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ABSTRACT

The aim of this dissertation is to help to redefine racial riots carried out against the African American community in the United States during the 19th and the early 20th century. I provide an examination to argue for those racial riots to be redefined as pogroms rather than riots. Racial riots that had been carried out against the African American community in the United States often did not get the attention they deserve. The initial framing of those attacks as riots, made it difficult for black victims of those racial riots to seek legal redress or request government assistance. I explore the causal factors that triggered racial riot against the African American community. I examine two racial riots: First is the 1898 Wilmington Riot, which occurred in the Reconstruction era; the second riot is the 1917 East St Louis Riot, which took place in the early 20th century. Juxtaposing these racial riots with the 1881 pogrom, carried out against Jews in Imperial Russia, ensures a foundation for the use of pogrom. My intention is to draw out any parallel that might exist between those racial riots and the 1881 pogrom. Within this dissertation, I argue against the inadequacy of social strain theory. My hope is that this study will help to shift the ways in which we talk about not only those riots, but other 19th and early 20th century racial riots, as well. Scholars of racial riots do not all agree on the term pogrom. Some scholars have argued that many racial riots against the African American community in the United State in the 19th and early 20th century can be characterized as pogroms. Though the term pogrom is rarely used in association with those 19th and early 20th century racial riots, scholars of racial riot violence continue to study the impact that such riots have had on 19th and early 20th century African American communities.
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CHAPTER 1

RIOTS OR POGROMS?

1.1 Introduction

The aim of this dissertation is to help to redefine racial riots that carried out against the African American community in the United States during the Reconstruction era and the early 20th century.

This thesis argues that most of those racial riots carried out against African American communities in the United States in the 19th and early 20th century should be redefined as pogroms rather than riots. To accomplish this task, this dissertation will examine two racial riots carried out against African American communities in the United States, 1) the 1898 Wilmington Riot, which occurred in the Reconstruction era and, 2) the 1917 East St Louis Riot, which took place in the early 20th century. My hope is that this work will help to shift the ways in which we talk about not only those particular riots, but other 19th and early 20th century racial riots, as well.

I will juxtapose those racial riots against African Americans with the 1881 pogrom against Jews in Imperial Russia. My goal here will be to draw any parallel that might exist between those racial riots that have occurred in the 19th and early 20th century and the 1881 pogrom against Jews in Imperial Russia. Along with comparing the two methods of rioting (attack), a side-by-side juxtaposition will help to show if racial riot and pogrom share similar characteristics and causal factors.

If similar causal factors are shown to have triggered pogrom as well as racial riot, then parallels can perhaps be drawn between racial riots against African American community in the United States and pogrom against the Jews community in Imperial Russia. In addition, if pogroms against Jews in Imperial Russia show more similarity than
difference to racial riots against African Americans, then those racial riots should be redefined as pogroms.

There are several questions that will guide this study, including the analysis of racial riots’ intended outcomes. For example, what are the causal factors that triggered racial riot against the African American community? In what way did 19th and early 20th century racial riots impact the African American community? What characteristics are associated with racial riot and pogrom? Why do Southern Whites use lynching to terrorize blacks? What are the ways in which Whites justify the Lynching of African Americans? Why were Southern Whites opposed to the franchise of African Americans and how did their objection lead to violence against blacks? What kinds of strategy did African American community use to protect themselves from white mob violence (racial violence)? Why did lynching occur at all? What caused the spike in lynching in the post Reconstruction period, when racial riot (racial violence) was equally successful in terrorizing Blacks? Reasonable responses to such questions would help to broaden our understanding as to why white Americans planned and carried out racial riots against Blacks.

For this study, I utilize a specific sort of racial riot that is representative of those attacks that have been carried out against African Americans in the 19th and early 20th century. Thus, racial riot in this study deems to be “deadly, historical lethal excesses organized and sanctioned by local officials, which cause irrevocable destruction of African American community, resulting in displacement and loss of lives, while severely diminishing African Americans involvement in the political system and black participation in the general economy in the area in which the riot occurred.” Earlier
description of racial riot fails to include the historical aspect of systemic white racial violence that targeted the African American community. “Deadly, historical lethal excesses” is a more critical description of those racial riots carried out by Whites against African American communities in the 19th and early 20th century. This description reflects the scope and breadth of historical violence often associated with White violence against blacks.

The current description of pogrom conveys the scope of historical violence, which shows characteristics similar to the 19th and early 20th century racial riots. David Engle’s description of pogrom, for example, speaks to the “excesses” of violence carried out against a “certain group of the population,” that have been “sanctioned by government officials. Implication of officials’ involvement in such “excesses” can be considered similar to local officials’ involvement in organized, racial riots against blacks in the 19th and early 20th century. According to Engle, in many pogroms “authorities take no steps to restrain those [who are] perpetrating the excesses.” This is because often as not these same officials were involved in directing and assisting rioters in their attack against the designated group. Ingle’s description lacks the political and economic marginalization, which African Americans often experienced as a result of racial riot, but it illustrates a clear example of a description in which racial riot fits into.¹

Donald L. Horowitz’s term, “deadly ethnic riot,” might be an adequate description in which racial riot fits. Horowitz uses this term to illustrates the severity of such riots. He explains that a “deadly ethnic riot” is neither spontaneous nor random, an attribute it

shares with racial riot. The number of casualties caused by the disturbance is often undetermined and is difficult to ascertain. Likewise, the disappearance of riot victims makes it difficult to confirm the number of casualties, for it is not certain if the riot victim has been murdered. Finally, if there is no evidence as to the person’s whereabouts, officials who investigate the scene might use estimated figures, which might be misleading. According to Horowitz, the problem of “accounting for the missing, the burned–to-death, secret mass burials is insuperable.”

Another equally important factor is the displacement and the exodus of people; most often the victims of the riot are from the area in which the riot occurred. Even though there might be a small number of murdered victims as a result of the riot, a homeless crisis may occur because riots generally often involve the burning and looting of the victims’ homes. Horowitz also demonstrates that the destruction of businesses, including “absenteeism from industry that continued long after the violence was over,” may result in the dislocation of people. Horowitz uses deadly ethnic riot in an international context where the victims of riots become “refugees, some of them will never return to their [original] homes”. But many African American victims of racial riots had similar experiences in that they seldom returned to their homes from which they were forced to leave at the time of the racial riot. This is because most victims ended up relocating to new areas in which they have created new lives.

Finally, the intentionality and purposes for the perpetration of the violence on the victims seem to share a good deal. In both the racial riot in America and the pogroms in

---

Imperial Russia, the varying precipitants are countless. However, some factors that trigger such riots range from religious differences to violation of community norms. The resolution to such problems regularly involved violence by which members of the targeted group are “murdered, tortured and mutilated,” another feature that is associated with white mob violence and lynching of African Americans in the 19th and early 20th century.  

In this study my objective is to redefine racial riots carried out against African American communities in the 19th and early 20th century, with the hope of shifting the way in which we talk about those racial riots. By juxtaposing racial riots against African American communities, namely 1898 Wilmington Riot and the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot, with the 1881 Pogrom that targeted Jews in the Russian Empire. I hope to draw out parallels that might exist between racial riot and pogrom. If parallels do exist between the two, then this can help to support the effort to redefine those racial riots against blacks. In chapter one (introduction) I established the basic premise of my research, with an examination of Ingle’s description of pogrom. Also, in this section, I provide a description of racial riot that I believe adequately represents the kinds of racial and anti-black violence that were used against African American communities in the United States.

Chapter two explores the terms riot and pogrom, and their social connotations. This chapter presents a critical analysis of the terms and a pointed discussion as to the ways in which society views and respond to incidents of riot and pogrom. Chapter three

---

3 Horowitz, 2–10.
examines the literature on racial violence and the argument over the adequacy of social strain as a viable tool by which to interpret anti-black violence such as racial riot and lynching. Perhaps, one of the more recognized incidents of racial riots, the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot is highlighted here and, this riot is determined by some Scholars of racial riots as a case in which social strain plays a major role. Scholars such as Charles Lumpkins disagree, arguing against the inadequacy of social strain theory. Considerable attention is given to these influential scholarships in order to gain a greater understanding about the factors that might have triggered this and other incidents of racial violence against blacks in the United States.

Chapter four focuses on Lynching, one of the more horrifying acts of unmitigated violence against a people. Used as a method of punishment on the American frontier, this chapter examines the impact of lynching on African Americans, and why blacks had been singled out as the main targets of the lynch mobs. Ida B. Wells investigation of lynching is central in this examination of lynching. Chapter five focuses on the 1881 pogrom, attempting to identify parallels that can be drawn between pogrom and racial riot. My visit to the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research enabled me to access this Institute’s archives. The YIVO digital archives on Jewish life I was able to view microfilm of American Hebrew and The Israelite newspapers. My visit to Amherst College Russian Cultural Center and the Yiddish Book Center at Hampshire College provided me with valuable information and leads to other resources. Unfortunately, I was unable to review Russian periodical and newspapers of the period. Access to Soviet archives was impossible. I was able to collect valuable research data from Jewish-American newspapers such as the American Israelite. I rely upon the research and scholarship
carried out in recent years by scholars of Russian Jewish history. I extend my gratitude to those scholars and express great appreciation for their work.

In Chapter six (conclusion) I consider the comparisons of my findings and try to determine the similarities, differences, and possible parallels.
CHAPTER 2

RIOT AND POGROM: A DESCRIPTION OF THE TERMS RIOT AND
POGROM AND OF THEIR SOCIAL CONNOTATION

The terms riot and pogrom represent two different descriptions of disturbances that characterize methods of attack, even though the level of violence and destruction of property associated with both disturbances are similar in many ways.

2.1 Riot

The term riot does not convey the same level of violence; nor does it result in serious political, or international backlash as is implied by pogrom. For that reason, there is a perception that pogrom is far more detrimental to its victims than the outcome of a riot, an incident that is defined as involving three or more people. Many riots are often interpreted as minor, spontaneous incidents. Because of such description, a riot might not be properly investigated or gotten the same attention as a pogrom does. Consequently, as Terry Ann Knopf points out, those racial riots are believed to be devoid of any political implications. Moreover, depending on the framing of the riot incident, the appropriate government response might not be forthcoming because government officials might not consider it as being politically significant. Such riots are reported as lacking serious planning and organization and, therefore, seen as having no serious threat.5

According to Chris M. Messer and Patricia A. Bell, the initial “framing process” that is associated with racial riot is an extremely important process. This is because the true character of the disturbance is determined and documented at this point. Thus

---

“framing” an attack lesser than what it actually is can result in detrimental consequences later. For example, framing an attack as a riot and not a pogrom significantly undermines the impact of the disturbance on the victims. As such, this initial description might result in nongovernmental intervention at a time when it is necessary for the government to act. Moreover, the wrong framing might absolve local and state governments from any responsibility for their conduct or involvement in the attack.

In addition, the right framing of an attack, racial riot for example, might lead to a national backlash, indicting government officials, and forcing them to compensate the victims of such attacks. Moreover, according to Messer and Bell, the government could be forced to establish “proffered solutions which may benefit the victims of racial riots.” Finally, the appropriate framing of racial riots can influence public policy by motivating officials to create funding programs that will be used to assist the victims of racial riot.6

Inadequate framing of racial riot, however, can adversely help to relinquish the victim’s right to legal redress or to file legal lawsuit against the perpetrators of racial riots. For example, the initial framing of the 1921 Tulsa Riot resulted in serious consequences for the riot’s African American victims. African American victims were prohibited from requesting legal redress. Lawsuits claiming monetary compensation for the destruction of their homes and businesses were denied. According to Messer and Bell, it was not until seventy-five years after the 1921 Tulsa Riot had occurred that the descendants of the riot’s black victims were able to win monetary compensation. In another report, “Report for the Commission for the 1921 Tulsa Riot,” no one was

---

convicted for the murdered African American victims of that riot. Therefore, victims could not have sued their attackers for damages. This might have been because Whites had orchestrated a massive cover-up of their involvement in that brutal massacre. As a case in point, White Tulsans’ initial framing of that 1921 massacre as riot counteracted Black Tulsans’ later version of this same riot.7

Mass media plays a significant role in the ways in which it reports on racial riots. Media reporting and coverage of racial riot can influence society’s understanding of the impact of racial riot on the African American community. For instance, if the media presents a one-sided view of a riotous event and downplaying the brutal treatment that is often experienced by black victims of racial riots, it might have a negative impact on blacks. A series of misleading newspaper stories against black men, for example, were repeatedly published in the major newspapers in Wilmington, North Carolina, at the time of the 1898 Wilmington Riot. The objective of the stories, as articulated by the city’s white supremacist Democratic Party, “was to prohibit the election of blacks in the upcoming November 1898 political election in Wilmington and evict blacks from [public] office.” Those articles featured stories of anti-black politics and wildly exaggerated description of black men as “black beast rapist.” David Zucchino found that the stories represent one of the most daring and effective disinformation Newspaper Campaign in Wilmington political history. Zucchino reports that the tactic worked because those newspaper stories frightened whites into voting for candidates for the City’s white supremacist Democratic Party. Thus, the Wilmington’s newspapers played an instrumental role in Whites’ effort to organize the 1898 Wilmington Riot. The local

7 Chris M. Messer and Patricia A. Bell, 851–870.
white newspapers ran stories that support Democrats’ plan to “redeem” the city in the
name of white supremacy.  

The Tulsa Tribune’s ambiguous reporting of the 1921 Tulsa Riot was no less
intentional. The Tribune also misreported the events of that riot. For example, the Tulsa
Tribune had acquired early information about the pending Tulsa riot that were organized
by Whites. However, the Tribune’s initial reporting gives a “prognostic framing” of that
riot which omitted white Tulsans’ plan to massacre blacks. It reported the riot as an
“uprising of a dangerous black mob,” diverting attention from white Tulsans who started
the riot and, instead blamed blacks for the Tulsa Riot.  

Still in the mid-20th century, Terry Ann Knopf’s examination of press coverage of
racial riots that occurred during the “riot cycles of World War I and World War II” found
“glaring instances of misreporting.” Published articles presented “One-sided, biased press
coverage” that blamed blacks for starting those riots. Reporting that the riots were
occurring spontaneously, the press also failed to document the involvement of local and
state officials in those riots. Messer and Bell have shown that omitting Officials’

---

8 Wilmington Messenger, “Incited Negroes to Assault: The Infamous Speech of a
Republican in Richmond County,” Wilmington Messenger (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 1,
1898; Wilmington Messenger, “A Negro Defamer of the White Women of North
Carolina,” Wilmington Messenger (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 1, 1898; David Zucchino,
“Wilmington’s Lie: The Murderous Coup of 1898 and the Rise of White Supremacy,”
Atlantic Monthly Press (2020): 75–78; Glenda E. Gilmore, “Murder, Memory and the
Flight of the Incubus,” in Democracy Betrayed: The Wilmington Race Riot of 1898 and
Its Legacy, eds. David S. Cecelski and Timothy B. Tyson. (Chapel Hill: Univ. of N.C.

9 Tulsa Tribune, “Blacks Carry Belongings as They Vacate,” Tulsa Tribune (Tulsa, OK),
Jun. 1, 1921; Tulsa Tribune, “Dick Rowland Spirited Out of Town,” Tulsa Tribune
(Tulsa, OK), Jun. 1, 1921; Tulsa Tribune, “Purity League to Keep Black Section Clean,”
Tulsa Tribune (Tulsa, OK), Dec. 31, 1921.
involvement in such riots absolved them of accountability. Similarly, the Kerner Commission’s investigation of those early to mid-20th century riots found that the media failed to report adequately on racial problems in the United States. Those racial problems were determined to be the fundamental cause of most of those racial riots that occurred in the period of the World Wars. The Commission points out that “slights and indignities are part of the Negro’s” daily life, most of which comes from the “white press.” The Commission concludes that Blacks’ grievances are seldom conveyed in the press, reflecting the inherent biases of the white American press towards African Americans.10

2.2 Pogrom

Pogrom, on the other hand, conveys that a serious and deadly attack of violence has occurred. Considered an organized persecution of an ethnic group, pogrom has become synonymous with most anti-Jewish violence and anti-Semitism against the Jewish community. Unlike a riot, which is believed to be a spontaneous act, it is broadly assumed that a pogrom is different. It is argued that the pogrom is planned and organized beforehand as an organized act of persecution against an ethnic group. Pogrom is akin to crimes such as genocide and ethnic cleansing which are considered to be violations of human rights.

Violation of human rights such as pogrom has serious international political implication. For instance, United Nations’ oversight provides safeguards against acts that violate peoples’ human rights. All acts of racial discrimination and Genocide violate the United Nations’ laws on human rights: Racial cleansing, massacre and pogrom, among other lesser-known titles are included as acts of violation of human rights. Protection

against such violations of human rights had gained international attention during World War I (WW I), 1914 to 1917, as a result of the Armenian genocide that occurred during the period of the War. Commonly referred to as one of the first reporting of genocide, Henry Morgenthau, United States Ambassador at Constantinople, “Turkish Empire” at the time, documented what he describes as the Turkish Empire’s plan to “exterminate all Armenians in this province,” of Van. The “Turks’ army,” Morgenthau reported, systematically “massacred uninterruptedly for days Armenian women, children and old men in the villages of Van.” The “young Armenian men,” Morgenthau continued, have been rounded up and “marched to the outside of town and every man shot in cold blood.”11

Similarly, during World War II violations of human rights were recognized and identified by reporters and observers covering the War. However, this time international condemnation of such violations was converted into United Nations’ laws that protect human rights. Guenter Lewy illustrates that as a result of the Jewish Holocaust that took place in World War II (WWII), 1940 to 1945, the world leaders agreed on laws that protect fundamental human rights for all people. Those examples of human rights violations are documented in Article 4 of the United Nations’ Code on Human Rights. The United States, however, did not ratify Article 4 because it claims that Article 4 conflicts with the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.12

12 Guenter Lewy, Outlawing Genocide Denial: The Dilemmas of Official Historical Truth (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2014), 15; U. S. Const. amend. I.
The Statue of Limitation regarding the prosecution of violation of human rights is open-ended. So, for example, members of the White mobs who were involved in 19th and early 20th century Lynching of African Americans may still be able to face prosecution for violation of African Americans’ human rights. But prosecution is unlikely to happen, since the United States did not ratify Article 4.

In 1965, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Article 4. This requires that all State parties and member states at the United Nations prohibit the dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority; also, Article 4 opposes incitement to violence against any race or a defined ethnic group. Four years later, June 15, 1969, States’ representatives to the United Nations convened at the International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) in order to register their commitment to United Nations’ international mandate to protect human rights. Except for few member States to the United Nations, including the United States, most member States have recognized Article 4 as international law.13

For instance, Malcolm X had attempted to register at the United Nations General Assembly, the United States human rights violation against African Americans. He illustrated that the “attainment of civil rights without ethnic dignity for Blacks was a violation of the African American’s human rights.”14 Upon his separation from the Nation of Islam, Malcolm X had begun to organize a “secular political organization,” Organization of Afro-American Unity (OAAU), which would have been involved in

“submitting the case of the American Negro before the United Nations.” According to Manning Marable, Malcolm’s appearance at the United Nations was intended to signal a “strategic shift in civil rights activism within the United States. Instead of passing legislation reforms through Congress, he sought to present blacks’ grievances to international bodies in hopes of global intervention. Under the banner of human rights,” cases involving lynching and racial discrimination, “issues that had long been perceived as domestic” problems would be presented before the United Nations. Had Malcolm been successful in “convincing just one African Government to bring up the charge” of human rights violation against the United States government, this would have brought international condemnation against the United States for its treatment of African Americans. This might have caused international embarrassment for the federal government, placing the United States in the “same category as South Africa as a violator of human rights.” As an apartheid regime, the South African government transgressed the fundamental human rights of its African citizens. 15

Malcolm X had sought to gather international support, especially from among African states, that would help to bolster his case at the United Nations against the United States’ violation of African Americans human rights. He had intended to broaden the scope of human rights violation against African Americans in particular and black people in general. In his May 1964 lecture at Ibadan University in Ghana, Malcolm had begun

this process, discussing the “true picture of our plight in America, and of the necessity of the independent African Nations helping us bring our case before the United Nations.”\textsuperscript{16}

CHAPTER 3

RACIAL VIOLENCE IN THE CONTEXT OF PRESENT LITERATURE ON RACIAL RIOT AGAINST BLACKS, ANTI-BLACK VIOLENCE AND LYNCHING

Allen Day Grimshaw’s influential scholarship helped to advance social strain theory, a sociological concept that is used to explain racial violence. Grimshaw argues that racial violence is one of several modes of conflict resolution. The reason for this choice can “be found within the structural arrangements of the [American] society,” and the result of the collapsed of certain forms of social relations that dictates the interracial status quo in American society. For instance, the breakdown of the long standing “accommodative relationship pattern,” particularly that which is practiced between black and white Americans. This social interaction between blacks and whites represents the “classic accommodative pattern of superordinate-subordinate relationship,” Grimshaw explains.\(^\text{17}\)

In this social arrangement, the superordinate group, namely Whites, expect obedience and compliance from the blacks labeled as inferior group. When this expectation is not realized, Grimshaw continues, the dominant white group responds with violence. As long as blacks accept their subordinate status and the “boundaries of white supremacy remained inviolate” there would be less reason for whites to attack blacks. On the other hand, if the subordinate blacks attempted to disrupt the “accommodative pattern” of race relations, white mob violence is inevitable in order to keep blacks in their

place. But, as Richard Maxwell Brown illustrates in his work, whites attack blacks, even with the absent of a deliberate challenge to the interracial status quo by blacks. He argues “Whites’ perception of blacks aggressiveness… was often enough to trigger white racial violence against blacks.”

