

# Race and Urban Structure

ANDREW CHIN

Florida A&M University

## Introduction

A traditional description of Atlanta's urban morphology usually presents one of two popular choices. The first is evident in A.E.J. Morris' *History of Urban Form*. Morris ties the city's order to the intersection of five railroad lines and states that "A small village called Terminus grew up around the (railroad) line, ...(and) determined the precise center of Atlanta, between Pryor and Central Streets. Around the depot the new town, still known as Terminus, was laid out on a basis of 17 land lots, its layout largely determined by the railway tracks and the existing foot-paths."<sup>1</sup> An 1847 map clarifies how "the early unrelated grid-iron districts of the first railway settlement were subsequently resolved into a standard north-south, east-west orientated pattern."<sup>2</sup>

The second description is the sprawling metropolis described by Rem Koolhaas. For Koolhaas, Atlanta is a city that defies conventional formal analysis. He states that "Atlanta does not have the classical symptoms of the City; it is not dense; it is a sparse, thin carpet of habitation, a kind of supremacist composition of little fields. Atlanta is not a City; it is a landscape."<sup>3</sup>

A less visible, but equally informative third option examines frequently ignored public policy issues that highlight the influence of segregation. Neighborhood street access, highway placement, Colored School designation, park use and housing patterns were spatial components of race and class. Together they fostered a complex Black and White Atlanta.<sup>4</sup>

## Race and Planning History

From 1619 to 1900, more than 75% of the nation's African-American population lived in the south. The population existed within a legal and social order that enabled black and white Southerners to coexist. In urban sites, Blacks often lived to the rear of larger houses in perpendicular units; or in more spatially detached units, that faced the alley.<sup>5</sup> Richard Morrill indicates that this early evidence of localized residential integration is attributed to laws that formally separated Black and White citizens. Spatial segregation was not demanded. Blacks were legally defined as inferior. The result was a legal and psychological separated from the white community.

As the legal constraints weakened, the need to separate spatially grew. Even after *Plessy vs. Ferguson* (1896) stated "separate but equal," the status of Whites was not threatened by neighboring black environments: the legality of a distinction was maintained. Once legal definitions were dissolved (, the abolition of slavery, *Brown vs. Board of Education* (1954) and after *Plessy vs. Ferguson* was overturned), alternative strategies to distinguish black from White had to be adopted.<sup>6</sup> Spatial separation became an effective strategy.

The impact of racial bias in planning is obscured by an ob-

session with individual agents, individual projects, or individual codes. It has become increasingly evident that historical approaches to the writing of planning history need inclusive perspectives regarding race, gender and class. First, such a perspective would bring planning more inline with contemporary analysts and urban historians. Second, such explorations could clarify the presence of racism within the broader society; balancing the tendency to blame planners for decisions that often came from the top down.

Contemporary planning texts have begun to amend this oversight in planning's history.<sup>7</sup> These texts recognize that the practice occurs at neither the material nor the ideological level that the great men and projects claimed to operate on. In the process, planning history will recognize that the formation of physical racial boundaries was not a casual coincidence, but a well orchestrated vision.

"Segregation and exclusion on every level are conceptualized in streets neighborhoods, types of buildings, individual buildings and even in parts of buildings. They are institutionalized in zoning laws, architecture and conventions of use. Visual artifacts of material culture and political economy thus reinforce—or comment on—social structure. By making social rule legible, they represent the city"<sup>8</sup>

## A National Practice

### Racial Zoning and Restrictive Covenants

It was during the beginning of this century that restrictive covenants and zoning emerged as tools of American planning. With more than 5 million African Americans migrating to the North, race relations changed from a Southern issue to one that affected lives in every city and suburb.<sup>9</sup> The increased visibility of the Ku Klux Klan, lynching and violent race riots framed the creation of zoning as a tool for social segregation.<sup>10</sup> Numerous scholars indicate that the primary decision-makers in the *Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Corporation* (1926) "held strong exclusionary views of African Americans and European immigrants."<sup>11</sup> Or, as stated by the author of New York City's 1916 zoning charter, Edward M. Bassett.

