human nature has fallen away (Ghassem-Fachandi 2009:1). For instance, particularly powerful anthropological approaches to catastrophe demonstrate that natural disasters are not irrational, unpredictable, or inevitable in regards to those affected; instead, the vast majority of harm is disproportionately shared by the socially and economically vulnerable, demonstrating the role of structural violence in the modern world (Hoffman and Oliver-Smith 2002). The role of representing indigenous peoples as inherently violent, often requiring pacification by colonial elites, has become an important topic of study (Taussig 1986; Whitehead 2004) and demonstrates how various forms of violence interact at the everyday level to produce a culture of terror in America and around the world (Bourgois 1996).

Anthropologists have investigated race riots and lynchings as well. This includes the sensitive accounts concerning the everyday effects of large-scale rioting on the lives of individuals in India. Das’ (2007) work is important because it highlights how quickly the violence and devastation of riots can become part of the everyday routine of citizens. She is “attracted to the idea that boundaries between the ordinary and the
eventful are drawn in terms of the failure of the grammar of the ordinary” (Das 2007:7). The grammar of the ordinary refers to the practice of everyday life (de Certeau 1988), and specifically the ways individuals and communities cope with violence. Her recent work moves beyond simple description and concerns how violent events are brought into the everyday, how people cope with these events. The various strategies employed by those experiencing violence and the role of verbal and/or physical expression, particularly choices of when to share and when to conceal one's experiences, are shown to be part of a larger process of coping after violence ends. Of course, the availability and range of coping strategies are structured by culture and society. Choosing the appropriate cultural meanings and strategies which allow people to heal are mitigated by social forces. These forces include basic aspects of life, such as the ability to find food and housing.

This becomes clear in anthropological studies of modern lynchings. Goldstein (2003) found that such extralegal vigilante violence was represented by locals as moral action stepping in to provide justice in light of a weakened local legal system. The strategy for coping with lynchings resorts to justifications similar to ones employed in the US during the late nineteenth century. Krupa (2009) intersects larger conversations about the representation of lynchings in American and Ecuadorian lynchings. He investigates the aftermath of lynchings, particularly as media-aware spectacles making specific political points. The coping strategy here centers on assigning political meaning to act of violence. Ultimately, these authors find such coping strategies fail to successfully explain these episodes of violence in ways which allow individuals and
communities to begin the healing process. I believe making sense of violence is an important first step in coping with its aftermath.

A handful of anthropologists have emerged who analyze intersubjective, structural, and symbolic forms of violence as a constitutive whole. I am particularly drawn to Phillipe Bourgois’ (2004) comparison of violence in revolutionary El Salvador and US inner cities. His work draws on a wide range of cultural anthropologists and discusses how various forms of violence work in tandem. His construction of a continuum of violence is particularly relevant for understanding not only inner city America today, but the interaction of various forms of violence throughout American history. Bourgois distinguishes between four types of violence; direct political, structural, symbolic, and everyday forms. Direct political refers to personal cruelty perpetrated by authorities, a form of state violence against citizens.

Galtung’s (1969) differentiation between personal and structural violence introduced the later term into academic usage. He viewed the term structural violence as more appropriate than the term exploitation, which he saw as taking attention away from structural conditions of inequality and focusing instead on intersubjective violence. This differentiation highlights how the effects of structural violence can be attributed to the victims. Structural violence is the historically conditioned inequality between elites and subordinates (typically along lines of class, race, and gender). The investigation of structural violence by anthropologists is typified by Paul Farmer’s (2003, 2004) work in Haiti. This remains one of the most recognizable examples seeking to understand “the social machinery of oppression” (Farmer 2004:307). His discussion of the spread of tuberculosis and AIDS highlights the role political economy plays in concentrating such
epidemics within certain communities. These are diseases which have different modes of transmission. Tuberculosis is an airborne disease which is transmitted when infected individuals cough and AIDS requires the close contact of soft tissue and the exchange of bodily fluids to spread between hosts. Farmer demonstrates how the creation and maintenance of social inequality provides a setting where two very different diseases can grow and spread at similar rates. His 2001 Sidney Mintz Lecture for the AAA took an explicitly historical approach tracing the development of structural violence in Haiti from colonial times. Haiti is a compelling case for understanding historical developments in relation to the ongoing sanctioning of a country by elite colonial nations. Farmer also questioned negative representations of Haiti and Haitians. This nation does not suffer because of internal failures due to poverty, race, or class as is so often cited by international media. This nation falters because structural violence has infiltrated its existence both externally and internally. Structural violence has a historical trajectory, and results in the disproportionate suffering of groups due to racial and gender inequality, impoverishment, corporate greed, global capitalism, and political perspectives. Structural violence draws on dominant ideology and political expediency to create intersubjective violence in the world today.

Bourgois’ discussion of symbolic violence is indebted to the development and explication of this term by Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Symbolic violence is one aspect of Bourdieu’s larger theory of the sociology of power, which explored how the symbolic domain contributed to the ongoing domination of subordinate groups by social elites. Symbolic violence masks, maintains, and enhances social inequality. In drawing on his work among the Kabyle of Algeria, Bourdieu explored how a masculine
ordering of society was so deeply entrenched in this group’s habitus that it went unnoticed and unchallenged. Bourdieu uses the term *misrecognition* to highlight how this deeply embedded form of violence is rarely acknowledged by those propagating it and those suffering from it. Thus, symbolic violence refers to the “mechanisms that lead those who are subordinated to ‘misrecognize’ inequality as the natural order of things” (Bourgois and Schonberg 2009:17). In regards to gender, such misrecognition obscures the “schemata of habitus that are at once gendered and gendering” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992:172). Habitus refers to the deeply socialized dispositions which are embodied and cognitive expressions providing a reasoned theory of why humans make both rational and irrational choices.

Bourgois’ view on everyday violence draws inspiration from Scheper-Hughes’ (1992) ideas about the creation of an ethos of violence out of routinized cruelty and fear. Scheper-Hughes’ investigation of the ways in which women in a drought-stricken Brazilian shantytown dealt with the death of half or more of their children presents a chilling account of how humans cope with the certainty of death. The poverty-induced infant mortality rates in Brazil, among the highest in the world prior to the 1990s, produced cultural practices which appear severe and even inhumane to outsiders. Coping strategies developed and included favoring children who were seen as destined to survive over those who appeared weak. Also, poverty impacted the women’s lives in other direct and embodied ways. This included the stark jump in sterilizations by women in the area after their first three or four children. Scheper-Hughes’ work with these communities demonstrated that humans could survive such brutal social conditions, but at a severe cost to their emotional and spiritual lives. Bourgois drew on these
perspectives to document daily practices of violence at the interpersonal level. Scheper-Hughes’ work pointed out that while such an existence could be tolerated, it manifested a common ethos of violence as omnipresent. This echoes work by Michael Taussig (1986), who interrogated the power of colonial representations of indigenous peoples and the relationship between shamanism and colonialism in the New World. He relies heavily on Walter Benjamin’s political philosophy and commitment to historical analysis. Taussig reverses the colonial representation of Indians as savage and wild through a careful and lengthy description of various atrocities committed by European colonials. The social constructions representing Indians as barbaric provide the cultural justification for violent colonial rule in both the past and present. Taussig’s work signals for Bourgois the interaction between direct political, structural, symbolic, and everyday forms of violence. This combination produces a “culture of terror” where “structural and symbolic violence fuse to translate themselves into an everyday violence” (Bourgois 2004:427).

I find the analysis of violence as multidimensional particularly illuminating in regards to race riots and lynchings. This type of analysis represents the first crucial step in academic praxis seeking to end violence in the modern world. This is the spirit which Žižek crafted his SOS call to end intersubjective violence. This call shares much in common with the anthropological study of violence. First, it seeks to recognize the true nature of violence as multidimensional. Second, it then examines the relationships between various forms of violence to better articulate this relationship. Finally, studies of violence from Bourgois to Žižek explore ways of promoting this understanding to the public. Public intellectuals such as Žižek attract crowds of thousands to their lectures.
Others are exploring a wide variety of traditional and new media to communicate research about the complex relationship between intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence to the public at large (Bourgois and Schonberg 2009). As such, a handful of researchers have begun exploring a more historical approach in their projects as a powerful way to illuminate the developing relationship between these forms of violence through time.

The conceptualization of violence by cultural anthropologists has shifted towards understanding how experiences of violence at the everyday and individual/community level interact with broader social structures and trends. Ethnographers are increasing relying on a broader range of data. This includes historical documents and accounts in addition to traditional ethnographic fieldwork. This is most evident in Taussig’s (1986) study positioning historical sources alongside his own ethnographic research. Researchers realize that intersubjective violence is simply the surface manifestation of much deeper tendencies stretching across time and interacting with one another in often unseen ways. As such, archaeologists as scientists of the human past are in a unique position to document, analyze, and interpret the historical aspects of intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence. However, archaeologists have yet to produce a synthetic treatment of violence in the same way as the anthropologists discussed above. The next section, and the following chapter, explores how archaeological evidence can illuminate the development of violence through time.

Archaeological studies of violence were initially framed as the study of past inequality and more specifically as the relationship between domination and resistance (McGuire and Paynter’s 1991). Early studies interpreted the use of artifacts by groups to
signal a developing creolized culture as a form of resistance to wider social domination and ideology (Ferguson 1991). Other studies explored the inscription of elite ideology on the landscape through an investigation of the shift from mercantilism to industrial capitalism (Mrozowski 1991; 2006). More recently, archaeologists have begun exploring the interaction of identity (race, class, gender) as a form of oppression and violence (Delle et al 2000). These “lines that divide” are seen as explaining social inequality as exclusion. Such studies articulated a view among historical archaeologists which increasingly accepted their role as researchers of the modern world.

This meant archaeologists now had to grapple specifically with issues arising from the growth and spread of global capitalism. Important studies included analyzing class and the ideological apparatuses underlying it (Mangan 2000; Mrozowski 2000), the manifestation of patriarchal forces as reifying a developing split between men and women in society (Delle 2000), and the development of institutionalized racism. Studies increasingly explored the relationship between industrialization and slavery and the ways in which racial hierarchies were built into the spatial landscape (Epperson 2000). Such studies share an interest in identifying and interpreting elite ideologies and various forms of resistance to it.

Mark Leone was one of the first archaeologists to conceptualize an archaeological study of past ideology (Leone et al 1987; Wilkie and Bartoy 2000). Leone has recently produced book-length reviews of his ongoing archaeological work of elite ideology in Annapolis, Maryland (2005). Leone draws heavily on critical theorists like Althusser and Habermas. The central goal for Leone while working in Annapolis is to understand how substantial differences in wealth and accumulation over the past 200+ years were
sustained without violent protest. For the author, this involves identifying the growth of ideology as a mask that naturalized society and socialized nature. Specifically, the different levels of wealth between rich and poor and across ethnicities were explained by increasingly restrictive social philosophy that drew on dominant narratives. These narratives proclaimed those who worked hard were rewarded with the greatest returns. These political economies allowed wealth to remain ever more concentrated in the hands of a few.

Archaeological studies of the African diaspora during the last two decades have increasingly focused on these types of concerns. Singleton’s (1999) edited volume brought together a wide range of scholars on a number of topics related to the archaeology of the African Diaspora. This included calls for archaeologists of the African diaspora to root their research in appropriate areas of (Posnansky 1999; DeCorse 2001). These critiques joined earlier ones concerning the idea that archaeology was largely supporting and reifying dominant white/elite, racist assumptions about the past (Ferguson 1992). Prior to the 1990s, this trend manifested as a concentration on the sites and lives of Anglo-Americans (Blakey 1997; Franklin 1997).

The most explicit framing of an archaeology of symbolic violence is found in the work of Charles Orser (2004; 2006; 2007). His analysis of Irish and Chinese migrants (Orser 2007) views racism as a form of violence against non-elites, echoing sociologists like Bonilla-Silva (2006). He acknowledges a correlation between race and class is due to structural violence inherent in social systems. He draws extensively on Bourdieu’s work on practice as it relates to an archaeological study of past social inequality. His review of Bourdieu begins with a discussion of the three aspects of habitus. First,
individual and collective action is conditioned – not determined – by the past. Habitus is durable and mutable. Second, habitus does not govern all human action, such as highly ritualized practices drawing on ancient ideologies where the individual's agency is restricted. Third, the agency of individuals interacts with the structures of society reciprocally. Orser briefly includes Bourdieu’s famous phrase that “structured structures [are] predisposed to function as structuring structures” (Bourdieu 1990:53), a phrase underlining the idea that agents (re)produce social structures through their habitus – those enculturated opinions and actions produced from growing up within a specific cultural setting. While Bourdieu’s ideas about the interaction of habitus and structures are similar to Gidden’s idea of structuration (1979), there is an important difference. Whereas Giddens believes that agents interact with social structures through conscious action, Bourdieu’s ideas of habitus state that such interactions can be conscious, but more typically are not.

Orser’s work looks at the effects of racism on various populations as revealed through their consumptive choices, which are seen as revealing their habitus, accumulation of various capitals, and location in the network of fields constituting an increasingly racist American society. Orser’s archaeology of race and racialization is an archaeology of habitus. As such, Orser’s work is less an archaeology of violence and more an archaeology detailing the ways in which minorities cope with the everyday violence of American society. This remains an important project and intersects anthropological studies of coping described above (Das 2007).

Archaeologists continue to expand their approaches to the development and effects of inequality in the past. Historical archaeologies of capitalism (Leone and Potter
situate American-made everyday objects within larger social practices. Identifying the ideological roles of cultural material highlights the translation of hegemony into the quotidiant practice of individuals and communities. Archaeologies of race are increasingly exploring how elites fight minority advancement. Christopher Fennell (2010) revealed how elites wielded structural and institutional violence against a mixed-race community in the nineteenth century. Local politicians and business leaders conspired to divert a railroad from intersecting New Philadelphia, leading to the eventual economic collapse of this important town. Archaeologies of the contemporary past (Buchli and Lucas 2001; Harrison and Schofield 2010) are calling for the application of archaeological methods and approaches to the present and recent past. This work represents a “dynamic new field which engages critically with what it means to be ‘us’, with the politics of late-modernity, and with the nature, shape and relevance of archaeology as a contemporary research practice” (Harrison and Schofield 2009:186).

Gonzalez-Ruibal (2008) has called for this type of work in regards to the sites destroyed/erased by supermodernity, and opens his article with a brief discussion of Marc Auge’s application of the term in regards to the late twentieth century’s revolution of speed, new modes of communication, and new spatial relations of non-places where no one dwells but many of us pass through. This trend presents a call for archaeologists to engage modern conditions and concerns in direct ways.

**Assembling an Intersectional History of Racial Violence in America**

My thoughts on the development of racial violence in American history take inspiration from the growth of intersectionality analysis. Intersectionality is a critical-theory inspired approach to analyzing social inequality as the interaction of various identity constructs, and has found its greatest proponents among critical race theorists.
and feminists. While the term came into usage through the work of Crenshaw (1989, 1991), its roots run much deeper. The seeds of intersectionality were present in the writings of some nineteenth and early twentieth century black leaders. Sojourner Truth’s essay *Ain’t I A Woman* viewed the treatment of black women as unique in American society. W.E.B. Du Bois’ work increasingly took an intersectional tone as his analysis turned towards understanding how race and class worked against black advancement throughout the twentieth century. Modern researchers trace intersectionality to a statement by the Combahee River Collective in the 1970s. Their concept of “simultaneity” was grounded in member experiences of occupying multiple identities commonly experiencing a mix of social stigmas. This group called on researchers and activists to realize how a mix of race, class, gender, and sexuality combined to create unique forms of oppression, and particularly the ways in which mainstream (read white, middle-class) feminism and black (read male) activism had silenced both the experiences and voices of black women. The collective’s statement also demonstrated that such divisions could be compounded when issues of sexuality were considered, such as the reluctance by African Americans to recognize the existence of gays and lesbians in their communities.

While Crenshaw’s work in critical race theory (CRT) focused on the ways in which various axes of oppression worked against women in social welfare programs, intersectionality as a term, theory, and method is best known from the work of Patricia Hill Collins. Collins (2000:276) work on black feminist thought specifically highlights the matrix of domination experienced by minority women. Her work has been instrumental in understanding how structures of inequality draw on socially constructed dichotomies.
(e.g., white/black, male/female) to reify differences between people. These dichotomies are not equal and each one carries a sense of the superior/inferior duality. An intersectional analysis points out, for example, how black women are doubly represented as inferior, as both female and black. Several feminists (Lourde 1984; Collins 1993, 2003; hooks 2000) point out how these dichotomous differences become entrenched in the minds of African American women, justifying the program of decolonizing our minds.

