

YALE UNIVERSITY

THREAT PERCEPTION, LEGITIMATION, AND THE 1911 BALTIMORE RACIAL
ZONING ORDINANCE

A SENIOR THESIS JOINTLY SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE COGNITIVE
SCIENCE PROGRAM AND THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE, MEDICINE, AND PUBLIC
HEALTH PROGRAM

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

BY

GRACE YI

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

APRIL 2017

“The greatest danger lies not in the so-called “problems” of race, but rather in the integrity of national thinking and in the ethics of national conduct.”

-W.E.B. Du Bois, 1928

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
PIGTOWN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES: HISTORICAL AND COGNITIVE DIMENSIONS OF SOCIO-SPATIAL THREAT.....	8
Cognitive Dimensions of Racial Experience.....	12
COGNITIVE FRAMEWORK OF THREAT PERCEPTION: SOCIO-CULTURAL CLIMATE BEFORE 1911.....	21
LEGITIMATION FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS OF 1911 BALTIMORE ORDINANCE.....	30
CONCLUSION, MODERN PERSPECTIVES AND SPATIAL STIGMA: WHY IT MATTERS...	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	47
Primary Sources.....	47
Secondary Sources.....	50
BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY.....	52

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Professor Henry Cowles, for his support, feedback, and encouragement throughout this year. His wealth of knowledge and insight as well as his seemingly unending patience and understanding were integral to my essay-writing process.

I would also like to thank Professors Joshua Knobe and Mark Sheskin for their guidance and support throughout the thesis process, and for encouraging me to combine my interests in cognitive science and history to write a joint thesis for my double major.

I would also like to thank Head David Evans, Dean Renita Miller, Andrew Dowe, and my residential college Commonplace Society, with whom I shared my work earlier this year. Their valuable feedback and thought-provoking questions inspired me to expand my thesis topic and explore different avenues of research.

Finally, I am so grateful to my friends and family, who have patiently supported me throughout this entire process, whether through editing, talking through concepts and ideas, or coffee deliveries.

Threat Perception, Legitimation, and the 1911 Baltimore Racial Zoning Ordinance

In 1910, an African-American lawyer named W. Ashbie Hawkins purchased a red brick, three-story rowhouse at 1834 McCulloh Street, in one of Baltimore's majority-white neighborhoods¹. Rather than in apartment houses as in other cities in the early 20th century, the majority of Baltimore residents lived in rowhouses. The rowhouse that Hawkins purchased stretched three stories high, and was only 13 feet wide². In a standard residential lease agreement, Hawkins then rented the residence to a young African-American man named George W. McMechen, a respected lawyer and graduate of Yale Law School, and his wife and three children³.

In Baltimore in 1910, this seemingly mundane transaction was anything but. Almost immediately, the white residents of McCulloh Street congregated and appealed to the Baltimore City Council to bar black residences in their neighborhood⁴. Three weeks later, *The Baltimore Sun* released an article on this real estate transaction: that Hawkins was an African-American grew into a city-wide scandal, prompting a headline warning of a “negro invasion⁵.” On May 15, 1911, J. Barry Mahool, the mayor of Baltimore, signed into law an ordinance for “preserving peace, preventing conflict and ill feeling between the white and colored races in Baltimore city,

¹ Antero Pietila, *Not in my neighborhood: How bigotry shaped a great American city*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2012, p. 6.

² Ibid.

³ BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25). *New York Times (1857-1922)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/97075778?accountid=15172>

⁴ Antero Pietila, *Not in my neighborhood: How bigotry shaped a great American city*, p. 6.

⁵ Ibid.

and promoting the general welfare of the city by providing... for the use of the separate blocks by white and colored people for residences, churches and schools⁶.”

This Ordinance - Ordinance No. 610 – acted as city legislation to enforce racial separation, under the guise of “preserving order, securing property values and promoting the great interests and insuring the good government of Baltimore City⁷.” The ordinance banned blacks from moving onto a block where the majority of occupants were white, and also banned whites from moving onto a block where the majority of occupants were black⁸. Although this residential segregation ordinance was the first law in the United States that directly targeted African-Americans; several other cities in the Southern US followed suit shortly after⁹. Moreover, while the legal consequences of the Ordinance were transitory, as the US Supreme Court ruled a similar ordinance in Kentucky unconstitutional and disbanded the rest, the social implications of the Ordinance persisted¹⁰. Indeed, by the early 20th century, African-Americans in the South (and across the country) were already familiar with such discrimination, especially with the advent of Jim Crow laws in the late 19th century¹¹. In the wake of Reconstruction, Jim Crow laws were rooted in white supremacy; in theory, the laws were meant to create “separate but equal treatment” of whites and African-Americans, but in practice they “condemned black citizens to inferior treatment and facilities¹².”

⁶ Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913," *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 289.

⁷Alexandera Stein. *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>. p. 9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁹ Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913," *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 289.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ "The Progressive Era." The Progressive Era | Scholastic.com. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.scholastic.com/browse/subarticle.jsp?id=1672>.

¹² William Anderson. "Progressive-Era Economics and the Legacy of Jim Crow." Mises Institute. September 14, 2015. Accessed April 02, 2017. <https://mises.org/library/progressive-era-economics-and-legacy-jim-crow>.

However, Baltimore was exceptional in passing an official statute – disguised as a social reform – that segregated the races and limited the spaces they could inhabit, which begs the questions: what are the lasting ramifications of having enacted an apartheid statute as a progressive social reform? What was the impact of legalizing segregation on shaping beliefs and behaviors of both individuals and larger society - consequences of which remain even today in a largely segregated Baltimore¹³? Through integrated cognitive science and historical analysis, this paper takes an interdisciplinary approach to understanding historical events, using the intersection of the two fields to unravel a new dimension with which to comprehend and make sense of the historical and present experience of inequality. By applying cognitive science theory to history as told through newspaper articles and media sources, the paper seeks to contribute novel information to both fields: it offers a new means of analyzing historical sources – that of the application of cognitive science theory – and concurrently presents a historical foundation for the understanding of experiences described by theories in cognitive science.

In terms of cognitive science theory, this paper uses two specific frameworks to evaluate and shed new light upon historical accounts. The first framework is one of threat perception, which seeks to identify the ways in which humans respond to an apparent social threat. Existing literature posits that social threats activate authoritarian tendencies, generating increased conformity, submission to authority, and intolerance and punitiveness¹⁴. Under this framework, there is a strong attachment to the ingroup and a correlated rejection of the outgroup, a theme that plays out recurrently in early-20th century race relations in Baltimore City.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Stanley Feldman and Karen Stenner, "Perceived threat and authoritarianism," *Political Psychology* 18, no. 4 (1997): 741-770.

The second framework is one of legitimation, which describes how social and psychological processes enable certain beliefs to be justified as merely conforming to normative standards. This framework encompasses three sub-structures that will be elaborated upon further in the paper: 1) aversive racism, where individuals endorse racial equality and also possess conflicting, often nonconscious, negative attitudes that promote racial bias, 2) social dominance theory, wherein societies tend to organize themselves into group-based social hierarchies where at least one group has greater social status than other groups¹⁵, and 3) system-justification theory, in which social processes lead to individuals perceiving social inequality as both legitimate and also natural and necessary. The paper reframes the historical events surrounding the 1911 Ordinance in Baltimore through the lens of these two frameworks, and uses modern cognitive science theory to elucidate psychological processes that shaped and directed historical trajectories.

To better understand the social and political contexts in which the 1911 Ordinance was passed, it is imperative to provide the larger historical background surrounding the event. A political deal in 1877 forced federal troops out of many southern states, prompting the old Confederacy to end Reconstruction¹⁶. In the decades following the Civil War, there were new efforts to codify segregation in an age of ostensible freedom. State officials began to ban African-Americans from voting and impinged further upon the rights they had just been given. Racial segregation gained steam in many Northern states, and signs declaring “*WHITES ONLY*” or “*NO BLACKS*” enforced segregation in shops, restaurants, hospitals, and even drinking

¹⁵ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," *European Journal of Social Psychology* 43, no. 4 (2013): 229-237, p. 229.

¹⁶Antero, Pietila, "Not in my neighborhood: how bigotry shaped a great American city," p. 17.

fountains¹⁷. Media and popular culture further promoted segregationist policies. The fast-growing popularity of film accelerated racial tensions: novelty films like *The Watermelon Eating Contest*, *Sambo*, or *Aunt Jemima* enforced stereotypes and emphasized black inferiority¹⁸. Soon thereafter, race tensions escalated into violence: from 1886 to 1935, over 3000 African-Americans were lynched¹⁹. The political power of blacks was so insignificant at this time that historian Rayford W. Logan described this period as “the nadir of the Negro’s status in American society²⁰.”

Furthermore, the period between 1900 and 1920 oversaw the Progressive Era, a movement to cure American social ills²¹. The Progressive Movement focused on developing housing for the poor, improving factory conditions, child labor and mental health care reform, and overall social change²². However, despite constructive progressive reforms, the Progressive Era was also characterized by a rise in institutional racism, reversing much of the progress towards racial equality that had been achieved during Reconstruction²³. In the 1896 US Supreme Court case *Plessy vs Ferguson*, the federal government defended racial segregation so long as

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 7.

¹⁸ Antero Pietila, “Not in my neighborhood: how bigotry shaped a great American city,” p. 7.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 8.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ In some ways, between 1900 and 1920, the Progressive agenda flourished. See Anderson, “Progressive-Era Economics and the Legacy of Jim Crow”: “In 1913 alone, the government headed by Progressive Woodrow Wilson created the Federal Reserve System... The rise of regulatory agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration... further directed the US economy away from destructive *laissez-faire* and more towards a rational model. Likewise, reform-minded leaders sought to extend their vision of a just and rational order to all areas of society and some, indeed, to all reaches of the globe. City governments were transformed; social workers labored to improve slum housing, health, and education; and in many states reform movements democratized, purified, and humanized government.”

²² Stein, Alexandra. *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 14.

²³ Thomas C. Leonard, "Retrospectives: Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19, no. 4 (2005): 207-24. doi:10.1257/089533005775196642.

