A Reacting Game in Development

The Atlanta Sit-Ins

Game Book

By Robert Baker, Marni Davis, Curtis Jackson, Amani Marshall, Jared Poley, and Jeffrey Young

Table of Contents

Overview of the Game

It began, simply enough, with students in a dorm room. Four of them, in Greensboro, North Carolina. They were young, eager to change the world, and were ready to fight against Jim Crow segregation. They were not remarkable. African-American students all over the South were doing the same thing, had been doing the same thing, for some time. But something was different this time. The students decided that they had had enough of waiting around, of polite strategy, and decided to act. They went to the local Woolworth store in downtown Greensboro, and they sat down. They were told they wouldn't be served, but they stayed put. Simple enough. Within several months, thousands of sit ins were occurring everywhere.

As simple as all this sounds, it was anything but. The students who decided to act had to face their parents, their school administrators, and established civil rights leaders who had their own ideas about how to tackle the indignities of Jim Crow. They faced white businessmen and politicians. They faced the public. And they also faced each other. However united they were in wanting to destroy Jim Crow segregation, they did not always agree on tactics, or even strategy. They had to build consensus. They had to build coalitions. They had to organize and plan and execute. Changing the world, it turns out, required a lot of work.

Prologue

[still needs to be written. A second person account will open the game book. This vignette will be told from the perspective of a bright young African-American student who has been awarded a scholarship to Spelman College, had a successful first semester, and is just returning to classes after Christmas break. She is a first-generation college student and excited about living in the city. She will reflect on the recent Civil Rights struggles in Little Rock, Arkansas, and the recent Federal district court order to the Atlanta Public Schools requiring desegregation. Governor Ernest Vandiver campaigned in 1958 on a segregationist platform, so there is reason for concern. On the other hand, Mayor William B. Hartsfield has publicly reached out to the Black community and forged some ties between the Auburn Avenue elite and the all-white Chamber of Commerce. She will also talk about world affairs, including the ongoing Algerian revolt against French colonial rule and the escalation of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is a presidential election year, and while the candidates have not yet been determined, she can talk about the front-runners, including her family's traditional support for Republicans and for Richard M. Nixon. The goal of the vignette is to set the scene, and also to introduce in a general way all of the factions. Estimated 3-5 pages, and will include links to photographs of Atlanta in 1960 and a map detailing the Atlanta University Center, the Capitol, and key businesses in the region.]

Historical Background

The Constitution and the Long Civil Rights Movement

Rights do not come from the air. They come from struggle, and they are only sustained by vigilance. A good part of American history is what we might term the "long civil rights movement," a centuries-long struggle to enshrine the idea of civic equality before the law. It was no easy task. The newly independent United States inherited a legal system predicated on inequality, and especially one of racial caste. Nonetheless, the United States had been founded on the "self-evident" proposition that all men were created equal. From the very beginning, equality and inequality coexisted.

The long civil rights movement was many things, but above all else it strove to change the law. In the period between the Revolution and the Civil War (1776-1865), a biracial coalition of abolitionists sought to end slavery, repeal black laws, and win equal protection of the law. During Reconstruction (1865-1876), that same biracial coalition sought to enshrine equality in both national and state law. For the century after the collapse of Reconstruction, and the fracturing of the biracial coalition, black activists fought the reimposition of racial caste in the form of Jim Crow laws.

Understanding these legal battles requires understanding how legal regimes operated under the Constitution. In this section, we will aim to understand several key concepts. In terms of legal doctrine, we will look at federalism, private v. public power, equal protection, the state action doctrine, separate but equal, formal equality, and legal realism. We will also look at various strategies deployed by civil rights activists, including political action, direct action, civil disobedience, public persuasion, and litigation.

The Constitution

The Founders' Constitution does not mention race. One searches in vain for the word "white" or "black," or even "slave." True, there are other signifiers. Infamously, the Three-Fifths Clause refers to "other persons." The Slave Trade Clause invokes the "migration or importation of persons." But as for the document's text, it is scrubbed clean of any word that specifically invokes race.

Neither does the Constitution define civil rights. In fact, the Constitution is hardly concerned with rights. What rights the Constitution does confer are scattered throughout, and almost always couched in the negative. The right to the writ of habeas corpus, for instance, "shall not be suspended" by Congress, except in times of rebellion or invasion. There is no express right to freedom of speech in the Bill of Rights. Rather, "Congress shall make no law … abridging the freedom of speech." In the eighteenth century, rights were often conceived in this way—as "negative" rights. Negative rights meant specific and limited constraints on government's power over your body, not substantive rights to "equal treatment," "education," or anything else.