Collins (2003) work on standpoint theory reveals a constellation of closely related concerns. The standpoint referred to by this approach is an individual’s unique world perspective and position(ality). Standpoint theory refers to the above ideas of intersecting axes of identity as uniquely constructed in specific times and places. As such, knowledge and experience varies depending upon the social conditions under which it is produced. Representation is particularly important to Collins’ theorizations of both standpoint theory and intersectionality. It is through representation, and particularly the objectification, of minority individuals that oppression is reified in societies. Anthropologists (Harrison 2008) have drawn heavily on Collins in their own search for ways to resist domination by majorities. Ultimately, self-evaluation and self-definition are viewed by these theorists as an important methodology for combating oppression. These concerns echo recent calls by African American researchers of race riots and lynchings to reclaim histories of these events as a form of minority activism. This includes Young’s (2005) call to re-examine lynchings as a way to recapture an aspect of black history, and Williams’ (2005) discussion of lynching photographs as a part of the broader, painful aspects of African American history.
Intersectionality analyses of modern individuals and communities presents a number of challenges. This centers on a researcher’s ability to accurately map and interpret the various ways matrices of domination impact the lives of informants. Most researchers approach this difficulty by focusing on specific aspects of individuals lives and examining the various ways race, class, gender, and so forth impact specific social practices. Crenshaw’s (1988) study of social welfare programs demonstrated how the positionality of both aid seekers and aid workers produced varying experiences in the welfare office. The goal of creating a historic intersectionality analysis of a community presents additional challenges.

Intersectionality is an important method for my own conceptualization of intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence. The goal for an intersectional study of violence begins by mapping the rates, forms, and degrees of violence through time. My objective is to contextualize the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot within larger structures of violence. Therefore, in the following pages I will explore the development of several forms of violence related to the African American experience. Intersubjective forms of violence include lynchings, race riots, and murder. Structural violence is explored through the development of Jim Crow and sundown towns. Symbolic violence was both constructed and reified through early cinema and the eugenics movement. I have chosen these specific forms because a wide range of readers can readily access their histories, and a synthetic treatment of their intersectionality has not been produced relating race riots and lynching to one another.

In my discussion of these various forms of racial violence, I draw upon a concept developed by Deleuze and Guattari, that of assemblage. An assemblage refers to the
arrangement of parts of a system. Assemblages are not random groupings of elements. An assemblage is a collection of interrelating, heterogeneous things. Assemblages are not so much identified by their parts as by their ability to produce effects. They are identified by people as a whole, even though they are actually collections of distinct things. To illustrate their point, Deleuze and Guattari describe a boy looking through his window to see a man whipping a horse which has stumbled under the weight of a wagon. While an assemblage includes the collection of objects, it also focuses on the effects of this collection, the horse

having eyes blocked by blinders, having a bit and a bridle, being proud, having a big peepee-maker, pulling heavy loads, being whipped, falling, making a din with its legs, biting, etc. These affects circulate and are transformed within the assemblage: what a horse “can do.”(Delueze and Guattari 1987: 257)

While an admittedly abstract example, the assemblage described here not only refers to the viewable, physical objects, but also to the boy’s feelings upon witnessing the violence of a man beating an overly burdened horse. The assemblage is a useful concept because it allows us to discuss collections of practices and objects as constituent wholes.

Topics like race riots, cinema, and the eugenics movements conform to this dual meaning of the assemblage. They are both collections of objects and practices as well as emotion-inducing experiences influencing the habitus of individuals. In the following section I concentrate on mapping various forms of racial violence in the early twentieth century. I do this is for three reasons. First, the period immediately following WWI represents a particularly troubled moment in US history regarding race relations. Second, understanding racial violence in its myriad manifestations at this time provides
a historical contextualization for the 1923 Rosewood race riot. Third, this contextualization reveals the deep connections between historical and present forms of intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence. This in turn supports a wide range of political goals including social justice education and the redress movement. Then, I discuss the ways in which aspects of assemblages are selectively chosen by individuals and groups to support racial violence through a process of bricolage.

**Early Twentieth Century America**

Intersubjective forms remain the most identifiable type of racial violence in the past and present. The visible occurrence of race riots, lynchings, and capital punishment allow scholars to document their development through time. Structural forms of violence like the development of Jim Crow in the Deep South and sundown towns across the nation have also received serious attention. These accounts trace various ways elites mobilize social and cultural capital to disadvantage minority groups. Symbolic forms of violence, while not always framed as such, have also been examined by a number of disciplines. Studies of these types of racial violence demonstrate how elites have mobilized the entertainment industry and scientific establishment to harm non-elite groups.

As discussed in the previous chapter, lynchings reached their peak in the 1890s. Spikes in lynching rates during the early twentieth century have been interpreted for nearly a century as the results of local, regional, and national economic crises (Ames 1942; Tolnay and Beck 1995). Others noted that although lynchings generally decreased during this time, the subsequent rise in brutality corresponded to the increasingly symbolic nature of lynching in the early twentieth century. Scholars began connecting the relationship between lynching rates and capital punishment. Several
researchers have noted the correlation between decreasing rates of lynchings and the unequal imprisonment and execution of minorities. Researchers continue to explore the unequal rates of imprisonment of African Americans (Alexander 2010) as well as the exclusion of blacks from blue-collar jobs in America (Royster 2003) as one legacy of slavery and Jim Crow.

The rise in race riots during the early twentieth century has been attributed to a variety of causes, some of them related to lynchings. These include the migration of blacks fleeing Jim Crow, race prejudice, labor competition, and ending black political participation. Dahlke (1952) proposed a correlation and saw the possibility of race riots as a form of racial violence replacing lynchings. Tolnay and Beck (1995), when read in relation to race riot studies, implicitly suggest a connection by crediting migration as one reason lynchings declined. Boskin (1976) referred to race riots as mass lynchings and other authors have commented at length about the long-term psychological effects race riots had on black communities.

Structural forms of racial violence during the early twentieth century constrained the participation of blacks in the legal, political, and social spheres. The constellation of tactics restricting the rights of African Americans is typically referred to as Jim Crow (Woodward 1955). This term is derived from a minstrel performer in the early 1800s, and was first used to denote racial segregation by a railroad company in the 1840s to identify rail cars restricted for black use. Jim Crow is the name given the white supremacist structure of society in the Deep South between the end of Reconstruction (1877) and the modern Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Jim Crow as a caste system had its roots in pre-1877 laws, called Black Codes. These laws were
designed to counteract the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the US Constitution; which were designed to guarantee African Americans equal rights as whites. However, Jim Crow relegated African Americans to the status of second class citizens and racial segregation of African Americans was sanctioned following the 1896 Supreme Court decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. This remained unchallenged until the Supreme Court decisions concerning educational segregation in *Brown v. Board of Education* and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Baker 1998).

In addition to segregating African Americans from public services, whites across the country, but particularly in the Deep South, increasingly excluded African Americans from political participation. The various methods employed to prevent black voting included grandfather clauses restricting the right to vote to those whose relatives possessed the same rights prior to the Civil War. Poll taxes, white primaries, and literacy tests were also common methods used to turn blacks away from polls. As African Americans organized grassroots efforts to combat these practices, whites increasingly resorted to intersubjective violence like lynchings and race riots to maintain their political dominance over blacks (Ortiz 2005). Ortiz' work is particularly important for understanding the full effects of Jim Crow on African Americans and highlights the agency of black communities, moving beyond previous representations of these groups as passive victims subject to the whims and desires of a white majority.

As Jim Crow gathered strength, a specific form of structural violence took shape. Sundown towns began to appear in the late 1800s and early 1900s, reaching their peak in some areas as late as 1970 (Loewen 2005). Sundown towns were named for the signs often posted at their city limits warning minorities to be out of town by sundown.
These communities formed as all-white enclaves, or were created when whites violently expelled minority residents. The practice began in the western states of California, Oregon, and Washington where Asian Americans were violently ejected from towns. It then spread to the Midwestern states and to a lesser extent the Deep South. White privilege allowed real estate agents, bank officers, policemen, and city governments to keep towns all-white through a variety of everyday practices. These included not renting or selling property to racialized groups, jailing minorities for exaggerated charges, and passing and enforcing unconstitutional ordinances.

Symbolic violence during this time centered on representing blacks as culturally and biologically inferior to whites. The influence of the media upon specific lynchings and race riots has been explored at considerable length by other studies. They focus on specific instances where local newspapers spread rumors, advertised racial violence, and published biased accounts supporting white versions of these events. The representation of southern culture and blacks was part of a much larger trajectory beginning in the nineteenth century and earlier. Newspaper advertisements, stories, and cartoons increasingly drew on stereotypes of various minorities throughout the nineteenth century, and accompanied similar movements in popular novels (Mizruchi 2008). Again and again minorities became the perpetrators of heinous crimes visited upon innocent, good-hearted whites. The most powerful form of representation to emerge in the early twentieth century was undoubtedly cinema.

D. W. Griffith’s 1915 film *Birth of a Nation* was the culmination of several trends in early American cinema. First, it was a technological wonder for its time and ran longer and cost more than any other film made before it. Second, it drew upon a developing
narrative representing a peaceful, utopic South alongside increasingly racist depictions of African Americans. Indeed, throughout the first three decades of the twentieth century blacks were increasingly represented in ways which made them defenders of a traditional southern way of life. This included numerous films portraying African Americans as happy, content, and peaceful prior to the Civil War. Edwin Porter’s 1903 version of Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* repeatedly showed enthusiastic blacks (Campbell 1981:37). Other films continued to portray blacks in ways which defended the antebellum way of life, often showing them as loyal to their pre-Civil War masters and even fighting to remain on plantations following Emancipation (Campbell 1981:43). In addition to constructing representations of blacks by tying them to a mythical benevolence of plantation society, early cinema also informed whites of their own (socially constructed) mythic past as the saviors of civilization. Early cinema played the dual role of inscribing a tropic misrepresentation of blacks as inferior and whites as heroic and masters of society (Bernardi 1996). The success of *Birth of a Nation* (1915) provided early US cinema the incentive to explore and represent minorities as increasingly essentialized stereotypes. White supremacy flourished after D. W. Griffith’s film; uniting and igniting the worst of white fears and portraying African Americans as hypersexual, deceitful, and inherently inferior. While the Ku Klux Klan had been outlawed as a terrorist organization by the US congress in 1871, the film’s heroic depiction of the Klan is widely credited with bringing the group back. The group reformed in 1915 in Georgia and the success of the film and a new system of recruiting promoted rapid membership growth following WWI. The encoding of Eurocentric values within early cinema created a powerful new form of symbolic violence casting minorities
as simple children in need of protection protection or as dangerous hoards polluting a pure and superior white race (Bernardi 1996).

Cinema fueled popular opinions among white Americans, and set the stage for a return to the psuedospeciation of African Americans. This process marked them and other minority groups as less than fully human, as genetically inferior and altogether a separate species (Erikson 1985). This sentiment gained additional support from the biological sciences scientific in the form of the eugenics movement. The Eugenics Movement began in the mid-nineteenth century when Charles Darwin’s cousin Francis Galton published *Hereditary Genius* in 1869. This book stated that intelligence, success, and propriety were the results of good genetics. He urged the British government to encourage children of well-to-do families to marry one another. While Galton paid little attention to the ‘unfit’, subsequent eugenicists increasingly insisted that poor, non-white, and/or mentally handicapped individuals should be segregated from society (Larson 1995:19-21). The famous Kallikak and Jukes studies (Estabrook 1915) provided the impetus for the development of a eugenics movement in the US. Goddard studied more than 2000 family members descended from the illicit sexual encounter between a successful businessman and poor prostitute. He characterized more than half as “feeble-minded”, meaning that they were ‘unproductive’ members of society; poor, uneducated, mentally handicapped, and so forth. Many of the factors explaining the appearance of these traits are today recognized as resulting, at least in part, from structural violence.

Goddard and researchers at the Eugenics Record Office (ERO) began developing programs to protect society. The ERO’s suggestions for fighting unfitness
included the passage of marriage laws, sexual segregation, involuntary sterilization, and limits on immigration. Indeed, the ERO wielded enough power that by the early 1920s that its officers aided the US government in writing the Immigration Act of 1924 (Hannaford 1996:331-337). Numerous abuses were committed in the name of improving the human species, including the forced sterilization of thousands of individuals against their will. While the majority of eugenicists advocated for segregating or sterilizing the genetically unfit, more radical members of the ERO supported genocide and euthanasia.

The eugenics movement in the Deep South developed along slightly different lines than in the Northeast, Midwest, and Western US. While a preoccupation with immigrants and racial minorities motivated eugenicists in these other areas to divide their efforts on segregating the feeble-minded from society and minority races from whites; southern eugenicists concentrated almost solely on feeble minded whites. While eugenicists affiliated with the ERO discussed at length the inferiority of African Americans (Baker 1998:87-94), eugenicists in the Deep South rarely considered the role of African Americans because they believed that no improvement was possible among an already irredeemably degenerate African American ‘race’ (Larson 1995). The symbolic violence resulting from this view should not be underestimated as it produced numerous scientific studies documenting the inferiority of African Americans, further justifying a false ideology of racial superiority among whites in America.

The view of southern eugenicists was popularized through a variety of means, including newspapers and radio. For instance, a 1914 newspaper article from the Evening Standard in St. Petersburg, Florida circulated a half-page story from the Florida
State Board of Health describing the potential benefits of instituting eugenics-based reform into Florida. As elsewhere in the Deep South (Larson 1995), eugenics in Florida was framed as a service to the tax payer. The basic premise suggested the state could prevent feeble-minded individuals from breeding and save the money it might spend caring (e.g., jails, asylums) for feeble-minded offspring in the future.

**Assemblages of Racial Violence in American History**

Framing intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence as assemblages presents a new reading of racial violence in American history. As lynchings decreased, the numbers of race riots increased. Lynchings, while becoming less numerous, were increasingly symbolic and gruesome. Capital punishment supplanted lynchings and satiated the murderous urge of a racist society. When I say racist society, I do not mean that all members of society are overtly racist. Numerous examples exist through time demonstrating otherwise (Figure 3-1).

My use of the term “racist society” is meant to highlight the changing nature of racism through time. The racist society of the early twentieth century amounts to any practice that “creates or reproduces structures of domination based on essentialist categories of race” (Omi and Winant 1994:71). However, the racist society of modern America conceptualizes “racism as a sociopolitical concept that refers exclusively to racial ideology that glues a particular racial order” (Bonilla-Silva 2006:173). In other words, the racist society of the early twentieth century combined elements of over racial violence with developing systems of structural and symbolic violence. Today, racism is primarily a product of the later forms. I use the term society because these practices are experience throughout society. Elites benefit from these arrangements. The patriarchal and race-based hierarchies of American society mean that white men are imbued with
the greatest privilege. Of course, there are degrees of privilege and wealthy elites command greater social capital than poor whites. That said, poor whites still benefit psychically from such arrangements because they support the view of racial hierarchy (Delgado and Stefancic 2001:7). This is visible in current conversations about immigration which break down along lines of race and nation. Regardless of one’s own perceptions about race and racism, elites benefit from the arrangements of a racist society. Recognizing one’s own racial privilege is an important step to transforming society (Jensen 2005).

Jim Crow laws and sundown towns highlighted the concentration of elite ideology in the fabric of American society. These forms of disenfranchisement grew quickly between the 1890s and 1920s. Early cinema contributed to a pseudospeciation representing African American as socially, culturally, and genetically inferior. The emerging technology of cinema became a tool of racial violence and realized its full potential as a vehicle of symbolic violence in the years prior to and following WWI. Views of blacks as inferior were given scientific credit through the eugenics movement, whose heyday in the Deep South was between 1915 and 1930 (Larson 1995).

A nationwide societal shift occurred between 1915 and 1925. Intersubjective violence was supplanted by structural and symbolic forms. American elites and their allies – consisting mostly of Anglo-American men of all classes – successfully transformed American society. An emergent ideology of racial superiority, drawing strength from assemblages supporting structural and symbolic violence, replaced the previous one focusing on intersubjective violence. While the residual ideology still
manifested itself, the dominant ideology now drew power from structural and symbolic violence. Plateaus of violence and racial hierarchy in American society had shifted.

Such a transformation intensely disrupted society. While previous studies have loosely suggested a connection between race riots and lynchings, viewing them as the visible manifestations of larger assemblages demonstrates their deep connections. Race riots and lynchings are not separate domains of social action; they’re reversal represents a response to the installation of a new dominant ideology. Whites felt intersubjective violence maintained their racial superiority prior to 1900. At that time, it was the prevailing assemblage of domination available to them. As structural and symbolic forms were reified, African Americans were viewed more as a collective than ever before. Changing attitudes towards miscegenation attest to this, prior to 1900 interracial sex was met with a mix of apathy and interpersonal violence. The reactions depending on factors like social distance, hue of skin, and prevailing attitudes locally towards those involved. The representation of African Americans as a genetically-inferior collective whole meant that interracial sex, political participation, economic success, and educational advancement became an attack on the white race. This helps explains the coeval appearance of spectacle lynchings and the rise of race riots.

I am suggesting that the period between 1915 and 1925 represents a unique moment in US history. New ideologies and assemblages of violence were replacing previous ones. Such a perspective represents a macrohistorical view, and the challenge for the social sciences is to connect these larger processes to specific instances and case studies. A microhistory approach connects this theoretical perspective to individual lives and communities. I will now explain how whites drew on these various
assemblages of intersubjective, structural, and symbolic violence during these times. To do so, I drew on an anthropological concept which has not received the attention it deserves in describing human action in the world. The concept of bricolage and its subsequent view on how individuals and groups selectively draw upon social knowledges and practices presents a crucial re-orientation regarding the process by which whites constructed their views and responses to minorities advancement.