"The basic purpose of zoning was to keep Them where They belonged - Out. If They had already gotten in, then its purpose was to confine Them to limited areas. The exact identity of Them varied a bit around the country. Blacks, Latinos and poor people qualified. Catholics, Jews and Orientals were targets in many places. The elderly also qualified, if they were candidates for public housing."<sup>12</sup>

Baltimore enacted the first racial zoning ordinance in 1910. Over the next few years, Atlanta, GA and eleven other cities followed.<sup>13</sup> In addition to zoning, racially restrictive covenants were used to limit home sales to Blacks and Jews. The use of covenants was upheld in the Supreme Courts in *Corrigan vs. Buckley*; the same year the Court upheld *Euclid*.<sup>14</sup> Although *Buchanan vs. Warley* (1917) later declared racial zoning unconstitutional, discriminatory ordinances went unchallenged and residential segregation became further entrenched.

Following the *Buchanan vs. Warley* decision, Atlanta and nine other cities<sup>15</sup> passed newer comprehensive strategies. First, because *Buchanan v. Warley* undermined zoning that explicitly segregated by race, an indirect and less explicit process was needed to segregate.<sup>16</sup> The new strategies required the assistance of professional planners to develop the policy initiatives.<sup>17</sup> One of the most notable professionals commissioned was John Nolen.<sup>18</sup>

## Professional Planners

Commissioned to market Venice, FL to new affluent immigrants, John Nolen proposed a separate all Black community with 50'x200' lots and provided space for amenities (including a small park, a village square for stores and community buildings, four church sites, a community school, and a swimming lake). Nolen stated that, "In all Southern developments adequate provision for the Negro working population is of great importance ... the only satisfactory answer is the setting aside of a tract large enough, and planning it completely for Negro village life."<sup>19</sup> Nolen's "Negro village" concept first appeared in his plan for Kingsport, Tennessee. The Kingsport Armstrong Village plan was "A Negro village of a high order with their own schools, churches, lodges, etc., providing the same grade of housing and general development as is furnished the White population of the same economic condition."<sup>20</sup> In 1928, Nolen was commissioned to develop an expanded version of his original 1907 Roanoke, Virginia "beautification plan". Because of the city was already severely segregated, instead of a "Negro village," Nolen included a one page section of the plan addressed "Areas for Colored Population." Black neighborhoods did not receive the same land use classifications as White areas, and were labeled "special" areas.<sup>21</sup>

The use of professionals fostered a wide array of methods. Street and highway planning design was used to create physical barriers as early as 1920.<sup>22</sup> The careful siting of public housing (explicitly and legally for black occupation) served to mark the limits of Black communities. Slum clearance, neighborhood planning, school board decisions, private deed restrictions, and racially charged real estate practices worked together to serve the social ordering objective as effectively as zoning. Numerous Atlanta examples illustrate how non-architects' practices drove the making of the city. For "the city to busy to hate," the resulting condition is an urban (infra) structure that once did, but no longer needs to, define the public realm of each race.

## Atlanta's Non-Architects

### Early Atlanta

While it is not obvious today, from 1880-1910, Black and White Atlanta often coexisted in the CBD.<sup>23</sup> Prior to 1906, Atlanta had "at least one black household on each street" in the city and numerous white neighborhoods "honeycombed with all-black alleyways and side streets," but after the 1906 Riot "the city wide dispersion of blacks was much less apparent."<sup>24</sup> For their own protection, blacks settled east of the CBD (Auburn Avenue).<sup>25</sup> As Black Atlanta's population grew to the point where eastern containment was no longer possible, blacks migrated west of the CBD, toward the Atlanta University Complex. As the Black community continued to acquire space in the West End, the White residents accelerated the change with immediate flight. By 1940, 40% of Black Atlanta was in the West End area.<sup>26</sup> By 1970, 80% of Black Atlanta was in the West End.<sup>27</sup>

Like many southern cities, Atlanta's black migration during reconstruction resulted in the creation of separate Black and White communities. Black residents moved to areas deemed unsuitable for white inhabitation.<sup>28</sup> According to Howard Rabinowitz "in unkept alleyways, on low lying ground near contaminated streams, or near slaughter houses, flour mills, or other industrial sites. In short, Negroes occupied land unfit for White habitation."<sup>29</sup> After the Civil War, Black neighborhoods were "throughout the city and beyond its limits in the eastern, southern, and western areas bordering downtown; near railroad tracks, industrial sections; on cheap land in the valleys and bottoms; as servants quarter's on the primarily white northern side; and near the Black Colleges."<sup>30</sup>

Atlanta's private sector pressures lead to public sector actions. Black and White decision makers joined to trade sections of the growing city. Each contributing to the making of two Atlantas. Christopher Silver indicates that the settlement pattern illustrated a self contained, racially identifiable community separated from the larger white city.