African-Americans were provided with “separate but equal” facilities²⁴. Indeed, at the end of the 19th century, Southern governments and municipalities imposed a range of Jim Crow laws²⁵ on African-Americans that legalized segregation between blacks and whites, rationalized as a catalyst for a “more orderly, systematic electoral system and society²⁶.” The Jim Crow laws represented the beginning of a new, darker era: the African-American experience was no longer characterized by implicit discrimination, but rather one in which segregation had been codified into official law.

During the Progressive Era, eugenic approaches to socioeconomic reform were ubiquitous and widely respected²⁷. Within the larger social movement of making implicit segregation explicit, the eugenics movement was rooted in the belief that heredity accounted for differences in human intelligence and character, and sought to improve human heredity through social human breeding^{28,29}. Progressives believed that eugenics could be a tool to subjugate ethnic groups that they deemed inferior; indeed, African-Americans were largely stripped of

²⁴ "The Progressive Era." The Progressive Era | Scholastic.com. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.scholastic.com/browse/subarticle.jsp?id=1672>.

²⁵ The Progressive Era also oversaw a rise of institutional racism, known as Jim Crow laws. See Anderson, “Progressive-Era Economics and the Legacy of Jim Crow”: “Jim Crow laws were an implementation of policies that exacerbated inequality at a time when intellectuals, journalists, and politicians were beating the drums of equality. Under rigid anti-black Jim Crow laws, African-Americans were relegated to the status of second-class citizens. Many Christian ministers and theologians taught that whites were the Chosen people, that God supported racial segregation. Craniologists, eugenicists, phrenologists, and Social Darwinists, at every educational level, buttressed the belief that blacks were innately intellectually and culturally inferior to whites. The practitioners and creators of Jim Crow were blind...to the needs of blacks, along with their basic humanity. Blacks were among those groups that Progressives believed needed to be subjugated to white rule and pushed into the margins of society.”

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Thomas C. Leonard. "Retrospectives: Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era, p. 213."

²⁸ Ibid, p. 212."

²⁹ While characterized by sweeping progressive government reform such as regulated working conditions, banned child labor, capped work hours, and minimum wage, the Progressive Era also oversaw a crude eugenic sorting of deserving and undeserving classes which informed labor and immigration reform. See Leonard, “Retrospectives: Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era,” 209: “They justified race-based immigration restriction as a remedy for “race suicide,” a Progressive Era term for the process by which racially superior stock...is outbred by a more prolific, but racially inferior stock...African Americans were... indolent and fickle, which explained why...slavery was required.”

their political power through economic “reforms” and minimum wage laws³⁰. For example, the Flexner Report of 1910 recommended for the closure of small medical schools that trained African-American doctors, which ultimately resulted in a scarcity of African-Americans in healthcare jobs³¹. Moreover, economists of the Progressive Era advocated for exclusionary labor and immigration legislation to rid the labor force of “unfit workers,” labeling them “parasites,” and “low-wage races³².” Removing the unfit supposedly would lift “superior, deserving workers,” a net benefit to society³³.

It is within this tumultuous context that brewing social and racial unrest eventually led to the passing of the 1911 racial segregation Ordinance in Baltimore. The essay is structured as such: the next section discusses Pigtown, the first sizable slum in Baltimore, and its impact on racial and class-based relations in Baltimore. The next section also elaborates upon the cognitive science literature used in subsequent analysis. The following two sections analyze historical accounts under frameworks of threat perception and legitimation, respectively. The final section includes concluding remarks and ties in the concept of spatial stigma, enabling the reader to extrapolate from historical analysis and take a modern perspective in evaluating how these frameworks are applicable today.

³⁰ William Anderson, "Progressive-Era Economics and the Legacy of Jim Crow," Mises Institute. September 14, 2015. Accessed April 02, 2017. <https://mises.org/library/progressive-era-economics-and-legacy-jim-crow>.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Thomas C. Leonard, "Retrospectives: Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era, p. 215."

³³ Ibid.

Pigtown and its Consequences: Historical & Cognitive Dimensions of Socio-Spatial Threat

The Development of Pigtown

Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, Baltimore served as a central hub for commercial activity, owing its success primarily to its strong railroad and ship building industries³⁴. The construction of the Baltimore Ohio Railroad in 1830 ensured Baltimore's relevance as a major player in the commercial market³⁵. By 1860, Baltimore had the fourth largest population in the United States³⁶. Given its unique geographic positioning as a border state during the Civil War, Maryland had played a key role in the military conflicts and in the political reconciliation that followed it³⁷. Similar to other border states, Maryland's loyalties were divided between the North and South. Because the economic livelihood of counties in the Eastern Shore and parts of Southern Maryland depended on agriculture, specifically tobacco, these counties relied chiefly on plantation economies and slavery and sympathized with the Confederate agenda³⁸. Despite Baltimore's large free black population, many businesses were still affiliated with Southern states through trade and thus remained politically neutral³⁹.

Free blacks developed their own schools and markets, but were nonetheless restricted from basic legal privileges such as working in certain occupations, carrying firearms, or attending religious services⁴⁰. Still, the growing population of free blacks was underscored by political tension. During the early 19th century, housing in Baltimore was not racially segregated:

³⁴ Alexander Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 7.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ "Maryland in the Civil War." Maryland in the Civil War. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.pdessay.info/pdfview/maryland-in-the-civil-war.html>.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Alexander Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*, p. 8.

though the majority of blacks lived in central, southern, and eastern Baltimore, there was no conception of a “Negro quarter or ghetto⁴¹”.

In light of the Industrial Revolution, which also gave rise to increases in factory labor, African-Americans across the south flocked towards cities. Urbanization in mid-late 19th century Baltimore brought with it significant changes: between 1880 and 1900, Baltimore’s African-American population increased 47% (from 54,000 to 79,000)⁴². The Industrial Revolution also served to enforce class lines: black newcomers who came to Baltimore were typically poor and unskilled and thus pursued jobs in factory labor; they sought cheap housing, renting shanties or living with multiple people in small houses⁴³. They tended to crowd together in “alley districts” that generally consisted of cheap and crowded row homes: these were the origins of Baltimore’s slums⁴⁴. The first sizeable slum in Baltimore was in the southwest area, called “Pigtown;” Pigtown was described by an account in the September 1892 *Baltimore News* as a place with “open drains...filled with high weeds, ashes and garbage...cellars filled with filthy black water, houses that are total strangers to the touch of whitewash or scrubbing brush, human bodies that have been strangers for months to soap and water, villainous looking negroes who loiter and sleep around the street corners and never work, vile and vicious women...hurling foul epithets at every passerby; foul streets, foul people, in foul tenements filled with foul air⁴⁵.”

Residents of these slums who could afford to move out migrated towards the north and west regions, away from the central and eastern districts. As whites and other neighbors in the

⁴¹ Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913." *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 290.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Alexandra Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 9.

⁴⁵ Garrett Power, "Deconstructing the Slums of Baltimore." *All Faculty Publications* (2002): 299.

area took flight, Pigtown grew into a ghetto⁴⁶. Even Baltimore's "black bourgeoisie... sought to remove themselves from the disreputable and vicious neighborhoods of their own race⁴⁷."

By 1908, a 26-block area along Pennsylvania Avenue in Baltimore became a designated area for black residents⁴⁸. Two years later, three streets parallel to Pennsylvania Avenue had become "desired streets for wealthier black residents⁴⁹." Though wealthier blacks slowly moved northwest out of Pigtown, poor living conditions followed: many still were unable to afford first-hand housing, and slums continued to develop even in wealthier but majority-black neighborhoods⁵⁰. The black migration towards northwest Baltimore also drove many whites to abandon their homes and flock towards new suburbs⁵¹. The white abandonment of homes in Baltimore was staggering. Of the 5,655 vacant homes in Baltimore City, 1,407 of them were located in a particular district in west Baltimore that included McCulloh Street, where W. Ashbie Hawkins had purchased his property⁵².

The construction of the B & O Railroad displaced over a hundred black families, who in turn migrated towards the northwest area⁵³. This second wave was poorer than the first and many doubled up in houses to afford rent⁵⁴. As a result, slum conditions similar to the existing ones in southwest Baltimore began to develop in the northwest area and grew worse with time, ultimately overtaking Pigtown as the worst slum in the city⁵⁵.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913." *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 291.

⁴⁸ Alexandra Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*, p. 11.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913." *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 291.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

Slums did not exclusively house blacks; they shared slum residences with poor and unskilled Polish and Jewish Russian immigrants who faced similar barriers⁵⁶. Immigrants' housing conditions were generally the same – “overcrowded, poorly ventilated, and lacked water and sewerage⁵⁷.” Indeed, immigrants often occupied residences in East Baltimore that had been abandoned by black residents; these homes were in severe disrepair⁵⁸.

As a response to the stark racial divide, a dual real estate market in Baltimore was born: one market for whites, a separate one for blacks, and one for Jewish immigrants⁵⁹. Properties fell into a trend of succession: neighborhoods went from non-Jewish to Jewish to black residences⁶⁰. At this time, racial segregation had intensified. In the early 1900s, blacks were “made to feel uncomfortable” in parks, theaters, hospitals, cemeteries and department stores alike⁶¹. A department store even declared that black customers could only try on merchandise in the basement of the store⁶². Shortly afterwards, all major department stores prohibited blacks from trying on any merchandise; in addition, anything that a black person purchase could not be returned unless a servant was running an errand for an employer⁶³.

On the other hand, McCulloh Street, formerly the site of significant white abandonment, was the new site of racial division: only a narrow alley separated whites from the backyards of the blacks⁶⁴. Towards the end of the 19th century, Jacob Riis published a book called *How the Other Half Lives*, which described the plight of the urban poor. The book, which became popular

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Garrett Power, "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910-1913." *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 291.

⁵⁸ Alexandra Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*, p. 12.

⁵⁹ Antero Pietila, “Not in my neighborhood: how bigotry shaped a great American city,” p. 17.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 12.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid, p. 16.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

throughout the US, depicted images of terrible slum conditions and overcrowding – a wake up call for upper and middle class Americans⁶⁵. The publication also prompted the US Congress to direct the Commissioner of Labor to conduct a study investigating the living conditions of the poor⁶⁶. The Labor Commissioner released a report in 1894 on *The Slums of Baltimore, Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia*, which argued that the “the characterization of impoverished neighborhoods as “slums” helped to justify the community’s response to poverty and racial inequality⁶⁷.”