**Writing Living History**

This section describes how the process of bricolage provides a cogent description of the ways in which individuals and groups select various aspects from the available assemblages of violence discussed in the previous section. As such, I begin with a brief discussion concerning the difference between writing history and experiencing history. What is the difference between experiencing the flow of history and the crafting of historical narratives? Michel-Rolph Trouillot (1995:113) observes how the construction of historical narratives transforms “what happened into that which is said to have happened”. Trouillot highlights the importance of writing historical narratives which do not erase the experiences and voices of past peoples. The erasure of “people without history” (Wolf 1984) is itself a form of symbolic violence extinguishing the experiences, perspectives, and very voices of non-elites from the historical record (Fontein 2006). In regards to researching and writing about race riots and lynchings, most scholars craft a chain of events prior to, during, and following the moment of violence. While such a moment may last hours, days, or even weeks the act of constructing a narrative collapses time. The effect produces a historical story which selectively lists precursors as discrete events, a selecting practice which has allowed researchers to continue treating race riots and lynchings as separate domains of human activity.
The representation of lived history as a chain of events, while somewhat unavoidable if one wishes to construct an understandable and accessible narrative, is nonetheless a product of industrial logic. This is particularly true when these narratives produce narrow views of the past. When I say industrial logic, I am speaking specifically of the chaîne opératoire (also referred to as chaîne d’opératoire by some) view of describing industrial technologies (Gosselain 1992; Lemonier 1992; Schlanger 1994). As Pfaffenberger articulates, this concept describes industrial processes, and by extension industrial communities, as a learned sequence of technical operations, tightly imbricated with patterned social relations, that must be carefully and empirically described as an initial step in grasping the nature and implications of technological activities. A chaîne opératoire is not dictated by the ‘one best way’ to accomplish a task technology; rather, it represents a choice among what generally turns out to be dozens, hundreds, or even thousands of options, a point not generally appreciated by those unfamiliar with technology. (Pfaffenberger 1998:294)

Historical archaeology of industrial communities has drawn on this concept to describe both technologies and communities (see the volume by Knapp et al 1998). In regards to industrial work, for example, this is an appropriate writing device as the transformation of raw ore into copper does involve certain unavoidable steps such as extraction, smelting, and refining (Hardesty 1988:17-65). The order and specific technologies/approaches utilized for each step is open to interpretation. Constructing a direct cause and effect relationship between these steps allows researchers, engineers, and the public to make sense of complex industrial processes. The chaîne opératoire does not represent the only, or even best, chain of events. It is instead the dominant method arising in a specific time and place. As such, it is socially constructed. Admitting the socially constructed nature of industrial processes and communities produced
through the chaîne opératoire approach still reduces and essentializes complex social relationships. These series of steps described with this approach develop through trial and error over time. The same is true of history. People experience the passage of time in fluid and interconnected ways, not in ways which are easy to diagram. History is messy; crafting historical narratives seeks to order this jumble. Unfortunately, too tight a focus on cause and effect handicaps a broader understanding of history and society.

Perhaps a more appropriate analogy for writing a history which more accurately describes the living experiences of past and present peoples, one which recognizes the complexities of living a life at any given period, is that of bricolage. Peter Schmidt’s (1996, 1997) work with iron smelting represents the primary application of this term and concept within archaeology. Expanding Lévi-Strauss’ (1966) work concerning the assembly of rituals and myths, Schmidt successfully applied this concept to indigenous iron working communities in Tanzania. Whereas Lévi-Strauss focused solely on cultural practices, Schmidt examined the interaction of ritual and technology. Schmidt’s views on bricolage moves beyond the chaîne opératoire approach (Lemonnier 1992) which “does not leave much room for the interplay of ritual bricolage with the order in which the steps occur” (Schmidt 1997:297). His interest focused on the organic nature of human activity. In regards to the writing of historical narrative, the concept of bricolage motivates me to craft historical narratives which expand the frame of reference regarding the true nature and interconnectedness of racial violence in American history. This does not mean that tipping points are not reached; it simply states that a tipping point does not exist in a social vacuum. Tipping points and chief precipitating events are interrelated. A key aspect to a bricolage approach to analyzing human activity
recognizes the complex intersections of society and individuals, and more importantly that past peoples invariably change the \textit{script} of racial violence through time.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Assemblages of violence provided individuals and groups in the past with a wide variety of available justifications and responses to perceived threats by minority groups. American society in the years following WWI experimented with a variety of attitudes and methods concerning racial violence. The approach to denying social advancement to minorities increasingly relied upon a complex interaction of structural and symbolic violence to disenfranchise non-whites, although the rise of spectacle lynching and explosion of race riots between 1917 and 1923 demonstrate how intersubjective violence remained a socially-appropriate method at this time as well.

\textit{Bricolage} provides a more robust framework concerning the process by which whites selectively choose from the wide range of justifications and methods for violently disadvantaging minorities. Bricolage by iron workers or storytellers involves selecting elements from an available repertoire of methods and themes to reach an end product similar to previously constructed artifacts or myths. Bricolage acknowledges that while the end product may be similar or even the same, the process, the actual steps, will differ in subtle ways between episodes.

A similar process is at work regarding race riots and lynchings. Elites had at their disposal a wide range of justifications for attacking minority groups. These justifications came from overt race hatred as well as from cultural (e.g., film) and scientific (e.g., eugenics) establishments. The methods for dealing with these supposed threats were equally numerous. Elites could lynch an individual as an example or attack and even destroy an entire community, as happened at Rosewood in 1923. The question
becomes, at least for Rosewood, is it possible to understand why the initial episode of violence, the lynching of Same Carter, did not satisfy the script of racial violence drawn upon by whites in January, 1923?

The next chapter draws on microhistorical approaches (Brooks et al 2008) and documentary archaeology to offer a more complete contextualization of the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot. I explore these methods and provide an answer to the above question. This requires that I situate the town of Rosewood and the riot itself within larger social trends. This contextualization in relation to broader assemblages of violence helps explain some of the peculiarities of the Rosewood riot in terms of its timing and location. For instance, most studies cite economic strains as a preconditioning factor for racial violence, yet the 1923 riot in Rosewood took place during a time of unprecedented economic growth in Florida and the nation as a whole. Not content to simply analyze these relationships as a scholarly project, I go on to explore new media methods for translating this academic research into public knowledge in chapters four and five.
Figure 4-1. Political cartoon against the KKK, from Literary Digest (1923)
CHAPTER 5
DOCUMENTARY ARCHAEOLGY OF ROSEWOOD, FLORIDA

The core of this chapter revolves around a documentary archaeology approach connecting the development of Rosewood, Florida and its environs to regional and national trends. This microhistorical study of Rosewood seeks to examine the influence of larger social trends at the community level. The central goal is to understand how local development interacted with regional and national developments setting the stage for the 1923 race riot. While previous work (Jones et al 1993; D’Orso 1996; Colburn 1997; Dye 1997; Jones 1997) focused on the event and aftermath of the riot, no previous study has produced an in-depth understanding of Rosewood prior to the riot. This chapter begins with a brief introduction to documentary archaeology and my thoughts on its relationship to microhistory and counter-mapping. I then review the specific methodology created for this study; including the mapping of several hundred historic property deeds with GIS. Census records allow the historic properties to illuminate how Rosewood increasingly became a racially segregated town during the 1910s, following general trends of Jim Crow America. The chapter ends with a brief discussion comparing the Rosewood riot to other riots between 1917 and 1923.

Documentary Archaeology, Microhistory, and Counter-Mapping

The term documentary archaeology was introduced to the academic literature in Mary Beaudry’s edited volume Documentary Archaeology in the New World (1988) and represents “an approach to history that brings together diverse source materials related to cultures and societies” in the past (Wilkie 2006:13). The diversity of approaches within documentary archaeology, framed as a distinct subset of historical archaeology in Beaudry’s edited volume, brings together a diverse mix of methods and materials for
investigating a wide range of questions concerning the past. For instance, Anne Yentsch’s (1988) study of memorializing houses brought together oral histories and kinship analysis to understand how females and other minorities were erased from local histories by selectively commemorating prominent males. Other studies demonstrate the importance of combining archaeological and documentary sources to produce a fuller picture of archaeological materials, such as Julia Curtis’ (1988) work combining shipping records and artifacts to better understand the centrality of Chinese porcelain in international shipping. Similarly, Schmidt and Mrozowski’s (1988) use of shipping and (secret) account records illustrates the role of clandestine smuggling as an important form of resistance in early America. Documentary archaeology represents an expanding sub-discipline of archaeology and several studies and volumes have appeared since Beaudry’s initial volume (Little 1991). Such work quickly expanded to include the use of oral history in combination with other archaeological data (Purser 1991), something I do throughout this dissertation. Documentary archaeology has continued to explore ways of using elite and colonial archives to uncover the histories of subaltern peoples by reading dominant reactions to subordinate resistance (Hall 2000).

Documentary archaeology can be seen as a form of historical anthropology. This is certainly the case with several of the cultural anthropologists discussed in chapter four (Taussig 1987). In his recent treatment of historical anthropology, Axel (2002) traces the development of historical anthropology to rising anthropological concerns during the Cold War and in response to the legacy of colonialism. Methodologically, early historical anthropologists freely drew on the traditions of both anthropology and history, treating “the materials of history the way an anthropologist treats his field notes”
(Cohn 1987:2, quoted in Axel 2002:9). These earlier works were much expanded by researchers like Wolf and Mintz who situated concerns of political economy as paramount sites of investigation for historical anthropology. As Axel’s edited volume (2002) demonstrates, the relationship between historical anthropology (and by extension documentary archaeology) and history is full of disciplinary anxiety. This results from the potential confusion arising from studies which blur disciplinary boundaries. Of course, the transgression of these traditional margins only worries academic traditionalists who view the differences between disciplines as immutable. Increasingly, anthropologists, archaeologists, historians, and a generation of scholars are realizing the immense potential and benefit of engaging in transdisciplinary work (Brewis et al 2011). This expansion results from the recognition that scholars in various disciplines are asking similar questions and applying a variety of theories and approaches. The anthropological gaze guides a different positioning in relation to both source and output and has a tradition of drawing upon the voices of the silenced in the present to highlight interactions in the past. This perspective produces commentary about the continuing effects of history as a lived experience (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992)

Documentary archaeology offers important intersections concerning inequality and violence. Indeed, several of the scholars in Beaudry and Little’s volumes also contributed and organized projects discussed at length in chapter four. The use of documentary resources has been a part of historical archaeology from its beginnings. Documentary archaeology also produces studies at various scales of analysis; from fine-scale investigations of individuals and families (Yentsh 1994) through diachronic
projects exploring communities through time (Schmidt 1997; Higman 1998; DeCorse 2001). Drawing on these examples, I approach historical documents as a class of artifacts in their own right, produced through human action in the past. Documentary archaeology’s focus at scales of analysis between the individual and community levels provides another important benefit for researchers, the ability to illuminate larger practices and social trends as they influence communities. This aspect of documentary archaeology echoes concerns found in microhistory.

Microhistorical studies are able to avoid the trap of becoming particularistic, essentialized recitations of specific events and individuals precisely because of researchers’ commitment to engaging broader issues through their case studies (Brooks et al 2008). This approach does not create a duality between micro and macro and instead treats such differences in scale as points along a continuum. Furthermore, microhistory does not preclude a particular way of analyzing various source materials and scholars explore various ways of thinking about microhistory. This includes focusing on the ethnography of a single individual (Maddox 2008) or artifact (Eiss 2008). Some of the most intellectually stimulating uses of a microhistorical approach include work by DeCorse (2008) and Beaudry (2008). DeCorse’s juxtaposition of the documentary record with the archaeological record in Ghana crafts a more complete history of this coastal African town as it became a sociopolitical entity and center of the slave trade. Beaudry’s combination of the archaeological and documentary records for the creation of “archaeological biographies” of everyday individuals is an effort to delineate the consequences of larger social practices as revealed in lives of ordinary citizens.
I am specifically drawn to the work of DeCorse and Beaudry because their projects reflect specific approaches which inform my own study of the development of Rosewood. My decision to explore the growth of Rosewood – in terms of race and class – mirrors Beaudry’s approach grounding theorizations of broader developments in society at smaller, more personal scales. DeCorse’s work in African demonstrates the effectiveness of microhistorical methods to promote transdisciplinary approaches to the past drawing on a wide range of available datasets. Also, the utilization of distinct datasets allows me to answer specific questions asked by descendants and visitors to Rosewood today. Ultimately, a microhistorical and documentary archaeological approach provides important information for constructing a counter-history of Rosewood; drawing on recent trends in community mapping.

**Counter-Mapping Rosewood’s Past**

The primary methodological approach utilized for this study centers on the recreation of historical property boundaries. I discuss this method in greater detail below. Mapping is a powerful practice and literally guides viewers of maps to conceptualize the world in specific ways. As such, my project seeks to seize the means of map production for a political purpose, with the full realization of the Marxist and radical intent of that statement. The creation of maps to subvert dominant and elite views of the world and its history represents a unique and growing form of political participation increasingly utilized by civic groups. This is particularly the case as computer hardware drops in price and the use of mapping software expands. This expansion results from the intersection of more intuitive mapping programs and a rising computer literacy among citizens in today’s world. As a politically-motivated mapping project, my use of mapping
technologies aims to specifically speak against dominant practices, such as the
continuation of racism and the unfair, disenfranchising nature of modern America.

Mapping is one of the strongest and most naturalizing forces available to the
colonial project. The power to name and erase moments, stories, and entire cultures
from the landscape means that hidden histories exist all around us and wait
(re)discovery and (re)naming. Counter-Mapping is defined as the use of cartography by
a group “or ethnic minority to assemble data, generate maps and other graphic
representations, and disseminate these materials for the purpose of better
understanding” a wide variety of topics expressed spatially (Maantay and Ziegler
2006:275). Counter-mapping is related to participatory geographic information systems
(PGIS) in that it presents the ‘radical’ idea that local people and knowledge should be
consulted and included in the representation of local environments via maps.

Counter-Mapping addresses larger problems of Western maps and map-making.
These maps’ “Western Gaze” skims the surface, surveys the land from an ego-centric
viewpoint (God View), and often invokes a dichotomy of subjective (viewer/male) and
objective (viewed/female). This western gaze is a discourse of power and hegemony,
and as such maps are imbued with social relations (Bender 1999). Maps remain a
powerful way of entrenching the hegemony of dominate ideologies. Seizing the art of
map-making for non-elite purposes is increasingly acknowledged as a primary tool for
subverting establishment politics and corporate interests (Thompson 2008; Mogel and
Bhagat 2008).

Social elites, by controlling access to certain technologies, have a unique ability to
mold a society’s ideology. The fact that elite goals and perspectives are accepted by the
rest of society, typically peacefully, is referred to as hegemony. Hegemony is the “process by which the ideology of dominant classes exerts control through social, political, and cultural institutions. Ideological hegemony is a form of non-coercive social control achieved through consensus than through direct and material coercion” (Castle 2007:311). The term itself comes for the writings of Antonio Gramsci and his famous Prison Notebooks. The achievement of non-violent hegemony is not benign, and many critical theorists view the manipulation of individuals and societies through coercive, nearly-invisible means as a particularly heinous form of abuse in the modern world.

Counter-mapping represents an important intersection allowing researchers and concerned citizens to posit alternative readings concerning the nature of society. The use of maps to illuminate the development of inequality – such as the rise of racial segregation in housing – represents a form of counter-hegemony. Counter-hegemony refers to attempts to critique or dismantle hegemonic power. Raymond Williams (1977) presents some of the clearest thinking about the nature of ideology, and specifically its development through time. The social tension in regards to ideology develops between the present (dominant) ideology as it usurps/replaces a previous (residual) one as well as contends with new, marginal (emergent) ideologies. These emergent ideologies can provide the fuel of counter-hegemonic thought attempting to resist and transform the status quo of modern society; or install new dominant ideologies. One of the battlefields’ where emergent ideology can combat elite narratives is in the naming and un-naming of places, objects, events, and experiences within the context of a map.

In regards to Rosewood, questions asked by academics, descendants, and visitors have remained largely unanswered. These tend to be deceptively simple
questions, and nearly all require a dedicated mapping project of Rosewood’s history to answer. Descendants wish to know where their ancestors lived, and seek more specificity than “ten miles east of Cedar Key” as the approximate location of the town. Academics (Jones et al 1993), journalists (Moore 1993), and popular authors (D’Orso 1996) have theorized that an illegal or unethical land grab motivated whites to attack Rosewood, although they have been unable to convincingly answer this question.

Tourists ask about the historical growth and spatial layout of the town. Previous research has relied solely on oral history and brief reviews of property deeds and census records. While this work has resulted in a largely undisputed account of the 1923 race riot, it has not produced an accurate picture of the history of Rosewood. Currently, most researchers provide only a broad time-line of Rosewood informed primarily by the oral histories collected in the early 1990s (Jones et al 1993) and oral traditions within families (Jenkins 2003). While these sources are important in illuminating the continued presence Rosewood has a place has for numerous individuals today, they cannot answer the above questions adequately. The inability of individual and collective memory to accurately map the locations of property boundaries, structures, and the like eighty to ninety years after the 1923 riot is undeniable. Oral histories with individuals present in Rosewood during 1923 only provide a general picture of the community. Earnest Parham, a white man who was 18 years old in 1923, delivered ice to Rosewood and remembered much about the town and the riot itself. When asked about the town, Parham responded, “of course that was 71 years ago. I delivered ice. My father was in the ice business and I delivered ice up there. I knew all of them and had a lot of respect for them. I would imagine about 25
Elmer Johnson had similar recollections, and stated that Rosewood was “just a bunch of houses spread out through the woods and they had a couple of churches, a masonic hall, which was a little run down black building.”