"The formation of the separate city was not a matter of demographics. Rather the physical contours of the Black community were shaped by neighborhood/ community development policy and urban renewal programs, often with black developers and civic leaders participating actively in the neighborhood spatial allocation process."<sup>31</sup>

## The Mayors

Mayors' Hartsfield and Ivan Allen Jr. both openly endorsed the use of public space to define racial boundaries. Regarding Interstate 20's exits, Hartsfield stated that, "As you probably know, the bi-racial committee is trying to assure residents of Center Hill and Grove Park that the proposed access road will be a boundary which will protect them as Negro citizens move further out." He urged that if whites panicked and sold their homes, it "would ... make the extension of the access road rather use-

less as any voluntary racial boundary.” Hartsfield stated that after the area stabilized, everyone must be made aware which parts of the area were for white or black housing so that “a market for white homes in Center Hill and Grove Park could be maintained.”<sup>32</sup>

Stagnant population growth in the 1950’s combined with an increased population of black residents required annexation on new land to address both trends. The intent was to decrease the proportion of black residents as well as impair black political power. In an attempt to deter white out migration, Hartsfield sent a letter to community leaders in the suburbs in the north that were about to be annexed. Hartsfield wrote:

“Our Negro population is growing by leaps and bounds. They stay right in the city limits and grow by taking more white territory inside Atlanta .... With the Federal government insisting on political recognition of Negroes in local affairs, the time is not far distant when they will become a political force in Atlanta if our white citizens are just going to move out and give it to them.”<sup>33</sup>

### The Real Estate Groups

To ensure segregated communities, the Atlanta Board of Realtors informed black Realtors, white property owners and unaffiliated brokers that it was unacceptable to sell real estate in white communities to black clients.<sup>34</sup> While the legality of “red-lining” weakened, both black and white realtors recognized the financial benefits of the spatial expansion of the Atlanta’s black population.<sup>35</sup> White land corporations worked with the black developers to secure lots for Black neighborhoods and bought black owned homes in areas designated for whites. The gentleman’s agreement called for “no limit ... to continued Negro expansion to the west”.<sup>36</sup>

### The Planners

With the rapid expansion of Black Atlanta, various responses were developed as part of the comprehensive spatial segregation process. Initially, limited sections of the city were open for black housing. After these areas were opened, zoning ordinances, highway construction, street integration, street paving and street naming practices illustrate the social potential of urban morphology.

### Racial Zoning Laws

Learning from other cities, Atlanta enacted racial zoning on June 16, 1913. The city’s ordinances followed the Baltimore formula except that, like Richmond, Atlanta assigned a racial designation to every city block based on the existing majority of the residents of the blocks.<sup>37</sup> Although Atlanta’s racial zoning failed its initial court test on 1915, it was revised to exempt residences acquired before passage of the ordinance. The Georgia high

court sustained the city’s later racial zoning plan in 1917.<sup>38</sup> A year later, *Buchanan v. Warley* ruled that the denial of the full use of property “from a feeling of hostility” constituted inadequate grounds to uphold racial zoning.<sup>39</sup>

The Buchanan decision did not end the practice or design for segregation; it only shifted it to a new ground. Additional zoning ordinances passed in 1916, 1922, 1929, and 1931 were developed in terms of land uses, building types and tenant categories. Robert H. Whitter, a city planner from Cleveland was commissioned to develop a municipal zoning ordinance. Race was not explicitly zoned, but linked to property usage. Atlanta became defined as “white and black single- and two-family dwelling structures, apartment house areas, and racially undetermined commercial and industrial districts: “R1 or White District,” “R2 or Colored District,” and “R3 or Undetermined.”<sup>40</sup> The nonresidential uses served as buffers between white and black neighbors.