In Grimshaw, ed., “Racial Violence in the United States,” Grimshaw puts together a compendium of essays on racial conflict in the United States, with a critical examination of racial violence that took place during the WW-I and WW-II periods. Most of the essays in this text are Grimshaw’s scholarship. Grimshaw demonstrates the ways in which blacks disrupted the established patterns of race relations. He points out that the influx of Southern blacks into Northern industrial cities during the Great Migration precipitated instances of social strain in the job and housing sectors, among others. Blacks and whites competing for jobs, for example, represented social structural change in those Northern cities where racial riots occurred. To avoid competing with blacks for employment, whites used anti-black violence to push blacks out of areas where job opportunity became available. In addition, Grimshaw points out that identification of the common patterns that exist in such cases of racial violence may in turn lead to solutions to deal with racial violence.

---

The scholarships of Elliot Rudwick and William Tuttle, Jr., on the racial riots that broke out in Northern cities from 1917 to the WW II period further demonstrates the application of Grimshaw’s social strain theory. Both scholars attribute whites’ fear of blacks’ challenge to the interracial status quo. Moreover, both Rudwick and Tuttle, Jr., point to the migration of the large number of Southern black laborers to Northern cities as the main factor that led to racial riots in those cities. However, Tuttle, Jr. also argues that the race riots that broke out during the “Red Summer” of 1919 was “part of a national climate of violence that was been created by postwar” variables such as “unemployment and labor disputes.” He did not see the riots as being restricted to one area of the country. Rather they represented a “more general, national social strains that has impacted the nation.”

Both scholars illustrate how Whites interpreted Southern black migration to the Northern urban areas as a process that would result in the decrease of opportunity for the white working class. Also, blacks relocating to those areas would eventually limit whites’ access to traditional social resources that were often offered to whites. For example, in industrial cities such as East St. Louis and Chicago, anti-black violence often was the preferred solution that whites used in order to prohibit blacks from employment they believed whites should get. Blacks refused to accept the subordinate status that was being assigned to them. Thus, blacks made real progress in their struggle for racial equality in those cities. However, as Rudwick points out, blacks’ gains in the economic and political

sectors were interpreted by whites as a threat to the security of white working-class people. Whites further enforced the interracial status quo.\textsuperscript{23} 

Another scholar of racial violence, Joseph Boskin, also found social strain to be adequately suited to explain why racial violence happens. Boskin associates social strain with “some extraordinary social condition” that adversely impacted the society and erupted into violence. Boskin points out, however, that the identification of the social strain, particularly at the time of the initial outbreak of the riot, is a better indicator as to why the violence occurred in the first place.\textsuperscript{24} 

Malcolm McLaughlin places blame for the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot on the City’s “corrupted politicians” and the “organized crime syndicates” that exercise control over E. St. Louis “Valley Saloon District.” Though he agrees with Rudwick’s interpretation of the riot, McLaughlin argues that social strain is not the main factor that triggered the riot. Corrupted politicians joined with the bosses of organized crime syndicates situated in the Valley Saloon District, planned and orchestrated the riot, targeting black owned and operated saloons in the saloon district.\textsuperscript{25} 

McLaughlin’s analysis corroborates Lumpkins argument. Both scholars inculpate corrupt public officials for their leading role in the riot. In the context of corrupted government officials, for instance, McLaughlin argument parallels Lumpkins’ findings. Public officials such as CTLU leaders, Lumpkins explains, planned dictated the riot.

\textsuperscript{24} Joseph Boskin, ed., \textit{Urban Racial Violence in the Twentieth Century}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ed. (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1976), 14. 
CTLU’s officials were uniquely positioned in the City’s government, where they served in dual roles in the city; one, as elected politicians and two, as elected representatives of the Union, CTLU. In their role as politicians, these men exercise control over E. St. Louis City’s budget, a position that enable them to influence the city’s economic policy to benefit themselves.

McLaughlin demonstrates how some E. St. Louis’ politicians used their position in the government to protect businesses located in the “Valley Saloon District.” In turn, organized crime “paid kickbacks” to the city’s officials who support them. However, not only did they protect the businesses of the affiliates of organized crime, some of the city’s politicians and police officers benefited as well. This is because they also own or invested money in the Valley District’s saloon businesses. Many saloons, McLaughlin illustrates, operated as “brothels and gambling halls, serving E. St. Louis’ working class.” Moreover, it was not uncommon to see members of E. St. Louis’ organized crime syndicates and politicians together at meetings held in saloons, McLaughlin states. Perhaps the Valley District saloons provided meeting rooms in which they planned and organized the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot.

Finally, notorious for its culture of violence, the “Valley vice district of saloons,” as McLaughlin characterizes the district, represents a key aspect of popular culture in the city. The area is recognized for its crime rate. McLaughlin’s examination of the riot shows the kinds of violence that was practiced in “Valley vice district of saloons” was used against blacks at the time of the riot. Such violence involved the use of knives.
Many suffered through brutal physical violence that result in injuries such as broken arms and legs.  

There are some scholars of racial riots who believe that social strain is not adequately prepared to interpret incidents of racial violence. Roberta Senechal, for example, disagrees with Grimshaw. Senechal asserts that social strain lacks the ability to explain variation in lynching, for example, across particular cases of conflict. Its approach fails to provide analysis of the people who have participated in racial riot. Thus, Senechal argues that the general theory of social control, “a process by which people define or respond to deviant behavior,” is better suited to interpret anti-black violence such as lynching.

Extending on Donald Black’s general theory of social control, Senechal offers a “theory of lynching that seeks to explain variation of lynching across specific cases of conflicts.” The theory of social control, Senechal demonstrates, employs strategy of predicting and explaining racial violence such as lynching. Informed by “how the [lynching event] is situated along a number of structural dimensions,” theory of social control attempts to interpret the social characteristics of the persons who are involved in each case conflict. For instance, whether the participants know each other or if they are strangers. What’s the social status of the participants, “equal or unequal?” Are the people involved in racial violence acting independently, or are they members of an organization or group? Answer to such pertinent questions will help to identify the “variables that are

associated with the likelihood and severity of lynching when a specific grievance arises.”

Additionally, Senechal concludes that the “likelihood and lethality” of lynching varies with the social structure of the lynching event. The outcome of a lynching, she continues, might be determined by the combinations of the structural arrangement that is associated with the lynching. For example, “Relational distance” which speaks to the degree of intimacy as well as the type of relationship people has with each other, might be the reason why the lynching is being carried out. Kinship ties (relationship), coworkers, or regular interaction between people in a neighborhood, for instance, would less likely. Regular contacts among people enable individuals to participate in one another lives. According to Senechal, this level of intimacy may be used to determine whether or not a lynching will take place. Another variable, among others, is “cultural distance.” The cultural differences that exist between the victim and those who carried out the lynching are also determining factors as to the likelihood and lethality of a lynching. The failure to link lynching theory and the actual participants in lynching (and other forms of racial violence) leave many unanswered questions. Though social strain explanation of anti-black violence helped to advance our understanding of racial riots, Senechal illustrates, that it has limitations when it comes to the examination of most racial riots.

---


Similarly, Charles Lumpkins questions whether the social strain theory is a viable tool by which to interpret the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot. Lumpkins centers African Americans advances in electoral politics in E. St. Louis, during the early 20th century, as the primary causal factor that triggered the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot. One of the two racial riot cases that will be examined in this dissertation is what, Lumpkins characterizes as the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot “American pogrom.”

Lumpkins asserts that the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot was not the result of social strain as Grimshaw has noted. He argues that the riot was a pogrom, planned and directed by officials of the Central Trades and Labor Union (CTLU). The powerful trades union located in the city of East St. Louis at the time. Lumpkins found that two groups of men associated with the CTLU, “politician-businessmen” and “real estate politician-businessmen,” was instrumental in organizing and leading the 1917 E. St. Louis race riot.

These “politician-businessmen” and “real estate politician-businessmen,” served in dual roles as CTLU leaders and as elected politicians in E. St. Louis’ city government. This was done in order to protect their political and business interests. Also, these men attempted to neutralize blacks’ advancement in electoral politics in the City so as to maintain control over the City’s government. Increase in the number of black votes, they claimed, threatened traditional white control over the City’s government. What is more, they had sought to curtail the employment of Southern black migrants in industrial jobs in the city of E. St. Louis. Lastly, CTLU officials had believed that new arriving Southern
blacks to the city were added to the existing voter roll of eligible black voters residing in the City during this same period of WWI.29

Saving whites’ industrial jobs was not the CTLU’s main concern as they had claimed. According to Lumpkins, the CTLU’s objective was to prohibit Southern black migrants from relocating to E. St. Louis. To accomplish this goal, officials had threatened to replace white industrial workers on the picket line with black workers. In turn, CTLU leaders prompted whites to repel blacks in order to protect whites’ jobs from the newly arrived Southern black migrants who have been relocating to the city.

New arriving southern blacks were added to the already high number of black voters residing in the city. Thus politician-businessmen were fearful that the increased number of black voters posed a serious challenge to traditional white political control over E. St. Louis city’s government. Local officials worried that the participation of blacks in the E. St. Louis’ political system would alter the existing political balance in the city. For one thing, they worried that the black vote could be used to shift political power away from CTLU officials to their opponents. The second problem, according to Lumpkins, is that CTLU officials believed that the increase in the number of black voters would empower blacks. As a result, this would enable the City’s black political leaders to negotiate with White politician-businessmen for more political patronage for E. St. Louis’ black community. Patronage is a “form of resource distribution and access to informal political power.” Even more troubling to whites was the idea that Blacks could seize political power and control the City’s government.30

Patronage for the E. St. Louis’ black community was delivered in the form of jobs for blacks. Patronage enabled black men to obtain industrial jobs from which they were able to earn a steady income (wage). This was unlike their experiences working in the agricultural sector where employment was seasonal and wages low. With the emergence of an industrial black working class in E. St. Louis, blacks were able to invest their money in building up the African American community there, what Richard Thomas refers to as the black community building process. Thomas asserts that the black industrial working class played a leading role in the building of the black community during the WWI period, setting in motion the entire black community building process during and after the World War. The major occupational group in the black community, black industrial workers contributed a portion of their earnings to black community’s institutions. They provided financial support to blacks’ political aspiration in cities such as E. St. Louis.  

Moreover, at the same time, CTLU leaders wanted to counter-acted white industrial workers “willingness to strike,” by playing on whites’ fear of Southern black laborers taking jobs whites believed belong to whites. White laborers’ strike often result in the complete shutdown of industrial production. To make matters worse, CTLU officials could not continue to use European immigrants to fill vacant industrial job positions. With the onset of WWI European immigration to the United States came to a halt. Though the Union had turned to the next available labor source, Southern black labor, it had still preferred to employ white industrial workers instead of blacks. Many

---

industries however only wanted to hire blacks as unskilled workers and to do the
dangerous jobs that whites did not want to do.

Lumpkins illustrates that the CTLU officials intended to establish a reserve labor
source of white workers. This is so that Union officials may have access to an available
pool of workers from which to select workers to fill industrial labor shortages. Also, in
times of workers’ strike Union leaders would be able to easily replace workers who had
joined the picket line. Officials encouraged white industrial workers to join the CTLU in
order to protect their jobs from blacks. Thus, CTLU officials’ insistence on a unionized
work force, was so that they would be able to exercise greater control over industrial
workers employed in the City’s industries.

Black E. St. Louisans organized their community to advance their own political
interests. With the ongoing arrival of Southern blacks to the city, more blacks gained
industrial employment. In turn, they used their earnings to construct black institutions at
E. St. Louis’s black community and to harness their political influence in the city. Blacks
organized political and social clubs to achieve their community’s political objectives, as
well as black institutions such as the black church. The black church played a
fundamental role in black political organization and activism. Those political
achievements of black E. St. Louisans were contingent on the continuous arrival of
Southern blacks to the city who, according to Lumpkins, “joined with long-term black
residents in using the ballot to exert political” power in E. St. Louis. These Southern
blacks had joined the Great Migration, particularly during the WWI period, 1914 to 1917, when many blacks had been leaving the south for the north.\(^\text{32}\)

Political influence that had been exercised by black E. St. Louisans enabled the black community’s political leaders to win additional “patronage, as well as appointive and elective offices” in the city of E. St. Louis. As Lumpkins demonstrates, it was this kind of political success, which blacks had achieved in E. St. Louis. In addition, coupled with black E. St Louisans voting power to “swing closely contested elections,” white political bosses took this as a threat to their control over the E. St. Louis’ city government. Ultimately, Lumpkins points out, whites concern over blacks’ political advancement in the City’s electoral politics pushed E. St. Louis’ political bosses to orchestrate a “terrorist assault” in May 1917 to destroy the “nascent” black political machine there in E. St. Louis. When this first attempt had failed, those same “politician-businessmen” who are associated with the CTLU organized and directed the July 1917 East St. Louis Race Riot. This second act of white terrorism destroyed the African American community there and reduced black E. St. Louisans’ political influence in the city for decades to come.\(^\text{33}\)

Though black men gained industrial employment, they often had to settle for job position as unskilled workers. The job opportunity for black women was no different. Black women in E. St. Louis had very limited opportunity for employment. For example, 

---


black women in E. St. Louis in the early twentieth century and in other Northern cities in
general, “toiled as domestics and laundresses.” These employments represent the main
source of employment for them. Those jobs offered the least remunerative wages and
long work hours. Plus, they were often forced to work under some of the most dangerous
and unhealthy conditions. However, Black women started to gain slightly better
employment opportunities when jobs in the wartime industry in the WWII period, 1940-
1945, were beginning to open up to them.34

Finally, both Senechal and Lumpkins agree that conflicts over race relations did
exist in Northern urban areas precisely from the 1830s throughout the WWI and WW II
periods. Race rioting increased in some decades and a variety of social and economic
strains impacted those Northern cities as well. Both scholars also agree that the “years
between those peak times of interracial violence were not stable either.” Therefore, it’s
hard-pressed to argue that fewer race riots occurring in those decades suggests the
nonexistence of social strain or lack of rapid change in the social and economic sectors.
Along these lines, Lumpkins asserts that the 1917 E. St. Louis riots “had much to do with
whites’ reaction to perceived threats to white racial entitlements.” Moreover, whites had
developed a new perception of black E. St. Louisans. This came about as a result of black
E. St. Louisans’ community building agenda and of their growing political influence in
the City’s electoral politics.35

34 Tera W. Hunter, To ‘Joy My Freedom: Southern Black Women’s Lives and Labor After
the Civil War (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Robin D. G. Kelley, Race
35 Roberta Senechal de la Roche, The Sociogenesis of a Race Riot: Springfield, Illinois, in
1908 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 4–5; Charles Lumpkins, American
Pogrom: The East St. Louis Race Riot and Black Politics, (Athens: Ohio University
CHAPTER 4
LYNCHING

“With the Southern white man, any mesalliance existing between a white woman and a colored man is a sufficient foundation for the charge of rape. The Southern white man says that it is impossible for a voluntary alliance to exist between a white woman and a colored man, and therefore, the fact of an alliance is a proof of force. In numerous instances where colored men have been lynched on the charge of rape, it was positively known at the time of lynching, and indisputably proven after the victim’s death, that the relationship sustained between the [black] man and [white] woman was [absolutely] voluntary and clandestine, and that in no court of law could even the charge of assault have been successfully maintained.”

Ida B. Wells, A Red Record

In a recent interview Caitlyn Rosenthal talked about the use of violence as a method of business practice that were conducted on slave plantations in the United State in the 18th and 19th century. Driven by economic profit, Rosenthal discussed how slave masters used horrific violence to force slaves to work. Planters monitored their slaves in order to observe the slaves’ productivity at work. In turn, some planters created reward and punishment system that were based on their observation of the enslaved workers. For example, Rosenthal explains that rewards might be clothing or food. On the other hand, punishment might result in “severe whipping or other forms of torture.” Slaves working in the field might “receive a lash of the whip for every pound of cotton they came up short.” This was done to motivate the slave to be more productive. Thus, the African American slaves have experienced a long and enduring racial trauma as a result of the impact of racial violence on their lives. This violent experience, Rosenthal points out, has left a legacy of historical and racial trauma within the African American community. Similarly, scholars of lynching laments that the crime of lynching has left an historical legacy of violence and psychic trauma that still impacts Black people in the United States.
today. Therefore, though this Dissertation does not allow nearly enough space in which to fully discuss lynching, it is worth mentioning here lynching’s historical trajectory and its impact upon the African American community in the 19th and early 20th century.\(^{36}\)

Lynching violence, another example of “deadly historical lethal excesses,” is perhaps one of the most impactful acts of white mob violence carried out against Blacks in the United States. Ida B. Wells should be credited for her pioneering investigation and reporting of lynching. Her anti-lynching journalism brought national attention to lynching. Wells’ investigation was instrumental in documenting the vast number of cases of lynching that had been carried out against African Americans. Among the first African American investigators of lynching, Wells argued publicly, on the national and international stage, that the lynching of blacks was a white terrorist campaign aimed at intimidating black men from exercising the franchise. Black women had not been granted the franchise under the 15th Amendment of 1870, only black men. Women, “all American women,” won the right to vote on August 18, 1920, under the 19th Amendment.\(^{37}\)

Blacks, however, were not always the primary targets of white lynch mobs. According to Michael Pfeifer, lynching became a popular method of punishment used to administer white community justice. It was almost entirely used on the American Frontier and in the Western territories during the early period of the American Republic. Lynching was more common in areas in the country where strong government institutions had not been established. In those areas, community members were unable to rely on the criminal


\(^{37}\) U. S. Const. amend. XIX.
justice system and law enforcement to maintain law and order. Thus, punishment meted out to law breakers was based on collective community agreement. Lynching, however, was only one type of punishment among others that was used to punish violators of the community’s norms. In that sense Pfeifer points out that lynching was not always exclusive punishment used against blacks. “It was used by whites to administer instant punishment to other white law-breakers” as well. With migration to the new American territories in the West, however, Law breakers soon included people who represented the diverse population that came to inhabit the American West. Thus, lawbreakers represented members of different ethnic groups who have been charged with violating established community laws. These might have included laws ranging from drunkenness to cattle thieves to immoral behavior, among others.38

In his examination of violence against blacks in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in the mid-19th century, Sam Bass Jr. found whites there held similar ideas about instant punishment for criminals. Alleged black criminals, they claimed, often escaped serious punishment that should have been administered by the criminal justice system. Thus, whites in Philadelphia at the time had believed that they had the right to punish “criminals and intruders” in their community. Also, Whites believed that they were empowered to act in order to protect their community from black criminals, when the government fails to arrest and punish such criminals. Whites’ allegation of blacks’ violation of the white community’s rules subsequently manifest in anti-black violence in

many Northern cities like Philadelphia around the same period in the mid-19th century.39 Moreover, by the 1890s increased white hostility against blacks in the post-Reconstruction period resulted in the lynching of many African Americans. Predominantly a southern phenomenon used to intimidate blacks, by this time lynching violence appeared to have been exclusively reserved for use against blacks by whites. This was registered in the spike in the number of blacks been lynched in the 1890 decade, followed by a steady pace of lynching of blacks in the 1st half of the 20th century.40 Wells had seriously started to investigate lynching, which is evident in her May 21, 1892, editorial published in Free Speech, a weekly black newspaper in Memphis, Tennessee, of which Wells was co-owner and publisher. Wells’ investigation of Lynching had been influenced by the lynching of the three black proprietors of the People’s Grocery Company. She was doubtful of the charge of rape that was levy against the three black men, who were Wells close friends. These men were considered to be leading citizens in the black community in Memphis,41 demonstrating a low degree of “relational distance” between them and the community. Moreover, they’re not characterized as “itinerant laborers.” Nor were they “strangers or recent arrivals in their community,” the kind of people that have been identified in some reports who comprised the majority of the victims of lynching.42

Wells’ 1892 editorial challenged Southern whites’ interpretation of lynching as punishment for black men for the alleged crime of rape. The editorial debunks and exposes whites’ allegation of rape, which Southern white men had used to justify their lynching of black men. Also, white supremacists in Memphis, Wells’ hometown, interpreted Wells’ editorial defense of black men as contributing to the breakdown of the established racial order. The racial order in which white “superordination” and black “subordination,” represents the fundamental structure on which southern society is based, as Grimshaw clearly demonstrates. Mia Bay further illustrates that Wells’ rebuke of Southern whites’ pretensions of alleged rape charge against black men is her attempt to “recasting lynching as a lesson of ‘subordination’ that had little to do with sex or sexual assaults.” As George C. Wright demonstrates, lynching served as an “extralegal” method of racial subjugation, Bay also concludes that Southern white men had been using lynching as a way to enforce Jim Crow and white supremacy in the post Reconstruction period in the south.43

In 1892, in the post Reconstruction period, 1880 to 1900, the period in which Wells conducted investigation on lynching, she published *Southern Horrors: Lynch Law in All Its Phases*, in November of that same year. This was Wells first major work on lynching. In a full-length pamphlet, she expanded on her May 1892 editorial, presenting greater research data and analysis on lynching. Wells documents in *Southern Horrors*...
undisputable evidence on lynching that further refutes Southern white men’s allegation of rape, on which most lynching of black men was based. The black men who were accused of raping white women, Wells asserts, were guilty of no more than having consensual sexual relationship with them. Still clearly angry over the lynching of her friends during that same year, Wells includes in *Southern Horrors* excerpts copied from *Exile.* This is an earlier article of Wells that appeared in the New York Age. *Exile* features Wells’ story of her forced exile outside of Memphis by white supremacists, and the lynching of the black proprietors of the *People’s Grocery Company.* This is significant because Wells was closely associated with the proprietors of the People’s Grocery Company. She wants to reiterate that these black men are leading citizens within Memphis’ black community and “They had committed no crime [of rape] against white women.” Thus, Wells’ 1892 editorial openly challenged Southern White men’s claim that black men were assaulting southern white womanhood. It is worth including the entire editorial, which Wells inserts as the opening paragraph in *Southern Horrors: Lynch Law In All its Phases.* Wells writes:

> “Eight negroes lynched since last issue of the ‘Free speech’ one at Little Rock, Ark., last Saturday morning where the citizens broke (?) into the penitentiary and got their man; three near Anniston, Ala., one near New Orleans; and three at Clarksville, Ga., the last three for killing a white man, and five on the same old racket---the new alarm about raping white women. The same programme of hanging, then shooting bullets into the lifeless bodies was carried out to the letter. Nobody in this section of the country believes the old threadbare lie that Negro men rape white women. If Southern white men are not careful, they will over-reach themselves and public sentiment will have a reaction; a conclusion will then be reached which will be very damaging to the moral reputation of their women.”