Actually, the Constitution left the question of civil rights specifically to the states. This was a key aspect of **federalism**, the division of power between the states and the federal government. Article IV, Section 2 states that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and

immunities of citizens in the several states." This was a vague constitutional command and certainly did not create any kind of national citizenship. What rights one had depended wholly on what the state was willing to give. Some states, such as Massachusetts, immediately adopted a broad view of civil rights, making bold declarations of universal equality even prior to the Constitution's adoption. Others took a more cramped view, equating race with slavery and elevating the privileges and immunities of white citizens over others.

Abolitionists and Civil Rights

Abolitionists predated the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, but the Revolutionary commitment to liberalism strengthened their resolve and their arguments. They organized voluntary societies and engaged in political action to end slavery. Black abolitionists from the start fought for civil rights. In 1777, Prince Hall of Boston presented a petition to the new state of Massachusetts. Prince Hall had been born a slave, but had reached a manumission agreement with his enslaver in 1770. He rose to prominence as a leather dresser and a caterer, and would go on to establish the African Masonic Lodge. His petition to the Massachusetts legislature to end slavery came not even a year into newly declared independence. In 1788, he petitioned for the protection of black people kidnapped into the slave trade (incidentally, the Massachusetts legislature heeded his petition and passed just such a law). In 1796, he petitioned the town of Boston on behalf of African-Americans who wanted access to the common schools.

Prince Hall was not alone. In Philadelphia, the Revolutionary war hero and wealthy businessman James Forten established himself as one of the leading political advocates for his free black community. In 1813, he protested the Pennsylvania legislature's bill to restrict black immigration into the state, and succeeded in halting the bill's progress. In Boston, the black intellectual David Walker penned an extraordinary pamphlet demanding not just an end to slavery, but an end to the racist colonization scheme that would repatriate ex-slaves back to Africa.

These examples of early activism by African Americans were not isolated, nor went unnoticed by larger political abolitionist societies. In 1833, when northern abolitionists came together to form the American Anti-Slavery Society, they made equal rights a prominent part of their political platform. "All persons of color who possess the qualification which are demanded of others," read the American Anti-Slavery Society's Declaration of Sentiments, "ought to be admitted forthwith to the enjoyment of the same privileges, and the exercise of the same prerogatives, as others; and that the paths of preferment, of wealth, and of intelligence, should be opened as widely to them as to persons of a white complexion."

This was not cheap talk. Northern abolitionists built a biracial coalition and challenged discrimination at home at the same time that they squared off with the Slave Power down south. They engaged in a massive propaganda campaign, pledging to "put slavery on trial" by publishing testimony from slavery's refugees, also known as fugitive slaves. The most famous fugitive was none other than Frederick Douglass himself, whose wildly popular narrative of his life earned him speaking engagements across the United States and Great Britain. They also kept up other forms of political action, including petitioning both their Congress and their home legislatures. They protested Black Laws (state laws that denied black people basic rights, such as

the ability to testify in court, vote, or hold office) by openly defying the law. The great transcendentalist, Henry David Thoreau, wrote an extended essay on the duty of civil disobedience in 1849. Abolitionists protested private discrimination by deliberately traveling in interracial groups and demanding accommodations at hotels and restaurants on an equal basis.

While abolitionist strategy was primarily in the political realm, they sometimes went to court to look for rights. After a decades-long fight to desegregate Boston schools, Benjamin Roberts sued the city of Boston. He lost his case in 1850, but black and white abolitionists kept fighting, ultimately convincing the legislature to desegregate the schools in 1855. In Wisconsin, abolitionists succeeded in passing a black suffrage ballot initiative in 1849, but the result was invalidated by the election board on a technicality. In 1866, the civil rights lawyer Byron Paine convinced the Wisconsin Supreme Court that black suffrage had been popularly approved back in 1849. In New York, Elizabeth Jennings was kicked off a streetcar in 1854 for no other reason than the color of her skin. She made a ruckus at the scene, and then sued the city with the help of the lawyer Chester Arthur (the future president). She won her lawsuit.

The Fourteenth Amendment

The biracial struggle for civil rights in the North became, after the Civil War, a national struggle for equality. Congress passed its first Civil Rights Act in 1866. It was, at the time, the most expansive interpretation of federal power to define and protect civil rights yet attempted. It survived a veto by President Andrew Johnson, which convinced Republicans that they needed to place the entire subject beyond the reach of future congresses or presidents to control. They introduced the Fourteenth Amendment, which was ratified in 1868.