### 1929 and 1931 Residence Laws

When the 1922 racial zoning was declared illegal, more indirect methods were implemented to de-integrate. A 1929 law made it illegal for someone to move into a building where “the majority of the (streets’) residences ... are occupied by those with whom said person is forbidden to intermarry.” A 1931 law denied “any person of either the white or colored races to move into a building last occupied by persons of a different race ... if such ... building is situated within fifteen blocks from a public school” of the other race.

### 1933 Nuisance Law

A 1933 nuisance law was used in 1953 by the Aldermanic Council to designate nuisance property. The law justified the elimination of 447 back-alley dwelling units designated as slums. The action was further legitimized in 1954 with an amendment to the State Constitution permitting a redevelopment and slum clearance program (after a survey indicated that 1,181 back-alley units were dispersed across the city).<sup>41</sup> It is important to note that the back units constituted localized residential integration. Their removal indicates the City’s intention to further homogenize the spaces of its residential communities.

### Highway Construction

Howard Preston’s *Automobile Age Atlanta* describes multiple uses of highways to limit Black migration. A 1941 and 1947 proposal for a West View parkway indicated that “whites were to have the land west of the road and blacks the territory to the east, thereby preventing further black encroachment into the West Side area claimed by whites.” The space between the north and south-bound lanes would be a 150’ park : a “racial forbidden zone between black and white neighborhoods. The Planning Commission also recommended that a fence be constructed on the park sides of the roads to prevent any integrated use of the parkland.”<sup>42</sup>

A second example is the 1946 Lochner Report that proposed highways and roads for “easing traffic flow around the city.” Ronald Bayor indicates that “wherever the highway/ road system could possibly serve the racial function, it was developed with that in mind also....new highways became the a factor in the creation of buffers and barriers to try to confine blacks to certain parts of mainly westside Atlanta.”<sup>43</sup>

This becomes most evident in the design of Interstate 20. An Atlanta Planning Bureau of Planning 1960 report recalled that “approximately two to three years ago, there was an understanding that the proposed route of the West Expressway (I-20 West) would be the boundary between the White and Negro communities.” Black developers were often denied requests to build housing as the city had “obligations to the Adamsville citizens to adhere to the expressway route boundary.”<sup>44</sup>

## Street Integration

In addition to building streets as walls to divide, the conscious misalignment of streets often reflected boundaries of ethnicity. Roads were closed or dead-ended to disconnect black from white neighborhoods. As shown in Willis Mills Road, “to prevent the southward migration of blacks into the white area, part of the road was abandoned.” The section of Willis Mills that went south from (what was) Gordon, never connected with the section of Mills that went north from Cascade. The middle third still remains unconnected.<sup>45</sup> A second example is the building of the 1962 Peyton Wall. When a black doctor purchased a home in the Peyton Forest Subdivision, Mayor Ivan Allen directed the public works committee to build concrete and steel barricades to cut off sections of Payton and Harlan Roads.<sup>46</sup>

Samuel Adams, the Research Director for the Southern Regional Council (SRC) observed that “only three streets provide fairly direct access between the Negro area to the northwest and the white areas to the southwest.” Adams indicates that this road plan and other barriers were set up to “complicate the process of going from Negro neighborhoods to white.”<sup>47</sup> A 1962 SRC report notes that “The city’s planning and zoning policies once were bent toward the maintenance of racial boundaries and the confinement of the Negro population through the use of barriers and buffers.

## Street Paving

The decision not to pave the city’s numerous black streets served as a visible illustration of power and access to the decision making process. At one point, the city determined that black developers could offer housing up to 100 yards away from Westview Drive (a white street). Therefore streets “going from the new black housing to Westview Drive were paved only up to one hundred yards of the road. “Thus, by the early 1950’s, the unpaved area as well as Westview Drive itself had become the unofficial dividing line.”<sup>48</sup>

## Street Naming

Bayor indicates that “Whites who wanted these (street name) changes had to make a request to the Atlanta-Fulton County Planning Board, and apparently they had little trouble getting the board’s approval. As late as 1960, the fact that blacks were moving onto a street was enough to make the board support a name change.”<sup>49</sup> Evident today on the western side of downtown, Monroe Drive becomes Boulevard, and Briarcliff Road becomes Moreland Avenue as they cross Ponce De Leon Avenue. Within the city center, Courtland Street becomes Washington Street south of Decatur Street. On the west, Hunter Street becomes Mozley Drive as it passes Chappell Road. Leon Eplan stated that “Whenever streets were long and continuous, sometimes these street took on new names as the racial composition changed.”<sup>50</sup>