A citywide campaign against tuberculosis in 1902 drew attention towards Baltimore’s injurious housing situation⁶⁸. The campaign emphasized the relationship between tuberculosis and overcrowding, lack of open spaces, and contamination, which were widely prevalent among the slums⁶⁹. Indeed, the death rate of black residents from afflictions like smallpox and tuberculosis nearly doubled that of white residents⁷⁰. Social reformers focused on the symptoms rather than the cause, criminalizing the blacks themselves rather than the underlying context behind the disparities in death rate⁷¹. Baltimore Mayor Thomas Hayes said in 1903, “These wretched abodes are menacing to both health and morals. They are the breeding spots from which issue the discontents and heartburnings that sometimes spread like a contagion through certain ranks of our laboring element⁷².”

Cognitive Dimensions of Racial Experience

These historical shifts take on a new dimension when we frame them in terms of the cognitive science of experiences to which they gave rise. The following discusses two primary

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 13.

⁶⁶ Alexandra Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*, p. 12.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 13.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 14.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 15.

⁷² Ibid.

psychological mechanisms, threat perception and legitimation, that play an important role in shaping beliefs surrounding issues like race, segregation, and inequality.

Threat Perception

Existing literature has drawn associations between perceived social threat and authoritarian – that is to say, autocratic, dictatorial, and oppressive – attitudes and behaviors. Research by Milton Rokeach in 1960 hypothesizes that anxiety stemming from external threat “is the underlying cause of intolerance⁷³.” Wilson et al. mirror this idea in arguing that authoritarianism is a response to a fear of uncertainty: they argue, “there is a common tendency to implicate threat and anxiety in the development of authoritarian character traits and intolerance⁷⁴.” Research by Wilson and his colleagues elaborate upon this idea and conclude that increasing anxiety and thus conservatism is associated with fear of death and dislike of complexity⁷⁵.

Further research posits that social threat “activates authoritarian predispositions⁷⁶.” A 1973 study conducted by Sales and Friend suggested that increases in social anxiety reflect “increased manifestations” of authoritarianism, like prejudice and intolerance⁷⁷. As the absence of threat is uncorrelated with authoritarian predispositions, threat appears to be critical to activating authoritarianism⁷⁸. In addition, nuance is drawn in considering the *type* of threat sensitive to authoritarianism: results indicate that political threat is particularly salient⁷⁹.

⁷³ Milton Rokeach, "The open and closed mind." (1960).

⁷⁴ Glenn D Wilson and John R. Patterson, "A new measure of conservatism," *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 7, no. 4 (1968): 264-269.

⁷⁵ Glenn D Wilson and John R. Patterson, "A new measure of conservatism."

⁷⁶ Stanley Feldman and Karen Stenner, "Perceived threat and authoritarianism," *Political Psychology* 18, no. 4 (1997): 741-770.

⁷⁷ Stephen M Sales and Kenneth E. Friend, "Success and failure as determinants of level of authoritarianism," *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 18, no. 3 (1973): 163-172.

⁷⁸ Stanley Feldman and Karen Stenner, "Perceived threat and authoritarianism," Pg. 765.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

Authoritarianism as a result of perceived threat, as conceptualized by John Duckitt, is something based upon “intense group identification” and the resulting “strain toward cohesion⁸⁰.” Duckitt argues that group membership and conformity to normative group ideals are the basis for self-esteem⁸¹. Subsequently, in response to a threat, an individual’s identification with their group grows more intense, as does conformity, submission to authority, and intolerance and punitiveness⁸². Duckitt defines threat as any challenge to conformity; essentially, perceived threat increases feelings of authoritarianism, which in turn involves a “heightened attachment to the ingroup and associated rejection of the outgroup⁸³.” The authoritarian’s anxiety is, in turn, released by “cleaving to the ingroup, uncritically submitting to ingroup norms, insisting on compliance of others, avoiding disruptive contacts with outgroup members, and exaggerating their differences⁸⁴.”

Moreover, both realistic and symbolic perceptions of threat serve as examples of justification for discrimination⁸⁵. Research conducted by Richard LaPiere found that threat perception was “the main reason invoked to explain intergroup antipathy⁸⁶,” even more, the more that an outgroup was seen as a threat, the more justifiable discriminatory behavior seemed to be⁸⁷. As we will see, the increasing presence and political power of African-Americans in the

⁸⁰ John Duckitt, “Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct.” *Political psychology* (1989): 63-84.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² John Duckitt, “Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct.” P. 70

⁸³ Stanley Feldman and Karen Stenner, “Perceived threat and authoritarianism,” Pg. 766.

⁸⁴ John Duckitt, “Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct.” P. 70

⁸⁵ Cicero Pereira, Jorge Vala, and Rui Costa-Lopes, “From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants,” *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40, no. 7 (2010): 1231-1250.

⁸⁶ Richard T LaPiere, “Type-rationalizations of group antipathy.” *Social Forces* 15, no. 2 (1936): 232-254.

⁸⁷ Cicero Pereira, Jorge Vala, and Rui Costa-Lopes. “From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants.”

early 20th century seemed to pose a symbolic threat to the social order, sparking authoritarian sentiment and backlash.

Legitimation

Colloquially, the concept of legitimacy generally refers to the idea that a given action is consistent with socially accepted standards and expectations⁸⁸. Social psychology literature expands upon this idea, citing that legitimacy reflects “the beliefs among members of a society that there are adequate reasons for a request of behavior...allowing individuals and groups to exert influence over others to gain voluntary deference in the absence of coercion⁸⁹.” In this sense, legitimation describes social and psychological processes that enable certain attitudes and behaviors to be justified as merely conforming to normative standards.

In societies where tenets like equality and fairness are woven into fundamental cultural values and social organizations, legitimation serves as a key aspect of stability within and between social group relationships⁹⁰. Many political and social theorists argue “every authority system tries to cultivate a belief in its legitimacy⁹¹.” Indeed, individuals are willing to comply more with authorities when they perceive those authorities to have been chosen through legitimate means, even at risk of personal sacrifice⁹².

However, social and psychological processes of legitimation also can contribute to the perpetuation of unjust relationships between groups. Legitimation permits “differential treatment of people on the basis of their social group memberships while allowing people to maintain positive self-images and to reinforce group-based hierarchies,” essentially bolstering a status quo

⁸⁸ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost. "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 230.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid, pg 231.

⁹¹ Morris Zelditch and Henry A. Walker. "The legitimacy of regimes." In *Power and Status*, pp. 217-249. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2003, p. 217.

⁹² Ibid, pg. 230.

that systematically benefits some more than others⁹³. Indeed, historical analyses reveal that members of dominant groups generally have more privileges, greater access to both material and social resources, and have more opportunities for advancement than members of non-dominant groups⁹⁴.

One of the most concrete examples of legitimacy occurs when decisions are made or rules are created that are designed to shape the behavior of others⁹⁵. Political and social studies posit that authorities can perform effectively only when those in power are able to convince their constituents that they deserve to both rule and make decisions that can affect the quality of others' lives⁹⁶. Somewhat ironically, the tendency to perceive existing arrangements as fair paradoxically contributes to the acceptance and legitimation of social inequality, as it encourages the culpability of individual victims rather than the structural or social factors contributing to their plight⁹⁷. Certainly, existing research and literature implicate legitimation as a primary mechanism that perpetuates inequality⁹⁸.

Furthermore, a 2003 study conducted by Smith et al. concluded that, when provided reasoning and justification for injustices (such as being told that inequality was more legitimate), people identified *more* strongly with their group and even cooperated more with their group in resolving any subsequent social dilemmas⁹⁹. As shown through historical media sources around

⁹³ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost. "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 43, no. 4 (2013): p. 229.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ Tom R Tyler, "Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation." *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 57 (2006): p. 377.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

the 1911 Ordinance in Baltimore, legitimation served as a powerful psychological tool to justify segregationist laws and discriminatory practices.

The relevance of legitimation can be further partitioned into three relevant cognitive processes by which legitimation is enabled and manifested: aversive racism, social dominance theory, and system-justification theory; each offers a different dimension in understanding legitimation as force driving inequality.

Aversive Racism

Aversive racism operates largely on the individual level, where individuals may “endorse principles of racial equality, sympathize with victims of past injustices... and possess conflicting, often nonconscious, negative attitudes about members of other groups that are rooted in basic psychological processes that promote racial bias¹⁰⁰.” Aversive racism largely describes discrimination that results when an aversive racist is able to justify a negative belief “on the basis of some factor other than race¹⁰¹.” Indeed, aversive racists might engage in behaviors harmful towards minorities, but in ways that enable them to maintain a non-prejudiced self-image¹⁰².”

On an individual level, legitimation enables aversive racists to maintain positive self-image while directly or indirectly discriminating against others¹⁰³. On the group level, legitimation acts to reinforce a position of advantage for dominant groups and concurrently disadvantages non-dominant groups¹⁰⁴. Indeed, legitimization directly enables aversive racism by justifying prejudiced beliefs and discriminatory actions in superficially egalitarian contexts. In

¹⁰⁰ Cicero Pereira, Jorge Vala, and Rui Costa-Lopes. "From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40, no. 7 (2010): p. 1232.

¹⁰¹ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost. "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 230.

¹⁰² Ibid, p. 231.

¹⁰³ Ibid, p. 231.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid, p. 230.

early 20th century Baltimore, aversive racism was a means by which white residents could subjugate African-Americans while preserving a certain moral integrity.

Social Dominance Theory

Social dominance theory, as formulated by Sidanius and Pratto in 1999, is designed to “explain the origin and consequence of social hierarchies and oppression¹⁰⁵.” This theory posits that societies tend to organize themselves into group-based social hierarchies where at least one group has greater social status than other groups¹⁰⁶. Within social dominance theory, there exist two key features: 1) disproportionate allocation of commodities 2) justification of inequitable allocations of commodities¹⁰⁷. The first key feature of social dominance theory, the disproportionate allocation of commodities, theorizes that social institutions distribute desired goods to “dominant and powerful collectives disproportionately¹⁰⁸.” As a result, dominant collectives receive disproportionately greater amounts of positive resources like prestige and power, while undesirable commodities such as contempt or subpar resources are allocated towards subordinate collectives¹⁰⁹. On an individual level, dominant individuals can enact inequitable behaviors that disadvantage certain ethnicities or groups¹¹⁰. Even more, ideologies often justify the tendency for dominant collectives to conduct egocentric behaviors – those that advance their personal interest.