Wilson Hall, an African American resident of Rosewood who was nine years old in 1923 was able to remember certain aspects about his family’s land, and described its location as “our home was here (facing this way) and behind us we had 80 acres kind of on the Northeast side but then we had another 60 acres, but where the house was sitting that really wasn’t our land, we was leasing that.” Hall was unable to remember where this property was exactly located. The Rosewood HP-GIS places the property Wilson Hall references on the northwest side of Rosewood, towards Sumner.

The creation of a historical geographic information system (GIS) to locate property boundaries can answer these questions. Such a project should be seen as complimentary to information from oral histories and traditions. A historical GIS for Rosewood not only answers from descendants, researchers, and visitors, it also addresses other concerns. This includes demonstrating the increasing segregation of the town as one indicator that Rosewood was reacting to broader social trends nationwide (e.g., sundown towns). This information is strengthened by the inclusion of census data in the historical property GIS (HP-GIS). The construction and analysis of the Rosewood HP-GIS occupies the remainder of this chapter.

**Overview of Archaeological GIS**

The remainder of this chapter has three interrelated goals. First, briefly define the term GIS and introduce the reader to its component parts. This will allow the reader to understand the meaning of GIS-specific terms. The use of GIS has become the primary practice within digital archaeology. Digital archaeology is a recent term (Evans and Daly
relating to the use of information technologies (IT) to the practice of archaeology. Second, I will explore the methods used for constructing the Rosewood historical properties GIS (HP-GIS). The primary focus of this section is to highlight the complexity of the Rosewood HP-GIS to explain why such a study has not taken place previously. Third, I situate the development of Rosewood within broader trends explored in chapters two and three. This includes an intersectional approach to history drawing on property deeds and census data.

What exactly is a geographic information system? The name “geographic information system” provides some answers. Geographic relates to attributes and spatial relationships. Information is the useful data that we attach to these positions. The word ‘system’ suggests numerous components, which in the case of GIS can be thought of as users, hardware, software, and data. So, in one sense, a GIS is simply a software package; in another sense, it is a computer database containing information about the earth; and in yet another way a GIS is an integrated system of software and geo-referenced data for planning. One widely agreed upon definition quoted in numerous texts on GIS in archaeology states a GIS “is an information system designed to work with data referenced by spatial or geographic co-ordinates. In other words a GIS is both a database system with specific capabilities for spatially referenced data as well as a set of operations for (analysis) with the data” (Wheatley and Gillings 2002:9). These definitions demonstrate that GIS is not simply a monolithic set of programs, or even one program, it is a concept that requires definition in order to understand it adequately.
Reviewing the components which constitute a GIS helps clarify the term. These include a computer system, data, data management procedures, and the people who use it. The computer system is perhaps the easiest to define, and includes hardware and software. Hardware is the computer itself, typically a desktop running Microsoft Windows. The software typically refers to ESRI’s ArcGIS suite of programs. However, the range of GIS programs continues to grow and includes both paid and free and open source software (FOSS). Paid programs are dominated by ESRI’s ArcGIS software, which is the software used for creating the Rosewood HP-GIS. FOSS GIS programs includes GRASS (Neteler et al 2008) and Quantum GIS.

Data within a GIS exists in thematic layers, which rest upon one another in any order the user defines. These layers can be thought of as transparencies with drawings on them and contain two forms of data. Vector data (Figure 4-2) refers to files containing points, lines, and polygons and raster data (Figure 4-3) refers to contiguous data such as rainfall and aerial images. The next component of a GIS is the data management procedures. In some ways, this is similar to the ideas common to any information management system, such as a database or a spreadsheet. The basic abilities of a GIS are to store, manipulate, and retrieve data. The final component of a GIS is people. In fact, this is arguably the most important component of any GIS. No GIS exists in a vacuum, and all are created in order to be used by someone. Individuals use these systems to plan and implement projects, basing critical decisions on the information contained in the GIS. A consideration of providing access to other users and implementing an efficient protocol for updating a GIS should inform any project that makes use of these systems, otherwise creating them serves little purpose beyond an
Archaeological uses of GIS have grown rapidly in the past two decades. Today, the use of GIS by archaeologists has become a common aspect of archaeological work and is presently viewed as the primary aspect of digital archaeology.

Maps represent perhaps the most fundamental tool of archaeology. These two dimensional representations of the world often divulge complex patterns and relationships, from early distribution maps of flake scatters to international networks of villages and forts (William 1992). The introduction of GIS into the archaeologists’ toolkit allows us to quantify complex, contextual relationships. GIS supports rapid increases in the collection, integration, and analysis of spatial information. Advances in data acquisition techniques (such as the introduction of GPS) and computational power means that work that took weeks just one generation ago can be completed in a matter of hours today. Unsurprisingly, this sudden increase of available archaeological data has created new specializations within the field of archaeology.

The incorporation of GIS into archaeological practice and the subsequent rise of digital archaeology allowed archaeologists to increase their productivity and experiment with new forms of analysis. Aldenderfer (1992) divides these uses into three classes. The first group involves common aspects of archaeology such as making maps. The second use involves forms of analysis rarely attempted before the use of GIS, such as predictive modeling (Hasenstab 1996; Kvaamme 1999). The third use involves doing wholly new forms of analysis, such as viewshed analysis.

This term is derived from the word watershed and refers to all points in an area (i.e. in a terrain model of a real or imagined landscape) viewable from one or more
points, known as viewpoints. Viewshed analysis has become a common analytical tool in landscape archaeology. Viewshed analysis has been used for understanding the meaning behind placing barrows near Stonehenge (Wheatley 1996), and has even been used to measure the effects of sound on decisions of where to place historic mining towns in New Zealand (Gonzalez-Tennent 2009).

The more recent classification system developed by Fisher (1999) is more representative of archaeological GIS in the twenty-first century. His approach stresses the material produced by the GIS as a means of classification. The first use Fisher terms inventory and refers to the mapping of archaeological resources across an area. Fisher’s second use focuses on spatial analysis and corresponds closely with the second and third class outlined by Aldenderfer. The use of spatial analysis has been explored above, but Fisher offers an additional important insight. He refers to the work of Madry and Crumley (1990), which looked at the visible areas from a series of hillforts in the south of France and verified the onsite perception that each fort was located in view of nearby roads. This study, done without any statistical proof, was termed a “contextual study” by Fisher (1999:8). Contextual studies are possibly the most common form of analysis used by archaeologists working with GIS. Fisher’s third use is publication. This refers to the use of GIS for publishing archaeological data. Fisher states that unique ways of presenting data become possible by employing a GIS interface. For instance, a sit plan in GIS format, accessed through a graphic user interface (GUI), can contain links to text, graphics, statistics, and so forth. This allows the author to share large amounts of information with other researchers.

This brief introduction the GIS and its archaeological uses provide a general background for
understanding terms and approaches outlined in the following section. The following pages present a general description of the process used to locate historic property boundaries on the landscape using GIS.

**Case Study: The Rosewood Historical Property GIS (HP-GIS)**

The Rosewood HP-GIS combines a variety of data to answer questions about the development of Rosewood as an African American community through time. This section describes these various datasets, the methods used for constructing the GIS, and specifically addresses questions of land transfer and community development in the years leading up to the 1923 race riot. My intention with this section is to demonstrate how the complexity of combining these datasets partially explains why such a study has not taken place earlier.

**Datasets for the Rosewood HP-GIS**

Like any modern archaeological GIS, the Rosewood HP-GIS utilizes both raster and vector data formats. These data come from many various places and include vector data created by me (see below). This section will briefly outline these various data types as well as their sources. Understanding the sources of data is important because it highlights the validity of data used for future analysis. If a data source is unreliable, honestly engaging with this fact and finding ways to verify its information means that even unprovenienced data can still be useful within an archaeological GIS. I begin by reviewing the vector data and then continue to a discussion of the raster data. Several of the raster datasets were either unprovenienced or did not cover the years in question. I will describe how these datasets were still usable in this and the following section.

The majority of vector datasets came from freely accessible, online data warehouses. For instance, environmental data about wetlands around Rosewood came
from the Florida Geographic Data Library (http://www.fgdl.org) hosted by the GeoPlan Center at the University of Florida. Likewise, other datasets such as roads and Public Land Survey System (PLSS) grid were downloaded from this freely available online warehouse. Also, the modern property boundaries, complete with owner information, was provided by the Levy County Property Appraiser’s office in late 2008. This dataset allowed me to determine the modern property owners of historic features, and important aspect of verifying the HP-GIS as discussed below. I created the majority of vector data found in the HP-GIS. These vector datasets describe historic property boundaries, the SAL railroad, and the 2010 archaeological work.

Raster datasets used in the GIS were all image files. The first is represented by an unprovenienced map of properties found in the Levy County courthouse (Figure 4-4). This map apparently shows the locations of black-owned property as well as numerous buildings (e.g., houses, churches, train depot) as they stood just prior to the 1923 race riot. While this map represents an intriguing piece of evidence, the lack of provenience information means that it could not serve as the sole piece of evidence describing the spatial layout of Rosewood. Although, as discussed below, the combination of this map with historic property boundaries revealed the map’s authenticity in regards to accurately describing the spatial layout of Rosewood prior to the riot. The second set of raster data used for the GIS was a series of aerial photographs taken in 1944. These photographs proved very useful even though they were taken twenty-one years after the riot. The fact that Rosewood was effectively abandoned in 1923 and little to no building activity took place following the riot means that clearings in the pine forest for homes and other structures in the town were clearly visible two decades later. Ultimately, the
raster datasets were used as a supporting form of information to verify and augment the vector data I created with the historic property deeds.

**Data Methods for the Rosewood HP-GIS**

The primary dataset created for the Rosewood HP-GIS represents historic property boundaries and their transfer over time. The methodology involves the following five steps: identify the appropriate historic property records, translate the boundary information into a GIS file, identify the owner in the census, add census data to the GIS, and contextually analyze the complimentary data. In the case of Rosewood, these steps are repeated hundreds of times for a period beginning in the 1880s and continuing to 1930. In this way, a diachronic dataset exists mapping the development and destruction of Rosewood’s community.

A fairly simple and straightforward example illustrates the complexity of mapping historic property deeds. In 1878 C. B. Dibble, one of the earliest white land owners in Rosewood, sold four acres to George Touliman (another white man). The property deed provides the following description of the land:

> commencing at a base stone described in a deed from the grantor to C. M. Jacobs sixty feet from the center of the Rail Road track and running northeasterly four hundred and twenty feet and parallel with the Road then at a right angle and running northwesterly fifteen hundred and twenty feet to the North East Corner of the lot hereby conveyed to the party of the second part then running southwesterly by and parallel with the Railroad four hundred twenty feet thence northwesterly and at a right angle four hundred twenty feet then northeasterly and at a right angle four hundred twenty feet thence southeasterly four hundred twenty feet to the said North East Corner of the lot and containing four acres more or less.

Figure 4-5 illustrates the location of this piece of property as well as the process of mapping the boundaries. While the property is a simple rectangle, locating its exact position and orientation in space is a difficult task. First, this required adding the Public
Land and Survey System (PLSS) grid to the GIS. The PLSS is used to divide lands into smaller and smaller units, providing the Section, Township, and Range property descriptions common to most states. The PLSS begins by dividing land into six-mile-square townships, which are further divided into thirty-six one-mile-square sections. These sections can be further divided into quarter-sections, quarter-quarter-sections, or irregular lots. The corners of townships and sections were typically marked by semi-permanent markers such as posts or large natural features like the stone described in the above property description. Fortunately, accurate PLSS shapefiles are provided by that State of Florida Geographic Data Library. Once the PLSS data was added to the Rosewood HP-GIS, the above property descriptions could be mapped by reconstructing the metes and bounds description as outlined in the historic deed.

Re-creating the boundaries of the above property presents a fairly straightforward process. The above property is a simple square of 420 feet on each side. Other lands in Rosewood were commonly divided into irregular lots, complicating the process of re-creating the boundaries described in individual deeds’ metes and bounds descriptions. A particularly difficult boundary to reconstruct was that sold by W. A. Sauls to Will Ingram (both white) in 1919. The deed does not provide any metes and bounds information, instead referencing an entire quarter section and stating that the deed includes all lands except those previously owned by Gordon, Masonic Lodge, King, Gordon, King, McCoy, Edwards, Morris, Ingram, AME Church, Williams, and Hall. The deed goes on to list the individual deeds for each of these names. This one example highlights the jigsaw nature of reconstructing properties in rural areas where maps (e.g., Sanborn fire insurance maps) and town directories (e.g., Polk directories)
do not exist. The referential nature of property deeds often required several hours to make sense of just a handful of deeds because of the back-and-forth between multiple documents required to extract meaningful information from several documents. In the past, the inability of archaeologists to reconstruct exactly this type of information has handicapped important work on the development of minority communities (Geismar 1982:7-8). At the time of this writing, the total number of historical properties re-mapped in the Rosewood HP-GIS stands at exactly 378. Overall, the reconstruction of properties within the GIS supported the unprovenienced map of found in the Levy County Courthouse (Figure 4-4). I also conducted two weeks of fieldwork at the site of Rosewood’s black Masonic as a way to groundtruth the GIS.

Verifying the Rosewood HP-GIS

I decided to complete a brief archaeological investigation at the former site of the Masonic Lodge in Rosewood in spring, 2010. My goal was to discern if the location of the Masonic Lodge as predicted by the GIS was accurate (Figure 4-6). The inclusion of the modern property owners’ vector data from the Levy County Property Appraiser allowed me to identify the current owner for the predicted location of the Masonic Lodge. The lodge’s location was recorded in Deed Book A pages 450 and 451 in the Levy County Courthouse, which referred to the building as Magnolia Lodge, Number 148. Notably, there were numerous magnolia trees on or near the property, a rarity elsewhere in Rosewood.

Numerous descendants either remember the lodge or remember family members telling them about the lodge’s existence in Rosewood. For instance, Gretchen Douglas describes the use of the lodge as related by her mother, saying that the children “went to school at the Masonic Lodge and her mother was her first teacher.” The lodge would
have served many public functions, and most likely as a community center in addition to fulfilling its masonic function.

I met with the property owners in March 2010 and they granted me full access to conduct archaeological work on their property. I visited their property twice in April. During the first visit of two days, I conducted a series of shovel tests. These were placed in the only denuded area of the aerial which corresponded with the historic lodge’s property boundary. These tests revealed domestic artifacts such as medicine bottles and whiteware ceramics. These everyday items dated to the period and suggested a community structure because of the lack of matching pottery and presence of medicinal artifacts.

The positive findings of the shovel tests motivated me to conduct test excavations over a two week period at the end of April, 2010. Four volunteers from the University of Florida joined me for these excavations. These volunteers were fellow graduate students Diana Gonzalez-Tennant, Lizzie Hare, and Noah Sims. Also, Mike Deidrick, a past undergraduate student of mine who’d volunteered with me and other researchers on a variety of projects joined us in the Rosewood. During the final two weeks of April, we opened two test units and several more shovel tests. We also conducted additional GPS mapping of surface features (e.g., SAL railroad track) to aid in better referencing the aerial images.

The excavation units and shovel tests revealed much about the predicted location of the Masonic Lodge. Artifacts were concentrated between 18 and 24 centimeters below the surface, and the aforementioned medicine bottle dated to the late 1800s and early twentieth century as revealed by mold seams. Various pieces of
whiteware ceramics, both transfer printed and banded, date to the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Also, dozens of building nails and hundreds of window glass fragments supported the prediction of a structure at the location. The discovery of burnt brick and masonry fragments further supported the location of a historic, north Florida structure on the site.

This brief archaeological testing certainly supports the HP-GIS’ prediction of a historic structure on the property. Several of the recovered artifacts attest to the destruction of the lodge and the town. The aforementioned burnt masonry used to support the structure was found in both excavation units as well as several shovel tests. Also, a medicine bottle and several pieces of glass have been deformed due to intense heat (Figure 4-5). A fired bullet was also recovered from one of the excavation units at a depth of approximately 20cm. These emotionally powerful artifacts are currently housed at the Levy County Courthouse in a display that I designed with Marvin Dunn of Florida International University. I consider the archaeological testing a success. It supported the HP-GIS’ prediction of the Masonic Lodge’s location, which in turn helped to narrow my placement of shovel tests and excavation units. This traditional archaeological work discovered emotive artifacts which serve the basic goals of public archaeology; namely, the sharing of results from archaeological work with the wider public. The Rosewood HP-GIS can do much more for research into Rosewood’s past than simply locate vanished structures on the landscape.

**Answering Questions with the Rosewood HP-GIS**

I had two main goals while re-creating historic property boundaries for Rosewood. The first revolved around using the resulting spatial layout of the town as a template for virtually reconstructing the town as it existed prior to the riot. This goal is explored in the
next chapter. The second goal grew over time as I become more involved in the
literature of race riot and lynching studies. This eventually grew into a substantial
interest explaining my interests in the intersectionality of racial violence. I explored this
concern in the previous two chapters. My interest in understanding the intersection of
various forms of racial violence required a new historical methodology to illuminate
interactions between various forces in the past. I found that the same process used to
create a spatial template of Rosewood’s development through time, namely the
Rosewood HP-GIS, provided important information for understanding how larger social
forces were experienced in Rosewood.