---

Here, Wells not only refutes the “rape myth,” she boldly suggests the “truth” as to why southern white men lynched black men with impunity. The truth, which Wells implies, involves white women’s consensual liaison with black men. Illicit sexual relationships that southern whites would want to keep secret because it contradicts whites’ allegation of rape. Moreover, this presents a false notion on the part of white supremacists that “pure white womanhood” would never freely consent to participate in such relationship with “black brute rapist.” As Jacqueline Jones Royster argues, Wells alludes to questions that cast doubt on southern white women’s virtue. Illicit sexual relationships between black men and white women were undoubtedly more obvious than southern white supremacists wanted to acknowledge. Unstated questions in the editorial, Royster argues, implies that “if assaulting white women is a threadbare lie, then what might be the truth?” Through this question, Royster illustrates that Wells is breaking down “all sorts of codes of etiquette” in southern society, inherent in the established racial order since the days of slavery. For example, Royster points to the segregation of the races in southern society, especially the separation between black men and white women.46

Martha Elizabeth Hodes argues that lynching was never used to punish black men because they engaged in “illicit sex” with white women. Like Royster, Hodes calls attention to the many unspoken relationships that went on between black men and white women in the South from since in the pre-Civil War period. She found that such intimate and illicit sexual relationship was not uncommon, nor rare. Those relationships, Hodes

asserts, had been going on since during the early settlements of the British North American colonies. For example, in the 17th century in the early British North American settlements in Virginia, European indentured servants and blacks “fraternized together,” and “intermarry.”

Hodes found that those relationships did not violate the law at the time and southern white society tolerated such interracial relationships. Only when the colonial authority had determined that intra-community relationship between blacks and whites had begun to interrupt colonial production that they separated the races. Still, even in the 1700s when slavery became more entrenched in the United States and the slave system instituted segregation, interracial relationships still existed. Neither did cohabitation between black men and white women generate serious debate about amalgamation. Though miscegenation represents one causal factor, Whites, in New York City, claimed it to have triggered the 1834 New York City riot. Finally, Hodes finds no evidence to suggest that black men violated southern social norms around interracial relationship or that they assaulted white womanhood.

The lynching of black men for alleged rape of white women, Hodes laments, came about during the post-Civil War period because blacks had been granted American citizenship, as well as the franchise. This brought about black political equality with whites. Whites, however, had long been opposed to black racial and political equality with whites. They fear that political and economic independence for black men

“produced a deadly combination” that will impact white supremacy. As Wells earlier illustrates “the Negro was given the right of franchise, and his ballot became his invaluable emblem of citizenship.” Thus, black men have been lynched just because they have attempted to exercise their right to vote.

By 1895, three years after publication of *Southern Horrors*, Wells published “A Red Record” (1895), her second major pamphlet on lynching. Wells reports that blacks made up the majority of the victims of lynching. She demonstrates how the rapid increase in the number of black victims of lynching progressed over the period of the decade. For example, Wells reports that in the ten years period between 1882 to 1892 fifty-two African Americans had been lynched. However, in 1892 alone 241 persons had been lynched. Of this number 160 were African Americans. Jacqueline Jones Royster points out that this number represents an increase of 200 percent in the number of blacks been lynched over the same ten-year period, 1882 to 1892. Moreover, 4,743 lynching were recorded between 1882 and 1968, showing a dramatic increase of “African Americans in the total number of lynching from 46 percent in 1882 to an average of 89 percent between 1900 and 1910.” Royster points out that the rate of lynching even went up above 90 percent in seven of the ten years during this same period.

---

Depending on the period of focus, the actual number of documented lynching may vary. Some reports on lynching indicate that 4,500 black people had been lynched between 1865 and the post Reconstruction period. On the other hand, few reports document 4,743 lynching, however, this number reflects the calculation of the number of lynching that occurred from the end of the Civil War to the mid twentieth century. This Dissertation will focus on the 4,500 number of documented lynching, the sum of the number of lynching at the post Reconstruction period, the period in which Wells writes.

New research on Lynching, however, indicates that the actual number of documented lynching, 4500, had been grossly undercounted. For example, Equal Justice Initiative (EJI) recent report, Reconstruction in America: Racial Violence After the Civil War, documents 2,000 more additional lynching that had taken place in the south between 1865, end of the Civil War and 1877, the end of Reconstruction. These newfound cases increased the total number of documented lynching to 6,500, which have occurred between 1865 to the mid twentieth century. This sum of lynching is far greater than the previous number (4,500) of lynching EJI earlier listed in its 2015 report, Lynching in America. 53

What the new documented cases reveal is that there is still uncertainty around the actual number of victims of lynching. Indeed, EJI asserts in its report that white mobs have murdered thousands more Southern blacks, but their deaths may never be discovered. George C. Wright confirms that scholars of lynching have “found it all but impossible to determine the exact number of lynching” that have occurred during that

same period, 1865 to the post Reconstruction period. White mobs, Wright found in his research on lynching in Kentucky in that same period, “often buried or burned the bodies of lynched victims.” Family members were often reluctant to report crime of lynching because they were afraid of retaliation from white mobs. Wells also expresses her suspicion over unreported lynching of blacks in, for example, isolated rural communities in the South. This makes it difficult to recover and identify victims of lynching. Hence, the proliferation of lynching in those rural areas often has been blamed on the lack of government institutions and weak legal systems on the American frontier. It is suspected that the lynching of blacks probably occurred to a degree far greater than scholars can ever document.54

Along with Wells, Frederick Douglass, a close friend and admirer of Wells, contributed two critical articles on lynching in the early 1890 decade. Wells first two major works on lynching also had been published during this same period. It is possible that perhaps the works of Wells and Douglass represent the first two major critical examinations on lynching at the time. Douglass and Wells had met and spent time discussing the “increasing number of lynching” among blacks in the South. This meeting took place when Wells visited Douglass in 1892 at his home at Anacostia, Washington, D.C. Wells mentions in her autobiography, Crusade for Justice, that Douglass expressed his gratitude for her work on lynching, “a revelation of existing conditions this article had

54 Equal Justice Initiative, *Reconstruction in America: Racial Violence After the Civil War*, (2020); George C. Wright, 250.
been to me.” He ended up writing the preface to Wells’ pamphlet, *Southern Horrors*. The two remained close friends until Douglass’ death in February 1895.55

Douglass 1892 speech “*Lessons of the Hour,*” appeared two months after Wells first pamphlet, *Southern Horrors*, in May 1892. Also, Douglass first article on lynching was published in July of that same year. Douglass delivered the “*Lessons of the Hour*” speech at different venues in 1892 and 1893, before he published the speech in pamphlet format in 1894. Douglass presents an unapologetic defense of the “colored people as a class” against the “atrocious crime” of lynching. There are sound reasons, Douglass asserts, “for doubting and denying this horrible…charge of rape as the peculiar crime of the colored people of the South.” Douglass opines that for one thing the “character of the Negro” is one of honesty and respect for all Americans. This is contrary to “what I know of the character…of the men and women who bring this charge [of rape] against him.”56

In the end, Memphis’ white supremacists forced the out-spoken editor, Wells, into exile. Wells explains in her autobiography that she could not return to her home in Memphis, Tennessee, because Whites had “threatened my life for hinting at the truth.” The truth about the real reason why whites lynch black men with impunity. As Wright illustrates, there are numerous instances in which “whites forced blacks to leave their homes and land.” This meant that as a result of forced exile, African Americans would lose everything that they owned. They would not regain those items, which could include

56 Frederick Douglass, “Address by the Honorable Frederick Douglass.” (Delivered in the Metropolitan A.M.E. Church, Washington, D.C. Tuesday, January 9, 1894); Frederick Douglass, *On The Lessons of The Hour* (Baltimore: Thomas and Evans, 1894); Frederick Douglass, “Lynch Law in the South,” *North American Review*, 1892
houses and businesses. Their clothes, money, furniture, and other properties were often taken away by the white mobs. A method of punishment, forced exile, like lynching and mob violence, was also an effective method of punishment inflicted by white terrorist mobs to intimidate and force Blacks to leave the area. According to Wright, this “practice of running Blacks off their lands was another form of oppression, used by whites to “keep blacks in their place,” as lynching and mob violence often dictates.\(^5^7\)

Similarly, other outspoken black editors of African American newspapers were forced into exile like Wells had been driven from her home. This is because they condemned lynching and challenged white supremacy. For example, in 1887, five years prior to Wells’ 1892 editorial, Jesse Duke, editor of the weekly “Montgomery Herald,” an African American newspaper in Montgomery, Alabama, was forced into exile from that city. Like Wells, Duke’s editorial alludes to consensual sexual relationship between black men and white women. Duke does not blame black men. Rather, in his editorial, Duke effectively placed the “burden of agency” on white women, shifting it away from black men. “Why is it,” Duke asks, “that white women attract negro men now more than the former days?” Duke continues in his attempt to explain the reason black men attract white women. “There is a secret to this thing,” he writes, “and we greatly suspect it is the growing appreciation of the Juliet for the colored Romeo, as he becomes more and more intelligent and refined.” Expressing those white women delight in their relationship with black men, frightened whites. Independent black men, Whites’ fear, would achieve social

equality with whites. This aroused their concern over miscegenation and those black men would seek out and marry white women.\textsuperscript{58}

In 1898, six years after Wells’ editorial, Alexander Manly (sometimes spelled Alexander Manley), the outspoken black editor of the African American newspaper “Daily Record” in Wilmington, North Carolina was also forced into exile. White supremacists threatened to lynch Manly, forcing him to leave Wilmington, Manly’s hometown. Manly’s expulsion from the city came about as a result of his editorial of August 18, 1898, in which he responds to Rebecca Latimer Felton’s speech of August 12, 1897. Here, Felton declares, “I say lynch; a thousand times a week if necessary.”\textsuperscript{59} Manly defends black men and refutes whites’ allegation of rape against black men. Manly’s editorial is viewed as the catalyst to the 1898 Wilmington Riot which is examine in this Dissertation.

Like Wells and Duke, Manly’s editorial talks about white women’s “clandestine meetings with colored men,” suggesting that such meetings had been going on for some time, with the consent of both the black man and white woman who are involved in the relationship. Manly reiterates in his editorial what Wells and Duke had earlier reported. This is that the obvious truth that white men refused to acknowledge is that “black men were sufficiently attractive for white girls of culture and refinement to fall in love with them . . .” This, Manly writes, is “very well known” to everybody.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{58} Martha Elizabeth Hodes, \textit{White Women, Black Men: Illicit Sex in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century South}, (New Haven: Yale Books, 1999), 187–197.


\textsuperscript{60} LaRae Sikes Umfleet, \textit{A Day of Blood: The 1898 Wilmington Race Riot}, (Raleigh NC: North Carolina Office of Archives and History, 2009), 105.
African American organizations moved to the forefront of the anti-lynching campaign, bringing federal attention to the practice of lynching. For example, at the turn of the century the leadership of the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), which included two founding members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Wells and Mary Church Terrell, wanted the NACW to support more bold programs against lynching. They proposed the development of programs that resonate with mainstream black Americans’ fight against disfranchisement, Jim Crow, and the ongoing threat of lynching. By 1912 the NACW had introduced its anti-lynching campaign. According to Deborah Gray White, the Association’s anti-lynching resolution, which was coupled with civil rights and woman’s suffrage, signaled a new direction for the NACW. Prior to such shift in its programing, NACW’s leadership had primarily been focusing on integrating the “unique concerns of black women into a program that addressed the problems of race and poverty.”

Wells and Terrell, for instance, had already been involved in anti-lynching work. As mentioned above, Wells’ investigation of lynching brought national and international attention to lynching. As president of the NACW, Terrell has written and spoken widely on lynching. Plus, by 1913 the Northeastern Federation of Women’s Club, a division of the NACW had been co-sponsoring and participating in anti-lynching rallies sponsored by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). NACW clubwomen, such as Wells and Terrell, had also been closely associated with the newly


created NAACP, founded in 1909. Both were members of the group that organized the NAACP in that same year.\textsuperscript{62}

In 1922, Mary B. Talbert, a member of the NACW and former president of the NACW, was appointed Director of the Anti-Lynching Crusaders. This is a women’s group, which was created by the NAACP to mobilize support for the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill. Talbert collaborated with other women organizations across the United States that was involved in anti-lynching work, particularly white women’s organizations. The NACW clubwomen had believed that white women organizations “could play a pivotal role in ending lynching and racism” against African Americans.\textsuperscript{63} Instrumental in this effort was the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention Lynching (ASWPL). One of few white women’s groups that were involved in the anti-lynching campaign, the ASWPL also was an interracial group.\textsuperscript{64}

The NAACP, perhaps more than any other black organization in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, has been instrumental in lobbying for federal legislation to combat lynching. Founded in 1909, the NAACP engaged in more concrete action against lynching by working with Representatives in the United States Congress to help create a federal anti-lynching bill. In 1921, for instance, the NAACP heavily lobbied Congress to pass the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill of 1918. This Bill intended to make lynching a federal crime. The Dyer Bill proposed to arrest and prosecute people who participated in lynching, but it did not
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pass in the United States Senate. As more lynching continued to take place in the first half of the 20th century, the NAACP started to display its “famous protest flag” at its Harlem, New York headquarters. A symbol for the number of black people who had been lynched each day, the organization had hoped to arouse the conscience of Americans and motivate them into action against lynching.65

On January 26, 1922, United States House of Representatives passed the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill after it was reintroduced in sessions in Congress that same year. However, again this Bill did not get passed in the Senate. Hence, it did not become law. Another attempt in Congress to pass an Anti-Lynching bill did not occur until the Costigan-Wagner Anti-Lynching Bill of 1934. Costigan-Wagner had proposed “federal trials for any law enforcement officers who failed to exercise their responsibilities during a lynching incident.” Again, Congress failed to pass this Bill. One reason that the Bill did not pass was because it did not attract most of the support of Congressmen. Thus, Congress failed to outlaw lynching in the United States.66

The U.S. Senate finally passed the Justice for Victims of Lynching Act in 2018 almost a century (84 years) after the Senators in Congress blocked the Costigan-Wagner Bill of 1934. Though the House of Representatives had tabled the Justice for Victims of

Lynching Act, it recently passed the Emmitt Till Anti-Lynching Act on February 26, 2020, a revised version of the 2018 Justice for Victims of Lynching Act.\textsuperscript{67}

CHAPTER 5
THE 1881 POGROM IN THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

The 1881 pogrom were a striking and singular violent uprising designed to intimidate and punish Russian Jews. While this chapter explores the pogrom’s violence and its impact on Jews, it sought to draw out the parallels between the 1881 pogrom and racial riots that targeted African Americans in the United States in the 19th and early 20th century. The 1881 pogrom is comprised of many riotous events that was propagated throughout the Russian Empire, particularly in the Pale of Settlement where most Russian Jews resided. It would be difficult to include all those riots in this study, so I attempt to highlight different aspects of the 1881 pogrom and juxtapose them to events of racial riots, while at the same time examining any parallels that might exist between the two, pogrom and racial riot. The chronological sequence in which the pogroms followed is important because it shows how the previous pogrom event influenced the next pogrom. The organization of this chapter follows that sequence of the pogrom events, and it examines the recurrent pattern that characterizes the pogroms.

5.1 Initial Similarities of the Pogroms and Racial Riots and Jim Crow Violence
The 1881 pogroms erupted in the Russian Empire (Imperial Russia) following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II on March 13, 1881. Those pogroms are considered the first in the modern era.\textsuperscript{68} They featured certain characteristics that distinguish them from earlier pogroms in the Empire. For one thing, the 1881 pogroms were broadly covered in the new, emerging media at the time, particularly the newspaper. Coverage of earlier events in the city of Odessa, in the first half of the 19th century, for instance, is lacking.

Another factor that sets the 1881 pogrom apart from its predecessors is that it was “essentially an urban phenomenon.” In the words of John Klier, despite the fact that the 1881 pogroms generated many riots in the rural villages and towns, as well. The riots spread across the Empire in what Michael Aronson describes as a “pogrom wave.” They became a “mass phenomenon,” as John Klier illustrates, able to spread through modern means of communication such as the railroads and the modern newspaper.\footnote{John D. Klier, \textit{Russians, Jews, and the Pogroms of 1881–1882}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 58–59; I Michael Aronson, \textit{Troubled Waters: The Origins of the 1881 Anti-Jewish Pogroms in Russia}, (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1990), 108–111.}

Klier asserts that those features of the 1881 pogrom helped to develop the idea of an anti-Jewish sensibility in Imperial Russia. Serious acts of violence became an implicit feature that is associated with pogroms in the modern era, with the total destruction of Jewish homes and businesses (and properties) the end result of these later 19th and early 20th century pogroms. They provided a model for future pogroms, creating a precedent that became associated with anti-Jewish violence in the second half of the 19th century and in the early 20th century. A “pogrom paradigm” was eventually developed, Klier explains, which officials used to justify their occurrences. Similarly, white supremacists came up with a justification for their lynching of Black men in the South as Jim Crow became the norm. Whereas Americans justified their violence on the need for social order, Native Russians, based their excuse for pogrom on their assumptions about Jewish economic exploitation, religious intolerance, and the notion of a Jewish “primitive culture.”\footnote{John D. Klier, Shlomo Lambrozo, eds., \textit{Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History}, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 34.} But in both cases, violence became, in effect, a tool to dominate and terrorize.
Strong parallels can be drawn between the 1881 pogroms and Native Russians
treatment of Jews in Imperial Russia, and racial riots that violently impacted African
Americans lives in the United States in the 19th century, and in the early 20th century.
Anti-Jewish violence that was associated with the 1881 pogroms mirror anti-black
violence that African Americans experienced during episodes of racial riots --- in spite of
the fact that both examples of violence played out in different parts of the world.

Native Russians anti-Semitism permeated every aspect of Jewish lives in Imperial
Russia. Anti-Jewish stereotypes were common practice in Native Russians interaction
with Russian Jews. For example, long standing stereotypes that characterized the Jews as
economic exploiters were used to exclude them from certain business opportunities. Jews
supposedly corrupted Russian society and encouraged alcohol (drunkenness). Those and
other prejudices against the Jews served as the basis for anti-Jewish legislation, basically
Russian governmental anti-Semitism. For instance, Imperial government policy restricted
Jewish residency to the Pale of Settlement.71

Similarly, systemic white racism in the United States dominated all aspects of
Blacks relationship with Whites. This feature was most visible in the system of
segregation that was represented in the states located in the southern United States, where
Jim Crow dominated every level of Southern society. Prior to emancipation, African
Americans had been forced to live and work on the plantations that existed in the
Northern and Southern United States. Though slavery and the relatively small plantation
system in the North gradually ended in the years following the end of the American

71 Heinz-Dietrich Lowe, *The Tsars and the Jews: Reform, Reaction and Anti-Semitism in
Imperial Russia, 1772–1917*, (United Kingdom: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1993)
27–33, 34–49.
Revolution, the plantation-slavery system continued in the Southern states until 1865 and the end of the American Civil War.

Anti-Jewish violence, as demonstrated in the 1881 pogrom, was in part attributed to Native Russians anger over the Jews economic success. For example, some Jews who were able to profit from their involvement in the tavern and liquor industries, which were blamed for Native Russians financial hardships. They, especially local Russians, also accused the Jews of monopolization of various industries such as the liquor distillery and tavern industries.

Similarly, whites in Wilmington, North Carolina for example, resented prosperous blacks. They believed that blacks should not do better than them. That is, not only were White Democrats opposed to African Americans political advancement, but they were against Blacks who were financially fortunate beyond the economic condition of the average white man. Blacks like John Campbell Dancy exemplified the level of socioeconomic achievement whites resented. He was appointed and elected to various government positions including “Collector of Customs at Wilmington, North Carolina.” Dancy was elected “Officer of Register of Deeds for Edgecombe County” in North Carolina. Dancy is the father of John C. Dancy Jr., who in 1917 became Director of the Detroit Urban League. Dancy Jr.’s “greatest contribution” in his position as director, Frank Angelo opined, was that he “opened many doors for Negroes to get jobs” in Detroit during the period of the Great Migration and WWI era.\(^72\) George C. Wright also found

that many Blacks in Kentucky who were “prosperous” or “independent” of Whites became targets for anti-black violence and the victims of lynching.\(^\text{73}\)

### 5.2 Origins of the 1881 Pogrom – Increasing Jewish Population

By the mid-18\(^{\text{th}}\) century, the small population of Jews residing in the Russian Empire at the time dramatically increased. This increase came about as a direct result of the “partition of Poland” by the three dominant Eastern European empires of the period, Russia, Prussia and Austria. Joining their military forces together, the three Empires invaded and conquered Poland. They divided up Poland’s land among themselves. Each was motivated by territorial expansion and by the desire to neutralize the mighty Polish Kingdom. For the Russian Empire, however, Tsar Catherine wanted to regain Russian land that was taken by Poland.