¹⁰⁵ J. Sidanius and F. Pratto, "Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression, 10.1017." *CBO9781139175043* (1999).

¹⁰⁶ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 231.

¹⁰⁷ Simon Moss, "Social dominance theory." *Social dominance theory / smoss2 - Sicotests*. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.sicotests.com/psyarticle.asp?id=237>.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Jim Sidanius, Shana Levin, C. Federico, and Felicia Pratto, "Social Dominance Approach," *Psychology of legitimacy* (2001): 307-322.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

The second feature, “justification of inequitable allocations of commodities,” posits that group hierarchies are maintained through legitimizing myths, which are defined as “consensually shared social ideologies that justify the behavior that distributes the positive and negative social value within the social system¹¹¹.” These myths and ideologies – representing beliefs, attitudes, stereotypes, etc. – maintain and attenuate existing hierarchies in society, many of which unfairly advantage dominant groups over subordinate groups¹¹². Legitimizing myths, particularly those that enhance and perpetuate existing hierarchies, provide moral and intellectual justification for inequality and group-based oppression¹¹³. Legitimizing myths function under a meritocratic ideology, where people “infer the quality of a person’s input on the basis of the status of the groups to which they belong,”¹¹⁴ rendering inequality something that is inevitable and moral. These myths not only attenuate existing hierarchies, but also encourage subordinate collectives to accept and internalize these inequities; in fact, members of subordinate groups are more likely to engage in behaviors that are *damaging* towards their groups¹¹⁵. As will be shown, social dominance theory in practice served to provide justifications for various racial and social inequalities that exclusively catered towards a white population, shaping the African-American experience of early 20th century Baltimore.

¹¹¹ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 232.

¹¹² Jim Sidanius, Shana Levin, C. Federico, and Felicia Pratto, "Social Dominance Approach," *Psychology of legitimacy* (2001): 307-322.

¹¹³ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 232.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

¹¹⁵ Jim Sidanius, Erik Devereux, and Felicia Pratto, "A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes," *The Journal of Social Psychology* 132, no. 3 (1992): 377-395.

System-Justification Theory

A system-justification framework focuses on social and psychology processes by which both individuals and groups legitimize social institutions and arrangements, viewing social inequality as both legitimate and also natural and necessary¹¹⁶.” In this theory, people both implicitly and explicitly defend and reinforce aspects of the status quo, which includes all existing social, economic, and political systems and arrangements¹¹⁷. The system-justifying motivations are largely unconscious, wherein people “engage in biased information processing in favor of system-serving conclusions¹¹⁸.” Individuals might justify the existing social system for different motivations: first, embracing the status quo lends a sense of stability and security¹¹⁹. Furthermore, the existing system can confer feelings of safety¹²⁰.

Such system-justifying ideologies enable individuals to explain social systems and structures in ways that provide rationale for differences in authority, power, or wealth¹²¹. According to this theory, individuals want to perceive the world as predictable at risk of feeling a loss of control, which could result in negative emotional states¹²². In order to perceive the world as predictable, however, individuals are thus induced to believe that society is fair and equitable¹²³. These ideologies also serve to inhibit redistribution of social resources and constrain emotional responses – such as frustration, outrage, or guilt – that might catalyze efforts to help

¹¹⁶ Jojanneke Van der Toorn and John T. Jost, "Twenty years of system justification theory: Introduction to the special issue on "Ideology and system justification processes," (2014): 413-419.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 232.

¹¹⁹ John T Jost and Orsolya Hunyady, "Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies," *Current directions in psychological science* 14, no. 5 (2005): 260-265.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 230.

¹²² John T Jost and Rick Andrews, "System justification theory," *The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* (2011).

¹²³ Ibid.

disadvantaged groups¹²⁴. In this sense, system-justifying ideologies are also mechanisms by which social and material inequalities can be viewed as legitimate, which serves to perpetuate social disparities¹²⁵. This motivation by groups and individuals to justify and bolster the existing social system results in the exaggeration of its virtues and the downplaying of its vices: society comes to view the status quo as “more fair and desirable than it actually is¹²⁶.” As we will see, system-justifying ideologies work to promote a social acceptance of racial inequality, thereby perpetuating the oppression of African-Americans in early 20th century Baltimore.

Cognitive Framework of Threat Perception: Socio-cultural Climate Before 1911

Within the larger backdrop of the Progressive Era, the imposition of Jim Crow Laws that institutionalized racism in the later 19th century through the mid-20th century shaped ideologies and attitudes towards African-Americans in the South¹²⁷; Baltimore was no exception.

This section makes use of historical articles published in the *Baltimore Sun Newspaper*, *Baltimore Afro-American Magazine*, *Boston Globe*, and *Washington Post* to provide a sociopolitical context for attitudes and beliefs surrounding race in the years preceding the 1911 Baltimore racial zoning Ordinance. This section also applies a cognitive framework of perceived threat and consequent authoritarianism to the historical context in Baltimore as told through newspaper and media articles, which helps to shed light upon the development of beliefs, behaviors, and controversies around race in the years leading up to the Ordinance’s passing.

To set the scene – largely before African-Americans began moving into white residential neighborhoods and traditionally white domains – race relations were not yet openly contentious

¹²⁴ John T Jost and Rick Andrews, "System justification theory," *The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* (2011).

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ William Anderson, "Progressive-Era Economics and the Legacy of Jim Crow," Mises Institute. September 14, 2015. Accessed April 02, 2017. <https://mises.org/library/progressive-era-economics-and-legacy-jim-crow>.

in the late 19th century. This is exemplified in an 1899 article published in *The Boston Globe*, “The South: The Negro’s Place,” which includes a quote by Reverend Fr. Slattery, Head of a Baltimore seminary: “The Catholic church is very much interested in the welfare of the colored man, and she is determined to convert him. The negroes...are a cheerful race. It has been reported on all sides that the negro race is not a gentle one, but I wish to assure my northern friends that such a statement is far from true¹²⁸.”

The phrasing here is undercut by patriarchal tones, ostensibly describing the desire of the church to unilaterally convert the “negroes” without any supposed input from those being converted. It further hints at a desire for dominance, evoking an implied social hierarchy of white churchgoers as morally superior to the “negroes” who are represented here as merely misunderstood. It is worth noting that Slattery’s quote is reminiscent of Rudyard Kipling’s famous poem, “White Man’s Burden,” published in the same year as the above article: the poem describes the duty of white colonizers to impart their culture and beliefs onto nonwhite indigenous people¹²⁹.

That race relations were not yet ostensibly unfavorable is also shown in a 1899 article published in the *Baltimore Afro-American Magazine*, “Colored People Stirred Up By the Prospective Adverse Legislation,” which describes the self-interested motivations of white residents of Baltimore for protesting disfranchisement of African-Americans¹³⁰. The article reads: “white folks do not want the old negro to be disfranchised... They want laws passed to make the young negro work on white folk farms for small wages¹³¹,” indicating a larger social environment less concerned with fairness and egalitarianism between races than unabashed self-

¹²⁸ "THE SOUTH THE NEGRO'S PLACE." 1899.*Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Jul 31, 5. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/499132247?accountid=15172>.

¹²⁹ Rudyard Kipling, "The white man's burden," (1998): 311-312.

¹³⁰ "THE STATE OF MARYLAND." 1904.*Afro-American (1893-1988)*, Jan 30, 1.

¹³¹ Ibid.

interest. There is no attempt to disguise or misrepresent the “white folks’” true motivations of discrimination against and exploitation of African-Americans, yet no attempt to remove or segregate physical African-American presence¹³².

However, articles published in the same year begin hinting at some subtle change within the social structure, demonstrated in the undertones of distrust and aversion embedded within language used to speak about race. An 1899 article published in the Baltimore Sun, “Negro Domination: The Colored Man’s Mecca” reveals an interesting dimension to white perception of African-Americans at the turn of the 20th century, one that exposes deep-rooted feelings of anxiety¹³³. The article quotes Captain William B. Redgrave, president of the fourteenth ward, as stating that it was a “dismal atmosphere always to have over you negro domination;” he continued on to declare that Baltimore “[could] not be a white man’s city until negro rowdyism and lawlessness is suppressed, but [would become] a white man’s city¹³⁴.” In his speech, Redgrave is deliberate in his marked distaste for African-Americans as well as in his conviction that Baltimore will return to a white man’s city, presumably once the African-American problem has been resolved.

The wording within the article also exposes a simmering anxiety over the rising sociopolitical power of African-Americans. Redgrave continues, “Baltimore was now the Mecca of negroes. They are coming here in search of political office...they have grown in voting population 5,000 in four years. If they continue to grow as rapidly in four years more they will be the controlling power. Their growth in population affects the business and property-owners,

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ "NEGRO DOMINATION." 1899. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Apr 20, 10. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/536054488?accountid=15172>.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

because they depreciate the value of property¹³⁵.” As can be extrapolated from Redgrave’s quotation, African-American influence had begun to permeate the political sphere, both in terms of authority and in a rapidly expanding voting population. In stating that “as rapidly as in four years more [African-Americans] will be the controlling power¹³⁶,” the article also reveals a historical general feeling of unease, of apprehension over the relative loss in white political power, over any unforeseen differences in business and property values.

Applying a cognitive framework of perceived social threat to this pre-1911 Ordinance context reveals nuances about the beliefs and actions surrounding racial issues that followed as the Ordinance took shape. In a sense, this framework renders the subsequent events in 1911 more digestible and sheds light on the cognitive processes that catalyzed the Ordinance’s passing. Under this threat perception and authoritarianism framework, this 1899 Baltimore Sun article “Negro Domination: The Colored Man’s Mecca” facilitates a more informed perspective, one that is almost foreboding given that the modern reader has the distinctive advantage of knowing the history that ensues. To reiterate, the article states: “They are coming here in search of political office...they have grown in voting population 5,000 in four years. If they continue to grow as rapidly in four years more they will be the controlling power¹³⁷.” For white Baltimoreans, the concern of rising African-American political power served as a potent threat to the existing social order, one that catalyzed feelings of social anxiety and perturbation. In accordance with the cognitive research regarding threat perception discussed above, it follows that a spike in authoritarian beliefs and actions, as well as forged separation between racial groups, would occur in response to these growing social ills.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ "NEGRO DOMINATION." 1899. The Sun (1837-1991), Apr 20, 10.