The core of the Rosewood HP-GIS is a time-series dataset showing the transfer of
property beginning in the late 1800s and continuing until 1930. As the historical property
GIS is populated with information from property deeds and the related census records,
patterns and relationships emerge on the landscape, answering long-standing
questions. For instance, our knowledge is poor concerning the transfer of property from
African American landowners to others following the 1923 riot. Researchers have
posited several possible scenarios, including the theory that the riot itself was partially
motivated by local Whites seeking to snatch land. This process was known to have
occurred in certain parts of America and involved whites running minority populations
(most often African Americans) out of an area and then 'legally' purchasing abandoned
land in the following years when original residents failed to return or pay their property
taxes. There were hundreds of examples of this practice in the eighteenth and twentieth
centuries, called White Capping, for the white caps often worn by whites as they ran
blacks off their land (Winbush 2001). This remains one explanation put forward by other
researchers explaining the 1923 race riot, but few have done the historical research to fully answer this question.

Figure 4-6 shows the boundaries for a property owned by John and Mary McCoy, and African American couple who moved to Rosewood shortly after 1900. McCoy’s 115 acres of property was sold for $300 on May 5th, 1923; a rate of $2.90/acre. The Florida economy of the early 1920s was firmly gripped in a growing tide of land speculation, and property values were rising rapidly across the state. Another deed dated April 19th, 1924, records how the 1923 purchasers of this property divided it and sold forty acres for $400, a rate of $10.00/acre. Property records only provide so much information. After all, the McCoy’s could have been white. To understand if this property sale might have had a racial dimension, we require complimentary information from the 1920 US census. Census records list the entire McCoy household - documenting each member’s relationship to the head of household, sex, age, and race. There were eight members of the McCoy household three years prior to the sale:

Table 5-1: Members of the McCoy household. Source: 1920 US Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship to Head</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John McCoy</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 60</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McCoy</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>age 50</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jr. McCoy</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 26</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert McCoy</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 14</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert McCoy</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 18</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marley McCoy</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 34</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel McCoy</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 7</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith McCoy</td>
<td>Nephew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>age 4</td>
<td>Negro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of property records and census data reveals larger patterns of land ownership prior to 1923. These patterns become more meaningful when related to larger trends at the regional and national scale of analysis. The interaction of local,
regional, and national economies sheds light on other factors influencing the racial violence of 1923. At the same time the area around Rosewood experienced an economic downturn in the 1890s, the nation experienced an economic depression following a national scare in 1893. As the local economy around Rosewood slowly rebuilt itself after 1900, the national economy slowly rebuilt as well. Following a fairly prosperous period for ten years beginning in 1897 and another national scare in 1907, President Woodrow Wilson oversaw the creation of the Federal Reserve System. The new economic structures helped bolster the US economy until World War I, when postwar inflation would once again disrupt the national economy (Freidman and Schwartz 1963). The post-war US economy experienced widespread inflation during 1918 and 1919, followed by a sharp depression between 1920 and 1921 which is often credited with playing a central role in the rash of racially charged collective violence which swept the US from 1918-1921. While the true extent of this depression is debatable, the fear it generated clearly influenced the nation (Romer 1988). By 1922, the entire US economy sprang back to life during the “Roaring Twenties”. In Florida, this was accompanied by a runaway real estate boom (Stronge 2008:100).

The economic bounce back of the early 1920s affected the area around Rosewood. The State of Florida began purchasing right-of-way tracts to clear and pave Highway 24, which still runs through the former town. Timber companies from as far away as New Jersey began purchasing tracts of land in Rosewood. A handful of white residents responded to the increased economic interest in the area around Rosewood and began purchasing large tracts of property as well. Many of these new purchases were subdivided and single lots of one or two acres were put up for sale. Following the
1923 race riots, these same individuals began purchasing land formerly owned by their black neighbors, such as the previously mentioned purchase and subsequent sale of the McCoy farmstead.

Structural and symbolic violence in and around Rosewood mirrored larger developments elsewhere in the country. Whites increasingly resorting to intersubjective violence across Florida during the early twentieth century to halt black political participation (Ortiz 2005). Symbolic violence was growing as the KKK developed stronger roots across the state at this time, with large chapters forming in nearby towns like Gainesville (Newton 2001). The southern eugenics movement was increasingly active across the state (Larson 1995:68-69). In Rosewood, patterns of home ownership were reversing regional and national trends in potentially alarming ways, at least in the eyes of local whites. While we don’t see much segregation in regards to employment (Figure 4-7) in and around Rosewood, we do notice a unique development of black home ownership, which was uncommon for the Deep South (Schweninger 1997). Figure 4-8 shows patterns of home ownership as reported in the 1900 and 1910 US censuses.

In 1900 forty percent of African Americans in the area around Rosewood owned their own homes. This was well above rates of black home ownership in Florida (31%) and the southern states (21%). At the same time, twenty-eight percent of whites owned their own homes in the area around Rosewood. These levels were lower than elsewhere in Florida (60%) and the southern states (52%). Lower levels of white home ownership in and around Rosewood resulted from the recent opening of sawmill and turpentine factories, which housed workers in company housing. By 1910 home
ownership for African Americans had jumped to forty-four percent, well above the rate of black home ownership in Florida generally (30%) and nearly double that of the southern states (23%). White home ownership in 1910 had also grown with thirty-five percent of whites owning their own homes in the area around Rosewood. This was significantly below the rates for ownership in both Florida (55%) and the southern states (50%). The picture which emerges is an area where higher percentages of African Americans owned their own homes than did whites in the same location.

While we do not have exact data for home ownership for 1920 due to the census taker’s decision not to record this information that year, the Rosewood HP-GIS continues to document the general trend of increasing home ownership among African Americans locally. Nearly a dozen African American families purchased properties in Rosewood between 1910 and 1920. At the same time, home ownership in nearby Sumner was consolidated in the hands of a few white families. These property purchases reference the location and existence of worker housing for the Cummer & Sons Sawmill; which began operating around 1915. Black prosperity in Rosewood was certainly developing at rate well above that elsewhere in Florida and the Deep South.

While home ownership in Rosewood bucked regional and national trends and went against the increased representation of African Americans as racially inferior to whites, the psychological effect of this development is perhaps best illustrated by the spatial patterning of these new black-owned properties. Figure 4-9 illustrates this development by relating the location of black and white-owned properties in Rosewood prior to the 1923 riot. The result is a town sharply divided by race. Unlike other towns where segregation positioned African Americans in obviously vulnerable positions,
Rosewood’s spatial segregation resulted in a small pocket of historically-owned white properties increasingly surrounded by black-owned properties. The resulting spatial organization would have appeared very dangerous to the minds of white southerners, particularly in a society constantly warning of penchant for crime and violence among the nation’s black population. African Americans were increasingly represented as sexually deviant and physically dangerous by politicians, science, and Hollywood. In Rosewood, blacks were literally surrounding a historically-established white downtown area of Rosewood. While we can no longer ask the white or black residents of the area how these developments made them feel, the creation of this racialized landscape is unique. As such, it produced a distinctive reaction. The 1923 Rosewood race riot eludes common reasons often cited by researchers to explain the appearance of racial violence. The area around Rosewood was experiencing rapid economic growth. While a precipitating event did occur – Fannie Taylor’s false claim – the white reaction was more severe than usual. Transgressions against the color line were known to have occurred before the 1923 race riot, but were not met with mob violence.

Local whites described blacks in terms suggesting fear and concern. Earnest Parham remembered the local white representation of one of Rosewood’s citizens, Sylvester Carrier, as an “aggressive kind of fellow. He considered himself the protector of the family.” While the protection of one’s family is typically seen as a noble trait, in 1920s Florida, this was a dangerous position to occupy as a black man – one who had been convicted of illegally changing the brands on white-owned livestock and served jail time for it in 1910 (Jones et al 1993:37). There were other offending blacks, apparently. Including a land-owning member of the Bradley family, who Parham remembered as “a
very intelligent black man and had acquired property. In those days that was not very popular. He had cattle and a lot nicer home than most of the clowns that were there (in Rosewood).” However, these transgressions had not previously engendered violent reaction from local whites. Instead, the precipitating event took place at a specific time, after specific developments had taken place locally. The Rosewood HP-GIS provides data contextualizing the riot and suggests how spatial patterning on the landscape may have resulted in the abnormally intense violence.

Discussion

The true uniqueness of the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot only becomes clear in comparison with similar events following WWI. This discussion briefly compares the events in Rosewood with other riots that occurred between 1917 and 1923. My goal is not to construct a typology of riots, such as the one created by Grimshaw (1969) that considered riots to be of either Northern or Southern style, or a mix of both (see chapter three for a full description of Grimshaw’s classificatory schema). I see little value in constructing riot typologies as they have had no appreciable effect in regards to halting racial discrimination and violence in the US. Instead, my goal with this discussion addresses three interrelated questions. The first examines differences in the timing and duration of racial violence in different places. The second compares rural and urban riots in an effort to see if such a divide translates into significant differences regarding rioters’ brutality. The third explores the reactions of various social institutions to better understand their role in promoting, halting, or acquiescing to racial violence locally.
Table 5-2: Comparisons of Eleven Race Riots, 1917-1923

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riot Location</th>
<th>Riot Date</th>
<th>Duration 1-2 Days</th>
<th>Duration 3-5+ Days</th>
<th>Setting Rural</th>
<th>Setting Urban</th>
<th>Black Resistance</th>
<th>Black Out-Migration</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>L, S, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>L, S, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview, TX</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L, S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L, S, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine, AR</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>L, S, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L, S, F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosewood, FL</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Urban setting is defined as a town with approximately 5,000 inhabitants or more.
2 Black out-migration refers to whether or not significant numbers of African American left an area because of a race riot.
3 Law enforcement refers to level present during a riot, L = Local, S = State, and F = Federal (e.g., army).
The first question concerning the duration of race riots demonstrates the variability of these events. As table 4-2 demonstrates, the majority of riots actually last for two or more days. The two riots which lasted for less than two days in the above sample were little more than extended lynchings where an overwhelming number of whites attacked either individuals or small groups of African Americans. The riots which lasted two or more days often saw episodes of calm in between renewed violence. This was the case in Rosewood when rain delayed the continuation of violence for nearly two days. In other locations severe weather was credited with ending hostilities completely, as was the case in Omaha in 1919 when a severe rainstorm drove everyone from the streets to seek cover and racial violence did not resume (Voogd 2007:488).

While the vast majority of race riots took place in urban environments, rural areas were not safe from the large-scale destruction of race riots. The Elaine, Arkansas riot of 1919 and the Rosewood riot of 1923 demonstrated how racial violence actually took a more prolonged and violent trajectory in rural areas. There are important differences between rural and urban riots. Precipitating events in urban areas typically referred to actual events. This included the murder of a 14-year-old African American boy in Chicago in 1919, or the accident bump a black man gave a white women on the sidewalk in Charleston, South Carolina which local sailors used as justification for rioting and attacking black neighborhoods in 1919. It seems that rural riots were able to start with much less, just a rumor. It was a rumor of supposed black uprising against landowners in Elaine, Arkansas that sparked a multi-day riot which left approximately 200 African Americans dead. It was a rumor, and as history would eventually show, a lie about a supposed attack by a black man in Rosewood which led to a week of violence
that only ended after every black-owned home, business, and structure has been burned to the ground in 1923.

The involvement of local, state, and federal law enforcement demonstrates another range of characteristics concerning race riots. Table 4-2 once again shows a wide variety of possible combinations. Nearly half of the riots in the above sample (five out of eleven) had law enforcement respond from all three levels. This usually involved local police forces realizing they were not going to bring the rioting under control and contacting extra assistance to end the violence. Typically, rioting ended within a day or so once state or federal law enforcement arrived. Rosewood stands out once again as one of the few riots where state and federal law enforcement were not contacted. One reason the 1923 Rosewood race riot went on for so long was precisely because of this lack of non-local involvement (Jones et al 1993).

Conclusion

This chapter's discussion of the development of the Rosewood HP-GIS suggests an expanded reading of the 1923 race riot. At a time when local, regional, and national economies were expanding, white supremacist attitudes gained increasing support from many developing social institutions. The reduction in intersubjective, face-to-face violence can be seen as inversely proportional to expanding forms of structural and symbolic violence. Blacks across America felt this transformation as they were pushed out of towns and routinely told by whites of their ‘inferior’ social and genetic status. However, in small pockets throughout the Deep South some African American communities not only survived, but prospered. Their populations increased and even surpassed those of local whites. This was not a problem as long as whites retained control of society and had little economic incentive to expel local blacks. Everyday
social relations remained vulnerable to violent disruption when black communities did not conform to white expectations. White attitudes demanded blacks adhere to an increasingly racist national order, typified by a suite of ideological state apparatuses (Althusser 1972) aimed at disenfranchising minorities.

As intersubjective violence decreased across the country, many locations were forced to physically embody the trauma of a dramatically changing social system. These traumatic events cannot be explained by local, regional, or national trends alone. A deeply contextual reading is necessary to understand why certain locations at specific times witness the explosion of intolerance into racially charged collective violence. The intense expansion of racial violence between WWI and the mid-1920s resulted from the friction generated as structural and symbolic violence surpassed intersubjective violence. It was the combination of economic motivation and transitional forms of violence – not one or the other – which best describe the social climate both required and responsible for the 1923 Rosewood race riot.

This chapter provided an overview of an archaeological project in the area where Rosewood once existed. The primary focus has been to juxtapose the unique economic and social patterns of this area with broader ones. While chapters two through four concentrated on an academic discussion of racial violence and Rosewood in particular, the next chapter explores new methods for sharing these findings with the wider public.
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CHAPTER 6
VIRTUAL ARCHAEOLOGY, SOCIAL JUSTICE, AND DIGITAL STORYTELLING

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the potential of virtual world environments (VWE) as a tool for social justice education. Social justice refers to efforts supporting the creation of a society "based on the principles of equality and solidarity, that understands and values human rights, and that recognizes the dignity of every human being" (Zajda et al 2006:1). An important method for the creation of a fair and equitable society involves discussing the legacy of intolerance and violence inscribed at historic sites of pain and suffering worldwide. As a starting point, I accept the premise that historical knowledge is inherently political and ideological. Furthermore, I believe the interactive potential of new media such as VWE and digital storytelling represents an emerging praxis, that is, the translation of knowledge about the world into action to change it. New media is the “translation of all existing media into numerical data accessible through computers” (Manovich 2001:20). This includes the translation of analog materials (e.g., photographs, movies, records) into digital formats as well as the creation of fully digital artifacts like digital images and 3D models. New media is what happens when media and computer technologies meet. This chapter explores the use of VWE platforms, digital storytelling, and new media to bring the history of Rosewood alive in the present and contribute to the goals of social justice education.

How can the representation of historical sites of pain and suffering within VWE contribute to positive social change? Are virtual worlds legitimate locations to encourage critical thinking about past and present social inequalities? The use of VWE by educators has recently emerged as an important field of experimentation and study. Researchers are increasingly exploring the economics (Castronova 2005), ethics
(Wankel and Malleck 2009), and culture (Boellstorff 2008) of virtual worlds. Online journals, such as *The Journal of Virtual Worlds Research*, provide important venues for the exploration of a wide range of topics. Likewise, more topical publications are appearing, including *The Journal of Virtual Worlds and Education*. This journal’s mission is to offer “a publication venue for articles and authors examining issues, ideas, and research inspired by the intersection of emerging virtual worlds technologies and education” (http://www.jvwe.org – accessed May 1st, 2011). In addition to sharing research about virtual worlds, these journals also embrace the growing internet ethic of making academic research freely accessible to the public (Hall 2009).

Since visiting the site of Rosewood, as a site of pain and shame, represents a key form of dark tourism, the following section describe recent scholarship on dark tourism as well as archaeological research into places of pain and shame (Logan and Reeves 2009). This discussion provides an orientation to dark tourism sites and the primary ways archaeologists contribute to social justice education. I then explore the intersection of ethnography, archaeology, and the internet in my description of ethnographic archaeology within VWE. This emerging methodology represents a hybrid practice providing the tools for exploring the reasons creators and visitors value VWE as a location for education. The value of VWE is supported by a thorough discussion of the Virtual Rosewood Research Project (VRRP), and its associated website at http://www.virtualrosewood.com. A central goal of this project is to explore the potentials of VWE and digital storytelling for social justice education; specifically, the ability of these new methods and approaches to translate archaeological research into public knowledge. The case study approach of this chapter examines the creation and
dissemination of virtual versions of archaeological landscapes. Also, an in-depth
discussion of the VRRP’s use of digital storytelling demonstrates the internet’s growing
role as an important source of public information, particularly as it encourages public
access to archaeological research, commonly referred to as public archaeology.