Moreover, the partition of Poland took place during the period of the “Enlightenment Movement” in Europe, 1650 to 1800. Advocating the use of reason and individualism instead of tradition and established doctrine, the Enlightenment ideals spread across Europe. Tsar Catherine had intended to diminish Poland’s influence in the region, making it less threatening to Russia. She did this by blocking any attempts by the Polish government to adopt Enlightenment ideals. Polish officials, by 1793, had started moving “towards a sort of broad-based representative government that was inspired by the French Revolution’s example.” As Kees Boterbloem illustrates, that the monarchs of

---
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the three partitioning powers “were frightened by Polish efforts to reform their
government based on Enlightenment ideals . . .”\textsuperscript{74}

The fundamental ideals of the Enlightenment Movement had formed the basis of
the revolutionary movements represented by the American Revolution and the French
revolutionaries. These two societies eventually adopted constitutions that were rooted in
the Enlightenment ‘s political theories.” if Poland was allowed to reform under
Enlightenment ideals, Tsar Catherine expressed fear that such movement might cross
over into Russia.\textsuperscript{75}

The first partition of Poland occurred on February 17, 1772. Here, Tsar Catherine
annexed to the Russian Empire 36,000 square miles of Poland’s land, along with
1,800,000 people who resided on that land. A majority of this number was Polish Jews,
though some identified as Russians who practiced Russian traditions and religion. Along
with Tsar Catherine, King Frederick of Prussia, Maria Teresa and her son Emperor
Joseph II, co-rulers of Austria, made up the three partitioning powers. Prussia gained
13,000 square miles of territory and 600,000 people. Austria’s share included 27,000
square miles of land located in southern Poland and 2,700,000 Poles.\textsuperscript{76}

In 1792 the second partition of Poland took place. The advancement of Russia’s
military with the support of Prussian forces into Poland, ended in the Russian military’s
occupation of Poland. In this instance Poland cede 89,000 square miles of its land and
3,000,000 people to the Russian Empire. Prussia won 23,000 square miles of land and

\textsuperscript{74} Kees Boterbloem, \textit{A History of Russia and Its Empire, From Mikhail Romonov to
\textsuperscript{75} Kees Boterbloem, 59–60.
\textsuperscript{76} Robert K. Massie, \textit{Catherine the Great: Portrait of a Woman}, (New York: Random
1,000,000 inhabitants. Austria did not share in the spoils this time because Austria had earlier signed a nonaggression treaty with Poland.\textsuperscript{77}

On January 3, 1795, the third and final partition of Poland was carried out. This came after the Russian military brutally defeated the Polish Resistance against Russian domination. The entire remainder of Polish land was subdivided among the partitioning powers. The lands and inhabitants of Lithuania, Belorussia and the Western Ukraine were annexed to the Russian Empire.\textsuperscript{78}

By 1772, the Jewish population in the Russian Empire increased to almost 2 million. Again, in the 1790s decade over 3 million Jews had been added to the Russian Empire’s population as a result of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} Partitions of Poland. The population of the Jews in Odessa, for example, dramatically increased as more Jews migrated to that city. As early as 1871 the \textit{American Israelite}, an American based Jewish newspaper located in Cincinnati, Ohio, reported on the rapid growth of the Jewish population in Odessa. In its July 14, 1871, publication, in the “Foreign Record Section,” the paper reported that the Jewish population surpassed that of the Greeks’ and Italians’, the two dominant groups in that city. In its July 28, 1871, issue, the \textit{American Israelite} again reports on the growing Jewish population. This is interesting because in that same year, as Jews continue to immigrate to Odessa, the city in 1871 experienced one of four violent pogroms that occurred there.\textsuperscript{79}
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The high number of Jews in the city caused great consternation among the non-Jewish population. The Jews threatened the traditional economic and political dominance of the Greek and Italian residents. As Klier illustrates that “Odessa, famous for its cosmopolitanism was also a hotbed of ethnic, religious, and economic rivalries particularly between the Greeks and the Jews.” Not only despised by the Greeks, Russian-Christians also expressed disdain against the City’s Jews. They eventually joined with the Odessa’s Greek population and attacked the Jews during the 1871 pogrom. They alleged Jews economic exploitation of Christian workers. Native Russians expressed bitterness over the Jews control of trade and commercial activities in the city.\textsuperscript{80}

A port city located in the Southwest region of the Pale of Settlement that is known as New Russia, Odessa in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century became the third largest city in the Russian Empire. 1882 Population figures for Russian cities that is outline in The Statesman’s Year-Book, Statistical and Annual of the States of the Civilized World, For the Year 1885 (\textit{The Statesman’s Year-Book for the Year 1885}), shows only St. Petersburg and Moscow with greater population numbers than Odessa, with 929,100 and 751,812 respectively. Odessa’s population figure for that year is 217,000. These two Russian cities represent the sites of the old (St. Petersburg) and new (Moscow) Russian Capitals.\textsuperscript{81}

\textit{The Statesman’s Year-Book for the Year 1885}, however, list Warsaw as the third most populated city in the Russian Empire. It fashioned a population of 406,261.


Warsaw, the capital of Poland, had been annexed to the Russian Empire at the time of the partition of Poland, but Warsaw is not geographically situated in “Russia proper.” Still, the population figures for 1882 shows Warsaw’s population as being greater than that of Odessa’s. Thus, some sources identify this Polish city as the third largest city in the Russian Empire in the latter decades of the 19th century. By the mid-19th century though Jews made up one-third of Odessa’s population. By 1858 Jews accounted for 14,000, 14%, of the aggregate population there. In 1897 140,000 Jews resided in the city, comprising 35% of the Odessa’s total population. By 1904 the Jewish population remained at 140,000, accounting for 28% of Odessa’s population. This is a decline from its 35% in 1897. This decline, Robert Weinberg asserts, is attributed to increase in anti-Jewish violence.82

Overall, the increasing numbers of Russian Jews led to tensions with the overall Native Russian populations culminating in the 1881 pogrom. A number of theories have been advanced regarding how the violence was took shape, the particular events that triggered it, and the extent to which the Russian government orchestrated it.

5.3 Origins of the 1881 Pogrom --- The Economic Crisis Argument

To what extent were the pogroms intentional instruments of policy? In their interpretation of the 1881 pogroms, some scholars of Russian Jewish history implicate the Russian government in planning and directing the attacks. Those scholars’ interpretation is rooted in what I. Michael Aronson describes as the “conspiracy theory,” the idea that the pogroms were planned by Russian government officials. Simon M.

Dubnow, scholar and Russian Jewish historian, agrees that Russian government officials played a leading role in orchestrating the pogroms. Dubnow’s interpretation of the pogroms informed his understanding of later pogroms carried out against the Jews in the Empire.

Following the “bloody” pogroms of October 1905, for example, Dubnow gives an emotional interpretation of the strategic nature of anti-Jewish violence in Russia. In his essay “The Moral of Stormy Days,” which was first published in “letters on Old and New Judaism,” Dubnow asserts that pogroms “came about as a result of the entire political system of Russia.” He talks about the “ignorant” Russian “masses” whom Russian government officials wanted to keep ignorant. This is because officials believed that they could easily manipulate the local population. Government officials, Dubnow concludes, tell the “native inhabitants,” particularly the rural Native Russians, that the “Jews are outside the pale of the law…. Therefore, if such information “leads to pogroms, let us not hasten to suppress the mobsters.”

Not all scholars agree on the cause of the pogroms of 1881. In fact, until recently, some scholars of Russian Jewish history disagree with that interpretation. For example, in his influential text, Russians, Jews, and the Pogroms of 1881-1882, Klier asserts that Russian government officials were not involved in the pogroms. They neither planned, nor did they participate in the pogroms. Imperial government officials tried “desperately”

to stop the pogroms and to protect the Jews from attacks. This finding, however, is contrary to Klier’s earlier assertion that government officials played a leading role in the 1881 pogroms.84

Other scholars likewise question the intentionality. Aronson argues against the “conspiracy theory.” In the opening chapter of in Troubled Waters, Aronson writes “this book is about the absent of a conspiracy theory. It sets out to disprove the widely held assumption that the Russian government, or elements within it, or close to it supported the pogroms of 1881.” According to Aronson the anti-Jewish violence that occurred in 1881 was “part of an intricate web woven from many dynamic strands.”

Rather the pogroms took place in a context of social tensions, and economic dislocations that came about in the immediate period following the assassination of the Tsar on March 13, 1881. Aronson points to economic factors such as the local crop failures in 1880 and 1881 that resulted in famine across the Empire. This brought about a shortage of food supplies, especially in the rural areas where local farm products represent the main source of food. Competition over scarce supplies pitted Native Russians against the defenseless Jews. The pogrom prevented many Russian laborers from getting regular employment in the rural towns and villages, and many local Russians left their jobs and joined the rioters.

Larger economic crisis across society also played a role, at least according to those scholars disinclined to the government conspiracy theory. Russian Jewish scholars point to the industrial depression that engulfed Russian society from 1880 to 1882. This

depression exacerbated an already difficult economic period that Russians were going through. Many people lost their jobs, plunging Native Russians as well as Jews into serious financial hardship. As Aronson illustrates, in previous years there had been plenty of jobs available for anyone wanting to work. Particularly during the spring and summer months, Russians were accustomed to finding jobs in the agricultural and industrial sectors. A decrease in the number of job vacancies resulted in Native Russians and Jews competing for the few available jobs. Angered over the lack of employment opportunity, Native Russians exhibited increased hostility toward the Jews. Thus, as the ranks of the unemployed Russian laborers increased, anti-Jewish violence emerged because Russians blamed the Jews for financial hardship that many Native Russians experienced. They claimed that the Jews took jobs away from Native Russians. Klier agrees with Aronson that it was this group of jobless Russian laborers who were responsible for the “dissemination of anti-Jewish rumors and the spread of anti-Jewish violence” throughout the provinces during the 1881 pogroms.85

Aronson laments that he has detected “pronounced biases” in almost all of the sources that he was able to review for his study of the 1881 pogroms. He explains that answers to the question of how the pogroms originated really reflected peoples’ own “basic assumptions, attitudes, and aspiration.” Thus, answers that had been given by people who were active in public affairs seem to represent their own desire and ideas. Their answers reflect their own ideas about “formulating public policy and practical

85 I. Michael Aronson, 231–232.
political, economic, and cultural programs” rather than any independent assessment of the situation.\textsuperscript{86}

5.4 A Larger Government Role?

Other scholars, however, view the concept of an “economic crisis” as a poor predictor of anti-Jewish violence. This is because, as Klier demonstrates, such economic failure was recurrent in the Empire in the latter decades of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, especially in the Pale of Settlement where most Jews in the Empire resided. Pogroms rarely developed out of those dire economic circumstances, Klier explains, though some scholars use social strain to explain the cause of the pogroms. This explanation, then, raises the question of what factor triggered the 1881 pogroms.

Interestingly, a similar debate has arisen regarding the cause of riots directed against African Americans. For example, Senechal explains that competition between blacks and whites in Springfield, Illinois was not the primary cause of the 1908 Springfield Riot. Senechal also raised some pointed questions about the use of social strain to interpret the 1908 Springfield Riot. This is because cities such as Springfield, Senechal explains, had also experienced serious economic crisis prior to the riot, but no racial riot broke out. Thus, she argues that greater information about the status of individual participants in the riot is needed in order to deduce a better understanding of factors that triggered the riot. Social strain is not adequate enough to fully interpret anti-black violence (racial riot).\textsuperscript{87}


Additionally, an ongoing anti-Semitic press campaign had been going on during the period leading up to the 1881 pogroms. Newspaper reports helped to encourage anti-Jewish violence perpetrated by Native Russians. Howard M. Sachar found that the Russian press, in the aftermath of the assassination of Tsar Alexander II, published stories about a “secret Jewish conspiracy” to overthrow the Imperial autocracy and seize control of the Russian government. The Jewish Kahal had been identified as primarily responsible for recruiting and organizing “all Jews together in an anti-Christian conspiracy.” Sachar argues that such charge against the Jews by the anti-Jewish press was an attempt to scapegoat the Jews for the murder of the Tsar.  

Such reports had a grain of credibility due to the fact that one member of the assassination group, Hessia Helfman (Hesya Helfman), was a Jew. She was involved in the revolutionary group, “People’s Will,” who carried out the assassination. Newspaper reports identify Helfman and accused her of being the assassin who murdered the Tsar. This is even though she was the only Jewish member of the assassination group. Six of the eight members that made up the primary assassination group were listed as Russian nationals, one registered as Polish Russian, and Helfman, the Jew. Three women, including Helfman, took part in the planning and eventual assassination of the tsar.

5.5 The Economic Fairness Argument

---


Other scholars such as Hans Rogger points to the larger demographic changes that occurred in the Jewish population in the Russian Empire, in the 19th century, and argue that those were a primary factor in causing the 1881 pogrom. Thousands of Jews became “subjects” of the Tsar as a result of the Partition of Poland. Jews outnumbered Native Russians in some cities especially in the Pale of Settlement, the designated area for Jewish residency in the Empire. Native Russians had to deal with the integration of the Jews into Russian society, a policy they opposed. For most Native Russians, this meant that they would have to compete with “poor Jews” for employment. To make matters worse, some Jews became wealthy even as Native Russians continued to experience economic hardship and unemployment. The financial success that some Jews achieved in the Empire was made possible during the period of the “Great Reform” of 1850, reform policies Benjamin Nathans refers to as “selective integration.” This is because most Jews were unable to gain access to or take advantage of the opportunities created by the Reform policies. Jews who were already participating in the economy experienced improvement in their financial status. Some took advantage of employment and educational opportunities created by the Great Reform policies. Only the trained worker, Jews who have acquired a special skill, were granted permission by the government to relocate outside of the Pale of Settlement where they were able to find meaningful employment.91

Introduced by Tsar Alexander II, the “Great Reform” represented a set of laws that was aimed at advancing economic, social, and political modernization in the Russia Empire. These new socioeconomic policies had been designed to help the Empire change from its “old corporatist social framework” and adopt new modern industrial technology. Equally significant was that the “Great Reform” initiated the 1861 peasant emancipation, abolishing serfdom in the Empire, clearing the way for the new process of economic modernization to take place. As a result, this helped to create job and employment opportunities for Russian workers. In addition, the “Reforms” brought about significant changes in the existing legal status of Jews in Imperial Russia. Russian officials had believed that the Jews presence in the Empire prohibited Russian society from full social and economic advancement in the modern era. This is because Jews in the Empire refused to adapt to modern social and economic norms, preferring to hold onto age-old preindustrial cultural practices.\(^\text{92}\)

As Rogger explains, by 1881 Jews in the Empire had been able to capitalize on business opportunities that were part of the Empire’s “economic modernization” plan, initiated during the period of the Great Reforms. By the 1850s decade, Jews were overrepresented in Russian villages’ liquor and “tavern-keeping” industries, in which the rural Russian peasantry gained employment. According to Rogger, some Jews earned small fortunes as lessees of the state’s liquor monopoly and as industrialists, operating food products, and distillery businesses, for example. To the dismay of Native Russians, however, “Great Reform” policies seemed to have greatly benefited the Jews, even

though there is little evidence to support this claim. On the other hand, it appeared to them that rural Russian peasants had been excluded from such economic opportunities. These opportunities coupled with the 1861 peasant emancipation resulted in the improvement of the Jews’ legal and economic position in the Empire. The social and economic modernization policies were a part of the “Great Reforms” that was introduced by Tsar Alexander II in the mid-19th century.  

Rogger sees social strain in the Russian economic sector as a contributing factor that caused the 1881 pogrom in Imperial Russia. Like Rudwick and Tuttle Jr. who argue that in-migration of southern blacks into E. St. Louis triggered the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot, Rogger illustrates how ongoing Jewish in-migration is a root cause of the 1881 pogrom that occurred in Imperial Russia. The increase in the Jewish population in the Empire, Rogger argues, was followed by rapid economic change that impacted both Native Russians and Jews. Job opportunities became scarce. Both Native Russians and Jews in many cases ended up competing for the same jobs. Such competition had often degenerated into fighting between both groups. Thus, Native Russians excoriated Jewish immigration to Russia.  

Native Russians blamed the Jews for their economic woes, but, Rogger contends, the “backward economic conditions” that existed in Imperial Russia at the time could not create enough jobs for the large number of unemployed Russians, regardless. As Peter Kolchin demonstrates that with its agricultural economy still structured around medieval

---

serfdom systems, the Empire’s economy lagged behind the industrialized Western European countries and the United States. The Great Reform initiative of the 1850s was an attempt to modernize the Russian Empire’s economy and society. The Empire had made some noticeable strides in its attempt to reform and modernize the economy. However, in the post assassination period, Russian government officials halted the “Great Reform” policies, effectively scaling back on economic and social reform measures that had been initiated in the pre-assassination period. 95

Another version of the economic interpretation of the 1881 pogroms, according to Klier, argues that the Native Russian response was more particular. This point of view shows that relative deprivation is link to specific grievances by Native Russians against the Jews. This represents strong parallels that can be drawn between pogroms against Jews in Imperial Russia and racial violence and lynching against Blacks in the United States. See chapter four for discussion on lynching.

Relative deprivation theory argues that a “disadvantage group determines its own level of social and economic deprivation by comparing itself to some reference group.”96 Simply put, relative deprivation “emphasizes the resentment that one group expresses for the success and prosperity of another group.” Thus, in the context of the Great Reforms of 1850 in the Russian Empire, Native Russians frowned upon the economic success achieved by the Jews during that same period.97

According to Rogger, change in the Russian Empire’s economy resulted in the broadening of economic opportunities that benefited some Jews. Those economic changes that occurred had been brought about by the Great Reforms, which initiated the process of economic modernization in the Russian Empire. Economic transformation came with industrialization, and this new developing economy profoundly impacted Jewish life in the Empire.

Jews were able to fully participate in the new Russian economy because some Jews, as Klier demonstrates, had achieved economic success far beyond that of their Native Russian counterparts. Unfortunately, their economic success became a source of Native Russians’ “frustration and envy.” Considering their failure in the new economy, many Native Russians became resentful of prosperous and wealthy Jews. They blamed the Jews for Native Russians financial hardship. This happened even during the period of the Great Reforms when economic opportunities had been available to all Russians.

Rather Native Russians’ allegations about prosperous and wealthy Jews’ malfeasance were reported to create suspicion about the Jews’ business practices. Perhaps more egregious was Native Russians’ allegation that the Jews thrived on economic exploitation of rural Russians. Exploiting the rural peasant population involved getting them intoxicated, a “widespread charge leveled against Jews” who operated businesses in the countryside. Under such circumstances the Jewish businessmen were accused of “granting usurious loans and engaged in deceitful business transactions.” Such allegations, Aronson illustrates, “lay at the very center of the charge that the Jews ‘exploited’ the [Russian] peasantry.” In the very next sentence Aronson writes that such charges are “…largely unjustified” as he demonstrates in the chapter, “The Jews in
Nevertheless, this is a recurring theme in the literature on the 1881 pogroms that took place in Imperial Russia. Some scholars, Rogger and Aronson for example, consider those allegations against the Jews to be a major factor that triggered the 1881 pogroms.\(^{98}\)

Similarly, several scholars have argued that perceived economic unfairness triggered episodes of violence against African Americans in the post-war United States. George C. Wright demonstrates how “white-capping activity in Kentucky,” in the last two decades in the 19\(^{th}\) century, “shows that most of the violence blacks experienced resulted from economic activities” that Black Kentuckians had been involved in. The reason for the violence carried out by the Ku Klux Klan against blacks in Todd County, Kentucky during that same period, a New York Times editorial speculated, is that “the Negroes of the region are thrifty, industrious, and prosperous.” Wells illustrates that it was not African Americans and their “alleged attacks on white women,” but rather black businessmen, such as the black proprietors of The People’s Grocery Company, who had been the target of the white lynch mobs. In the same way, in the 1898 Wilmington Riot, the white terrorist mobs’ “main targets” were black men “…whose crime was that they were more successful and prosperous” than many of their white counterparts.\(^{99}\)

5.6 The May Laws and Government Policy Following the Pogroms


The “May Laws,” replaced the Great Reforms legislations. Issued on May 3, 1882, the following year after Tsar Alexander II assassination, the “May Laws” had been enacted “in the form of temporary rules.” According to Howard M. Sachar, it was believed that the new May Laws would be temporary and that the new Tsar, Nicholas II, would use the May Laws in an effort to regain control over the Empire. Chaos and confusion permeated the Russian Empire in the immediate period following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. However, the May Laws appear to have been designed to target the Jews. In fact, the language that is outline in the first section of the May Laws is clear about the purpose of the Law. It stipulates, “as a temporary measure, and until a general revision is made of their legal status, it is decreed that the Jews be forbidden to settle anew outside, of towns and boroughs, exceptions being admitted only in the case of existing Jewish agricultural colonies.”