From the perspective of the white resident of Baltimore City, African-American encroachment was not limited to the political sphere. A 1906 *Washington Post* article, "A Negro on Baltimore's School Board," stated: "Rev. Engleston is the first colored School Commissioner to be elected in this city. One of the Republican members made a hot fight against him...a ward in which reside many of the wealthiest citizens is now represented in the first branch of Councils and the school board by colored men¹³⁸." The article describes a pivotal moment where an African-American man not only has taken on a role of social and educational authority, but also serves as a face of representation for wealthier, white residents. In this sense, the African-American man has moved to occupy a higher social playing field, a similar, if not equal, status to the wealthy, white man. This aligns with what Duckitt defines as a social threat - any challenge to conformity – and exemplifies a subsequent "strain towards cohesion" that will ultimately result in a spike in authoritarian beliefs¹³⁹.

In the following years of the early 20th century, animosity towards African-Americans seemed only to grow, becoming increasingly flagrant and derogatory. To some degree, the larger conversation about race turned away from social and political spheres, and instead towards more physical inhabitable spaces, a gradual specialization of previously-abstract fears. Insofar as specific neighborhoods were singled out, the social "threat" was increasingly understood as a spatial one, inextricably connected to housing and residence. This shift towards intrusion into geographical rather than metaphorical space is exemplified in a 1907 *Baltimore Sun* article, "The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore," which states: "The primary and fundamental object [of the New Neighborhood Improvement Association in Northwest Baltimore] is the prevention of the still further negro objectionable element invasion in our section of the city...we propose to

¹³⁸ Special to, The Post. 1896. "A Negro on Baltimore's School Board." *The Washington Post* (1877-1922), Feb 25, 1. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/143761128?accountid=15172>.

¹³⁹ John Duckitt, "Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct," p. 70

use effective means to eliminate those Africans who have recently moved in among white residents...and see to it that the objectionable invader is run out¹⁴⁰.”

Arguably the most salient characteristic of this article is the language used to describe African-Americans: language of objection, of invasion, of elimination. The article continues on: “White churches are being compelled to close their doors against the inroads of this pestilence...the “dark cloud¹⁴¹.” Here, the entire African-American race is lumped together into an indistinguishable sum, framed as an invasive pest, something objectionable to eliminate. The usage of the descriptor “pestilence” is particularly interesting, as “pestilence” is defined as “a contagious or infectious epidemic disease that is virulent and devastating¹⁴².” Where African-Americans are described as a pestilence, they are characterized as a physical plague, something tangible and corporeally damaging – distinct from the abstract social or political presence that they previously occupied.

Furthermore, the article suggests a moment of change; the wording indicates some perceived infringement and threat by African-Americans in terms of physical space: “...means to eliminate those Africans who have recently moved in among white residents. ...Now, who is to blame for this encroachment of the blacks upon the domains that have always been occupied by the whites¹⁴³?” Around this time, African-Americans started to physically move into and inhabit certain spaces that had until then been dominated by whites. Through the cognitive lens of a perceived threat framework, for white residents this influx of African-Americans into previously white arenas represented a realistic, physical threat to the social order, a concrete imposition

¹⁴⁰ "The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore." 1907. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Oct 24, 7. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/537412375?accountid=15172>.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² "Pestilence." Merriam-Webster. Accessed April 02, 2017. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pestilence>.

¹⁴³ “The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore." 1907. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Oct 24, 7.

upon the existing status quo. The article clearly embodies the perceived threat of African-American intrusion into “domains that have always been occupied by the whites¹⁴⁴”.

Moreover, the author of the same 1907 *Baltimore Sun* article goes on to delineate a physical space that has apparently been tainted by African-American invasion, drawing abstract boundaries between existing geographical spaces. The article reads:

Take the Fifteenth ward... The prettiest streets in the lower precincts are being invaded by the advance guards of the objectionable element, the “dark cloud... In only one ward in the entire city does the negro outnumber the white man and that is the Seventeenth, ... it is time now that the white man “sit up” and “take notice.” These “discontents” of the Southern land are of treacherous caliber and do not induce any more of these black pariahs to leave their cabins and huts and settle in any portion of this grand office State of Maryland. The pestilential black army... should be forced back to alleys and obscure streets... even out of the city and its environments¹⁴⁵.

Here the article singles out a specific ward of the city – the Seventeenth ward – as being inherently problematic due to the overwhelming African-American population relative to the other wards; this again indicates a shift from abstract African-American encroachment towards a tangible threat to a geographical and socially constructed space. The author even rallies a cry for action, galvanizing his kin to “sit up” and “take notice” of the invasion of their space¹⁴⁶, reminiscent again of Duckitt’s argument that a perceived social threat – such as encroachment upon previously white-only spaces – can evoke “intense group identification” and “heightened attachment to the ingroup¹⁴⁷.” In the perceived threat/authoritarianism framework, Duckitt further argues that some anxieties surrounding a perceived social threat can be assuaged by “avoiding disruptive contacts with outgroup members... and exaggerating their differences¹⁴⁸.”

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ “The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore.” 1907. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Oct 24, 7. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/537412375?accountid=15172>.”

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ John Duckitt, “Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct,” p. 72.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 70

The quote from the above 1907 article directly exemplifies this tendency to “avoid disruptive contacts with outgroup members” as the speaker, the organizer of the New Neighborhood Improvement Association of Northwest Baltimore, explicitly recommends that African-Americans be “forced back to...obscure streets...even out of the city¹⁴⁹.” It seems that the speaker desires to forge not only a conceptual, abstract divide between races, but also a physical separation where the African-American presence – threat – is entirely removed from society. Indeed, creating this artificial separation would drive both abstract and physical barriers between races and create a social climate in which there would be no interaction, even inadvertently, between whites and African-Americans at all.

Under the same framework, the quote from the 1907 article is demonstrative of how social anxieties can be ameliorated through “exaggerating...differences¹⁵⁰.” The speaker refers to African-Americans as “discontents...of treacherous caliber,” even going so far as to call them “black pariahs” who live in “cabins and huts,” intruding upon the “grand office State of Maryland¹⁵¹.” The vilification and even dehumanization of African-Americans in this article are in stark contrast to the 1899 *The Boston Globe* article, which cited that the “negroes are a cheerful race¹⁵²,” or other articles in which African-Americans are plainly referred to as “negroes or colored men¹⁵³.”

Also notable within this article is the juxtaposition between the “cabins and huts” of the “black pariahs” and the “grand office State of Maryland” that the ‘pariahs’ have begun to settle

¹⁴⁹ “The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore.” 1907.*The Sun (1837-1991)*, Oct 24, 7.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² THE SOUTH THE NEGRO'S PLACE."." 1899.*Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Jul 31, 5. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/499132247?accountid=15172>.

¹⁵³ Special to, *The Post*. 1896. "A Negro on Baltimore's School Board." *The Washington Post (1877-1922)*, Feb 25, 1. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/143761128?accountid=15172>.

within¹⁵⁴; the speaker in the article begins to use language surrounding place and social spaces¹⁵⁵. Implicit in his words are the ideas of belonging and possession, that the “cabins and huts” are the designated and warranted spaces for African-Americans to reside within, while the “grand office State of Maryland” is a social sphere that belongs exclusively to whites – one in which any African-American presence becomes an intrusion¹⁵⁶. These attacks, limited not just to abusing the race itself but also its fundamental character, are both intense and explicit; the quote describes African-Americans as “treacherous,” a genuine danger posed to society, and paints them as fundamentally undomesticated in that they reside in “cabins and huts¹⁵⁷.” By and large, the article outlines the intrinsic and substantial disparity between races. Within the perceived threat framework, this exaggeration of differences could plausibly serve as a defense mechanism by which white residents could cope with a perceived social threat and ultimately justify future authoritarian actions.

The cognitive framework of ideological change in the presence of a perceived threat permits a deeper and more nuanced evaluation of the trajectory of relevant historical events. The usage of historical events as a case study for a cognitive framework offers modern cognitive theory a certain advantage of hindsight, as the theoretical component of the cognitive processes is given a practical application. In this sense, history both can serve as a tool in cognitive science and inform the field of study. The historical application provides a valuable and novel dimension to cognitive science theory in allowing conceptual theories to be mapped onto and substantiated by historical literature.

¹⁵⁴ “The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore.” 1907. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Oct 24, 7.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

In a different vein, applying this cognitive framework to history draws an original connection between historical literature, public health, and cognitive science theory, revealing aspects of history that historians alone haven't seen. Indeed, mapping this cognitive science framework onto historical contexts provides a novel mechanism for historical study in considering the ways in which external factors and psychological processes are able to shape more than just individual-level beliefs and actions, instead both implicitly and explicitly influencing larger structural factors like social and political environments.

As indicated by the cognitive research discussed above, perceived social threats catalyze more authoritarian beliefs and behaviors, leading to intensification of ingroup identification, rejection of outgroups, and subsequent justification for discriminatory values and actions. The historical events that elapse in 1911 and the years following mirror this conceptual trend towards authoritarianism and intolerance, a direct historical manifestation of the modern cognitive science literature on threat perception and resulting attitudes.

Legitimation Framework Analysis of 1911 Baltimore Ordinance

In transitioning to looking at the events surrounding the Ordinance, a new cognitive framework of legitimation becomes salient. As in the previous section, this one places a legitimation framework – encompassing concepts of aversive racism, social dominance theory, and system-justifying theory – upon historical discourse in the early 20th century. This frame-shift is achieved by applying modern cognitive science theory to elucidate historical thought patterns and psychological processes that lead to manifestations of shifting racial ideology. With related media sources, specifically newspaper articles from the *Baltimore Sun* and the *New York Times*, this section ultimately attempts to reveal a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the passing of the 1911 residential segregation Ordinance in Baltimore.

At the turn of the 20th century, a citywide campaign against tuberculosis focusing on the causal effects of overcrowding and lack of open space brought attention to the bleak housing situation in Baltimore¹⁵⁸. Indeed, the African-American community occupied the worst housing in the city; the death rate of African-Americans from tuberculosis doubled that of the white average¹⁵⁹. As settlement housing and crime prevention initiatives proved unsuccessful, social reformers began to define disease in racial terms to justify “racial containment as an effective strategy to combat contagion¹⁶⁰,” exacerbating racial tensions between whites and African-Americans¹⁶¹.