**Dark Tourism, Archaeology, and Social Justice Education**

What is the attraction of concentration camps, historic prisons, and monuments
commemorating the locations of racial violence? Dark tourism, also referred to as
thanatourism when specifically dealing with death, is a term originally coined by Foley
and Lennon (1996) and involves the “visitation to places where tragedies or historically
noteworthy death has occurred and that continue to impact our lives” (Tarlow 2005:48).
Recently, a handful of scholars have begun questioning the ability of these sites to
contribute to social justice education. While numerous sites claim to provide a critical
awareness of intolerance, hatred, and injustice as (re)configured through time, Lennon
and Foley’s (2000) research suggests many locations accomplish little more than an
essentialized, bifurcated view of history as the struggle between good and evil. This
conflict is typically couched in nationalist terms and represented as the battle between
opposing cultures, us versus them. The public debate about the so-called Ground Zero
Mosque in New York City represents a recent example of how nationalist symbolism
was conflated with place and deployed against other cultural groups (Huyssen 2003).
The possible construction of an Islamic community center several blocks from the
former site of the WTC was seized upon by America-based Christian fundamentalists to
attack ethnic and religious difference. Fundamentalists cloaked their rhetoric in terms of
respect, sensitivity, and tolerance highlighting the difficulty of transforming past trauma
into critical reflection. The utilization of heritage to support nationalistic sentimentality is
not restricted to Western contexts. Lennon and Foley identify locations such as Changi Goal in Singapore where distrust and hatred of Japanese actions during World War II continue to elicit strong, nationalistic responses from site visitors (Lennon and Foley 2000:13-14).

Fortunately, examples of sites successfully confronting past trauma and directly engaging visitors in ways supporting critical reflection do exist. Lennon and Foley’s (2000:21) discussion of the Museum of Intolerance, attached to the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, is one place which successfully accomplishes the goals of social justice education. At this museum, visitors are not confronted with artifacts seeking to create tropic, emotional reactions reducing the meaning of sites to black and white treatments of history. Instead, interactions with various media (e.g., photography, video, oral history recordings) encourage visitors to take an honest look at their own attitudes towards racial and religious difference.

A primary reason dark tourism sites struggle to confront successfully the legacy of social inequality is because of the anxiety they elicit in site visitors. This tension arises because these places question many of the foundations of modern society. Anxiety about the project of modernity is difficult to avoid in places like World War II concentration camps. These sites question “key tenets of the project of modernity such as progress, rationality, science, technology, industrialization and liberal democracy” (Lennon and Foley 2000:21). Visitors to these sites are confronted – through personal artifacts, photographs, and interpretive signage – with a primary example of how rational planning and modern industry were prerequisites for the Jewish Holocaust. Sites like Dachau force thoughtful tourists to confront the legacy of modernity, echoing
concerns of critical philosophers who have questioned the role of rationality and state bureaucracy for more than half a century (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002).

The commodification of the past has become increasingly common in a world where global telecommunications technologies can instantaneously promote death as a heritage resource and destination (Palmer 1993). The consumption of dark tourism is fueled by the late twentieth century’s revolution of speed and new modes of communication. Marc Augé’s (2008) discussion of supermodernity is illuminating for dark tourism. His discussion of non-places – supermarkets, airports, expressways – resonates with the sites of death and suffering. “Non-spaces” are places whose primary role revolves around consumption and communication while “spaces” refer to those traditional places like the home where social bonds (e.g., familial, religious) constitute a central function. The separation of place/non-place is not a value-laden dichotomy, but an analytical tool demonstrating the blending of public and private. In regards to dark tourism, the separation between non-spaces and spaces is apparent in the differentiation between sites about death and sites of death. Recognizing this difference is important if a site is to successfully contribute to social change by eliciting an emotional connection between visitor and past victim (Mills 2002). The ability to produce this emotional connection is affected by forces beyond the individual site, interpreter, or visitor. They result from the influence of current events (wars, terrorism, public debates) and popular culture (movies, television) which lend “moral meanings to the sites of death and the macabre” (Stone 2006:150).

There are numerous types of sites which fall within the rubric of dark tourism. Some of the earliest forms of travel and community-based leisure dealt with death,
including religious pilgrimage (Lennon and Foley, Seaton 1996) and gladiatorial games (Stone 2006:147). Sites associated with war have recently become the most common form (Smith 1998; Henderson 2000). Tourists are also increasingly visiting graveyards (Seaton 2002), holocaust museums (Lennon and Foley 2000:145-161), prisons (Strange and Kempa 2003), and a growing list of heritage sites associated with African slavery (Dann and Seaton 2001).

Many authors (Seaton 1996; Sharpley 2005; Stone 2006) suggest that constructing a continuum of dark tourism is useful in analyzing these sites. I draw on Stone’s (2006) continuum to highlight the kinds of sites which lend themselves to social justice education. These are sites of death eliciting strong emotional reactions from site visitors. The emotional connection provides an opportunity for educating the public about the nature and history of violence in the past. Truly successful sites, like the aforementioned Museum of Intolerance, incorporate a mixed media approach to realize their potential as a location of social justice education.

**Archaeology as Social Justice Education**

Creating an emotional connection between visitor and site history is important, but alone it does little to provide the public with the tools and perspectives useful for understanding the present implications of the past. Difficult heritage refers to sites associated with pain and shame, places where suffering, trauma, and death have become a site’s primary meaning (Logan and Reeves 2009). The practice of harnessing difficult heritage for social justice education is expanding; groups like the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience provide examples of dark tourism sites which contribute to critical reflection. According to this coalition, a site of conscience “engages in programs that stimulate dialogue on pressing social issues; promote humanitarian and
democratic values as a primary function; and share opportunities for public involvement in issues raised at the site” (www.sitesofconscience.org, accessed May 1, 2011). Archaeologists and museum professionals are increasingly “approaching difficult pasts and explicitly connecting the past with the difficult present” (Little 2007:163).

The complete realization of archaeology’s role as a form of political action is no longer in question (McGuire 2008). Early attempts at utilizing archaeological research for contributing to the goals of social justice education centered on providing interpretive tools to the public encouraging critical reflection on the ideological nature of US society (Leone et al 1987). This work demonstrated the role of ideology in cementing social inequality within American society and how such developments were naturalized, or perceived as inevitable. Adopting Habermas’s (1984) theory of communicative action, Leone (2005) “recognized that the people who were alienated by the contradictions, inequalities, and exploitation in society would be the most open to alternative histories” (McGuire 2008:73). This realization motivates archaeologists to explore a variety of approaches engaging the public in archaeological practice, a primary method for realizing the discipline’s social justice potential.

Public archaeology draws inspiration from a broad array of disciplines and approaches, often resulting in new forms of archaeological practice. Collaborative approaches (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2007) establish a group of co-researchers (professionals and public stakeholders), create a nurturing environment conducive for group learning (formal and informal meetings), collaboratively put forth research questions, and explore appropriate methods for answering these questions. This approach closely mirrors participatory action research (PAR) (Whyte 1991) and as
such is concerned with “real world problems” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2007:10). This approach is advocated as an alternative to traditional academic practices which reduce the public’s role to that of passive consumer.

Civically engaged archaeology is a closely related form of public archaeology deriving its inspiration from the civic renewal movement. This form of archaeology is “committed to a long-term sustained relationship with communities” (Little 2007:5), particularly minority communities who continue to experience the inequality of American society. Engaged archaeology fosters transparency and accountability regarding archaeological research (Agbe-Davis 2010:2). This goal is motivating a new generation of archaeologists to include community service learning projects as part of their academic and professional research (Nassaney and Levine 2009; Agbe-Davis 2010). These trends highlight a growing interest among archaeologists to include the public in all stages of archaeological practice. This emerging practice allows scholars to craft their interpretations of places to the needs of various communities. This represents a crucial step for realizing a site’s full potential as a place of social justice education.

The recognition of the ideological and political nature of historical knowledge also motivates archaeologists to specifically engage in projects fostering restorative justice. Archaeologists are in a unique position to comment on the development of modern inequality. Our work can contribute to the truth-telling goals shared by South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2007; Little 2007: 148-153). A vindicationist approach to archaeology recognizes the importance of moving beyond simply interpreting past society as racist and contributing to a discussion of how the structure of American society maintains systems of elite privilege
and minority disenfranchisement (Mullins 2008). Archaeologists are increasingly following the work of sociologists like Bonilla-Silva (2006) who state that it is whites in America who need lessons about the legacy of racism because they no longer recognize its effects, yet continue to reap its benefits (Farnsworth 1993).

The majority of public archaeology as political action takes place at physical sites like archaeological parks and museums. The primary output of this work involves the creation of interpretive signage, short videos, and pamphlets for visitors. The exploration of VWE represents a powerful new method for archaeologists to engage in social justice education. The use of VWE in general remains a largely untapped resource for public archaeology.

**Case Study: The Virtual Rosewood Research Project (VRRP)**

The Virtual Rosewood Research Project (http://www.virtualrosewood.com) is positioned at the confluence of these trends, particularly as they might apply to the archaeology of the African Diaspora. In order to do this, I explore a variety of methods to both create and deliver virtual content. This is a conscious strategy designed to maximize access to the data and results for other researchers and the broader public. As an engaged project (Gonzalez-Tennant 2010), this approach balances the requests of descendants with the demands of academic research. This case study focuses on the virtual methods and delivery options currently available to historical archaeologists interested in doing this type of work. The next section presents a brief overview of the virtual archaeology and netnography. This is followed by a discussion of Second Life’s potential as a vehicle for social justice education. My discussion of Second Life is supported by netnographic experiences within this VWE at the Virtual Rosewood Museum and other sites of dark tourism translated into the VWE of Second Life. I also
discuss the second VWE created for this study, a complete reconstruction of the town of Rosewood as it existed prior to the 1923 race riot. Then, I shift gears and discuss the use of digital storytelling for engaged archaeology as an additional form of social justice education encouraging collaboration between researchers and the public. This chapter concludes with a more in-depth discussion of new media situating the VWE and digital storytelling examples within recent information technologies.

Virtual Archaeology and Netnography

This section outlines two important methodologies employed for this case study. The first concerns the representation of archaeological sites in VWE, commonly referred to as virtual archaeology. The second refers to the translation of traditional ethnographic approaches to the internet, referred to as netnography. My own application of these approaches combines them into a form of ethnographic archaeology within VWE (Castaneda and Matthews 2008), a hybrid practice I term netnographic archaeology. This first half of the case study focuses on the use of Second Life and the creation of a Rosewood Virtual Museum within this VWE. I will discuss other methods of virtual archaeology as well as digital storytelling in the second half of the case study below.

The use of virtual world environments by archaeologists is growing in recent years. At present, this encompasses literally hundreds of projects around the world and plans for a multimedia journal on the subject are in the works (Bawaya 2010). The term “virtual archaeology” entered the archaeological vernacular twenty years ago, referring to the use of 3D models to represent archaeological contexts (Reilly 1990). Common usage during the 1990s centered on visualizing sites and the production of images and short videos. Since the development of Web 2.0 and the ability to deliver interactive content, the creation of virtual world environments allowing visitors to interactively
explore past landscapes is defining the widening field of virtual archaeology. Perhaps the best known example of the potential for delivering archaeological content via the internet in an immersive and interactive format is the virtual reconstruction of archaeological work at Çatalhöyük (a Neolithic site in modern day Turkey) in the popular online virtual environment Second Life (www.secondlife.com) by professors and students at the University of California, Berkeley (Morgan 2009). The name of this site in Second Life is Okapi.

While virtual archaeology is increasingly used at prehistoric and monumental sites, the application of such technologies to the archaeology of the recent and contemporary past is less common. Another new term in the archaeological vernacular (Buchli and Lucas 2001), the archaeology of the contemporary past represents a “dynamic new field which engages critically with what it means to be ‘us’, with the politics of late-modernity, and with the nature, shape and relevance of archaeology as a contemporary research practice” (Harrison and Schofield 2009:186). Gonzalez-Ruibal (2008) has called for this type of work in regards to the sites destroyed/erased by supermodernity, and opens his article with a brief discussion of Marc Auge’s work regarding the late twentieth century’s revolution of speed, new modes of communication, and new spatial relations of non-places. One of Gonzalez-Ruibal’s main themes examines possible alternatives for presenting the past. He argues that academic narration in books, book chapters, and scholarly journals remains the dominant form of scholarly dissemination, and calls on archaeology to explore alternative forms of dissemination. This includes the use of technologies like interactive computer mapping as well as traditional ones like illustrations and paper maps. While Gonzalez-Ruibal’s project focuses on negative
spaces where terrible things happened, he specifically states that his is not a crippling pessimism; it is a call to action. New VWE platforms provide archaeologists one method for accomplishing this, a method which also supports engaging the public in new and creative ways. This includes the combination of archaeological and ethnographic approaches within VWE.

Kozinets (2010:191) defines netnography as a type of online ethnography which “provides guidelines for the adaptation of participant-observation procedures … to the contingencies of online community and culture that manifest through computer-mediated communications”. This term is used instead of virtual ethnography (Hine 2000) for a number of reasons. Virtual ethnography as a method tends to focus primarily on the online aspect, often divorcing such research from the non-virtual side of issues and experiences. Also, as Boellstorff (2008:65-66) discusses, qualifying one’s methodology as “virtual” is seen by many as reducing the overall value of such research by confusing the term “virtual” with notions that such interactions are “less real” and less valuable.

Netnography embraces a mix of methods for collecting and analyzing online data. Many of these involve translating traditional qualitative research practices to the internet. These include the use of online surveys and text analysis of forums and websites. New forms of data collection have also become available and include the use of video conferencing for in-depth interviews. Such practices allow researchers to identify the subtleties of communication like face gestures.

My principle methodology combines virtual archaeology and netnography. I primarily utilized this methodology in Second Life; a massively multiplayer virtual world
(MMVW) launched in 2003 by Linden Labs in San Francisco, California. I prefer to refer to Second Life as a MMVW over the use of terms like Massively Multiplayer Online Game (MMOG) or Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Game (MMORPG) because unlike plot-driven virtual world games like World of Warcraft (WoW), Second Life is an open world allowing members to explore at leisure. While numerous role-playing opportunities exist in Second Life, most users are content to simply explore the online world. Joining and participating in Second Life is free, although owning land and building objects requires a monthly fee. Upon joining, users create an avatar, give it a name and profile. This may or may not include information about the user's actual name, location, job, age, gender, and so forth. Users move around the virtual landscape by walking, running, flying, or teleporting between locations. Land in second life is divided into regions. Users can purchase various sizes of land between small plots of 512 square meters to entire regions of 65,536 square meters. The user community and individual property owners create the majority of sites and objects in Second Life, and the trade in objects and services has created a booming virtual economy exchanging Second Life’s currency (Linden Dollars) with real-world currencies.

It is important to note that ethical standards for netnographic research are no less rigorous than traditional qualitative research. This requires sensitivity to the wishes of informants. While the majority of Second Life users do not include personal information in their avatar profiles, many wish to keep their conversations and comments private. I respected these wishes in a variety of ways. The majority of my netnographic involvement took the form of participant observation, the principle methodology of cultural anthropology where a researcher participates in the everyday activities of a
group. I rarely used other research methodologies such as formal interviews. Therefore, if a quote was not part of a formal interview or I was unable to obtain permission to use it, I use pseudonyms and paraphrase other’s statements. If part of a formal interview, I asked users to agree to a standard consent form. Asking other Second Life users if I could use transcripts of our conversations elicited a mix of responses. For some, the question raised their interest and became an active discussion about anthropological research in VWE, an apparently common experience for others (Boellstorf 2008: 76-79). However, other users requested to remain anonymous or refused outright to allow their names and quotes to be used, citing Second Life’s terms of service (TOS) as a justification. For instance, one user I encountered while exploring a World Trade Center (WTC) memorial had entered only one line into their avatar’s profile. Derivations of the following quote are increasingly common in Second Life as more journalists and researchers explore VWE.

I DO NOT consent to my instant messages or chat being logged, shared, saved or transmitted in any form on Second Life or outside of it. I consider it an immediate Terms of Service violation as per the Second Life Terms of Service. (anonymous Second Life user)

While Second Life’s TOS may not specifically address this concern, as an ethical netnographic researcher I honored other user’s requests to remain anonymous or not have their conversations cited by either not including their quotes or paraphrasing them. I use public statements such as descriptions of sites and locations without specific permission as this information is clearly intended for public knowledge.

Social Justice Education in Second Life

The exploration of VWE by educators is rapidly growing. While exact numbers are difficult to obtain, dozens if not hundreds of universities, colleges, and primary
schools have a presence in Second Life. The majority are experimenting with the relevance of interactive, user-centered technologies for education. Second Life, as the leading online world, has emerged as the dominant venue for these explorations. A recent review (Bowers et al 2010) of forty-two articles published between 2005 and 2008 in EDUCAUSE and the Chronicle of Higher Education showed that most educators see the adoption of Second Life within education as a positive experience. They view the challenges of adopting Second Life in broad terms of adopting new technologies in general. Most framed their experience as experimental and saw Second Life as encouraging exploratory education to aid students at all levels, including low-income, at-risk students (Harrell and Abrahamson 2010).