The Laws are clearly intent to restrict and curtail some rights and freedoms Russian Jewry had gained under Tsar Alexander II’s administration, particularly around economic and business opportunities for Jews. In its attempt to place restrictions on Jews’ business practice and to curb Jews economic advancement in the Empire, the Laws prohibit the “registration of Jews as lessees of real property situated outside of towns and boroughs.” Moreover, the Laws made it unlawful to issue to Jews the “powers of attorney to manage and dispose of real property.” It appears to be that the enforcement of the May Laws is mainly a means by which to restrict Jews’ mobility as well. The new Tsar, Nicholas II, held that the Jews had been involved in revolutionary organizations that were

determined to overthrow the Imperial government. He believed the Jews had been responsible for the murder of Tsar Alexander II and, thus he had intended to punish them.\footnote{Howard M. Sachar, 674.}

On the other hand, Herman Rosenthal illustrates that the official motives for the enactment of the Laws, “was an effort of the government to improve the relations between the Jews and the native population in the Pale of Settlement.” Another interpretation of the May Laws suggests that the Laws had been introduced as method by which to protect the Jews from the hostility of the Native Russians. This is because the relationship between the two groups “has manifested itself in outburst against the person and property of the Jews.” However, when examined more closely, the Russian government issuing of the May Laws address Native Russians’ allegation of Jewish economic exploitation of the rural Russians masses. The laws were being enacted to use in ways to “lessen the economic dependence of the native population upon the Jews.”\footnote{Jewish Encyclopedia Online, s.v. “May Laws,” accessed February 22, 2021, jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/10508-may-laws; Jewish Encyclopedia Online, s.v. “Ryesheniya Obsch. Sobran. Senata,” 1888.}

“Essentially an urban phenomenon,” the 1881 pogrom in this sense is like those racial riots carried out against blacks in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Most racial riots of the periods, the 1898 Wilmington Riot and the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot for instance, occurred in cities. One major difference though, between the two, is that the 1881 pogrom was not planned and orchestrated by the Russian government, or by officials within the government. On this fact, the pogrom of 1881 and those racial riots of the 19\textsuperscript{th}
and early 20th century diverge. However, on most, all other aspects relating to the two disturbances, 1881 pogrom and racial riot, strong parallels can be drawn between.

Anti-Jewish violence that was associated with the 1881 pogrom in most case is identical to and mirror anti-black violence that African Americans experienced during episodes of racial riots. Beatings (whipping), broken body parts, gun violence and ultimately murder were enacted upon their victims. The destruction of homes, businesses and other properties are a central feature of those attacks, showing a strong parallel between pogrom and racial riot. In addition, victims of pogrom and racial riot were often forced to relocate because rioters burned or destroy the victims’ homes.

One viewpoint about the economic interpretation of the 1881 pogrom is that relative deprivation is link to specific grievances by Native Russians against the Jews. Here, again, parallel can be drawn between that pogrom and racial riot against Blacks in the United States. In both pogrom and racial riot, the Rioters almost always participate in the looting and larceny of their victims’ property. In these two instances, money, clothes, furniture and other personal items belonging to the victims were reported stolen by the rioters. For example, one underlying factor that triggered the Wilmington riot was whites’ notion of perceived financial success achieved by blacks in Wilmington. They resented prosperous blacks who were financially well off more so than the average white man in that area. They believed that blacks should not do better than whites. The perpetrators of the 1881 pogrom held similar notions about the Jews.

The newspaper played a major role in disseminating information about the pogrom. It was even more frequently used as a medium by which to advertise “anti-negro
rule” political campaign slogan, racial riot and lynching events against blacks in the United States.

Finally, Native Russians anti-Semitism permeated every aspect of Jewish lives in Imperial Russia. Anti-Jewish stereotypes were common practice in Native Russians interaction with Russian Jews. Those and other prejudices against the Jews served as the basis for anti-Jewish legislation in the Empire. Similarly, systemic white racism in the United States dominated all aspects of Blacks relationship with Whites, as Grimshaw earlier demonstrates. White prejudices and racism were the fundamental basis on which anti-black legislation were based. Especially in the Southern states where Jim Crow segregation was strong, the Black Codes represent one example of anti-black laws that violate blacks’ rights as American citizens. Denied “due process of law,” a fundamental right granted to American citizens, Blacks seldom were able to seek redress in courts for the wrongs done to them by whites. Law enforcement, for example, rarely arrest and prosecute whites who participated in white lynch mobs because of insufficient evidence to prove their guilt. Eyewitness to such lynching do not report the crime. Thus, the murder is reported as committed by “parties unknown.” Though not utilized in court case involving murder, the “May Laws,” were designed to target the Jews in similar ways Jim Crow policies were used against blacks. The Laws curtailed the rights and freedom Russian Jewry had gained in the pre-assassination years, under the reign of Tsar Alexander II. The May Laws restricted Jews’ mobility throughout the Empire and drastically limit their right to own and manage businesses (property ownership). And though the Laws did not terminate all rights of Jews to participate in businesses in the Empire, the May Laws, however, were created with the conscious aim to isolate them
within the boundary of the “Pale of Jewish Settlement.” On the other hand, blacks in the United States around the same period of the 19th and 20th century suffered under Jim Crow segregation, until in 1954; In the Brown v. Board of Education case, the Supreme Court of the U.S. ruled that the “state laws establishing racial segregation in public schools are unconstitutional.” This court decision effectively repealed the earlier 1896 Court’s decision in the Plessy vs. Ferguson case, which upheld the doctrine of “separate but equal.” This ruling set the process for the integration of public schools in the country, paving the way for broader social integration in American society.104

104 Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537. 1896.
CHAPTER 6

THE 1898 WILMINGTON RIOT: “WE EXPECT EVERY WHITE MAN TO DO HIS DUTY IN THIS CRISIS”

In a lengthy article published on election day, November 8, 1898, the Morning Star made its final appeal to whites in the city of Wilmington, North Carolina. It did this on behalf of white supremacy and the Democratic party in Wilmington, by expressing Morning Star’s support for the Democratic party (and white supremacists Democrats) in the upcoming November 8th Wilmington municipal election. This was a pivotal election for the Democratic party, the party of white supremacy, who sought to regain its power in Wilmington city government since its defeat in the 1894 election. This meant not only control over the city’s vibrant economy and business center, but given Wilmington’s population size (over 20,000), a leadership role in the powerful North Carolina General Assembly. Moreover, if the Democratic party won, it would enable Democrats to gain a strong presence in New Hanover County, where Wilmington is situated. This is the eastern region of the state, a stronghold for the majority African Americans who often supported the Republican party. In short, there was no limit as to what the Democratic party wouldn’t do to win the 1898 Wilmington municipal election.

6.1 Positioning White Supremacy Rule in the 1898 Election Campaign

White supremacy rule in the city of Wilmington was the primary goal of the Democratic party and white supremacist Democrats during the 1898 Wilmington municipal election. The Democratic party’s plan for a victorious election was demonstrated in the Party’s “anti-negro rule” and “white supremacy” election campaign for that year. This message was being advertised in the leading Democratic newspapers
such as the *Morning Star and Raleigh News and Observer*, among other newspapers.

Though *Raleigh News and Observer* was not located in Wilmington, as the *Morning Star* was, it was considered to be the state’s leading Democratic news organ.

As if to summon white Wilmingtonians into action, the *Morning Star* newspaper printed pro-Democratic party articles so as to stir up whites’ bias and prejudices against blacks in Wilmington. Ultimately, the objective was to generate among white voters a fear of electing blacks or having them serve in high-ranking government jobs in Wilmington city government.

Newspapers such as the *Morning Star* denounced blacks and Republicans as “unscrupulous and incompetent” men who are unable to rule the state and local governments. Adopting Democrat’s white supremacy campaign talking points, newspapers targeted blacks as unqualified to rule over whites, and “warning against the pitfalls of black officeholding.”

For example, in its November 8, 1898 issue, the *Morning Star* directly confronts white Wilmingtonians and those supporters of the Democratic party. The *Morning Star* informs them:

“...we are not only to elect men to Congress to represent us in the shaping of national policies, but a [state] Legislature to make laws to govern us; judges and magistrates to administer our laws, and county officers to manage our county affairs, but more than all this we are to decide whether the white man or the black man is to be in power in North Carolina, and whether Eastern North Carolina is to be rescued and forever freed from the strangling grip of negro domination. That is the issue, more appealing to the white man, and more vital than who shall hold office.”

---

106 *Morning Star*, “The Question to be Settled,” *Morning Star* (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 8, 1898.
Unambiguously, the *Morning Star* newspaper makes it clear to whites to vote for white supremacy rule in the upcoming 1898 mid-term election, in the state and particularly in the city of Wilmington.

Wilmington is situated in “eastern North Carolina” is the coastal plain region where black people make up most of the voting population. The *Morning Star* insisted that whites should act to free the region from “negro domination,” and to install white supremacy in its stead. This was a difficult task for white supremacist Democrats and the Democratic party, because the area was a Republican stronghold and included the Second District, which encompassed the city of Wilmington.¹⁰⁷

The position that the city of Wilmington occupies in the state’s electoral political process cannot be overstated. The largest city in the state, Wilmington had a population of 20,055 in 1890. Of this number blacks made up 11,324 and whites 8,731. The black voting majority was estimated at 1,400. No other city in North Carolina came close to having this number of inhabitants. By 1900, only two other cities, Asheville and Raleigh, had populations above 10,000.

As noted above, the people of the Second District consistently elected blacks and Republicans. The County of New Hanover was represented by an African American politician in the North Carolina State Legislature. George Henry White, the sole black Representative in the United States House of Representatives was elected from the Second District in 1896. The election of these black officials to public office demonstrates the power of the black vote in the coastal plain region and suggests the

level of difficulty which the Democratic party would encounter in its quest to exercise full control over the eastern part of the state. Certainly, it would be difficult without the support of the blacks there. Nonetheless, the Democratic party and white supremacist Democrats were “bent” on installing white supremacy and sustaining a white man’s government, particularly in Wilmington by any means.

Citizens of the city of Wilmington were not only going to vote for Representatives to Wilmington city government during the 1898 election term but would also vote to elect Governor or other State officers. So, Democrats wanted to make a clean sweep of the 1898 election. Their goal was to elect and install a white supremacy government and state Legislature. As the *Morning Star* reported elected state representatives to North Carolina State Legislature would in turn elect two of its members to serve in the upper chamber of the United States Congress, the Senate. Prior to the passage of the Seventeenth Amendment in 1913, it was the responsibility of state Legislatures to elect their state’s representatives to the US Senate. This outdated procedure by which to elect US Senators was eliminated in the early 20th century and replaced by the Seventeenth Amendment, which provided for direct popular vote for US Senators.108

Given Wilmington’s representative significance, a win for the Democratic Party in the 1898 municipal election in Wilmington would increase the chance of more Democratic elected officials in the state’s Legislature. This in turn would lead to the

108 *United States Constitution*. Amend. XVII.
The election of white supremacist Democrats from North Carolina state to serve in the US Senate.\textsuperscript{109}

White supremacist Democrats characterize the 1898 election as one that is vital for white supremacy leadership in Wilmington, and as noted above, that began with the Democratic party’s continued control over the city of Wilmington. With this aim, Democrats put forth a scheme of sinister campaign methods, including the use of violence. This they believed would increase the chance that the Democratic party would emerge victorious in the 1898 Wilmington municipal election. In a pre-election-night speech, for example, Alfred Moore Waddell, leader of the mob that destroyed the \textit{Daily Record}’s office, told the white men who comprised that mob to “go to the polls tomorrow, and if you find a Negro out voting, tell him to leave the polls.” Waddell, who would be appointed mayor of Wilmington after the 1898 Wilmington riot, told the white mob that “if he, [the black male voter], refuses, kill, shoot him down in his tracts (sic). We shall win tomorrow if we have to do it with guns.”\textsuperscript{110}

Besides the use of violence and intimidation against black voters, white mobs disrupted polling places that were predominantly Republican precincts and obstructed the counting of the ballots on election day. Much “planning went into disrupting the counting of ballots, one Democratic election officer claims. This involves “depositing Republican ballots so they could be replaced” by their Democratic opponent’s. For example, when the lights were turned back on at one Republican precinct, the “Fifth Division of

\textsuperscript{109} Morning Star, “The Question to be Settled,” \textit{Morning Star} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 8, 1898.

\textsuperscript{110} Mary Elizabeth Hodes, “The North Carolina Race Conflict,” \textit{Outlook 60} (1898) 707–09.
Wilmington’s predominantly African American First Ward,” the police officer who arrived at the scene reports “it was evident that the ballot box had been stuffed” after the lights had been extinguished.111

The newspapers associated with the Democratic party were instrumental in organizing Democratic operatives around specific events such as ballot counting, monitoring division precincts and polls. These newspapers continued in this role after election day, November 8, 1898. For example, *Morning Star* and *Wilmington Messenger*, on the morning of November 9, 1898, advertised a meeting to be held at eleven o’clock at the New Hanover County Courthouse. The advertisement requested the attendance of “the city’s white citizens.” June Nash, scholar of racial riot who interviewed in 1968 residents of Wilmington who witnessed the 1898 Wilmington Riot, states that it was a mass meeting of “800 of the best white citizens.” These men pledged to “protect the [white] community against negro domination and to reject rule by negroes.”112 It was at this meeting that Wilmington white supremacist Democrats planned and organized the November 10, 1898, Wilmington Riot and “coup d’état.” This coup is recorded as being the only event of its kind to have occurred in the United States.113

6.2 The Function of Alexander Manly’s Editorial and Rebecca Latimer’s Speech in Igniting the 1898 Wilmington Riot

---

111 LeRae Sikes Umfleet, 70–73.
It was the *Morning Star* that reprinted Alexander Manly’s editorial of August 18, 1898, taken from the *Daily Record*, the African American newspaper based in Wilmington, North Carolina. Manly, the African American editor of the *Daily Record*, uses the newspaper as a “progressive voice for the improvement of conditions in Wilmington’s African American community.” Through Manly’s leadership, the *Daily Record* cultivated a wide readership and it achieved broad support from Wilmington’s citizens. A “creditable colored newspaper,” as cited by many Wilmingtonians, Manly successfully expanded the paper’s frequency of publication from weekly to a daily paper.¹¹⁴

Considered to be the catalyst to the 1898 Wilmington riot, Manly’s August 18th editorial was a response to Rebecca Latimer Felton’s speech, given at South Bend Hotel, Tybee, Georgia on August 12, 1897.¹¹⁵ Both Manly’s editorial and Felton’s speech were reprinted in full in the October 1, 1898, issue of the *Morning Star*. For dramatic effect, *Morning Star* highlights sections of Manly’s editorial, explaining how Manly defamed white women, while at the same time the paper praised Felton’s for defending white women’s “virtue.” It is interesting to note that both editorial and speech were reprinted several times leading up to the election day of the 1898 Wilmington municipal election. Sometimes they were featured twice in the same issue but in different sections of the

Morning Star newspaper. For example, Felton’s speech appeared twice in the Morning Star issue of October 1, 1898, on the front and third pages. This was done so that the readers would constantly review the speech (or the editorial), thus enforcing a negative or positive response from the reader.

Those newspapers that are associated with the Democratic Party, the Morning Star for example, exaggerated the content of Manly’s editorial, implying that black men sexually assault innocent white women with impunity. Such stories persisted even as evidence confirmed the contrary. What the newspapers failed to report is that those relationships between black men and white women had been consensual. In his August 18th editorial, Manly illustrates that most of those interracial relationships had been going on for a long time. Only when the “woman’s infatuation or the man’s boldness bring attention to them [that] the man is lynched for rape” by Southern white men.116

In fact, Manly’s editorial argues the opposite. It exonerates black men and, instead, accuses white men of raping black women, a practice which white men have indulged in since during the period of slavery. In his editorial, Manly agrees with George Henry White, the African American Congressman from North Carolina, who on the floor of the United States Congress, documented for the records how “white men committed far more sexual assaults against black women than black men committed against white women.” Evidence of those sexual assaults of black women by white men is shown in the

“great number of mulattoes” and [biracial children] who reside in African American communities throughout the South, White explained.117

Manly, the product of mixed parentage, himself, explains that whites should hold back their condemnation of black men. This is simply because many of those black men, Manly explains, who have been lynched for alleged crime of rape “…had white men for their fathers….” Here, Manly is suggesting that white men should take responsibility for their own part in the practice of interracial relationship between blacks and whites. White men introduced the practice of sexual relationship across racial lines. Whites should not punish (or lynch) black men for their involvement with white women, when, in fact, white men freely engage in sexual relationship with black women. It is clear that such interracial relationship violates white supremacy doctrine, still the community tolerates white men’s illicit sexual relationship with black women, even as they lynch black men for their sexual involvement with white women.118

At least some of fever pitch around this issue was brought on by Rebecca Latimer Felton. Born in 1835 at Decatur, Georgia, Felton was educated at Madison Female College. Felton was an accomplished and provocative author. An outspoken advocate of lynching black men accused of raping white women. She attracted and welcomed the support of Southern white supremacists and Southern whites in general. Felton also gave speeches in which she addresses social topics such as public education and women’s suffrage. However, “her virulently anti-black speech of 1897” in which she calls for

118 Alexander Manly, 254–257.
“mass lynching of Negro rapists is representative of the prejudices” she openly encouraged in public against blacks. Such prejudices formed her central beliefs about interracial relationship. Moreover, they represent the fundamental factors on which she has based her argument about biracial relationship --- particularly those relationships between black men and white women. Felton’s contempt for such interracial union influenced her August 1897 speech, to the point where she clearly advocates for violence against black men.\textsuperscript{119}

In her speech, “Mrs. Felton Speaks: She makes a Sensational Speech Before Agricultural Society, Believes Lynching Should Prevail as Long as Defenseless Women is (sic) Not Better Protected,” Felton “discussed at length the public questions of interest in Georgia at the time….” However, a portion of her speech refers to lynching of black men. Like most white supremacists, Felton expresses little interest in using the courts to pursue justice for victims of crimes such as rape. Showing little confidence in the court’s ability to adjudicate rape crime, Felton argues for quick condemnation of guilt against alleged black rapists. She states, “when there is not enough… justice in the courthouse to promptly punish crime,” then the people (meaning white men) should enforce their own form of justice.\textsuperscript{120} Michael Pfelfer refers to this kind of justice as “rough justice.”\textsuperscript{121}

\textsuperscript{120} Morning Star, “Mrs. Felton Speaks,” Morning Star (Wilmington, NC), Aug. 18, 1898; Aug. 26, 1898; Morning Star, “Daily Record on the Move,” Morning Star (Wilmington, NC), Aug. 26, 1898.
Here Felton sides with the lynch mobs who violates their black victim’s right to “due process.” What’s more, is that most rape charge against black men during this period was simply based on an “allegation of rape.” Moreover, such accusations were often upheld absent proof of solid evidence that the black male were even involved in the incident at all. Still, in her speech Felton advocates for lynching. “If it needs lynching to protect woman’s dearest possession from the ravening human beasts,” she espouses, “then I say lynch; a thousand times a week if necessary.”122

Lynching, Felton insisted, was the only way to mitigate black men’s assault against white women. This response to lynching was in line with Southern whites’ and white supremacists’ treatment blacks. Investigation of lynching has revealed that most black men who have been accused did not commit the crime. As Wells and Manly have demonstrate those black men and white women were involved in consensual relationships. What’s more that “white girls of refinement and culture,” Manly illustrates, “have found these black men sufficiently attractive enough to fall in love with them is very well known to all.” Thus, whites’ charge of rape against those black men were entirely fabricated to justify terror in response to Black success in the workplace and politics. As Wells has proved, and Congressman White illustrates above, less than 15 percent of all lynching cases in the Nation actually involves assault against a woman victim. This shows that most black men who has been lynched for raping white women, have paid the ultimate penalty for a crime of which they did not commit.123

122 Rebecca Latimer Felton, reprinted in LaRae Sikes Umfleet, 62.
Democrats recognized benefits may be derived from juxtaposing Felton’s speech and Manly’s editorial as a way to help to promote its “anti-negro rule” election campaign. Furnifold Simmons, state chairman of the Democratic party, instinctively persuaded members of the Wilmington Light Infantry to suppress talk of attacking Manly. He wanted them to restrain from making an issue of Manly’s article until after the election. This is because Simmons’ campaign strategy was to juxtapose Felton’s speech to Manly’s editorial, as a way to show Manly’s derogatory reflection on the virtue of white women. Felton’s speech laud Southern white women’s virtue. Simmons used these authors works as a campaign issue to turn voters against blacks and Republican party’s candidates. This campaign strategy was “tremendously effective,” spurring whites to go to the polls and to vote Democratic.¹²⁴

Though Felton’s speech was delivered August 12, 1897, one year prior to Manly’s editorial, it was featured a year later in the *Morning Star* issue of August 18, 1898. Here, the Democrats’ objective was to use the speech as part of the campaign tactic, so as to galvanize whites’ support for the Democratic party at the time of the 1898 Wilmington municipal election. Felton’s speech was again published in the *Morning Star* on August 26, 1898. Under the title, “*Rebecca Felton Speech, A Horrid Slander: The Most Infamous That Ever Appeared in Print in This State,*” her speech was reprinted gain on October 1, 1898, in this same paper. Multiple reprinting was done in the weeks leading up to the election, in an attempt to enrage whites and to stir up white racial hatred against blacks.