Between 1907 and 1910, racial intolerance in Baltimore only intensified as African-Americans began to be seen as unwelcome in public parks, hotels, theaters, and department stores¹⁶². Tensions came to a head in June of 1910, when Margaret G. Franklin Brewer sold the 1834 McCulloh Street residence to an African-American man named W. Ashbie Hawkins¹⁶³. Hawkins, in turn, rented the residence to a young African-American lawyer named George W. McMechen, a respected lawyer and graduate of Yale Law School¹⁶⁴. Just a few days later, white residents of McCulloh Street met with residents from the Madison Avenue, McCulloh Street, and Eutaw Place Improvement Association; they sought to appeal to the Baltimore City Council to prevent black residence in their neighborhoods¹⁶⁵. To these mounting complaints, Baltimore City

¹⁵⁸ Garrett Power, “Apartheid Baltimore Style: The Residential Segregation Ordinances of 1910-1913,” *Maryland Law Review* 42 (1983): 18. Print. 3. See also: S Olson Baltimore 233 (1980)

¹⁵⁹ Alexandra Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 14.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ Garrett Power, “Apartheid Baltimore Style: The Residential Segregation Ordinances of 1910-1913.”

¹⁶² Alexandra Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 14.

¹⁶³ BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25). *New York Times (1857-1922)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/97075778?accountid=15172>

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Stein, Alexandra. *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 14.

Councilman Samuel Dashiell responded: “I am only able to say that the colored person, considered to represent the most enlightened of the negro race, should have established his home in the midst of his race and that he should have encouraged others of his race to do likewise...¹⁶⁶”

From this dialogue emerged the 1911 Baltimore residential segregation Ordinance, a turning point in which implicit exclusion was made and codified into explicit law. As summarized by a 1913 Louisville *Courier Journal* article, “Segregation of Races is Urged,” the 1911 Baltimore Ordinance stated:

“It shall be unlawful for any white person to use as a residence or place of abode any house...located in any colored block, and it shall also be unlawful for any colored person to use as a residence or place of abode any house, building, or structure located in any white block; it permits the employment of persons of other races as servants¹⁶⁷...”

Though implicit segregation and discriminatory practices were widespread through the South in the early 20th century, the Baltimore City Council was the first legislative body in the United States to enact a residential segregation Ordinance¹⁶⁸. The Ordinance was an effort to make explicit and legal what had previously been implicit segregation, largely as a response to shifting demographics. A 1911 *New York Times* article, “Baltimore Tries Drastic Plan of Segregation,” declared: “The Baltimore Ordinance is pronouncedly permanent. Nothing like it can be found in any statute book or ordinance record of the country. It seeks to cut off from men

¹⁶⁶Antero Pietila, “Not in my neighborhood: how bigotry shaped a great American city,” p. 24.

¹⁶⁷“SEGREGATION OF RACE IS URGED.” *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Nov 15, 1913. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1023580653?accountid=15172>.

¹⁶⁸Alexandera Stein, *Mapping Residential Segregation*, Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 14.

of a certain class the right to purchase and enjoy property anywhere within the limits of Baltimore, saying: “Thus far shalt thou come but no further¹⁶⁹.”

When considering the framework of perceived threat as discussed in the previous section, such a drastic and authoritarian action proves unsurprising. The perceived threat model predicts a surge of authoritarian actions and beliefs in the face of challenges to conformity and perceived threats to the existing social order; it follows that the unprecedented residential segregation ordinance in Baltimore is indicative of a breaking point, where social anxieties ultimately catalyze authoritarian ideology.

The following paragraphs evaluate a 1911 *New York Times* article, “Baltimore Tries Drastic Plan of Segregation,” within a legitimation framework¹⁷⁰. To recap, legitimation describes “social and psychological processes that enable certain attitudes and behaviors to be justified as merely conforming to normative standards¹⁷¹.” Within a larger cognitive structure of legitimation theory, there are three sub-structures at play, discussed at length in an earlier section: aversive racism, social dominance theory, and system-justification theory. Using this framework as a lens to reframe history, the following analysis shows how historical media sources can provide direct and realistic accounts of manifestations of these sub-structures.

Explicit in the words of Baltimore Major J. Barry Mahool, who is quoted at length in the article, is the language of deliberate infringement by African-Americans upon physical spaces, transecting metaphorical boundaries. Mahool states, “...the negro began to have a desire to push up into the neighborhood of the white resident. It is clear that one of the first desires of a

¹⁶⁹ BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25). *New York Times (1857-1922)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/97075778?accountid=15172>

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," *European Journal of Social Psychology* 43, no. 4 (2013): 229-237, p. 229.

negro...is to leave his less fortunate brethren and nose into the neighborhood of the white people¹⁷².” Here, the influx of African-Americans into previously white-dominated spaces is conceived no longer as a passive intrusion; instead, the African-American is painted as an active *intruder* into the white realm.

Mahool’s quotation activates a different reasoning for segregation, that of property security, which directly feeds into the legitimation substructure of aversive racism. He continues, “...the white and colored races cannot live in the same block in peace and with due regard to property security¹⁷³.” Indeed, where aversive racism describes the justification of a negative belief “on the basis of some factor other than race¹⁷⁴,” Mahool also uses the neutral metric of property security to substantiate the segregation of races. To supplement this point, he states, “The ordinance is not personal in character, nor is it directed at the negro race... it will be observed that the restrictions apply as well to white persons as to negroes. Its sole intention is to protect our people and to prevent the depreciations...bound to follow when the colored family moves into a neighborhood... exclusively inhabited by white people¹⁷⁵.” By proclaiming the Ordinance’s supposedly equal restriction on whites and African-Americans alike, Mahool rationalizes this segregation as inherently fair and non-racist, affording himself and his peers the luxury of maintaining a positive social self-image while performing inherently unjust actions.

The aversive racism substructure surrounding the 1911 Ordinance is further substantiated in a 1913 *Louisville Courier Journal* article, “Segregation of Race is Urged,¹⁷⁶” which discusses

¹⁷² Ibid, p. 230.

¹⁷³ BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25). *New York Times (1857-1922)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/97075778?accountid=15172>

¹⁷⁴ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 231.

¹⁷⁵ BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25).

¹⁷⁶ "SEGREGATION OF RACE IS URGED." 1913. *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Nov 15, 4. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1023580653?accountid=15172>.

the Baltimore Ordinance at a city-wide meeting as a potential law worth emulating in Louisville, Kentucky. Louisville Councilman Trippe states: “I believe it will benefit both races to have them segregated. No one more than I will welcome the day when the negro will be lifted to a higher plane of citizenship and responsibility in the community in which he lives...but so long as he insists in encroaching upon white sections...little progress can be made¹⁷⁷.” Here, Councilman Trippe demonstrates a fundamental tenet of aversive racism – “endorsing principles of racial equality” while subconsciously possessing negative attitudes towards members of these implicated groups¹⁷⁸. Speaking favorably about the potential increase in African-Americans’ sociopolitical status, Trippe paradoxically expresses his ostensibly equitable racial ideologies while advocating for a discriminatory action. Indeed, legitimation of the Ordinance in non-racist ways enables aversive racists such as Trippe to maintain non-prejudiced self-images while actively engaging in harmful behaviors towards subordinate collectives.

Viewing this same historical context from the lens of a legitimation paradigm, specifically the social dominance theory sub-structure, further sheds light on how the 1911 Ordinance was rationalized and how it ultimately came to be fiercely defended. Social dominance theory posits that societies naturally organize themselves into group-based social hierarchies through disproportionate allocation of commodities and the justification of this inequitable allocation¹⁷⁹. Mapping this cognitive infrastructure onto the events that transpired in Baltimore, as traced through media accounts, provides a larger-scale and more cohesive understanding of the rationale behind the professed ideologies. Furthermore, it allows the

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Costa-Lopes, Rui, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost. "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 231.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 229.

modern reader to think critically about contemporary issues and draws attention to unconscious psychological processes that work to subtly influence broad-reaching beliefs and behaviors.

Both tenets of social dominance theory are illustrated in a 1911 *New York Times* article, “Baltimore Tries Drastic Plan of Segregation,” which quotes Milton Dashiell, an eminent attorney of Baltimore: “The city, under its police power, has a right – a duty – to step in and, by the prohibition of influx of negro population into the white districts, prevent further destruction in value¹⁸⁰.” Dashiell touches upon the first key feature of social dominance theory, the disproportionate allocation of commodities, in a subtle way: he frames the city’s police power as obligated to prevent the African-American encroachment from expanding.

In accordance with research conducted by Sidanius et al., not only does this framework shunt undesirable commodities such as contempt and censure upon African-Americans, but it also creates an implicit hierarchy in society where the police power is intended to serve the white population, while, if necessary, condemning the rest. Assuming that this framework holds, police and municipal power act exclusively as a positive and desired resource for the dominant and white population. In the same quotation, Dashiell’s rationalization of both the legality and the benefit of the Ordinance epitomizes the second key feature of social dominance theory, that of the justification of inequitable allocations of commodities through legitimizing myths. Dashiell states: “The moving in of negroes depreciates property... [and] tends to the disturbance and destruction of the peace to a marked degree. ...But if for no other reason, the destruction in property values is a sufficiently good one to support the ordinance in question¹⁸¹.”

Reframing Dashiell’s rationalization of the Ordinance as a legitimizing myth predicts moral and intellectual justification for inequality and group-based oppression. In analyzing

¹⁸⁰ BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25). *New York Times (1857-1922)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/97075778?accountid=15172>

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

Dashiell's own words, this prediction is validated. Indeed, he not only provides the quantitative metric of depreciating properties to justify the Ordinance's mandate, but also provides a socially moral justification: the threat and potential loss of peace, a ubiquitous and unequivocal social good. In fact, Dashiell states that the destruction in property values "is a sufficiently good [reason], indicating that – more so than a subtle, unconscious bias – he is self-aware of the fact that he is explicitly justifying this action. Whether or not he is self-aware that his arguments of depreciating property values and disturbing peace seem to belie deep-rooted racial biases and discrimination is ultimately unclear.