While the majority of researchers celebrate the adoption of VWE for education, others warn about Second Life re-inscribing notions of identity discrimination from the physical world. Researchers remind us how privilege and whiteness are becoming entrenched in online worlds (Sanchez 2010). While noticeable examples of privileging whiteness in Second Life such as favoring Caucasoid-looking avatars during account creation have been addressed with the addition of a wider selection of avatar ethnicities, racism and discrimination still occur through a variety of visible and invisible ways. Educators using VWE for social justice work need to find ways of articulating their efforts which avoid reproducing colorblind assumptions about society. Online communities are not immune to the inscription of discrimination any more than physical ones. Fortunately, a growing tide of non-white, non-male VWE inhabitants are addressing these concerns in new and important ways (Nakamura 2008). These include creating education sites within VWE and reporting offenders.
One group which has embraced VWE’s potential for social justice education is the LGBT community. As of May 2011, the Second Life Destination Guide (secondlife.com/destinations) lists two dozen LGBT friendly locations, many of them including social justice education as a primary goal. The listed sites are only a fraction of the overall LGBT friendly locations, such as the Transgender Outreach Center (TOC). Groups like the TOC are exploring the potential of VWE to help marginalized communities explore their identities. Recent studies are demonstrating how the exploration of identities considered non-normal by dominant society within virtual spaces help individuals develop real world strategies for expressing and defending their identities (Cabiria 2008). One drawback to these locations in Second Life is the time commitment required to realize such goals. For instance, one individual I encountered at the TOC remarked that she had been coming to the center for a couple of weeks “to meet fellow sisters and brothers in gender identity” but had only met one additional person besides myself. Social justice sites whose primary approach is to encourage dialogue on issues are not effectual if nobody visits them or the creators are not involved on at least a weekly basis.

These are concerns which memorials and museums can address in a variety of ways. A site creator does not have to visit these locations as often, as the exhibits are designed to speak for themselves. A virtual memorial is equally capable of eliciting a genuine emotional reaction from visitors. For instance, numerous memorial sites exist throughout Second Life. These include memorials to national tragedies and wars (Figures 5-1 and 5-2) as well as areas where individuals can purchase small plots and create personal memorials in the form of graves or monuments. These smaller, user-
created monuments are some of the most emotionally touching locations in all of Second Life. One visitor I encountered at a child’s memorial (Figure 5-3) put it thusly,

Visiting the grave of a child in Second Life is a very emotional experience. I am drawn out of myself and transported to the grave, it hits me and is real, as real as visiting a cemetery in the real world. That site turned my desk and computer into a place of meditation, and I cried real tears after reflecting on the loss another human being felt.

Contrary to the assumptions of potential critics, VWE can be transformative places. The experience of telepresence connects visitors to one another and transcends the immediate technology. VWE can touch the very core of being human. The true effect of taking a moment and connecting with the pain and suffering of another person in a VWE is difficult to describe in words, but the emotions it elicits are real and can have a profound effect on virtual travelers.

Perhaps the most successful site in all of Second Life combining an emotional connection with social justice education is the Holocaust Memorial Museum (Figures 5-4 and 5-5). Upon arrival, visitors are greeted by an automated message:

Welcome to Witnessing History. You are entering an environment focused on a single event – Kristallnacht (The Night of Broken Glass). Here, you will take the role of a journalist, recalling the testimony of eyewitnesses as you investigate what happened during the November 1938 pogroms.

This location combines the emotional connection of a memorial with new interactive methods of education to support social justice. Various points throughout the museum are labeled with the words “Witness Point”. At these locations a mix of media objects can be triggered heightening the visitor’s experience. For instance, while visiting a desecrated Synagogue (Figure 5-6), a visitor can touch a burnt prayer book, activating the following automated message:
After seizing the archives and valuables, Nazis destroyed the interiors of synagogues and desecrated religious objects, such as prayer books.

The voices of Holocaust survivors are heard as they recount experiences seeing the desecration of synagogues in Germany. The overall mix of audio, virtual buildings and interactive messages presents a powerful experience encouraging critical reflection concerning the effects of the Holocaust. The engagement of multiple senses makes full use of VWE’s potentials for social justice education.

**Virtual Rosewood Museum in Second Life**

My use of Second Life for social justice education centers on the creation of a virtual museum. Second Life does have its drawbacks. Navigating the program’s interface and the VWE favors individuals who are already comfortable with video games. My Second Life neighbors were not always respectful, including one neighbor who hung Confederate flags on his property near the museum (Figure 5-7), although he assured me the flag was about heritage, not hatred. This particular neighbor eventually sold his land and moved away. My other neighbors have been more supportive and welcomed the museum. If an engaged researcher’s intended audience is young students, Second Life is an increasingly useful platform.

The museum’s basic design is that of a repurposed, historic building converted into a local history museum (Figure 5-8). This decision is based on the fact that at least one structure has survived the 1923 riot, the house of John Wright. The Florida Department of Parks and Recreation and a group of interested researchers (myself included) are looking into the possibility of repurposing this building to use as the foundation for opening a memorial museum in Rosewood. This group’s primary
motivation is to create a park and physically reconstruct part of the town. Second Life allows me to prototype what this museum might look like.

The virtual museum allows visitors to experience the site in a number of ways. In the repurposed building, visitors can explore the history of Rosewood through museum-like displays, including a diorama of the town as it stood in the early 1920s (Figure 5-9). In a second, modern-looking building, virtual visitors can take a seat in a theater and watch a twenty-five minute digital storytelling video about Rosewood. A handful of structures representing the homes of African American residents in Rosewood include a timeline of the riot itself. There are also quiet areas where visitors can relax and chat with one another as well as a memorial statue and garden (Figure 5-10).

Second Life provides, for a fee, a complete package for the creation and delivery of virtual reconstructions of archaeological contexts. Second Life allows a user to control many aspects of their virtual land. For instance, while building and outfitting the virtual museum, I kept the land closed to others. Now that the land is open to visitors, I have placed restrictions on it, including removing visitors’ ability to fly (although this can be circumvented by experienced users with a simple hack). In order to deliver the virtual museum content, all a creator has to do is open the land to visitors. The content is delivered in the same format it was created, without the need for converting between formats or using additional software. This is not the case for the other methods of content creation discussed in the next section.

Another benefit of Second Life for social justice is its effectiveness as an educational tool. The studies cited above (Cabiria 2008; Bowers et al 2010; Harrel and Abrahamson 2010) demonstrate that educators are increasingly viewing Second Life as
an appropriate technology encouraging active learning. My experiences with the Rosewood Virtual Museum support these studies. Within a couple of weeks of opening the Virtual Rosewood Museum to visitors, students from a class on social justice visited the site while I was completing minor details; hanging pictures and setting up a donations box. At first, I didn’t know the dozen or so individuals exploring the museum in mass were part of a class. I found this out after one of them, Lorrie, approached me about the museum. Unfortunately, I never found out the name of the instructor or the location of the course. Lorrie simply informed me their teacher gave them “a list of places that would be good to go learn about social justice, and this was one of them, along with an Islamic culture site and Nonprofit Commons.” The later site, I found out, is primarily dedicated to teaching visitors about sustainable development.

Several weeks later, another set of students visited the site and many of them approached me to ask about my personal opinions regarding racism in American society. Students shared observations like “I’m sure many Americans are racist but are unaware of it” and “hopefully as new generations honestly explore issues of racism, they’ll gradually be completely accepting of differences”. Comments like these allowed me to address issues of colorblind racism. Also, this conversation and others I have had since demonstrate that dialogue is seen as an effective tool for combating discrimination among today’s students. The Virtual Rosewood Museum continues to grow, and I visit it to speak with other Second Life users at least once or twice a week.

**Virtual Rosewood on the World Wide Web**

Whereas Second Life is a particularly useful pedagogical tool, delivering content via traditional internet methods like websites reaches the greatest number of individuals. Fortunately, the possibilities for web-based delivery of VWE are rapidly expanding.
Currently, a handful of programs dominate the entertainment industry in terms of creating 3D content. These include 3DS Max, Maya, and Vue among others. These are expensive software packages and licenses typically cost between US$1,000 and US$3,000+. They’re also complex programs with steep learning curves. In the past, the high cost and lack of training limited the use of these programs for virtual archaeology. Fortunately, companies are increasingly creating educational licensing programs. Autodesk, the parent company for 3DS Max, Maya, AutoCAD, and other industry standard software began offering free educational licenses for their software in 2010. Educators and students can now download these programs and teaching resources by visiting http://students.autodesk.com.

My program of choice for constructing a virtual version of Rosewood is 3DS Max. The production pipeline for producing a 3DS Max version of Rosewood begins with modeling individual structures. The overall design of structures modeled for Virtual Rosewood is based on information from property documents, census records, historical photographs, and personal accounts. Oral histories report on the general appearance of homes in and around Rosewood.

Mary Hall remembered asking her mother and sisters about their house in Rosewood often, they explained we “we had a big two-story house and we still lived there (after her father died) because it was a lot of us children.” Dr. Annett Shakir remembered his mother telling him that relatives, the Carriers, had “a two-story house and with a porch on it, lace curtains, and manicured lawns. My grandmother also played piano. So, there was a piano in the house.” Earnest Parham, who was 18 in 1923, remembered substantial houses in Rosewood, such as the Bradley’s, whose home
“wasn’t painted but it was a big substantial house.” Eva Jenkins, who was thirteen in 1923, had one of the clearest memories of her home in Rosewood. She described it as:

our house had three bedrooms and this big hall down the middle (open hall) and a kitchen and dining room and it was onto the house; a lot of people said their’s were separate from the house, but ours was all joined, we had front porch and back porch, and two big old Magnolia trees in the front yard, oak tree with a swing on it. But anyhow they had nice furniture (Eva Jenkins 1993)

Some of the property deeds include basic building descriptions. Other times, census records provide a basic idea of the numbers of people living in a structure, indicating whether a building was home to a large or small family, used as a boarding house, and so forth. The size and construction of public buildings like stores, churches, schools, and masonic lodges were fairly standard for the area at the time and photographic evidence of similar historic structures from nearby location were used as templates.

An additional benefit of using 3DS Max is its ability to create models using real-world measurements. For example, one of the houses modeled in Virtual Rosewood is based on a nearby farmhouse built in the 1880s. Measured drawings of this structure were created in the early 1990s and provide precise measurements for virtually recreating the building. After building the model, the next step involves texturing it. Texturing, as the name suggests, refers to the placement of colors, patterns, and/or images on the 3D model. It involves a flat image pasted onto a 3D surface. Finally, the models are rendered to increase their photorealism. Rendering refers to the final production of an image or video using the textured 3D model. The process involves the computer calculating how light would interact with the 3D model as though it were a physical thing. This produces shadows and adds an increased sense of realism.
Delivering high quality 3D content in an interactive way via the web was nearly impossible just two or three years ago. Recent developments have changed that. They include larger numbers of internet users as well as an overall increase in speed of internet access through cable internet. Also, new software has appeared facilitating the delivery of 3D content via web browsers. A popular program for this type of work is the Unity3D game engine. A game engine is a software program designed for the creation and development of video games. Unity3D reads assets created with 3DS Max as a native format, eliminating the need to convert between file formats. The software also offers one-touch convenience for uploading VWE to the internet. There are a couple of drawbacks to this program, including a steep learning curve similar to 3DS Max Design, although excellent online tutorials are available. In addition, there is no real-world scale in Unity3D, so creating content with accurate spatial dimensions can be difficult. Finally, navigating a VWE created with Unity3D retains the feeling of playing a video game, although navigation using a mouse and keyboard is fairly straightforward. I found the creation of visibly stunning VWE outweighed these concerns (Figure 5-11).

Visitors to the Virtual Rosewood Research Site can explore a fully reconstructed version of the town as it existed prior to 1923. The placement of models on the landscape was informed by the GIS work described in chapter five; and the VWE is viewable on the website via the freely downloadable Unity3D browser plugin. The availability of the VWE on an easily navigable website is producing a number of engagements. The site has been featured in several newspapers across Florida as well as the Florida Humanities Council’s quarterly journal *Forum*. A key benefit of managing a website is the ability to monitor traffic to the site. In the day following a Sunday write-
up in the *St. Petersburg Times* more than five hundred visitors came to site. Another key benefit of working with new media and the internet is to provide additional resources for the public to explore the history and development of Rosewood. This includes digital storytelling, a powerful tool encouraging public engagement with Rosewood’s history.

**An Introduction to Digital Storytelling**

Digital storytelling traces its roots to a series of workshops in Los Angeles during the early 1990s. These workshops proved so successful that a Center for Digital Storytelling (CDS) was created shortly thereafter and remains the national center for working with digital media to tell personal stories (Lambert 2009:1-10). Indeed, the impulse to share personal lives continues to characterize digital storytelling. Joe Lambert’s (2009) recent book by the CDS captures this spirit as well as outlining the components, themes, and methods for creating digital stories.

Lambert outlines nine types of stories conducive to digital representation (Lambert 2009: 24-27). The first group is character stories relating the experiences between people. Memorial stories share personal views on why certain events, people, and places are important to us. Adventure stories document travel experiences and personal exploration. Accomplishment stories relate the experiences of achieving a personal or communal goal. Place stories explore those spaces and landscapes which are particularly important to individuals and/or communities. Job stories discuss professions. Recovery stories reveal the struggles of overcoming a great challenge. Love stories explore romantic relationships between people. Discovery stories reveal personal realizations and their effects on people.

In addition to discussing the varieties of stories people tell, Lambert goes on to discuss the specific methods storytellers employ when crafting digital stories. As the
majority of digital storytelling projects focus on one or a handful of individuals, these suggestions focus on bringing out the emotional aspect of personal experiences. Digital storytellers are encouraged to own their insights, find their voice and use it to speak. As digital stories are often personal stories, the importance of confessing one’s true feelings and opinions is paramount. Lambert stresses the importance of emotional content because it creates a more interesting story and reflects reality in more genuine ways. In addition to the personal content, planning the actual structure of the story is highlighted. This includes clarifying the story’s meaning by the use of storyboards and other traditional aspects of filmmaking. Lambert encourages the use of music, but warns against using copyrighted material; instead, he encourages digital storytellers to utilize copyright-free music and to always provide attributions for content created by others.

The importance of mapping out a digital storytelling project’s general timeline and script is encouraged, even for short pieces. As most digital stories range between five and twenty minutes, many neglect the importance of planning out a story from start to finish. The final consideration for digital storytellers is their method of delivering digital content. Will the video be presented online, at a public location, distributed via DVD?

My goal for adopting a digital storytelling approach as an emerging method to share historical research was motivated by numerous concerns. First, the major benefit digital storytelling has over traditional film/documentary making is cost. Digital stories can be created with little investment of time and resources. The primary equipment required can be broken down into three parts. The first consists of a laptop or desktop computer – the hardware component. The second involves an image and/or audio capture device. These typically take the form of camcorders and digital voice recorders.
The final component is the software, programs for editing both video and audio content. Just a decade ago these three components could easily cost thousands, even tens-of-thousands of dollars, equipment and programs have dramatically dropped in price. Today, low-cost computers and video capture devices are increasingly available to people around the world. Indeed, modern mobile phones often have the required hardware and sharing capacities to create and share digital stories quickly and effectively.

My second concern involved exploring the internet as the primary delivery method for sharing my research. Using the internet to freely deliver content makes research immediately accessible to a wider range of individuals. Also, using the internet eliminates the cost of producing hard media such as DVDs, further reducing the cost of sharing research. A third goal for exploring digital storytelling grew out of a commitment to social justice education, and was inspired by recent trends in visual anthropology.

**Creating an Engaged Visual Archaeology of Redress**

Barbara Little (2007) recognized how research at sites like the African Burial Ground can participate in the truth-telling aspects common to many Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRC). While most TRCs form as part of national democratic transition processes, they have also formed locally. One example is the Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission created to seek justice for the 1979 murders of five civil rights and labor activists by local Klu Klux Klan and Nazis organizations (Bermanzohn 2007). TRCs have become typified by the South African case where amnesty was granted to state actors in the interest of producing an accurate accounting of apartheid. While the granting of amnesty has received serious critique, it should be noted that South Africa’s TRC also recommended monetary
reparations to victims of apartheid as a way to combat structural inequalities (Castillejo-Cuéllar 2007).

Knowledge that the capitalist nature of American society results in structural inequalities has become a prominent focus among reparations activists (Munford 2007). While many acknowledge that current racial inequalities for African Americans derive from slavery, increasing numbers are fighting for Jim Crow reparations. This secondary position has developed because the arguments for slavery reparations remain difficult to justify in public debates. Also, only two marginally successful cases for Jim Crow redress exist. These are the 1994 compensation bill for Rosewood and a 2004 decision concerning the 1921 Tulsa race riot. Rosewood, as the first example typifies this secondary position and the architects of the 1994 Rosewood Compensation Bill framed it as a personal claims suit against the state, distancing themselves from the terminology of reparations (D’Orso 1996). This bill paid significant sums to survivors, variable amounts to descendants, and set up a minority scholarship. The 2004 decision granting compensation to victims of the 1921 Tulsa riot has had to downplay the idea of slavery reparations, even though some of the most vocal advocates see the connection as paramount (Ogletree 2007). These two examples drew on the 1980 Supreme Court order to pay $122 million to Sioux tribes for a treaty violation in 1877 and the 1988 $1.25 billion compensation to Japanese Americans for unlawful internment.