Felton’s speech was at times published along with even more outrageous stories that characterize black men as “rapists”, “black brute”, “black beast.” For example, one article which the Morning Star published along with Felton’s speech was titled, “More Negro Scoundrelism: Black Beast Attempt to Outrage the Young Daughter of A Respectable Farmer.” The Democrats’ hope was that after reading such articles, enraged whites would go to the polls and vote for the Democratic ticket. Those same newspaper articles had been circulated among white farmers in the rural areas, so as to create rural whites’ hostility against blacks and Republicans. Democrats believed that full support from all eligible white voters would enable Democrats to soundly defeat the Fusion coalition of Populists Republicans and African American voters in the election. 

George H. White was the only black man in Congress at the time when he served in the US House of Representatives. A congressman representing North Carolina State in the 55th Congress, 1897-1899, White was reelected and served a second term in the 56th Congress, 1899-1901. Congressman White defended Manly and corroborated Manly’s editorial. When Manly, Unable to find employment for months after white supremacist banished him from Wilmington, White hired the editor as his private secretary in the Congressman’s Washington, D.C. office. This job helped to stabilize Manly’s life and enabled him to support his family. Like Wells and Duke before him, Manly was forced

---

into exile by white supremacists who threatened his life with death. He was unable to ever return to his home in Wilmington.\textsuperscript{126}

Congressman White sought to bring national attention to the crime of lynching and to Southern whites’ gross violation of blacks’ political right as American citizens. His argument illustrates that lynching represents a method of intimidation meant to discourage blacks from participating in the political system in North Carolina and to prohibit black men from voting. Showing how whites in North Carolina state had been “Preparing for the [November 8\textsuperscript{th}] election,” Congressman White referred to an article in the \textit{Raleigh News and Observer} to demonstrate to Congress the ways in which white supremacists sought to destroy black turnout. “An absolute slanderous and misrepresentation of the truth” about blacks, as Congressman White called it, the article is just one example of the overt, ongoing effort by white supremacist to disenfranchise blacks in the state. “Those whom the Constitution of the United States…has enfranchised,” White laments, “are to be reduced once more to the condition of goods and chattels.” This would become a reality, White continues, “if such men as the one who edits the \textit{[Raleigh] News and Observer} can have control of affairs in North Carolina.”\textsuperscript{127}

As noted earlier, the narrative of black men lusting and assaulting white women was a pretext to conceal Whites’ real reason for carrying out lynching and other violence against blacks --- their political influence and economic success. To begin with, as Congressman White argues, most lynching was based on false accusation of black men


\textsuperscript{127} 56\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 33, 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 33, 11:1365.
committing rape against white women. For example, in his speech on lynching on the floor of Congress, on January 31, 1900, Congressman White states that “not more than 15 percent of the lynchings are traceable” to reported cases of rape in the United States. On the local level, Congressman White continues, the percentage of rape cases in North Carolina is far less than the 15 percent reported to have occurred nationally. What’s more is that in Wilmington during this same period the crime of rape was almost nonexistent in the city.128

On January 20, 1900, Congressman White had already drafted and submitted an “unprecedented bill to make lynching a federal crime.” Plus, this bill would have subjected those who “participated in mob violence to potential capital punishment, a sentence equivalent to that of treason.” Unfortunately, Democratic opposition to Congressman White’s anti-lynching bill led to its defeat in the Judiciary Committee in Congress.129

A native of North Carolina, the Republican White, represented the Second Congressional District, which included Wilmington and was located in the eastern part of the state, also referred to as the “Black Second.” As noted above, black voting population significantly out number that of whites, and the Democratic Party had trouble in exercising its control over the predominantly black counties.130

White supremacist Democrats view Congressman White as a dangerous “Negro” because this “negro is regarded by his race as a leader…” It is “sufficiently clear,” Josephus Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer remarked, that Congressman White has the ability to influence “the negro’s attitude toward the white man.” Daniels’ fear is that a black leader such as Congressman White could easily influenced blacks to assert themselves and challenge Democrats at the polls. This, Daniels warned, “is significant and should not be allowed to escape us,” the white supremacist leadership of the state.\footnote{Raleigh News & Observer, “The Colored Member,” Raleigh News & Observer, (Raleigh, NC), Feb. 2, 1900.}

Thus, white supremacist Democrats wanted Congressman White removed from his Congressional seat and to be replaced by a white supremacist Democrat. This was part of the Democrats’ “white supremacy” campaign plan during the 1898 election of that same year. The state’s white supremacist leadership did not want a black man representing North Carolina in the United States Congress, much less the white people in Congressman White’s Second District. They vowed to maintain white supremacy rule in the County and in Wilmington city government.

Clearly, the Democrats had intended to use Manly’s August 18, 1898, editorial, as an election campaign stunt to motivate whites to go to the polls to vote and to vote the Democratic ticket. The way in which they did this was by criticizing Manly’s editorial as a source of insult to white women. Such accusation against black men had been commonly used as a means to incite violence against blacks; Moreover, a mere assertion of sexual assault, real or imagined, was sufficient for whites to justify Southern white
men’s lynching of black men. This, Wells and Duke have demonstrated. Anti-black violence appears to be the objective when one newspaper confirms that Manly’s editorial is “reflecting” negatively “on the virtue of…white women of the state.” Challenging white men to act, this same newspaper further attempts to provoke whites’ reaction against blacks with incendiary charges: “white ladies and children were constantly annoyed and insulted when on the streets.” The implication was clear --- blacks were getting successful and, as a result, “uppity.” They didn’t know their place. The newspaper suggests that such behavior by blacks is among a list of black insults and humiliation suffered by whites, implying that something must be done to blacks in order to correct blacks’ behavior.\(^{132}\)

Manly’s editorial was “sensationally reprinted in Democratic newspapers… and exploited as a unifying issue…,” which white supremacist Democrats used to galvanize whites’ support for the Democratic party. What’s more is that the editorial, originally published August 18, 1898 in the *Daily Record*, two months prior to its “resurrection,” was used by Democrats to “stir up racial hatred for partisan [political] purposes.”\(^{133}\) This, the *Fayetteville Observer* effectively demonstrates: “Every white man in the state,” the paper announced, “having any regard for the purity of his mother, sisters and daughters, must take this matter into consideration,” a clarion call to whites to rebuff blacks.\(^{134}\)

\(^{133}\) H. Leon Prather, Sr., 81–82.  
Similarly, in a broader context, the *Morning Star*, calls on white voters to act in this time of “crisis” and save the county from ongoing humiliation by blacks and from “negro domination.” “New Hanover,” the *Morning Star* blared out for all to hear, “expects every white man to do his duty in this crisis.” Making it seems as if whites’ existence in Wilmington depended on the reelection of the Democratic party to power, the paper impressed upon whites to “do not fail to register [to vote] today.” As if to make sure that white voters do not arrive late to register to vote, the paper reminds its readers that 9:00 am to 4:00 pm is reserve for people to register to vote.\(^{135}\)

H. Leon Prather, Sr., African American scholar and history professor, illustrates how Manly “…and his editorial were discussed in the streets, bars and offices by white men.” Some whites wanted to lynch Manly, but they decided against the use of violence to silence the black editor. Instead, white supremacist Democrats decided to use Manly’s editorial as race bait, making the editorial a feature article in the city’s newspapers during the weeks leading up to the November 8, 1898, election. This was done in order to generate whites’ hostility against black political officials and blacks in general. As one member of the Association of the Wilmington Light Infantry recalled:

> “I may state right here that when that article appeared, it required the best effort we could put forth to prevent the people from lynching him. The office was right over a saloon across the street from the [Morning] Star’s office. Senator Simmons, who was here at the time told us that that article

---

would make it an easy victory for us and urged us to try and prevent any
riot until after the election.”136

The controversy in Wilmington drew attention beyond North Carolina. National publications such as Collier’s Weekly also got on the act, Collier’s substantiates white supremacist Democrats’ advice to the leading Democratic newspapers in the city. Their advice was to inform the newspapers to delay the publication of Manly’s article until it could be used as a more effective campaign issue. Thus, around mid-October 1898 Manly’s controversial editorial reappeared in and was strategically placed as frontpage story in Democratic newspapers such as the Raleigh News and Observer. Also, at the same time Morning Star featured the editorial and reprinted it in subsequent issues of the paper. Prather describes the reprinting of the editorial right before election as an “eleventh-hour bombshell,” that deflated the Republican’s campaign. This strategic publication of the editorial ultimately shifted the momentum of the 1898 election campaign to the Democrats side. This shift all but guarantee victory to the Democratic party at the 1898 Wilmington municipal election.137

Part of the reason that this white supremacy attempt had legs beyond the race baiting was due to the way that fears of miscegenation played into the growing social Darwinism interest in racial purity. Local newspapers knew this and made the most of

136 H. Leon Prather, Sr., 81–82.
miscegenation as an issue, particularly since it connected with Manly’s attempt to explain the benign characteristics of consensual relationships between black men and white women.

“Political mixing with Negroes means miscegenation…” the Raleigh News and Observer headline exclaimed. The message targeted Whites who expressed profound contempt over miscegenation, especially when the union between black men and white women result in producing offspring. Implicating black politicians’ involvement in miscegenation, the Raleigh News and Observer claims those politicians used their position to seduce white women. The Raleigh News and Observer printed such stories during the 1898 campaign to manipulate and frighten whites into voting Democratic. Without evidence, David Zucchino illustrates, Raleigh News and Observer published stories about miscegenation that were part of a “political propaganda campaign that gained momentum during the spring and summer of 1898.” For example, the paper published articles about “poor Bessie,” a white woman who was sexually involved with a “black politician” who Bessie’s father “permitted to live in his house and share his meals.” Bessie became pregnant, the Raleigh News and Observer documents, and attempted to abort the baby by ingesting a “concentrated lye given her by her negro destroyer.” Not surprisingly, the story turned out to be fabricated, Zucchino discovered. Zucchino concluded that the article’s purpose was to “warn [whites] of the risk of allowing black men to hold [political] office.”

6.3 Economic Stresses and the Planning Meeting of November 9, 1898

This group of Wilmington’s leading businessmen who attended the November 9th meeting, acted like “businessmen politicians” of E. St. Louis, who Lumpkins found to have played an instrumental role in the 1917 E. St. Louis Riot. Those leading businessmen in Wilmington had played a similar role in the 1898 riot that took place there, in Wilmington. As mentioned above, these same businessmen dominated the November 9th meeting, demonstrating their involvement in planning the Riot.

One difference exists between these two groups, “businessmen politicians” and Wilmington’s leading businessmen. Unlike those prominent businessmen of Wilmington, “businessmen politicians” that Lumpkins identified did not want to drive black workers away from the city of E. St. Louis. They wanted, however, to build a sustainable labor source that was made up of white workers, while at the same time employing black laborers to fill unskilled job positions. Unskilled laborers had been given the most difficult and dangerous jobs. White workers refused to do those jobs, particularly those jobs that required no skills paid the lowest wages. Also, CTLU officials had intended to use Southern black migrant laborers to the city as a way to threaten white workers’ jobs. This they believed would force whites to become union members in order to protect their jobs. As a result, CTLU would be able to exercise full control over the workers.139

Wilmington’s leading businessmen, on the other hand, who attended the November 9th meeting agreed to displace black workers. They plan to do this by taking away “jobs held by Negroes” and giving those jobs to white men. Those white men in attendance at the November 9th meeting, assured each other that replacing black workers

with white workers was another way by which to protect whites from “negro domination.”\textsuperscript{140}

In other words, Wilmington’s prominent businessmen wanted to continue to be able to influence Wilmington’s economic policy to benefit their own business enterprises. To this end, most of Wilmington’s leading businessmen supported the Democratic Party and the party’s white supremacy rule campaign during the 1898 Wilmington municipal election. This allegiance was basically second nature since most of these businessmen served in dual roles as officials of the Democratic Party (elected politicians) and as business owners in the city of Wilmington. Like the “real estate businessmen politicians” Lumpkins discusses, Wilmington’s leading businessmen used their job positions in the government to gain access to lucrative business opportunity and to enrich themselves. They believed that the city’s economy (business sector) would not thrive without the Democratic Party’s victory in the 1898 Wilmington municipal election. Republican leadership of the City’s government, they warned, would not be good for businesses that are operating in the city and that businesses would fail. There is lack of sufficient evidence to support the claim that black and white Republicans in leadership positions in the City’s government caused the slowed economy, still Democratic leaders continued to blame them for bad business management.\textsuperscript{141}

A factor that might have slowed the City’s economy was the overall corruption. That is those same businessmen exploited their position in the Democratic Party in order

\textsuperscript{140} June Nash, 157.
\textsuperscript{141} Wilmington Messenger, “The Great Meeting,” \textit{Wilmington Messenger} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 10, 1898; Wilmington Messenger, “Remarkable Meeting,” \textit{Wilmington Messenger} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 10, 1898.
to influence Wilmington government’s economic policy to benefit themselves. For example, these businessmen are often motivated by the economic incentive attached to bringing major investors and outside business enterprises to Wilmington, North Carolina’s economic hub. This most likely would be in the form of substantial financial reward. In the same way, as Lumpkins has shown, “real estate businessmen politicians” collected large financial profit from leasing and/or selling real estate to firms who they persuaded to relocated to E. St. Louis, Wilmington’s businessmen stand to profit from their business dealings with businesses they bring to the city. As Umfleet explains, “Whoever controlled the city government also controlled its purse, taxation policy and internal improvements agenda.” Moreover, the city’s leading businessmen who met together at the November 9th meeting knew that Democratic Party victory in the 1898 Wilmington municipal election would enable them to regain control over the city’s economy. They did not imagine having the same level of control if the other side won the election.142

The November 10, 1898, issue of the Wilmington Messenger, featured the “White Declaration of Independence.” Wilmington white business leaders also introduced this document, in which they reiterate white supremacy rule, during the November 9th meeting. Structured around similar language Democrats had used during their 1898 white supremacy rule election campaign, the “White Declaration of Independence” basically asserts whites’ notion that the white men of Wilmington should govern the city.143

142 Charles Lumpkins, 5–9; LeRae Sikes Umfleet, 34.
143 Wilmington Messenger, “The Great Meeting,” Wilmington Messenger (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 10, 1898; Wilmington Messenger, “Remarkable Meeting,” Wilmington Messenger (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 10, 1898.
In the document’s preamble, for example, parallel is drawn between Wilmington’s whites and the Framers of the United States Constitution, who Wilmington whites claim constructed the government (national and state governments) to be ruled by white men. The “Constitution of the United States, the Preamble states, contemplated a government to be carried on by an enlightened people…. Framers did not anticipate the enfranchisement of an ignorant population of African origin.”

The document further outlines a series of seven resolutions. One resolution which is outlined in the “White Declaration of Independence,” for example, expresses the businessmen frustration, placing blame on black and white Republicans for the slowdown of the city’s economy. “…unscrupulous white men” and “negroes,” the document states, sought to “dominate the intelligent and thrifty element in the community, thus causing business to stagnate and progress to be out of the question.” Documented in the last resolution, number seven, is the demand that Alexander Manly be banished from Wilmington. In addition, Manly’s printing press, the document states, should be “packed and shipped from the city without delay….” Unknown to anyone, Manly had already left the city on the previous night, November 9th. Mainly, the document purports “anti-negro rule,” and it supposedly “represent unequivocally the sentiment of the white people of [New Hanover] County and City [of Wilmington].” For example, supporting white rule, the First resolution points out that “…time has passed for the intelligent citizens of the community owning 90% of the property and paying taxes in like proportion, to be ruled by negroes.”

---

144 Wilmington Messenger, “The Great Meeting,” Wilmington Messenger (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 10, 1898; Wilmington Messenger, “Remarkable Meeting,” Wilmington Messenger (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 10, 1898.
Committed in their agreement to white supremacy rule, the four hundred forty-five white men who attended the November 9th meeting signed the “White Declaration of Independence.” Binding the men together “in the stand we now pledge ourselves to…..,” the document characterizes the period in Wilmington as a moment of “crisis.” Thus, the men collectively signed their names to the “White Declaration of Independence,” committing themselves to staging an armed rebellion in Wilmington in order to install a white supremacy government there. “Our eyes are open to the fact,” the document illustrates, “that we must act now or leave our descendants to a fate too gloomy to be borne.”

In her interview with June Nash, Mrs. Cogswell explains that the “poor and ignorant whites” had been “jealous of blacks” because of blacks’ financial and commercial enterprises achievement in Wilmington. It was this class of white laborers that made up most of the rioters who attacked blacks in the 1898 riot. But what appeared to have not been clear to those whites, is that advances in blacks’ financial status was linked to their support of Republican politics in the city.

As mentioned earlier, the black population in Wilmington comprised the majority number of voters in the city of Wilmington. However, voting restrictions were placed on blacks. This was adopted in the City Charter after Redeemers regain “home rule” in the city.

---
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1870s in the post-Reconstruction period. Blacks used their votes in creative ways in order to benefit themselves and the black community. One way in which they accomplished this was by using black voters as a means to bargain for tangible community benefits such as jobs for blacks. Thus, Wilmington’s blacks traded votes in exchange for political patronage and for equitable hiring of blacks in the government sector. Blacks used the “block vote” method to swing political elections in favor of the Republican Party there. As a result, black employment in the city increased, but blacks in Wilmington are not the only group to demand patronage from political officials in exchange for vote. Blacks in E. St. Louis in the early 20th century, adopted similar block vote method. According to Lumpkins, black E. St. Louisans also demanded patronage from elected officials in exchange for their vote.

Political patronage came in the form of jobs for blacks. Though job opportunities at the time for many blacks in Wilmington had been on the “cotton boards, hauling bales to the wharves and loading them on ships,” many other blacks gained what is to be considered middle-class employment. For example, many blacks had been employed in other jobs in the city’s government as police officers, firemen, and in sanitation and road work (maintaining city streets). There was even a “Negro Collector of Customs” at Wilmington. This was John Campbell Dancy. As John Campbell Dancy, Jr. explains, his father, John Campbell Dancy, was considered to be a wealthy man by the standards of the time. “U.S. Collector of Customs at Wilmington, Dancy achieved an economic status far above that of most people in the city.” This, Dancy Jr. laments, “led to great resentment” against “father on the part of many of the whites” in Wilmington.147

147 John C. Dancy, 60–61; June Nash, 159.
According to David S. Cecelski, many Freedmen had acquired specialized skills such as brick masons and bricklayers since during slavery. What’s more is that during their enslavement, some Freedmen who had specialized skills as pilots and boatmen had been working in the maritime trades on the Cape Fear River. Therefore, as artisans of the trade they practiced, many Freedmen were able gain employment over whites. In the construction industry in Wilmington, for example, skilled black bricklayers and carpenters were hired to work instead of white workers. They got those jobs because of their ability to work and not because of their former status as slaves, as some whites had claimed. Moreover, in their positions as skilled artisans during their time in slavery, those same Freedmen gained valuable experience in business and in dealing in the economy. Some of them had been able to “hire themselves out” during slavery, acquiring management skills and at the same time, learning about the free market economy. Possessing such skills enabled Freedmen to transition easily into the new free market economy that emerged in the post-Civil War period, unlike less skilled blacks.¹⁴⁸

White laboring class blamed blacks for their financial hardship, claiming that the employment of blacks is the reason why whites experience under-employment. Those white laborers started to “agitate” for real change in employment opportunity for whites. Thus, embittered by competition of blacks in the labor market, white laborers joined white vigilante and paramilitary groups, such as the Red Shirts, and attacked blacks during the riot. In the end, whites used the “White Declaration of Independence”

document as means to introduce greater measures by which to displace black workers.

For example, the Fourth and Fifth resolutions of this document states, respectively:

*That the progressive element in any community is the white population and that the giving of nearly all the employment to negro laborers has been against the best interests of this County and City and is a sufficient reason why the City of Wilmington, with its natural advantages has not become a city of at least fifty thousand inhabitants.*

*That we propose in the future to give to white men a large part of the employment here to fore given to negroes because we realize that white families cannot thrive here unless there are more opportunities for the employment of the different members of said families.*

Besides black employment, another aspect of whites’ resentment against blacks in Wilmington is associated with black community building process there. “Negroes build beautiful homes, and they were doing well,” Mrs. Cogswell confessed to Nash. One reason for this is, because “Negroes [who] had businesses” in the black community did not only contribute to the community building process, but they also served as a source of employment for other blacks as well. As a result, working class blacks in turn used some of their wages to contribute to the building up of the black community there. These jobs were coupled with employment opportunities that were available to blacks in naval stores and the turpentine industry in Wilmington. In addition, many Freedmen in the post-Civil War years ended up settling in city because they were able to gain employment there, in Wilmington. They joined with free men who remained in Wilmington, helping to develop Wilmington’s black community.