The Fourteenth Amendment fundamentally changed the Constitution in five key ways.

1. It declared birthright American citizenship;
2. It declared that no state shall abridge “the privileges or immunities of a citizen of the United States” (thus making birthright citizenship universal);
3. It forbade the states from taking any person’s life, liberty, or property except “by due process of law”;
4. It required the states to extend the “equal protection of the law” to all people within their jurisdiction;
5. It gave Congress the power to pass “appropriate legislation” in order to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment.

Birthright citizenship and the privileges or immunities clause created the very first national citizenship. It explicitly overturned the Supreme Court’s white supremacist interpretation of citizenship in *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857). The due process and equal protection clauses enshrined legal equality not just in federal law, but in state law as well. No state could legally enforce slavery after the Thirteenth Amendment, and now the Fourteenth Amendment required that states treat all people (not just citizens, but *all people*) equally. And finally, these

principles were given real teeth by the enforcement clause. The original Constitution had extended a limited power to Congress to pass *only* those laws that were "necessary and proper" to execute its enumerated powers. The Fourteenth Amendment (and, indeed, the Thirteenth and Fifteenth Amendments) gave Congress the power to pass "appropriate" laws, thus relaxing the standard and giving Congress a broader latitude to act.

The Supreme Court and the State Action Doctrine

Congress may have taken an expansive view of its power to enforce civil rights, but the Supreme Court did not. In the Slaughterhouse Cases of 1873, the Supreme Court interpreted the privileges or immunities clause as only affirming those rights that existed under the original Constitution, essentially making the Fourteenth Amendment's privileges or immunities clause a redundancy. This effectively nullified the clause, and to this day it remains a dead letter in constitutional law.

But Congress had not hinged its civil rights legislation on the privileges or immunities clause. Civil rights laws were passed pursuant to the broad grant of "appropriate power" to enforce both the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Amendments. Congress passed Enforcement Acts in 1870, 1871, and 1872 to target the violent terrorism of the Ku Klux Klan. The laws created new federal crimes, making it illegal to, among other things, "go in disguise upon the public highways" to intimidate people from voting, holding office, or otherwise exercising their political rights. The law of 1871 gave the president authority to suspend the writ of habeas corpus, an extraordinary measure that allowed federal officers to throw Klansmen in jail without charging them. Armed with these new laws, federal officers decimated the KKK. Federal district attorneys brought hundreds of prosecutions across the South.

A number of men appealed their conviction under the Enforcement Act of 1870 all the way to the Supreme Court. In 1875, the Supreme Court issued a convoluted ruling in *United States v. Cruikshank* that freed the defendants. The Court's official reason was that the indictments were too vague, but Chief Justice Morrison Waite also cast doubt on Congress's power to target the KKK. "The Fourteenth Amendment," Waite wrote in the Opinion of the Court, "prohibits a State from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, but this adds nothing to the rights of one citizen as against another." In short, Chief Justice Waite was reading the Fourteenth Amendment's mandate narrowly. The federal government might prevent a state from denying someone due process or equal protection, but it could not prevent the KKK from doing it. The KKK was a private group of citizens. It was not clothed in state authority. Its actions were not "state action."

This was a bombshell of a legal doctrine. But the Supreme Court had not fully embraced it in *U.S. v. Cruikshank*. The Court's official reasoning for invalidating the federal indictments were that they were too vague to be considered crimes, not that the Enforcement Acts themselves were invalid. And in the same year that the Supreme Court decided *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, Congress passed its most ambitious civil rights act yet. The Civil Rights Act of 1875 desegregated hotels, inns, conveyances (coaches, ferries, railroads and the like), theaters and other houses of entertainment. Anybody denied such services on the basis of color could sue and win monetary damages in federal court. The Civil Rights Act of 1875 made no distinction between public or private property. If you were denied a ride on a streetcar owned and operated by the city

government or if you were denied entry into a private theater, and it was because of your race, you had a case you could take to federal court.

Discrimination by privately owned enterprises (like hotels, inns, and railroads) was commonplace in America, and not just in the South. It is notable that many of the cases that were filed under the Civil Rights Act of 1875 were in northern and western states. In San Francisco in 1876, a black man named George Tyler was denied entry into a theater to see the Tennessee Jubilee Singers. He sued under the Civil Rights Act, but the judge dismissed the case as having "no warrant in law." He appealed, although it took seven years for the Supreme Court to take the case, which it consolidated with others in the Civil Rights Cases of 1883.