At present, activists are urging the federal government to develop a redress commission to investigate the legacy of structural inequality in America (Martin and Yaquinto 2007: 21). A variety of tactics are being explored and recently the need to educate the US public about redress is motivating groups like the National Coalition of
Blacks for Reparations in America (N’COBRA), Black Radical Congress (BRC), and the TransAfrica Forum to step up education efforts. Archaeologists can participate in this aspect of the redress movement as we seek to engage the modern world. The continuum of what constitutes engaged archaeology varies. It includes working closely with communities as a form of applied archaeology (Shackel 2004), raising awareness of social injustices (Davidson 2004), interrogating the historical development of dominant ideologies in modern America (McGuire 2008), and challenging historical representations that disadvantage entire continents (Schmidt 2006). Recently, a growing movement among archaeologists mirroring a movement in applied anthropology framed as “community centered praxis” (Singer et al 1992), which attempts to, by de-privileging us as experts, situate community concerns as central to archaeological projects (Mullins 2003). Participating in the redress movement allows archaeologists to engage anywhere along this continuum (which should not be taken as hierarchical or exclusionary).

My utilization of digital storytelling resulted in a short (26 minute) documentary, prepared in consultation with descendants for use in educational bus tours to the area around Rosewood. A central mission of these bus tours, and in fact many of the descendants, is to keep the story of Rosewood alive. I was attracted to digital storytelling’s emphasis on small-scale, personal perspectives. The short documentary used medium quality video I took in 2009 with the last two living survivors, both in their 90s. It describes the historical and geographical context of Rosewood from settlement in the mid nineteenth century until the race riot of 1923. Then, it examines what has happened to the community during the past 87 years, as related by the two survivors.
A particularly touching moment in the documentary occurs when Robie Mortin describes meeting her father for the first time following the 1923 race riot. Mortin’s father recognized early on how the accusation of rape and subsequent attacks on Rosewood residents might turn into large scale violence. Therefore, he sent Robie, who was eight at the time, to Williston with her sister. After hearing about the destruction of Rosewood several days later, and not being able to meet up with their father, the two girls assumed he had been killed. They began looking for work and over the next couple of months made their way to Riviera Beach, north of Miami to work as migrant farmers. Robie Mortin shares what happened one morning when she went to a newly constructed church several months after the riot:

There was a ditch that separated Riviera Beach from the black neighborhood. There was a bridge across it, and there was a Hearst Chapel AME Church there. They had built that church right on our side of the ditch. So, we (my sister and I) went to church, and would you believe our daddy was there, and we didn’t know where he was, hadn’t seen him in months. We didn’t even know he was still alive, and there he was in the front of that church (Robie Mortin, 2009)

The ability of digital storytelling to share touching moments like these with a wide audience is an important aspect of social justice education. Robie Mortin’s words, delivered in her soft, ninety-four year-old voice, touch the viewer in an unmistakable way. The emotional impact of her brief story demonstrates the trials, and in this one example, happy surprises which make a life scared by trauma bearable.

The same weekend 500 visitors came to the VRRP website, 400 of them watched some amount of the digital story. The honest depiction of research methods and project goals in the documentary has created new forms of engagement for me. This includes several land owners in Rosewood contacting me to do traditional archaeology work. For instance, this includes the individual who owns the piece of land where Rosewood’s
African American cemetery is located. I am working with him to document and preserve this important resources for the descendants of Rosewood and their families (Figure 5-12).

Also, several descendents have contact me about the history of the town and their families. This has motivated me to open a data warehouse on the website allowing visitors to access many of the same datasets I have used for my study (e.g., census records, oral history transcripts). Not only does this decolonize the practice of archaeology by publically sharing our research data, it also invites the public to openly engage with researchers. In regards to Rosewood, this was represented by an unexpected email I received one morning in early 2011 from Helena Hendrix-Frye. Hendrix-Frye is one of the descendants of the Goins family, who presently lives in South Carolina. She had come across the VRRP website and decided to contact me after taking the virtual tour and watching the digital story. As part of this initial contact, she shared images Figure 5-13) and correspondence of her family from when they lived in Rosewood more than a century ago. Since the majority of personal belongings in Rosewood were destroyed while residents fled for their lives, these images and letters represent unique and new items about the site. In an exciting twist of serendipity, one of the images she scanned and sent to me was of a funeral taking place in the very same cemetery I was currently working on with the landowner mentioned above.

Discussion

Lev Manovich, in his now seminal work *The Language of New Media*, not only provides us with the most concise definition of the term *new media*, but also presents five characteristics useful in conceptualizing the use of virtual archaeology and digital storytelling for social justice education. New media is the “translation of all existing
media into numerical data accessible through computers” (Manovich 2001:20). This includes the translation of analog materials (e.g., photographs, movies, records) into digital formats as well as the creation of fully digital artifacts like digital images and 3D models. New media is what happens when media and computer technologies meet.

“All new media objects… are composed of digital code” (Manovich 2001:27) represents the first characteristic, and while modern media such as film follow an industrial logic (large scale production studies, expensive equipment costs, necessity of labors), new media provides us with a post-industrial method, one not regulated by mass standardization. This aspect of new media means its potential as an emancipatory form is literally hardwired into its very structure.

Secondly, new media is modular; parts can be deleted, re-arranged, and added without destroying the original. This invites experimentation and exploration. This feature is easily coupled with pedagogical interests at the core of digital storytelling in regards to teaching media literacy and social justice. The characteristic, when embedded within new programs, is also responsible for the ability to seamlessly share 3D models between creator and user in new and exciting ways.

A third aspect involves automation, and this is particularly important for creating the immersive experience of virtual world environments, or simply delivering a 25 minute documentary via an online video service like Vimeo. The most common form of automation is the creation of programs to access information, and while Manovich’s central concern here is the proliferation of access agents (e.g. Google search) for sorting through the bewildering amounts of information now available online, without the ability to automate access, the present state of virtual archaeology would not exist.
The fourth characteristic centers on the variability of new media objects. This flexibility is useful for virtual archaeology, allowing us to posit alternative interpretations side by side, a practice nearly impossible to do in full-scale, physical reconstructions of structures. This also means that we can create a variety of interfaces with the same content. Drawing on the examples above, the same content can be delivered via traditional formats like print images and videos, through web-based online worlds like Unity3D, or in settings conducive to group interaction like Second Life.

The final characteristic of new media is cultural transcoding. This involves the interaction between cultural ideas and new computer methods. At present, this is dominated through analogy with traditional media, the printed page becomes a webpage, cinema becomes online video (edited and navigated based on analog concepts like fast forward), the human computer interaction of fingers on keyboard become fully immersive virtual reality. In regards to VWE and social justice, this takes the form of interacting with dark tourism sites supporting critical reflection. As with the birth of any new technology, we can only begin to hypothesize about the range of potential applications. The term “transcode” means to translate, and how researchers and collaborators chose to translate traditional forms of historical knowledge into these new formats, and the reciprocal effect on our practice as educators is only beginning.

Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to explore the emerging intersections between virtual archaeology, digital storytelling, and social justice education. The use of VWE has been restricted to monumental and/or prehistoric sites for far too long. The creation of new media – whether that is VWE, digital stories, or some other object – represents a pedagogical toolkit. The new forms of knowledge produced by the synthesis between
historical research and new media accomplish a number of things. It highlights the experiences of descendants and other interested parties, provides tools for critically engaging with history and media, and offers researchers new techniques for crafting the way historical knowledge is accessed and interpreted by others. In many ways, new media offers a new set of tools, ones not found in the master’s house (Lourde 1984:110-113) and therefore potentially very liberating, a constellation of approaches and technologies not regulated by gatekeepers and tradition - although certainly in dialogue with them. Obvious and sizable obstacles to full participation in new media include the manifestation of a digital divide as well as the (re)inscription of negative identity politics within virtual spaces. However, just as the printing press was utilized in the past to democratize knowledge, so too can we teach ourselves and others to draw on new media methodologies for the same. Only time will tell if this optimistic viewpoint will produce transformative fruit or if mass standardization will assert itself and crush individual creativity and expression. I have chosen the later.
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CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This dissertation had two central aims. The first dealt with understanding how larger trends in American society were manifested in Rosewood in the years leading up to the 1923 race riot. A significant part of this initial goal required a new reading of racial violence in US history. I developed this perspective by identifying what appeared to me as a significant weakness in previous approaches, namely the continued treatment of race riots and lynchings as largely separate domains of human activity. Over time, I came to understand these two forms of racial violence as intimately related, especially when viewed within developing trends of structural violence on the one hand, and the mobilization of science and cinema to support symbolic violence on the other. Understanding how larger social patterns manifested in Rosewood prior to the riot became a primary challenge.

I responded to this by using geographic information systems (GIS) to reconstruct historic property ownership for more than fifty years. The addition of census data allowed me to map the growth of spatial segregation in the town following 1900. Patterns of segregation in Rosewood resulted in a small pocket of historic white properties increasingly surrounded by a growing population of economically successful African Americans. Spatial segregation became a primary component of the structural and institutional violence characteristic of Jim Crow, and my use of GIS demonstrated how Rosewood was not immune to this broader development.

In addition to offering a new reading of racial violence in the past, and providing new knowledge about its development in Rosewood prior to the riot, I explored new media methods for translating scholarly research into public knowledge. As discussed in
chapter six, new media refers to the “translation of all existing media into numerical data accessible through computers” (Manovich 2001:20). This concept also includes the translation of traditional methods of disseminating research (books, images, videos) into digital forms and formats. I explored the use of the internet as a primary delivery vehicle for sharing the outputs of virtual archaeology and digital storytelling with as wide an audience as possible, and particularly today’s youth.

As a public archaeology project, I sought to engage with a wide range of individuals and groups. These included descendants, their advocates, and other researchers. These interactions did not always go the way I intended, but they did produce positive results. I feel that these interactions would have progressed more rapidly had I remembered that fundamental differences exist between the ways academic disciplines approach research and informants. As a personal lesson, these engagements taught me the very important lesson of patience, as well as helping me develop a more reasoned approach to engaging with others. Specifically, I learned the value of abandoning the moral high ground in favor of equal collaboration.

While I was familiar with the literature on collaborative approaches to archaeological work, it took sustained experiences with this form of academic inquiry to produce in me an awareness that such work requires a level of diplomacy I was initially unprepared to provide. While my work with the Rosewood HP-GIS and new methods of disseminating research are already serving me well academically (e.g., publications, invitations to speak publically, conference participation), it was the lessons learned during collaboration which will serve me well as a human being. I came to cherish this lesson above many of the others, my own transformation from a participatory mode of
academic inquiry to a more collaborative one. The difference between participatory and collaborative archaeology may seem like a small one to other, but I came to understand precisely the importance. A participatory approach to public archaeology involves the researcher setting the agenda and determining the appropriate methods, and only then inviting comment from the public. This type of archaeological research only listens to those members of the public which tend to agree with the researcher's predetermined project goals and methods. A collaborative approach involves researchers and the public meeting together to determine through conversation the types of questions and methods most useful for a project. My own experience with a collaborative practice for public archaeology motivated my exploration of new media as an emerging and powerful set of tools for addressing specific public concerns about the painful past.

Rosewood remains a difficult place to conduct research. The responsibility of doing justice to a site scarred by racial violence can be overwhelming. How can researchers possibly do justice to such a place? This was an intense question for me to ponder, and at times I wished I had selected a less politically charged site. At times, this was motivated by a concern for my personal safety. Informants shared stories of death threats and anger conversations with their neighbors in Levy County. The continued vandalism of the historical marker also attested to the potential for strong feelings about the site's history locally. I thought, perhaps the vandalism was just that, reckless and bored youth rebelling against authority. Even if that was true, such actions in Rosewood become ominous because of their association with the site and its legacy.

I treated the stories of intimidation experienced by informants and warnings from local whites about the dangers of researching Rosewood as legitimate concerns.
Numerous individuals approached me throughout my time researching Rosewood to warn me about the potential dangers. For instance, one longtime white resident of Sumner who now lives elsewhere in Florida, whose ancestors’ properties I had successfully mapped with the Rosewood HP-GIS, contacted me in early 2010. This individual told me about receiving death threats throughout the 1990s when attempting to organize public forums about Rosewood in Cedar Key. The fear some individuals feel about Rosewood, and their own safety, is palatable.

The idea that dark forces still lurk in the swamps of southwestern Levy County is a rarity among those whites who call the area home today. They remain on friendly terms with one another and peacefully coexist. Unfortunately, the fact that few if any African Americans live in the area speaks to the continuing legacy of towns like Cedar Key as a sundown town areas (Loewen 2007:171). One set of African American informants whom I accompanied during an outing to Cedar Key in 2009, confided in me that they prefer to be out of southwestern Levy County before dark, “just in case.”

I have been asked by numerous reporters if I’ve ever felt concerned for my own safety. Jon Wilson, who interviewed me for the Florida Humanities Council quarterly journal Forum in early 2011 (Wilson 2011), asked “have you ever felt threatened or otherwise actively discouraged from doing research in Rosewood?” While I initially worried about these issues prior to 2008, I explained that I’d never experienced any form of intimidation, or received anything even coming close to a threat during my entire time working with Rosewood. In fact, my experience was completely positive. This was the case throughout Levy County. Employees at the courthouse in Bronson pulled records for me in anticipation of my next visit, landowners in Rosewood welcomed me
onto their properties, and local newspapers across the county ran stories about my research. Lou Elliott Jones, Editor for the Chiefland Citizen, a weekly newspaper in Levy County, explained how she felt it was the duty of her paper to examine the tragic history of Rosewood as a way to open a dialogue about racism. While at lunch one day, Jones also stated that running articles about Rosewood was good business, as any issue of her newspaper with a story in it concerning Rosewood automatically sold an additional 200 copies! While Jones and others in Levy County remain committed to examining painful aspects of their past, the same cannot be said for other parts of the state.

While my experiences with Rosewood were positive, particularly when dealing with the citizens of Levy County, there remains a sense of dread about the site and its history in other areas of Florida. This was made very clear to me in early 2011 after giving a public lecture on my research in Orlando as part of the Central Florida Anthropological Society’s monthly lecture series. Several of the officers came up to me after the lecture and apologized for the low numbers of attendees. I hadn’t noticed, at least forty or fifty people had shown up, and I thought attendance was very good. The society’s officers explained to me that attendance at previous events normally included eighty or more people, and they felt that my lecture would have drawn many more because of the topic. However, as the officers explained, the Orlando Sentinel refused to run the announcement for my talk and insisted that it didn’t want anything to do with issues of race and racism, and Rosewood in particular (Jason Wenzel, per. comm.).

It was through experiences like these that I came to realize the true extent of Rosewood’s infamy in the state of Florida. The very word had become synonymous with racism, hatred, and murder. I began to understand why local whites sometime wanted
people to stop commemorating and researching the site’s history. I came to understand how researchers have a responsibility to the Rosewood survivors and descendants and the African American community as a whole as well as the local whites in and around Rosewood today. This is a sentiment shared by many of the individuals I collaborated with over the past several years.

The lessons I’ve learned in Rosewood are widely applicable. My own development as a collaborative researcher, particularly understanding the importance of developing a diplomatic approach, represents an important skill for working with similar sites in the future. Unfortunately, there is no shortage of similar events across the US. Race riots have remained a part of US history. Race riots prior to the WWII were characterized by white violence against black communities, a form of pogrom seeking to either expel or exterminate a group locally (Lumpkins 2008). The nature of what constitutes a race riot following WWII changes considerable and often involved blacks using riots as a form of political protest (Feagan 1973). My experience with documentary archaeology has produced a methodology translatable to other locations. One important direction I see for my research agenda focuses on creating comparative work at other sites. This includes the locations of race riots prior to WWII as way to understand the different ways large social forces were manifested locally in different parts of the country. Research with post-WWII sites will allow me to continue tracing the effects of structural and symbolic forms of violence through time.

I can foresee no restrictions in terms of applying the new media methods I’ve explored in this project to a wide range of sites. I remain committed to exploring the application of virtual archaeology and digital storytelling as primary methods of social
justice education. I predict these methods will become crucial approaches for the translation of academic research into public knowledge, the first step in contributing to the development of a global citizenry. This has become my primary goal as a historical archaeologist. As an academic committed to positive social transformation, I am principally concerned with providing future generations the experiences and knowledge required for the development of a more just, humane, and democratic society. My time in Rosewood not only helped instill this dedication in me, it provided me with the theoretical, methodological, and personal tools to realize it.
APPENDIX A
LIST OF DATA AVAILABLE ONLINE AT THE VRRP WEBSITE

As part of my dedication to making the results of academic research available to a wider audience, I have also made some of the primary datasets used for my study available for download at the Virtual Rosewood Research Project website. Members of the public, students, and other researchers can access a wide variety of information by visiting http://www.virtualrosewood.com/data.html.

The following data are available as of May, 2011

Fifteen years of daily weather observations from Cedar Key. Weather has profound effects on our everyday actions. I used this data to discuss the possible role of weather in postponing hostilities between January 1, 1923 and January 4, 1923 in chapter one of this dissertation.

Census data for the years 1900, 1910, and 1920. Census data provides important information about communities. This includes information about race and gender, home ownership, employment, education status, and composition of individual households. The above link provides complete transcriptions of the 1900, 1910, and 1920 census for Rosewood and surrounding areas. I have also included maps covering the enumeration districts for each of these years. Enumeration districts reference the geographic area recorded in each set of census forms.

Searchable PDF copies of the 1993 oral histories (Jones et al 1993). While the full text of the report to the state is available online, gaining access to the oral histories collected as part of writing that report has been difficult to access. I have made these available so that others can access the direct testimony of the witnesses and survivors of the 1923 Rosewood Race Riot.
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