As they agreed under the “White Declaration of Independence”, Wilmington white employers replaced their black workers with white workers. This impacted black

---

stevedores, “dock workers who loaded and off-loaded goods between ships and warehouses along the shore.” For example, prior to November 1898 blacks had been the main employees hired to work as stevedores at Wilmington. However, after the riot, white stevedores had been hired to replace the black workers. By 1900 the “Wilmington Stevedore Company”, a white firm, became the only company that hired stevedores to work in the city. Black stevedore company such as “Lee, Starnes, and Company”, who recruited and employed black stevedores, went out of business that same year because it was unable to compete against the white firms in the city. Not all employers replaced their black workers with white employees. Sprunt Cotton Compress, the site where the white mob first attacked blacks at the opening of the 1898 riot, continued to employed blacks.150

6.4 White Declaration of Independence

At the November 9th meeting, Wilmington’s white businessmen deliberate the course of action for the riot that was planned for the following day on November 10, 1898. Unable to carry out the riot without the help of working-class whites, the business leaders promised all jobs will be given to white workers. To further motivate laboring class whites to join in the riot, white employers agreed to fire their black employees and turn over those jobs to whites. “…we propose,” the white leaders espoused, “in the future to give to white men a large part of the employment here to fore given to negroes.” This shows that the riot was intentional because it had been planned and organized in advance. The riot, thus, was an instrument of policy not spontaneous anger as the white business

leaders wanted people to believe. The “White Declaration of Independence” represents an unequivocal position agreed upon by whites:

“White Declaration of Independence”

Believing that the Constitution of the United States contemplated a government to be carried on by an enlightened people; Believing that its framers did not anticipate the enfranchisement of an ignorant population of African origin, and believing that those men of the State of North Carolina, who joined in forming the Union, did not contemplate for their descendants subjection to an inferior race: We, the undersigned citizens of the City of Wilmington and County of New Hanover, do hereby declare that we will no longer be ruled, and will never again be ruled by men of African origin. This condition we have in part endured because we felt that the consequences of the War of Secession were such as to deprive us of the fair consideration of many of our countrymen. We believe that, after more than thirty years, this is no longer the case. The stand we now pledge ourselves to is forced upon us suddenly by a crisis and our eyes are open to the fact that we must act now or leave our descendants to a fate too gloomy to be borne. While we recognize the authority of the United States, and will yield to it if exerted, we would not for a moment believe that it is the purpose of more than sixty millions of our own race to subject us permanently to a fate to which no Anglo Saxon has ever been forced to submit. We, therefore, believing that we represent unequivocally the sentiment of the White People of the County and City, hereby for ourselves, and as representing them, proclaim:

First - That the time has passed for the intelligent citizens of the community owning 90% of the property and paying taxes in like proportion, to be ruled by negroes.

Second - That we will not tolerate the action of unscrupulous white men in affiliating with the negroes so that by means of their votes they can dominate the intelligent and thrifty element in the community, thus causing business to stagnate and progress to be out of the question.

Third - That the negro has demonstrated by antagonizing our interest in every way, and especially by his ballot, that he is incapable of realizing that his interests are and should be identical with those of the community.

Fourth - That the progressive element in any community is the white population and that the giving of nearly all the employment to negro laborers has been against the best interests of this County and City and is a sufficient reason why the City of Wilmington, with its natural advantages has not become a city of at least fifty thousand inhabitants.

Fifth - That we propose in the future to give to white men a large part of the employment here to fore given to negroes because we realize that white families cannot thrive here unless there are more opportunities for the employment of the different members of said families.
Sixth - That the white men expect to live in this community peaceably; to have and provide absolute protection for their families, who shall be safe from insult or injury from all persons, whomsoever. We are prepared to treat the negroes with justice and consideration in all matters which do not involve sacrifices of the interest of the intelligent and progressive portion of the community. But are equally prepared now and immediately to enforce what we know to be our rights.

Seventh - That we have been, in our desire for harmony and peace, blinded both to our best interests and our rights. A climax was reached when the negro paper of this city published an article so vile and slanderous that it would in most communities have resulted in the lynching of the editor. We deprecate lynching and yet there is no punishment, provided by the courts, adequate for this offense. We therefore owe it to the people of this community and of this city, as a protection against such license in the future, that the paper known as the “Record” cease to be published and that its editor be banished from this community. We demand that he leave this City forever within twenty-four hours after the issuance of this proclamation. Second, that the printing press from which the “Record” has been issued be packed and shipped from the City without delay, that we be notified within twelve hours of the acceptance or rejection of this demand. If the demand is agreed to, within twelve hours we counsel forbearance on the part of all white men. If the demand is refused or if no answer is given within the time mentioned then the editor, Manly, will be expelled by force.151

6.5 The 1898 Wilmington Riot, November 10, 1898

The 1898 Wilmington Riot commenced on November 10, 1898. This came after long planning and deliberation among the “City’s white citizens,” during a meeting on the previous day of November 9, 1898. June Nash asserts that this was a mass meeting of “800 of the best white citizens.”152

These white citizens, “a respectable representative assemblage” of Wilmington’s business leaders, pledged to “reject rule by negroes.” Also, in deliberating the aim of the riot, they collectively agreed to use violence, even murder, against blacks (or Republicans) who might pose a challenge to white supremacy rule in Wilmington. Thus, the official leaders participant in the November 9th meeting decided to “banish” black professionals and black political leaders from the city. For example, Armond Scott, a brilliant African American attorney, with his law office located in Wilmington, was banished from the city. During this same time, some white Republicans had been “banished” from Wilmington as well. These men had been most active in politics and encouraged African Americans to vote in Wilmington’s elections. Manly had escaped from the city on the previous night, November 9th, after he was alerted that the white mob was going to lynch him. White supremacist Democrats labeled these men as threatening to white supremacy rule in Wilmington.153

6.6 The Murder and Massacre of Blacks

The first scene of violence took place at the corner of Fourth and Harnett streets in Brooklyn, Wilmington. Brooklyn was the predominantly black community, which occupied the northern section of Wilmington. An anomaly in the South in the post-Civil War period and in Reconstruction, Brooklyn’s black population rapidly grew as more blacks migrated there. Brooklyn fashioned a black middle class and many of the influential blacks lived in integrated neighborhoods (mixed-race neighborhood).

---
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Unfortunately, Brooklyn’s black community became the scene of the tragic 1898 Wilmington riot.\textsuperscript{154}

Gun violence erupted though, at Fourth and Harnett streets, where a group of black men gathered on the southwest corner of the street. The white mob, returning from the burning of the \textit{Daily Record} took up position on the other side of the street, between “Heyer’s store and St. Matthew’s English Lutheran Church.” It is not clear who fired the first shots, but when the initial shooting stopped, four blacks laid dead and three wounded. Five whites were identified as having been present at the scene, but none of them were shot. Following this incident, fighting between blacks and whites raged on throughout the day of November 10\textsuperscript{th} and into the evening.

The epicenter of the riot, Brooklyn had been invaded by white terrorist mobs. With their superior weapons, the white mob massacred blacks, leaving the bodies of the dead to “remain stretched on their backs with their eyes open as a warning to other blacks.”\textsuperscript{155}

Both blacks and whites accused each other of shooting first. However, Aaron Lockamy, a deputized white police officer stationed in Brooklyn after the November 8 election, “asserted that the only people on the corner who were armed were whites.” Lockamy had attempted to mediate a truce between both white and black opponents who

\textsuperscript{154} H. Leon Prather, 21–23.
\textsuperscript{155} Morning Star, “Bloody Conflict with Negroes: White Men Forced to Take Up Arms for the Protection of Law and Order,” \textit{Morning Star} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 11, 1898; Harry Hayden, \textit{The Wilmington Light Infantry}, (Wilmington: New Hanover County Public Library, 1936).
were present at Fourth and Harnett streets. He was unsuccessful in his attempt to urge them to disperse.\textsuperscript{156}

It is uncertain as to the actual number of dead that resulted from the 1898 Wilmington Riot. Contemporary sources and subsequent enumerations vary greatly. “These varying accounts from local and statewide sources, many by witnesses, prove that no actual number of dead will ever be known,” thus confirm the 1898 Wilmington Race Riot Report, the official report submitted on May 31, 2006, by the 1898 Wilmington Race Riot Commission (Riot Commission).

The Riot Commission documents in its report of May 31, 2006, thirty-one men had been wounded or killed as a result of the violence that occurred during the Wilmington Riot. Of the thirty-one victims listed, eleven of them are marked as unknown due to the lack of information necessary in order to identify those bodies. Nine of the thirty-one victims are listed as “wounded, fate unknown.” It is not clear if these wounded individuals survived their injury. Some of the wounded had been treated at their homes, therefore information that would reveal their survival or death is missing. Lastly, it is important to note that all the victims on this list are African American men.

Few white men suffered any serious injury much less died from gunshot wounds. Here, again, conflicting sources make it difficult to ascertain accurate information by which to determine fatality among whites who participated in the riot. With exception to William Mayo, a white man, no serious injury or white fatality has been recorded to have occurred to whites in the riot. Mayo, “who lived at 307 Harnett Street,” where the

\textsuperscript{156} Wilmington Messenger, “Awful Calamity. Wilmington’s Dred Fear Realized: Bloody Race Conflict,” \textit{Wilmington Messenger} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 11, 1898; LaRae Sikes Umfleet, 88–89.
opening scene of the riot took place, was seriously wounded by gunshot. Receiving immediate care, however, Mayo was able to survive his injury. At Wilmington City Hospital, Dr. Robert Zachary, the physician who tended to the injured men, treated fourteen men for gunshot wounds, which they received during the riot. Of this number, all but two of the men were black. Moreover, the black men had been shot in their backs. Two of the black men died from their wounds, but the remaining ten survived. Also, the two white men survived. One of them had been shot in his leg.¹⁵⁷

Due to Limited and at times inaccurate records, the Riot Commission found that it has been extremely difficult to ascertain the real number of people who died in the Wilmington Riot of 1898. What the Riot Commission has done, however, for the purposes of its May 31, 2006, report, is that it collected information from other sources pertaining to the men who have perished in the riot.

In examining those various sources, the Riot Commission identified the dead victims. To eliminate any possibility of duplicating the findings, the Riot Commission compared its own list of dead victims with those sources. In the end, along with the location in which each man was murdered, the Riot Commission produced a detailed list of dead and wounded men in the 1898 Wilmington Riot. We should consider this a partial list, however, because the names of some of the dead will remain unknown. This is because of the paucity of definitive sources on the names of the dead. Moreover, conflicting information about location where murders took place, and the accuracy of

¹⁵⁷ Wilmington Race Riot Report, 202–204.
existing sources are all obstacles that hinder an accurate calculation of the actual number of murdered victims.\textsuperscript{158}

Those sources examined by the Riot Commission includes newspapers such as the \textit{Wilmington Messenger} (11/11/1898) and \textit{Evening Dispatch} (11/11/1898). Both Issues document killings that took place during the riot. The \textit{Evening Dispatch} notes that “…there are a number killed not accounted for and who will never be accounted for,” basically reiterating the inaccuracy of the number of deaths that is been recorded in the riot.\textsuperscript{159}

Another source is Harry Hayden’s memoir, “The Wilmington Light Infantry,” in which Hayden compiles a list of the men who died in the riot. Hayden was a member of the Wilmington Light Infantry (WLI), a citizen volunteer military group formed before the Civil War and continued in operation into the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The WLI played an instrumental role in the 1898 Wilmington Riot. On the day of the riot the WLI marched into the Brooklyn neighborhood to subdue black rioters and to put down the riot. Hayden documents the events of the riot on November 10, 1898, in his text, The Wilmington Light Infantry.

Scholars of the 1898 Wilmington Riot agree that though Hayden’s work, \textit{The Wilmington Light Infantry}, is considered to be a valuable source that documents events of the riot, it is filled with inconsistencies regarding the number of deaths that resulted from

\textsuperscript{158} \textit{Wilmington Race Riot Report}, 200–201;
\textsuperscript{159} \textit{Evening Dispatch}, “A Summary of the Situation: Correct List of Fatalities Will Never Be Obtained Though the List May Reach a Dozen,” \textit{Evening Dispatch} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 11, 1898; \textit{Wilmington Messenger}, “Awful Calamity. Wilmington’s Dred Fear Realized: Bloody Race Conflict,” \textit{Wilmington Messenger} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 11, 1898.
the riot. Hayden’s scholarships on the 1898 Wilmington Riot includes, The Wilmington Light Infantry, unpublish memoir held at the New Hanover County Public Library and The Story of the Wilmington Rebellion, 1936. For example, the Riot Commission explains:

“Harry Hayden’s history of the Wilmington Light Infantry proved to be a valuable source for oral traditions within the white community regarding the deaths of black men. Hayden’s work, written decades after the riot, was based on oral interviews and printed accounts in newspapers and other contemporary sources. Hayden’s list has been compared with other sources, and some of the deaths reported in his work are found in the [Riot Commission’s] list above. Other deaths could not be substantiated. Hayden also wrote that Walker Taylor reported 11 deaths but later estimated the number at 20, that others contended that more than 100 were killed because bodies were tossed into the river or buried in secret, and that additional claims ranged as high as 250 deaths.”

Walker Taylor is also a member of the WLI and one of the officers of Battalion in service during the November 10, 1898, Wilmington Riot.¹⁶⁰

June Nash also attempts to clarify the uncertainty around the actual number of deaths that resulted from the 1898 Wilmington Riot. In a series of interviews in 1968, which she conducted with white and black residents of Wilmington, Nash was able to gain firsthand accounts of the riot. The interviewees were toddlers and teenagers when the riot occurred. Those Whites who Nash interviewed recalled very little about the 1898 riot and most of them did not want to recall the events of the riot. “We’d just as soon forget it,” the white librarian said to Nash. Blacks, on the other hand, were eager to talk about their experiences or what they have heard about the riot from their parents and neighbors…. For example, Mrs. Cogswell, an African American child at the time of the riot, refutes the claim that only 19 blacks had been murdered, a figure published in an

¹⁶⁰ Wilmington Race Riot Report, 204.
1898 New York Times article. Cogswell asserts that that was “utterly false. Those who had casualties in the family would refute that” number of deaths. Many blacks were murdered and thrown into the Cape Fear River. Still other dead black bodies have been buried in mass graves, Cogswell testifies, making it difficult to get an actual count of the number of blacks who died in the riot.\textsuperscript{161}

Some scholars of racial riots and other events of anti-black violence such as lynching also talk about trouble they have encountered in their attempt to calculate the number of murdered black victims resulting from such violent events. Unfortunately, the difficulty that scholars of the Wilmington Riot experienced as they attempt to ascertain the actual number of people who died in the riot is not an unusual occurrence.

Harry Hayden illustrates that “there has always been a tendency to minimize or magnify the casualties” of the 1898 Wilmington Riot. One reason for the inaccuracy in calculation of the number of deaths, Hayden explains, is that many victims were “removed from time to time from places of hiding under buildings, houses and shanties and in the woods” after dying from their wounds. Another problem in counting all the deaths in the riot is created by relatives of the dead victims. Some family members who were unable to pay for burials and grave markers, retrieved and buried the body of their murdered relatives.

Such burials were often carried out absent of the coroner’s inquest, which means that some deaths would have not been recorded. Thus, those deaths were not counted as

part of the city’s official record of deaths. As a result, it is not added to the whole number of deaths.\textsuperscript{162}

\textbf{6.7 List of Black Dead and Wounded}

Below is a list of the number of black men dead and wounded in the 1898 Wilmington Riot. Compiled by the Riot Commission, information about the dead and wounded victims included here was taken from various sources. You will notice that several of the victims are listed as unknown. Though they are not identified by their names, their deaths have been recorded. As a result, these unknown deceased men have been added to the number of dead. This is unlike those victims who have been secretly buried by family relatives or those buried in unmarked graves. According to the Riot Commission, those deaths that are “not found in this list are the names of others, or locations of shootings, who have only vague references.” Here the Riot Commission refers to the report of dead victims in “Hayden’s History of the Wilmington Light Infantry, in which Hayden records the deaths of 25 men near Sixth and Brunswick Streets.” Such deaths could not be validated. For the purpose of this work, I have condensed this list by making minor adjustments in order to fit this list into this document. I changed font size, merged sources and the Riot Commission notes into one section and created one section for first and last names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Location(s)</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898 and 11/14/1898</td>
<td>killed at Carolina Central Tracks west of 2nd on Harnett;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>killed as he shot at whites east of railroad repair shop near Third at 4:00 P.M. on tenth;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/14/1898</td>
<td>left where he was shot and body still on tracks at nightfall.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/14/1898</td>
<td>killed at Manhattan Park [Halsey?] Hayden’s History of the WLI, p. 92.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>shot dead by guard at 4:30 P.M. on the tenth at Fourth Street bridge after he snapped a musket at the guard;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>killed on ACL tracks near Fourth Street bridge.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>killed at Seventh and Bladen [Halsey?] Hayden’s History of the WLI, p. 92.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>shot on Fourth near Red Cross, supposed dead.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>killed at Tenth and Princess at 8:00 P.M. on tenth for refusing to stop for a patrol.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Raleigh News &amp; Observer</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>killed at railroad tracks early in the morning of the eleventh by a soldier.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Raleigh News &amp; Observer</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>killed at Tenth and Mulberry (Grace) for failure to stop for a patrol.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Gray] Bizzell</td>
<td>Morning Star</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>shot and died at home on 411 Harnett (where George Davis was found).</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L.</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>died on Third between Harnett and Swann;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>given inquest on twelfth;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Star</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>given inquest on twelfth;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1301 N. Fifth Street, laborer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Gregory</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>died between Harnett and Swann.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/14/1898</td>
<td>died at Fourth and Harnett.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Halsey</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>killed, Bladen near Seventh;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Star</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>sister Mildred Clinton testified at inquest on twelfth that body she saw in street was her brother;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Star</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>inquest given Association of the WLI mentions his shooting in a couple of places Hayden’s History of the WLI, p. 92 (Seventh and Bladen).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lindsay</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>among first killed at Fourth and Harnett, buried 11/11;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>given inquest on twelfth;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morning Star</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>inquest on twelfth;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>listed as “unknown” and first to die at Fourth and Harnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam McFallon</td>
<td>Morning Star</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>wounded and taken to hospital—had crawled under house on Fourth between Harnett and Swann—was discovered on eleventh and taken to hospital, expected to die;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>an unknown man found dead under the house;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1897 tax list, Two Simon McFallon, one an elderly father that owned property and another, possibly a son, age 32. Neither listed in 1900 records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam McFarland</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>wounded and taken to hospital;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>died 11/12/1898, shot and thought dead on Harnett at SAL tracks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam McFarland</td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>in hospital; gives details of his life, job, work, died 1897 CD: h) 512 Taylor, laborer 1897 tax list: age, 47.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Miller</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>in hospital; to hospital on tenth; Died</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mouzon</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>among first killed at Fourth and Harnett, buried 11/11; died</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>given inquest on twelfth; Star: inquest on twelfth; listed as “unknown” and first to die at Fourth and Harnett</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>to hospital, expected to die. Died</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Peamon</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>shot as he jumped off train; Died</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Rowan</td>
<td>June Nash, “Cost of Violence,” p. 168</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>body still lying-in woods near tracks. was a bar owner killed on wharf.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Townsend</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>among first killed at Fourth and Harnett, buried 11/11; died</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>given inquest on twelfth; Star: inquest on twelfth; listed as “unknown” and first to die at Fourth and Harnett</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>to die at Fourth and Harnett Hayden’s History of the WLI, p. 92.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Wright</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>on his death;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>11/13/1898</td>
<td>given inquest on twelfth; Mayo’s assailant, died at hospital on eleventh</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispatch</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>Association of the WLI mentions his shooting Hayden’s History of the WLI, p. 90;</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Died 1897 tax list: age, 40, 1897 CD: h) 810 N. 3rd, laborer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. R. Davis</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/12/1898</td>
<td>at hospital, wounded in kidneys; Wounded.</td>
<td>Died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>taken to hospital on tenth; Wounded.</td>
<td>Fate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>wounded and treated at home on Davis Street by a doctor; wounded.</td>
<td>Fate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Evening Star</td>
<td>11/11/1898</td>
<td>wounded at Front and Castle because refused to stop for patrol, attended by a doctor;</td>
<td>Fate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similarly, in his investigation of lynching in Kentucky, George Wright also experienced problem in his efforts to come up with the actual number of blacks who had been lynched in that state. One reason for this Wright explains, is that many lynching of blacks went unreported.163

The burning of the Daily Record office precipitated the murder of blacks by whites in the Brooklyn community in Wilmington. About an hour before the initial shooting at Fourth and Harnett streets, a white mob that numbered about 1000 to 1500 white men, led by Alfred Moore Waddell, marched to the Love and Charity Hall building (Ruth Hall). The building in which the Daily Record is housed. This building “stood in the heart of the black neighborhood near the corner of Seventh and Nun Streets” in Wilmington. Entering the Daily Record office, the white terrorist mob proceeded to demolish the Daily Record’s printing press, furniture and all other contents within the office. Finally, the mob set fire to the Daily Record office which destroyed the office and

163 George C. Wright, 250–254.
the building in which the office is situated. Destruction of the *Daily Record* newspaper marked the beginning of overt violence that would engulf the city over the following days.

From the burned *Daily Record* office, the white mob marched to Sprunt Cotton Compress to attack the “hundreds of black men” who worked there as “stevedores, laborers, and equipment operators.” A major employer of both blacks and whites, the Cotton Compress was located at “Front Street between Walnut and Red Cross Streets.” Violence, however, was averted when the white mob “stood down” and the white men rejoined the citizens militia group, Wilmington Light Infantry, and “took their places in the ranks.”

### 6.8 The Impact of The Riot

Based on analysis of data taken from Wilmington’s 1897 and 1900 Directories, the 1898 Wilmington Riot Commission Report (Riot Commission) documents the riot’s impact on the city’s black community. The Riot Commission identify fifteen occupational categories in which blacks in Wilmington participated during the riot period. By 1900, significant changes in the number of blacks employed in the fifteen occupational categories had occurred. Such changes were the result of the white supremacy rule campaign and violence of November 1898 in Wilmington. Also, the banishment campaign and termination of jobs held by black employees, all actions whites agreed upon at the November 9th meeting, which helped to decrease the number of black workers in the city.