## South West Atlanta

The final part of the research examines the relationship between urban structure and race at the neighborhood scale. In particular, in knowing how urban design was used to reinforce separatist visions for South West Atlanta suburbs. Drawings that isolate the urban structure accentuate the differences between the Black (Bush Mountain) and White (West Oakland Estates) neighborhoods and reveal how the constituent parts of the American City (streets, blocks, and lots,) record difference. The drawings argue that although the ethnic history is not apparent in the visual and census based examinations, a dissection of the constituent parts reveals the difference.

## The Study Area

The spatial impact of segregation is evident in the Southwest Atlanta neighborhoods of Oakland City. The research looks specifically at two adjacent, but isolated Oakland City neighborhoods: Bush Mountain and West Oakland Estates. Bush Mountain is on the north of Bridges Avenue and West Oakland Estates is immediately on the south of Bridges. The two major boundaries are Oakland Avenue to the east and Avon Avenue to the south.

A census-based comparison of these contiguous African-American neighborhoods yields predictable results: similar demographic profiles, similar incomes, and similar educational levels. An architectural survey presents uniform conclusions. Building materials, scales of construction, units per acre and architectural styles are common across the two neighborhoods.<sup>51</sup> Although they appear similar today, the housing developments were initially developed for different clientele. West Oakland Estates was a white neighborhood and Bush Mountain was a separate black enclave.

## The Drawings

The final part of the research investigates the relationship between urban structure and segregation at the neighborhood scale. In particular, in knowing how urban design was used to reinforce separatist ideologies. Drawings that isolate the urban structure accentuate the differences between the Black (Bush Mountain) and White (West Oakland Estates) neighborhoods and reveal how the constituent parts of the American city (streets, blocks, and lots,) record racial difference. The drawings confirm that although race is not apparent in the visual and census based examinations, a dissection of the constituent parts reveals the difference.

The work contrasts existing discussions of African-Americans and architecture that focus on the object: the African origins of the object, the professional production of the object, or an African-American perspective in making the object. Consistently, the object or figure is addressed and not the ground. If segregationist ideals are the impulses behind the making of the city, then difference can be traced to the making of the city's apriori marks.

## Closing Comments

The long-term impact of the city's intentions toward urban form is evident in the 1980 Atlanta Comprehensive Plan. One of the major concerns identified is the traffic congestion on the West Side because of the "limited street network" and "lack of adequate north-south arterial capacity." While the obstacles to residential integration were overcome, the inappropriate urban structure remains.

Revealing this convergence of ethnicity and space requires reconfiguring a long-standing architectural bias. Preferences toward the figure over the ground must be challenged. Once challenged, dissecting the structure becomes a tool for researching segregated landscapes.

A deeper understanding of a community (, planning, and architecture) must include built objects and social artifacts that are not physically manifested. In the 1748 Giambattista Nolli maps (and Southwest Atlanta), the space and the object, the figure and the ground, and the black and the white are all inseparable. One serves to define the other.

"Cities are full of stories of time, some sedimented and catalogued; others spoor-like, vestigial, and dispersed. Their narratives are epic and everyday; they tell of migration and production, law and laughter, revolution and art. Yet, although obvious, their register is never wholly legible because each foray into the palimpsest of city surfaces reveals only traces of these relations. Once lived as irreducible to one another, they are registered as part of the multiplicity and simultaneity of processes that turn the city into an infinite geometry of super-impositions. Their identities, modes, forms, categories, and types recombine in the gray matter of streets."<sup>52</sup>