Another salient aspect described in social dominance theory, the internalization of inequities by subordinate collectives, can also be traced through media sources around 1911. The same 1911 *New York Times* article quotes at length an African-American woman of high status:

The first night I moved in they... flung a brick through my skylight. As soon as I moved in the white people in the neighborhood organized themselves into an Improvement Association, which... prevent[ed] negroes moving into the neighborhood. I think it is erroneous to say that the colored people have tried to push their way in among the whites. All they have done is merely to occupy the vacant houses... impossible to obtain a white tenant. We colored people rent only those houses in the white districts which it has been found impossible to rent to white people¹⁸².

Notably, the woman's objection to the surrounding neighborhood's reaction to her presence is not the expected indignation or fury over the treatment she received; she does not speak of racism, of segregation, or of injustice. Instead, she speaks with little conviction ("I think it is erroneous¹⁸³"), with the tone of someone trying to justify or rectify a situation in which they have wronged. In stating that her race only rents "those houses... impossible to rent to white people," she implicitly places herself and her kin ("we colored people") on a subordinate level of being inherently less desirable, painting their presence as a last-resort for white residents – only

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

more advantageous than having no tenant at all¹⁸⁴. The key here is that the woman has internalized this view of herself and her race as a barely viable last-resort, fundamentally shaping the way that she interacts with society.

Internalization of inequality and racism permeated several social circles, including that of the religious sphere. A 1917 article, “Methodists Discuss Negro Question,” states: “One of the colored commissioners told the southerners they should not be skeptical about negro domination with the present ratio of whites to negroes in the churches – 15 to 1. He said further that if permitted to govern their own churches, there would be no disposition on the part of the colored bishops to preside over any of the white conferences¹⁸⁵.” Here, the African-American commissioner occupies a peculiar role: one in which he is assuring the white commissioners that African-Americans have no intention to intrude upon the traditionally white domain. In doing so, however, he only reinforces the legitimacy of white spaces. He speaks reassuringly about white domination in the church as if to assuage the concerns and fears of the white person by affirming the relatively low social status and bargaining power of his own kin. In a sense, he is telling the white commissioners what they want to hear, playing into an abstract role of the docile, perhaps even sycophantic, subordinate.

The internalization of inequality also feeds into the third discussed sub-structure, system-justification theory, which describes the processes by which social inequality comes to be viewed as legitimate, natural, and necessary¹⁸⁶. In effect, system-justification theory constantly interacts with the other substructures of aversive racism and social dominance theory to legitimize social

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ METHODISTS DISCUSS NEGRO QUESTION. (1917, Jan 02). *Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville American (1910-1920)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/920646601?accountid=15172>

¹⁸⁶ Jojanneke Van der Toorn and John T. Jost. "Twenty years of system justification theory: Introduction to the special issue on “Ideology and system justification processes”." (2014): p. 415.

and racial inequalities. As with the other substructures, analysis of the discourse surrounding the 1911 Ordinance under a system-justification theory framework not only sheds new light on the various rationales for the Ordinance that authorities preached, but also synthesizes them under a common theme.

The tenet of system-justification theory that posits that people “engage in biased information processing in favor of system-serving conclusions” rings true in the various ways in which residents and authorities of Baltimore warranted the 1911 Ordinance¹⁸⁷. Despite varying motivations, the end product – one in which the status quo was defended and reinforced – remained constant. For example, in a 1913 *Baltimore Afro-American Magazine* article, the editor concludes: “Colored people themselves are responsible for a large amount of their trouble...Conditions could be better if the colored people themselves would try to make them so. They dirty the cars...and act in a way that no decent traveler ought to act. As for a broom...they would hardly know one if they saw it¹⁸⁸.”

Here, the editor sets up a simple cause and effect paradigm: because African-Americans are dirty, uncouth, unable to fend for themselves, and apparently make no concerted effort to remedy this, they have stirred sentiments of ill-will, discontent, and prejudice of their own accord. Within this paradigm is the implicit notion that African-Americans are culpable for all of their misfortunes, and that their actions have directly activated an undesirable outcome. It follows, then, that whites are absolved of any responsibility in the African-American man’s plight, and have the luxury of believing still that society is “fair and equitable¹⁸⁹.” Within the system-justification theory proposed by Jost and Hunyady, this sentiment of exculpation serves

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ J. M. (1913, Mar 29). SOUTH THE PLACE FOR THE NEGRO. *Afro-American* (1893-1988) Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/530348123?accountid=15172>

¹⁸⁹ John T. Jost and Rick Andrews, "System justification theory," *The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* (2011).

to “inhibit redistribution of social resources and constrain emotional responses¹⁹⁰,” ultimately further perpetuating an inequitable system.

In epitomizing system-justification theory, other residents took more macro-level approaches to rationalizing the existing system, though the common current of justifying differences in authority and wealth remains consistent. In 1911, City Attorney Edgar Allen Poe (the grand-nephew of the poet) declared: “This [race] problem exists not because of mere race prejudice but because experience...[has] proved that commingling of the white and colored races...bring about grave public disaster. This fact has resulted in the passage of a number of laws enforcing the separation of the two races in the schools¹⁹¹.”

In proposing the notion of a “grave public disaster,” Poe portrays the intermingling – read: perceived encroachment of African-Americans into white spaces – as a serious public health issue, with underlying tones of risk, threat, and to some extent, danger¹⁹². He uses this public health hazard to warrant the “passage of...laws enforcing the separation of the two races¹⁹³.” Within the system-justification theory framework proposed by Costa-Lopes et al., Poe’s argument serves to legitimize a specific social arrangement and enables viewing social inequality as “natural and necessary” insofar as it ultimately promotes positive public health¹⁹⁴. Indeed, the argument of a public health hazard is a robust one as good health of a society is imperative, an indisputable feature that cannot be compromised upon. If a municipal decision is reached based upon probable positive contributions to public health, individuals are accordingly

¹⁹⁰ John T. Jost and Orsolya Hunyady, "Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies," *Current directions in psychological science* 14, no. 5 (2005): 260-265.

¹⁹¹ “SEGREGATION OF RACE IS URGED." *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Nov 15, 1913. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1023580653?accountid=15172>.”

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Rui Costa-Lopes, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost, "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future," p. 232.

more likely to view the decision as fair and equitable, consequently coming to perceive the status quo as more fair and desirable than it is.

As represented in the preceding analysis in this section and the previous one, the larger legitimation framework serves as a robust tool for historical analysis and study. On one hand, it provides a new dimension with which to evaluate and better understand realistic and practical historical accounts, lending some insight into the cognitive processes underlying racial issues in 1911 and the passing of the Ordinance. On the other hand, these historical accounts – with the added advantage of realism as well as hindsight – serve as a case study platform that can further cognitive science study and theory.

Conclusion, Modern Perspectives and Spatial Stigma: Why it Matters

Cognitive science and history are generally pursued separately, even when they address related questions. But what if we combine them? What is to be gained by addressing historical and ongoing issues from cognitive and historical perspectives at once?

In fact, an interdisciplinary approach to historical analysis and cognitive science theory can serve as a predictive tool. It offers more than a deeper perspective into historical events; rather, it also enables the modern reader to think critically about contemporary social issues surrounding race. The larger psychological processes at play in early 20th century Baltimore were not an isolated instance in history: these processes are constant, intrinsic within the way that each individual interacts with social groups and the greater society surrounding them. These innate human tendencies – the way that we react to perceived social threats, how we legitimize inequalities by performing aversive racism or feeding into social dominance and system-justifying theories – undercut history, run beneath present issues, and are foreseeable occurrences in the future. Where cognitive science theory explains these instinctive predispositions, history

maps out the ways in which they manifested in various sociopolitical climates. Ultimately, the intersection of the two fields encourages us to think introspectively about the way that present-day racial issues are perceived and addressed, and how often-unconscious psychological processes can influence sociopolitical environments and contribute to structural violence and other subjugating forces.

Stigmatization and attempted spatial restriction of African-Americans have persisted far beyond the 1911 Ordinance. Baltimore's subsequent history of red-lining and discriminatory housing policy far outlived the early 20th century, and endure as controversial contemporary issues. Through a spatial stigma mechanism, which represents the way "material and social conditions interact with the symbolic dimensions of place to affect health¹⁹⁵," urban neighborhoods like Baltimore become are not only divided into physically differentiable spaces but also serve as symbolic spatial representations of structural inequalities¹⁹⁶. These inequalities are reinforced through processes like geographic marginalization and are shaped by social and popular discourse; people who live within certain vilified spaces suffer both the stigmas of race and class and by a "blemish of place" that serves to reduce their personhood to something inferior or corrupted¹⁹⁷.

Indeed, location and place have profound influences on health status and health behaviors. Spatial stigma is theorized to function as a "fundamental cause of illness" that affects access to resources that individuals need to maintain and improve health¹⁹⁸. Living in an environment of long-term economic deprivation can lead to close physical proximity to unhealthy actors, exposure to deleterious social behaviors and patterns, and limited access to

¹⁹⁵ Danya Keene and Mark B. Padilla, "Race, class and the stigma of place: Moving to "opportunity" in Eastern Iowa," *Health & place* 16, no. 6 (2010): 1217.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1216.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1217.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

health-promoting resources¹⁹⁹. Moreover, experiences of stigmatization can serve as a critical source of psychosocial stress. Research by Popay et al. show that residents of stigmatized places withdraw from the larger community and retreat to a more private sphere, thereby reducing their access to health-promoting social support and resources²⁰⁰. Such resources take form of material or monetary goods, skills and capabilities, even strength of social relationships²⁰¹.

Segregation, especially in early 20th century Baltimore, served as an “omnipresent physical symbolic representation to both Blacks and Whites of norms of Black inferiority²⁰².” Relative to African-Americans, Whites lived relatively longer and healthier lives; this can be attributed to comparatively greater access to material and health-promoting resources as well as conferred psychological benefits of having their voice and values respected in public and institutional discourse²⁰³. Theorists seek to explain African-Americans’ worse health statuses as compared to those of Whites with the “weathering effect” framework, which posits that African-Americans more frequently experience great social and economic adversity²⁰⁴. Prolonged and high-effort coping with both acute and chronic stressors can impact the body on a physiological level and affect health²⁰⁵. The body has natural mechanisms in place to respond to acute stressors; these mechanisms act as a defense in life-threatening situations, yet prolonged activation of these systems that are activated by stress – allostatic systems – can be damaging²⁰⁶.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Arline T. Geronimus, Margaret Hicken, Danya Keene, and John Bound, ““Weathering” and age patterns of allostatic load scores among blacks and whites in the United States.” *American journal of public health* 96, no. 5 (2006): p. 828.