---


165 Wilmington Race Riot Report, 250; LeRae Sikes Umfleet, 148.
A shift in the black and white population in Wilmington occurred later, but this came about in the post-riot period. The city’s black population decreased to 10,407, reflecting a drop of about 1,917 of its black residents. Whites’ number, however, increased to 10,556, gaining 1,925 white residents. There is no doubt that such drastic changes in the city’s population was directly related to the 1898 riot. Many blacks fled from the city, or they were murdered. Whites, on the other hand, relocated to the city adding to the number of white residents already there.  

This shift from black to white workers that occurred between 1897 and 1900 resulted in serious changes in some categories and less overt in others. For example, there is a noticeable change in the aggregate number of blacks employed in the city. 3,462 black people had been employed in 1897. However, in 1900, 2 years after the riot, that number decreased to 2,546 black workers. This was a drop of near 1000 workers. At the same time, the number of white workers increased from 2,990 in 1897 to 3,375 in 1900. This is an increase of 385 white workers, while at the same time nearly 1,000 few blacks than in 1897 had lost their jobs.  

Skilled artisan and building trades categories received some attention in the literature. For one thing, this is because white workers accused employers of hiring more blacks than whites to work in these areas. However, as the Riot Commission report shows, white workers were overrepresented in both of those occupational categories. For example, white skilled artisans far outnumbered black artisans by 203 to 99 in 1897. What’s more is that in 1900 that number of white artisans jumped to 214, while the city’s

166 Lerae S. Umfleet, 18–19; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Eleventh Census of the United States, 1890, 1:473; H. Leon Prather, Sr., 31–32.
directory of 1900 shows the number of black artisans decreased to 83, 16 less than in 1897. So, it is unclear as to why white artisans complained that they are under-employed in skilled trades occupation. One reason for their complaints might have been that they only wanted to see white workers in skilled trades and not blacks. Most whites did not want to work alongside blacks.

Building trades is another occupational category in which white workers dispute the hiring of blacks. For blacks in this sector, their numbers did not go down, instead the number of blacks slightly increased from 139 to 142 blacks in building trades in 1900 in Wilmington. On the other hand, the number of white workers in building trades went up from 173 to 247 in 1900, a gain of 74, while only 3 additional blacks gained employment in building trades. One reason why those blacks in building trades experienced little change is because they owned their own building company. They did not have to depend on white employers for employment in that job sector. This is because, as noted by Cecelski, many African Americans in the city have been working in building trades sector well before the Civil War and during slavery. During those periods they acquired their specialized skill as carpenter or bricklayer.168

As early as in the post-Civil War years, blacks in Wilmington had begun their black community building process there. Like blacks in E. St. Louis in the early 20th century, black Wilmingtonians established their community institutions characterized by the black church and other black organizations. This helped to create a dynamic and complex black community in which the black church was central. Black cultural and civic life centered around the church. As C. Eric Lincoln and Lawrence H. Mamiya

---

illustrate, “black churches constituted the central institutional sector in black communities is common in the American understanding of the black…” community. For many, the tradition of the black church represents one of the few stable black institutions to emerge from slavery. This, Lincoln and Mamiya explain, resonate with “free blacks who had established mutual aid societies and churches that were among the first institutions created by black people.”169 One example of the centrality of the black church in early free African American community is in the late 18th century in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Led by “Black Founders” Richard Allen and Absalom Jones in the 1790 decade, the Free African Society helped to establish the African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1796, and the first African Church of St. Thomas in 1794. Church members organized mutual aid society and other relief organizations that helped to sustain its black community.170 In Wilmington at the time of the 1898 riot, black churches played a similar role in the black community there. St. Stephens AME and St. Lukes AME, fashioned large congregations from among the city’s black laboring class. As for middle class blacks in the city, they were attracted to St. Mark’s Episcopal Church and Chestnut St. Presbyterian Church. As Umfleet points out, the clear social division that exist among Wilmington’s black churches did not prevent the church from carrying out its traditional responsibilities in the African American community there in Wilmington.171

171 Wilmington Race Riot Report, 19.
6.9 Conclusion

The city of Wilmington held a strategic political position in the 1898 mid-term election cycle. For that reason, Wilmington would play a major role in the Democratic party’s 1898 election campaign in which it promoted its “anti-negro rule” and white supremacy rule campaign. However, the Democratic party face serious problems in its effort to win reelection. It had already suffered a major defeat in 1894, followed by another disappointing loss to the “Fusion” coalition in the 1896 municipal election in Wilmington. In addition, the Republican Party won the governorship in the 1896 election, the first time since Reconstruction. Plus, it faced a difficult challenge from “Fusion coalition of Populists, Republicans” and African American voters who mount a serious challenge against the party.

A pivotal election year for the Democratic Party, Prather explains, so white supremacist Democrats had been willing to do anything to win the Wilmington municipal election. This, white supremacist Democrats demonstrated throughout the 1898 election campaign in Wilmington, through campaign events and newspaper publications, leading up to election day, November 8, 1898. Through these mediums Democrats propagate anti-black violence, voter intimidation and characterize blacks and Republicans as unfit to govern the city.

The importance of Wilmington in electoral politics cannot be overstated as well. The size of the city, in terms of its population and economy, makes it hard to ignore the city in local or state’s politics. By 1900, turn of the century, Wilmington fashioned a population of 20,055. No other city within North Carolina came close to matching Wilmington’s population number. At the time only Asheville and Raleigh were the only
two cities within the state with population at about 10,000. With its large population, Wilmington’s elected representatives to the North Carolina’s State Legislature would be able to take over leadership positions in the North Carolina General Assembly.

Control over the General Assembly is the main reason why both the Republican and Democratic parties focus on winning in the Wilmington municipal election. For one thing, the North Carolina General Assembly is the most powerful organ of the state’s government agencies. The Assembly is endowed with unparallel constitutional powers. For example, the constitution states that the General Assembly “shall have full power by statute to modify, change or abrogate any or all…charters, ordinances and provisions relating to municipal corporations.” Also, the General Assembly can arbitrarily replace such charters and ordinances without approval from any other government agency, and “substitute other” documents “in their stead.” Thus, the party that controls the General Assembly has sway over the entire state government, as well as empowered with constitutional mandate that allows it to exercise broad powers over the cities and state.

The problem for the Democrats though, was figuring out how the party would persuade Wilmington’s blacks to vote for the Democratic party, the party of white supremacy. Blacks comprised a majority of Wilmington’s voting population and those black voters often vote for Republican candidates, not Democrat’s.

Through voter intimidation, violence and eventually banishment of blacks from Wilmington, white supremacist Democrats ultimately achieved their political goal; to render black voters ineffective in Wilmington municipal elections. Though black voters

---

have been singled out as the primary targets for exile, some whites had also been driven
out of the city as well.\textsuperscript{174} Alleged accomplice to blacks, white Republican leaders, “dirty
white Republican scoundrels” as some whites referred to them, had also been forced to
leave the city. This is because of their collaboration with black politicians during
Wilmington municipal elections.\textsuperscript{175}

A new suffrage amendment to the North Carolina state constitution carried the
final act of legal disfranchisement of blacks right to vote in the state. This new suffrage
amendment law was made possible with the new Democratic majority Legislature of
1899. White supremacist Democrats had gained full control over the state Legislature.
Here, the Legislature enacted its plan, to use “poll tax” and “literacy test” as methods by
which to disfranchise blacks. Democratic legislatures eventually added a grandfather
clause to the amendment, because they realized that not only would blacks be disqualified
under these methods, white voters also would be impacted, especially illiterate whites.\textsuperscript{176}

Finally, in 1900 the Democratic Legislature passed the Suffrage Amendment to
the North Carolina State Constitution, which adopts a “Grandfather Clause” that was
aimed at blocking blacks from voting and maintained segregation up until the 1950s and
1960s Civil Rights Movement. However, the grandfather clause created a loophole for
white men that enabled them to vote. For example, the Grandfather Clause permit those
men who had exercise the right to vote prior to 1867 to be exempt from the law of the

\textsuperscript{174} Morning Star, “The City Pastors: Praise People for Forcibly Crushing Out Negro
Domination,” \textit{Morning Star} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 15, 1898.
\textsuperscript{175} Morning Star, “Order is Restored: The New City Government is Proving Thoroughly
Effective,” \textit{Morning Star} (Wilmington, NC), Nov. 12, 1898; Lock Shields, “White Men:
Tillman’s Strong, Clear, Logical Speech at Charlotte,” \textit{Raleigh News & Observer},
(Raleigh, NC), Nov. 5, 1898.
\textsuperscript{176} Helen G. Edmonds, 198–204.
new suffrage amendment. In addition, the new law states if your father or grandfather had been allowed to vote before this same year, 1867, then the voter would be excused from the state’s poll tax and literacy test. Only white men had been allowed to vote in the United States prior to 1867. A significant fact as blacks

The 1899 North Carolina state Legislature focused on 1867 as the benchmark year because universal suffrage was granted under Reconstruction laws this same year. Whites had opposed social and political equality for blacks. Prior to 1867 blacks lived as slaves in the United States and they did not have the right to vote. In fact, blacks had been considered noncitizens and second-class citizens with no legal nor political rights. Only white men have been allowed to vote in the pre-Civil War period. In 1860, Eric Foner illustrates, only five Northern states, all with tiny black population, allowed black men to vote on the same terms as whites. Women in general (black and white women) did not gain the franchise until passage of the 19th Amendment in the 20th century.

Though the 15th Amendment of 1870 grant to blacks the right to vote, North Carolina state’s suffrage amendment was upheld because it was argued that the “Grandfather Clause” suffrage amendment did not violate the 15th Amendment. This amendment, they claimed applies to both blacks and whites. It did not single out one race over the other.

---

179 United States Constitution. Amend. XIX.
It, however, empowered registrars to question any voter about their identity and qualifications in order to vote. The real purpose of the law was then intended to help registrars to identify blacks for disqualification to vote. This was done by documenting the applicant’s race, particularly black applicants who registered to vote. By doing this, it made the process easier to weed out and disqualify blacks from registering to vote.¹⁸⁰

With no challenge from the opposition parties, Democrats in the Legislature basically enacted its anti-black vote agenda, scaling back rights blacks had gained during Reconstruction. Democrats move quickly to codify Jim Crow legislations that were aimed at subjecting blacks to racial and social segregation. For example, the first Jim Crow law targeted railroad cars initiated segregated train compartments. According to Helen G. Edmonds, this bill was amended because railroad companies complained that the new law, among other things, would place unnecessary financial burden on railroad companies. This is because they would be required to build separate railroad cars for blacks and white passengers. The new law was still implemented. One new Jim Crow law followed the other. Each law was designed to enforce segregation, stripping away rights blacks had won in Reconstruction. In many ways these segregation laws pattern the “Black Codes,” restricted blacks rights and freedoms, and forcing blacks to live under conditions like that of slavery. Unable to mount a serious challenge against the Democrats, the Republican Party became the minority party. As a result of the 1898 election, Democrats gained 134 seats in the State’s Legislature, while Republicans held 34 and Populists was able to only win 6 seats. With exception to the governorship,

Democrats held the majority in the state’s government. Even though the black vote remained a viable vote in the eastern region, it mattered little. Ongoing fraud and intimidation kept blacks away from the polls.

Many blacks could not vote because they were unable to provide the necessary documents required to vote under the new suffrage amendment. This significantly helped to reduce the number of black voters who participated in the Wilmington municipal and state elections. For example, nearly eighty thousand black men registered to vote in 1868 when black men had been granted the right to vote in Reconstruction in the state. By 1900, this number drastically decreased to about fifteen thousand, a drop by 65,000 registered black voters. Surely, the new suffrage amendment of 1900 played a major role in this precipitous drop in the number of registered black voters.

It is believed that the election for state governor in 1900 demonstrated the first noticeable impact of the new suffrage amendment on voters. The Democratic candidate for governor soundly defeated the Republican candidate by 60 to 40 percent respectively. However, we cannot rule out voter intimidation and violence against blacks during the Democrats’ “anti-black rule” and “white supremacy rule” campaigns of the previous elections.

White supremacy rule election campaign of 1898 had proven successful. White supremacist Democrats, in the 1898 Wilmington municipal election, seized control over the city of Wilmington away from Fusion Populist-Republicans and black voters. What’s more is that by the time of the state election of 1900, Democratic Party’s victory had returned control over the state’s Legislature and the governorship back to the Democrats and away from the Republicans.
White supremacist Democrats had managed to eliminate the threat posed by black voters to sway elections in the city of Wilmington, North Carolina state’s largest city. They accomplished this using voter intimidation, fraud, and political violence against blacks. More significant is that the state’s Democratic Legislature, bent on installing Jim Crow segregation, passed the North Carolina suffrage amendment, with a grandfather clause inserted in the amendment that target blacks. This effectively blocked many blacks from voting and, for the first time since Reconstruction, no blacks had been elected to public office in the election of 1900. Unfortunately, the success of Democrats’ white supremacy rule campaign and the effectiveness of the state’s suffrage amendment inspired other states across the South to follow North Carolina’s example in their effort to disenfranchised blacks. The suppression of blacks right to vote in many Southern states would continue until passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. A landmark federal legislation that culminated during the height of the Civil Rights Movement in the 20th century. This Act prohibits racial discrimination in voting and sought to enforce voting rights enshrine in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.  

Strong parallels exist between the 1881 pogroms against Jews in Imperial Russia and racial riots carried out against the African American community in the United States in the 19th and early 20th century. Similar causal factors triggered racial riots and pogroms, while violence associated with those racial riots and the 1881 pogroms feature similar characteristics. Within my research I have sought good reason to redefine those 19th and early 20th century racial riots.

---

181 David Zucchino, 309–317; United States Statutes at Large, 79 Stat 437; 89th Congress, 1st Session; An Act to enforce the 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; Public Law 89–110.
Anti-Jewish violence that was associated with the 1881 pogroms mirror anti-black violence that African Americans experienced during episodes of racial riots. I found that both examples of violence featured similar characteristics of physical violence that had been targeted at both blacks and Jews. What’s more is that such attacks often result in destruction of the victims’ homes and displacement. This was done to force the victims of racial riots and those of pogrom to relocate from the area in which the riot or pogrom had occurred.

Anti-Jewish violence, as demonstrated in the 1881 pogrom, was in part attributed to Native Russians’ anger over Jews advancement in the Russian economy in the 19th century. Such progress was the result of Great Reforms policies which opened opportunity for Russian Jews in sectors of the economy, where they had earlier been blocked from participation. For example, some Jews, who were able to profit from their involvement in the tavern and liquor industries, were blamed for Native Russians financial hardships. Native Russians believed that such economic opportunity was diverted to Jews. Such perceived inequity was often enough for Native Russians to instigate pogroms.

Turning to racial violence in Wilmington, North Carolina, whites resented prosperous blacks. Some blacks had achieved financial success because of their involvement in Wilmington’s economy. Blacks worked as businessmen and entrepreneurs, particularly during the post-Civil War period and in the last decades of the 19th century, beginning in the 1870 and 1880 decades. Black entrepreneurs opened businesses in the medicine sector and established law offices, professions typically dominated by whites. Some blacks became independent building contractors, among
other businesses, in Wilmington during this same period in the last three decades in the 19th century. While black businesses prospered and competed with white enterprises, many whites turned against prosperous blacks because they believed that blacks should not do better than them. Blacks who were financially fortunate beyond the economic condition of the average white man became a target for racial violence. White democrats were opposed to African Americans political advancement.

Violence impacted both African Americans in Wilmington, NC and Jews in Imperial Russia. Like blacks in Wilmington, some Jewish entrepreneurs achieved economic success in the new Russian economy that was initiated by Great Reform policies. Jewish entrepreneurs who achieved economic achievement represented a source of Native Russians’ envy, because they were far more successful than their Native Russian counterparts. They blamed Jews for Native Russians financial hardship. Native Russians perceived economic unfairness triggered episodes of violence against Jews. Such targeted violence occurred during the period of the Great Reforms, when economic opportunity had been available to all Russians.

Native Russians against Jews in Imperial Russia, and whites against blacks in the city of Wilmington, North Carolina, exhibited the economic interpretation that relative deprivation is link to specific grievances. Such grievances have often been used as the basis on which violent racial riot had been planned and carried out against blacks and pogrom against Jews in the Russian Empire. Parallels exist between pogroms against Jews in Imperial Russia and racial violence against Blacks in the United States in the 19th and early 20th century. Based on the findings of this study it is possible to redefine those 19th and early 20th century racial riots as pogroms.
APPENDIX A

ALEX MANLY’S EDITORIAL

A Mrs. Felton from Georgia made a speech before the Agricultural Society at Tybee Ga, in which she advocates lynching as an extreme measure. This woman makes a strong plea for womanhood and if the alleged crimes of rape were half so frequent as it oft times reported, her plea would be worthy of consideration. Mrs. Felton like many other so-called Christians loses sight of the basic principle of the religion of Christ in her plea for one class of religion as against another. If a missionary spirit is essential for the uplifting of the poor white girls, why is it? The morals of the poor white people are on a par with their colored neighbors of like conditions and if one doubts the statement let him visit among them. The whole lump needs to be leavened by those who profess so much religion and showing them that the preservation of virtue is an essential for the life of any people. Mrs. Felton begins well for she admits that education will better protect the girls on the farm from the assaulter. This we admit and it should not be confined to the white any more than to the colored girls. The papers are filled often with reports of rapes of white women, and the subsequent lynching of the alleged rapist. The editors pour forth volumes of aspersions against all Negroes because of the few who may be guilty. If the papers and speakers of the other race would condemn the commission of crime because it is crime and not try to make it appear that the Negroes were the only criminals, they would find their strongest allies in the intelligent Negroes themselves; and together the whites and blacks would root the evil out of both races. We suggest that the whites guard their women more closely, as Mrs. Felton says, thus giving no opportunity for the human fiend be he white or black. You leave your goods out of doors and then complain because they are taken away. Poor white men are careless in the matter of protecting their women, especially on the farms. They are careless their conduct toward them, and our experience among poor white people in the country teaches us that the women of that race are not any more particular in the matter of clandestine meetings with colored men than are the white men with colored women. Meetings of this kind go on for some time until the woman’s infatuation or the man’s boldness bring attention to them, and the man is lynched for rape. Every Negro lynched is called a ‘big, burly, black brute,’ when in fact many of those who have thus been dealt with had white men for their fathers and were not only not ‘black’ and ‘burly’ but were sufficiently attractive for white girls of culture and refinement to fall in love with them as is very well known to all. Mrs. Felton must begin at the fountain head if she wishes to purify the stream. Teach your men purity. Let virtue be something more than an excuse for them to intimidate and torture a helpless people. Tell your men that it is no worse for a black man to be intimate with a white woman, than for a white man to be intimate with a colored woman. You set yourselves down as a lot of carping hypocrites in that you cry aloud for the virtue of your women while you seek to destroy the morality of ours. Don’t think ever that your women will remain pure while you are debauching ours. You sow the seed—the harvest will come in due time.\(^{182}\)

\(^{182}\) Wilmington Race Riot Report.
APPENDIX B

MRS. FELTON’S SPEECH

Mrs. Felton Speaks She Makes a Sensational Speech Before Agricultural Society Believes Lynching Should Prevail as Long as Defenseless Woman is Not Better Protected.

[J. A. Holman, Special to Atlanta Journal] South Bend Hotel, Tybee, GA., August 12, [1897]

I hear much of the millions sent abroad to Japan, China, India, Brazil and Mexico, but I feel that the heathen at home are so close at hand and need so much that I must make a strong effort to stop lynching, by keeping closer watch over the poor white girls on the secluded farms; and if these poor maidens are destroyed in a land that their fathers died to save from the invader’s foot, I say the shame lies with the survivors who fail to be protectors for the children of their dead comrades. I do not discount foreign missions. I simply say the heathens are destroyed in sight of your opulence and magnificence and when your temples of justice are put to shame by the lynchers’ rope. If your courthouses are shams and frauds and the law’s delay is the villain’s bulwark, then I say let judgment begin at the house of God and redeem this country from the cloud of shame that rests upon it. When there is not enough religion in the pulpit to organize a crusade against sin; nor justice in the courthouse to promptly punish crime; nor manhood enough in the nation to put a sheltering arm about innocence and virtue – if it needs lynching to protect woman’s dearest possession from the ravening human beasts – then I say lynch; a thousand times a week if necessary. The poor girl would choose any death in preference to such ignominy and outrage, and a quick death is mercy to the rapist compared to the suffering of innocence and modesty in a land of bibles and churches, where violence is becoming omnipotent except with the rich and powerful before the law. The crying need of women on the farms is security in their lives and in their homes. Strong, able-bodied men have told me they stopped farming and moved to town because their women folks were scared to death if left alone. I say it is a disgrace in a free country when such things are a public reproach, and the best part of God’s creation are trembling and crying for protection in their own homes. And I say, with due respect to all who listen to me, that so long as your politics takes the colored man into your embraces on election day to control the vote; and so long as the politicians use liquor to befuddle his understanding and make him think he is a man and brother when they propose to defeat the opposition by honey-snuggling him at the polls, and so long as he is made familiar with their dirty tricks in politics, so long will lynchings prevail, because the causes of it grow and increase.183

APPENDIX C

ESSENTIALISM

Ghiselin, Mayr and Hull agree in regarding essentialism as the most pervasive intellectual assumption of the nineteenth century to be challenged by Darwin's theory. The clearest definition of essentialism is the one Ghiselin borrows from K. R. Popper's *Conjectures and Refutations*: "essentialism" is the belief that an unchanging essence, whether an ideal form (neo-Platonism) or inherent within each being (Aristotelian philosophy), is what truly exists. In this framework, a "species" is an actual entity, of which the members are merely representatives.
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