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> A. E. J. Morris, *History of Urban Form* (New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1974): 240.
- <sup>2</sup> Morris, 1974: 240.
- <sup>3</sup> Rem Koolhaas, "Atlanta, a reading," *S, M, L, XL* (The Monacelli Press, 1995)
- <sup>4</sup> Ronald Bayor, *Race and the Shaping of Twentieth-Century Atlanta*. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1996): 9.
- <sup>5</sup> Although Free Blacks could later be found also living to the rear, the proximity reflected an economic need. The communities were by no means integrated. Michael James O'Connor, *The Measurement and Significance of Racial Barriers in Atlanta, 1890-1970* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1977): 14-15 and Bayor, 1996: 6.
- <sup>6</sup> Richard L. Morrill, *The Spatial Organization of Society* (Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1974): 231.
- <sup>7</sup> See the various essays in Leonie Sandercock, *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), June Manning Thomas, *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In The Shadows* (London: Sage, 1977), and Anthony D. King, *Re-Presenting the City: Ethnicity, Capital and Culture in the 21st-Century Metropolis* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1996).
- <sup>8</sup> Sharon Zukin, "Space and Symbols in the Age of Decline," King, 1996: 44.
- <sup>9</sup> Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How it Changed America* (New York: Knopf, 1991): 6.
- <sup>10</sup> Yale Rabin, "Expulsive Zoning," in Haar and Kayden, *Zoning and The American Dream* (Chicago: Planners Press, 1989): 106.
- <sup>11</sup> Thomas, 1977: 5; William Randle, "Professors, Reformers, Bureaucrats," in *ibid*; Rabin, 1989 :106; *Village of Euclid v. Amber Realty Corporation*, 272 U.S. 365 (1926), 465 S. Ct. 114
- <sup>12</sup> J. Popper, *The Politics of Land-Use Reform* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981): 54.
- <sup>13</sup> Richmond, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Roanoke, and Ashland, Virginia; Greenville, SC; Asheville and Winston Salem, NC; Birmingham, AL; and Madisonville and Louisville, KY also embraced the idea of racial zoning. In Charlotte, NC; Charleston, SC; Meridian, MS; and New Orleans similar policies were considered, but not passed Charles Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Separation* (New York: Harper and Row, 1943); Roger L. Rice, "Residential Segregation by Law, 1910-1917," *Journal of Southern History* 64 (1968): 181-183; Gilbert T. Stephenson, "The Segregation of the White and Negro Races in Cities," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 13 (1914): 3.
- <sup>14</sup> *Michigan v. Buckley* 299 F.899 (1924); 27 U.S. 323 (1926)
- <sup>15</sup> The cities included Indianapolis, Norfolk, Richmond, New Orleans, Salem, Dallas, Charleston, Birmingham, and Dade County (Florida).
- <sup>16</sup> See O'Connor, 1977; Bayor, "Expressways, Urban Renewal and the Relocation of the Black Community in Atlanta," paper presented to the Organization of American Historians, Reno, NV, 1988; Raymond A. Mohl, "Race and Space and the Modern City: Interstate 95 and the Black Community in Miami," paper presented to the American Planning Association, Atlanta, GA, 1989; Arnold Hirsch, 1983; John F. Bauman, *Housing, Race and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987).
- <sup>17</sup> Rabin, 1989: 106-107, Rice, 1968: 196; Mohl, 1983: 26; White,