²⁰² Ibid., p. 830.

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 831.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

The body's response to a stressor has two parts: first, an allostatic response is activated, wherein stress hormones are released into the body²⁰⁷; once the threat has diminished, the response is shut off. However, when the body is exposed to a constant, even low-level threat, the allostatic system never gets completely deactivated, and the body gets overexposed to stress hormones²⁰⁸. Long durations of overexposure result in "allostatic load" which can negatively impact the body's immune systems²⁰⁹. Allostatic load can occur from exposure to many acute short-term stressors like job loss or eviction, or from long-term exposure to chronic stress like social stigmas or economic adversity²¹⁰." Indeed, African-American residents of high poverty urban areas, such as those in Baltimore, are subjected to acute and chronic environmental and psychosocial stressors. Urban African-Americans suffer persisting burdens that accumulate throughout the developmental stages into adulthood; over a life course, accumulating allostatic load can cause allostatic systems to become exhausted, leading to "cardiovascular disease, obesity, diabetes, increased susceptibility to infection, and accelerated aging²¹¹."

Even today, Baltimore's demographics are largely segregated, and certain pockets of poverty exist along racial lines. For example, in the Sandtown neighborhood of Baltimore where Freddie Gray lived²¹², in which 96.6% of residents are African-American, the unemployment rate stands at 24%, while more than half the households make a median income less than

²⁰⁷ Bruce McEwen, "Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators," *New England journal of medicine* 338, no. 3 (1998): p. 174.

²⁰⁸ Arline T. Geronimus, Margaret Hicken, Danya Keene, and John Bound, "Weathering" and age patterns of allostatic load scores among blacks and whites in the United States," p. 839.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid*, p. 837.

²¹⁰ *Ibid*.

²¹¹ *Ibid*.

²¹² Freddie Gray was a 25-year old African-American man who died in 2015 from a severe spinal injury while in Baltimore Police custody. See Hermann, Peter and John Woodrow Cox, "A Freddie Gray primer: Who was he, how did he die, why is there so much anger?:" "Freddie Gray [was] once the nation's most prominent symbol of distrust in police." Angry protests and violent riots erupted for days after his death, surrounding the larger national issue of police mistreatment of black men.

\$25,000²¹³. In Baltimore, around 28% of African-American residents live below the federal poverty line, a rate that nearly doubles that of white residents²¹⁴. Moreover, the median African-American household income in Baltimore stands at nearly half that of white households²¹⁵. Impoverished neighborhoods with predominantly African-American residents are the same areas that were redlined in the 1930s, even similar to the neighborhoods that were outraged and up in arms about African-American “intrusion” in 1911²¹⁶.

The ultimate effect of the 1911 Ordinance on structural inequalities in Baltimore cannot be precisely quantified. It is also important to note that other contributing factors, such as economic insecurity, can drive racial animosity. Furthermore, psychological analysis of demographics is inherently open to many interpretations, as there is no way to conduct a fully cohesive analysis without being able to interview subjects in person. However, evaluating historical media accounts surrounding the Ordinance does begin to elucidate thought patterns and behaviors, many of which shaped and contributed to larger social and political climates. Indeed, historical work not only adds to cognitive theory but also can change cognitive science practice; it provides a novel platform upon which we can study human nature in contexts that are difficult to re-simulate – such as Baltimore circa 1911, where overt racism was not only ubiquitous and codified, but also preached by authority figures. In this sense, considering historical work offers a new avenue of study into how humans behave in contexts that are difficult to access or taboo in modern society; it allows us to evaluate individual and social ideologies in variable and often uncomfortable environments under a myriad of sociopolitical pressures, contributing to a

²¹³ "Baltimore: The divided city where Freddie Gray lived and died." Al Jazeera America. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/4/29/baltimore-protests-race-and-poverty-freddie-gray.html>.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Alexander Stein. *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>, p. 14.

growing understanding of how we conceive of human nature and of how minds – and resulting ideologies and beliefs – work. When operating en masse and in close proximity, individual-level acts of aversive racism or system justification grow into much larger forces, which are able to affect structural social change. Even more, the spatial stigma mechanism discussed above exemplifies how stigmatization of place or space – and even stigmatization on its own – can affect physical health outcomes and result in poverty and chronic health burdens. Perhaps the lasting effect – of responses to threat perception, the tendency to legitimize inequalities when it is beneficial – is ultimately more deeply rooted and recurrent than we understand.

Word Count: (11,277)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

BALTIMORE TRIES DRASTIC PLAN OF RACE SEGREGATION. (1910, Dec 25). *New York Times (1857-1922)* Retrieved from

<https://search.proquest.com/docview/97075778?accountid=15172>

Costa-Lopes, Rui, John F. Dovidio, Cícero Roberto Pereira, and John T. Jost. "Social psychological perspectives on the legitimation of social inequality: Past, present and future." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 43, no. 4 (2013): 229-237.

Duckitt, John. "Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct." *Political psychology* (1989): 63-84.

Feldman, Stanley, and Karen Stenner. "Perceived threat and authoritarianism." *Political Psychology* 18, no. 4 (1997): 741-770.

Geronimus, Arline T., Margaret Hicken, Danya Keene, and John Bound. "'Weathering' and age patterns of allostatic load scores among blacks and whites in the United States." *American journal of public health* 96, no. 5 (2006)

Jost, John T., and Orsolya Hunyady. "Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies." *Current directions in psychological science* 14, no. 5 (2005): 260-265.

Jost, John T., and Rick Andrews. "System justification theory." *The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* (2011).

Keene, Danya E., and Mark B. Padilla. "Race, class and the stigma of place: Moving to 'opportunity' in Eastern Iowa." *Health & place* 16, no. 6 (2010): 1217.

Kipling, Rudyard. "The white man's burden." (1998): 311-312.

- LaPiere, Richard T. "Type-rationalizations of group antipathy." *Social Forces* 15, no. 2 (1936): 232-254.
- McEwen, Bruce S. "Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators." *New England journal of medicine* 338, no. 3 (1998).
- METHODISTS DISCUSS NEGRO QUESTION. (1917, Jan 02). *Nashville Tennessean and the Nashville American (1910-1920)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/920646601?accountid=15172>
- "NEGRO DOMINATION." 1899. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Apr 20, 10. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/536054488?accountid=15172>.
- "Pestilence." Merriam-Webster. Accessed April 02, 2017. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pestilence>.
- Pereira, Cícero, Jorge Vala, and Rui Costa-Lopes. "From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 40, no. 7 (2010): 1231-1250.
- Rokeach, Milton. "The open and closed mind." (1960).
- Sales, Stephen M., and Kenneth E. Friend. "Success and failure as determinants of level of authoritarianism." *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 18, no. 3 (1973): 163-172.
- "SEGREGATION OF RACE IS URGED." *Courier-Journal (1869-1922)*, Nov 15, 1913. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1023580653?accountid=15172>.
- Sidanius, Jim, Erik Devereux, and Felicia Pratto. "A comparison of symbolic racism theory and social dominance theory as explanations for racial policy attitudes." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 132, no. 3 (1992): 377-395.

- Sidanius, J., and F. Pratto. "Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression. 10.1017." *CBO9781139175043* (1999).
- J, M. (1913, Mar 29). SOUTH THE PLACE FOR THE NEGRO. *Afro-American (1893-1988)* Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/530348123?accountid=15172>
- Special to, The Post. 1896. "A Negro on Baltimore's School Board." *The Washington Post (1877-1922)*, Feb 25, 1.
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/143761128?accountid=15172>.
- "The Negro Invasion in Northwest Baltimore." 1907. *The Sun (1837-1991)*, Oct 24, 7.
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/537412375?accountid=15172>.
- "THE SOUTH THE NEGRO'S PLACE." 1899. *Boston Daily Globe (1872-1922)*, Jul 31, 5. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/499132247?accountid=15172>.
- "THE STATE OF MARYLAND." 1904. *Afro-American (1893-1988)*, Jan 30, 1.
<https://search.proquest.com/docview/530283947?accountid=15172>.
- Tyler, Tom R. "Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation." *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 57 (2006).
- Van der Toorn, Jojanneke, and John T. Jost. "Twenty years of system justification theory: Introduction to the special issue on "Ideology and system justification processes"." (2014): 413-419.
- Wilson, Glenn D., and John R. Patterson. "A new measure of conservatism." *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 7, no. 4 (1968): 264-269.
- Zelditch, Morris, and Henry A. Walker. "The legitimacy of regimes." In *Power and Status*, pp. 217-249. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2003.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, William. "Progressive-Era Economics and the Legacy of Jim Crow." Mises Institute. September 14, 2015. <https://mises.org/library/progressive-era-economics-and-legacy-jim-crow>.
- "Baltimore: The divided city where Freddie Gray lived and died." Al Jazeera America. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2015/4/29/baltimore-protests-race-and-poverty-freddie-gray.html>.
- Hermann, Peter, and John Woodrow Cox. "A Freddie Gray primer: Who was he, how did he die, why is there so much anger?" The Washington Post. April 28, 2015. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2015/04/28/a-freddie-gray-primer-who-was-he-how-did-he-why-is-there-so-much-anger/?utm_term=.2cb0f44e83ed.
- Leonard, Thomas C. "Retrospectives: Eugenics and Economics in the Progressive Era." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19, no. 4 (2005): 207-24. doi:10.1257/089533005775196642.
- "Maryland in the Civil War." Maryland in the Civil War. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.pdessay.info/pdfview/maryland-in-the-civil-war.html>.
- Moss, Simon. "Social dominance theory." Social dominance theory / smoss2 - Sicotests. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.sicotests.com/psyarticle.asp?id=237>.
- Pietila, Antero. *Not in my neighborhood: How bigotry shaped a great American city*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2012.
- Power, Garrett. "Apartheid Baltimore style: The residential segregation ordinances of 1910- 1913." *Md. L. Rev.* 42 (1983): 289.

Stein, Alexandra. *Mapping Residential Segregation*. Trinity College. Trinity College Digital Repository. April 26, 2011. <http://commons.trincoll.edu/>.

"The Progressive Era." The Progressive Era | Scholastic.com. Accessed April 02, 2017. <http://www.scholastic.com/browse/subarticle.jsp?id=1672>.