- "The Black Sides of Atlanta: A Geography of Expansion and Containment, 1970-1870," *Atlanta Historical Journal*, (26: Summer/Fall, 1982/1983); Silver, *Twentieth Century*, 112; Morris Knowles, "General Plan of Charleston, South Carolina, 1931. "Unpublished manuscript, Charleston City Archives.
- <sup>18</sup> Birmingham, Alabama and Atlanta, Georgia hired Warren Manning, a Boston landscape architect. Charleston, South Carolina hired Morris Knowles of Pittsburgh to protect its preservation interests.
- <sup>19</sup> James Arthur Glass, *John Nolen and the Planning of New Towns: Three Case Studies* (Master's Thesis, Cornell University, 1984): 309.
- <sup>20</sup> Margaret Ripley Wolfe, *Kingsport, Tennessee: A Planned American City* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1987): 51.
- <sup>21</sup> John Nolen, *Comprehensive City Plan, Roanoke, Virginia, 1928* (Roanoke, VA: Stone Printing and Manufacturing Company, 1928): 65.
- <sup>22</sup> See O'Connor, 1977; Bayor, 1988; Mohl, 1989; Christopher Silver, *Twentieth Century Richmond: Planning, Politics and Race* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1948).
- <sup>23</sup> White, 1982/1983: 212.
- <sup>24</sup> Silver and Moeser, 1995: 20.
- <sup>25</sup> White, 1982/1983: 212, Clifford M Kuhn, Harlon E. Joye and Bernard West, *Living Atlanta: An Oral History of the City 1914-1948*, (Atlanta: The Atlanta History Center, 1990): 38.
- <sup>26</sup> Clifford Kuhn Et al, 1990: 45.
- <sup>27</sup> Truman A. Hartshorn, Sanford Bederman and Sid Davis, *Atlanta: Metropolis Georgia* (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing, 1976): 46. See also Charles Rutherford's *Imagineering Atlanta: The Politics of Place in the City of Dreams* (New York, NY: Verso, 1996): 85, map 2.
- <sup>28</sup> Bayor, 1996: 7.
- <sup>29</sup> Howard Rabinowitz, *Race Relations in the Urban South: 1865 to 1890* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978): 97, see also Silver, Christopher, and Moeser, John V., *The Separate City: Black Communities in the Urban South, 1940-1968*. (Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press, 1995): 20.
- <sup>30</sup> Bayor, 1996: 54-55.
- <sup>31</sup> Silver, and Moeser, 1995: xi.
- <sup>32</sup> Bayor, 1996: 63.
- <sup>33</sup> Clarence Stone N., *Regime Politics Governing Atlanta 1946-1988* (Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1989) 30.
- <sup>34</sup> O'Connor, 1977: 105-107
- <sup>35</sup> Herman Perry (Atlanta Life Insurance) worked with the Empire Real Estate Board, a coalition of black owned real estate firms, and the (White) National Development Company.
- <sup>36</sup> Bayor, 1996: 64.
- <sup>37</sup> In addition to Bayor, O'Conner, White, Rabinowitz and Silver/Moeser see Ray Stannard Baker, *Following the Color Line* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1908); Neil Irvin Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919* (New York: W.W.Norton, 1987): 218-223.
- <sup>38</sup> *Harden v. City of Atlanta*, 147 Ga. 248, 93 S.E. 401 (1917).
- <sup>39</sup> Power, "Apartheid," 312-313; Rice, 1968: 183-188.
- <sup>40</sup> White, 1982: 214-217; Bayor, 1996: 54-55.
- <sup>41</sup> Charle Levi Sanders, *A Study of the Relocation of Rear and Alley Tenants in Atlanta* (Master's Thesis, Atlanta University, 1956): 7-9
- <sup>42</sup> Preston, *Automobile Age Atlanta*: 102-103; See also Bayor, 1996: 58 who references Flint, "Zoning and Residential Segregation," 86, 341; *Atlanta Journal*, December 21, 1928.
- <sup>43</sup> Quote from Bayor, 1996: 61 who references H.W.Lochner and Company and DeLeuw, Cather and Company, *Highway and Transportation Plan for Atlanta, Georgia*: 9, 12; H. Jay Wallace, "The Story Behind the 'Lochner Plan'" 2 April 1946, ABP.
- <sup>44</sup> Bayor, 1996: 61 references "Report on the Adamsville Transition Area," 26 August 1960," ABP, AHS.
- <sup>45</sup> Bayor, 1996: 66.
- <sup>46</sup> *Atlanta Constitution*, 19 December 1962; *Atlanta Journal*, 19 December 1962. Bayor, 199: 66 references Browning. "Atlanta Wall"; Council on Human Relations of Greater Atlanta, Report, 27 March 1967, SRC, AUC; Ivan Allen Jr. to Ralph Moore (chairman of the Committee on Appeal for Human Rights), 23 December 1962, Walden Papers, AHS; *Atlanta Daily World*, 14, 18 December 1962.
- <sup>47</sup> Bayor, 1996: 68 quotes Adams, "Blueprint for Segregation," 78.
- <sup>48</sup> Bayor, 1996: 65.
- <sup>49</sup> Bayor, 1996: 68 : Adams Blueprint for Segregation," 80; *Atlanta Daily World*, 12 August 1960
- <sup>50</sup> Bayor, 1996: 68 quotes Eplan, "Background Paper," 29 May 1968, SC, AUC.
- <sup>51</sup> Notable aesthetic differences do not exist between the two developments. The stylistic shifts that occur are common across the two study areas. Bungalow, shotgun, and ranch structures are in both sites. A noticeable change from Bungalow to Ranch homes in West Oakland Estates indicates the shift in popular building practices.
- <sup>52</sup> James Holston, "Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship," Sandercock, 1998: 37-56