Justice Joseph P. Bradley wrote the Opinion of the Court. He began by examining the text of the Fourteenth Amendment:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

A plain reading of the text, decided Bradley, revealed that it prohibited only the "state" from acting. "Individual invasion of individual rights," Bradley explained, "is not the subject matter of the amendment." If the Fourteenth Amendment did not authorize Congress to protect individuals from private discrimination, then Congress had no power to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1875. And so, the Supreme Court declared the law unconstitutional.

This was the first, full-throated statement of the **state action doctrine**, and that doctrine would guide constitutional law for the next century. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that the state action doctrine was not inevitable. Congress had, after all, interpreted the Fourteenth Amendment much more broadly when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1875. And Justice John Marshall Harlan wrote a spirited dissent in the Civil Rights Cases. He found the entire case to be decided upon ideas "entirely too narrow and artificial." Harlan felt that "the substance and spirit of the recent amendments of the Constitution have been sacrificed by a subtle and ingenious verbal criticism."

It is important to see the differences between Bradley's majority opinion and Harlan's dissent. Bradley interpreted the text of the Fourteenth Amendment in its narrowest possible way in order to draw a distinction between "public" and "private" action. In Bradley's analysis, only actions taken directly by the state were public, and the Fourteenth Amendment only reached those actions taken directly by the state. Harlan took issue with the public-private distinction that the Court had drawn. Any conveyance on the public highway, and any inn, or hotel, or other business that served people on that public highway was, for Harlan, a public service (or, at least, a quasi-public service). And, for Harlan, that meant that Congress could regulate them under the Fourteenth Amendment.

Separate but Equal Doctrine

But Justice Harlan wrote only for himself in the Civil Rights Cases. All of his other colleagues signed on to Chief Justice Waite's opinion. The Supreme Court had adopted a cramped view of the federal government's powers under the Fourteenth Amendment. Emboldened, former Confederates waged a violent campaign to reimpose white supremacy in the South. After 1890 they were brutally effective. Not only did they regain control of legislatures and local offices, but they systematically disenfranchised African Americans, scuttled the Republican Party, and imposed Jim Crow laws on their states to separate the races and reimpose white supremacy.

The Supreme Court encountered these cases in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). The state of Louisiana had passed a law requiring railroads to segregate their passengers by race. Homer Plessy challenged the law by informing the railroad company that he would ride on the white car. Plessy had one black grandparent, meaning he was one-eighth black, which by Louisiana law was all that was required. Plessy was arrested, and the case went to the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court held that the Louisiana law was constitutional. Segregation laws did not touch interstate commerce, the Court reasoned, because they only regulated travel within the state. As to whether the Louisiana law violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Supreme Court held that the "object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but, in the nature of things, it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality." To the argument that the separation of the races stamped people of color with inferiority, the Court reasoned that "if this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act, but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it." Thus was born the legal doctrine of "separate but equal."

Dissenting again was Justice John Marshall Harlan. The railroads, said Harlan, operated as public highways. And no one could deny that this was indeed **state action**. If all this was so, then Harlan reasoned that the spirit of the Fourteenth Amendment's abolition of the color line ought to prevail. To admit the opposite would invite great mischief, said Harlan, in a passage worthy of being quoted at length:

> If a State can prescribe, as a rule of civil conduct, that whites and blacks shall not travel as passengers in the same railroad coach, why may it not so regulate the use of the streets of its cities and towns as to compel white citizens to keep on one side of a street and black citizens to keep on the other? Why may it not, upon like grounds, punish whites and blacks who ride together in streetcars or in open vehicles on a public road or street? Why may it not require sheriffs to assign whites to one side of a courtroom and blacks to the other? And why may it not also prohibit the commingling of the two races in the galleries of legislative halls or in public assemblages convened for the consideration of the political questions of the day?

Harlan intended this line of argument to be a *reductio ad absurdum*--an exercise in drawing the logical, extreme conclusions from a proposition in order to draw attention to its weaknesses. The point of *reductio ad absurdum* is to be outrageous. It was a mark of tragedy, then, that Harlan's outrageous arguments soon became common features in the Jim Crow landscape.

The NAACP and the Litigation Strategy

Race relations deteriorated after *Plessy v. Ferguson*. In the face of mob violence, lynching, and legal discrimination, Black civil rights leaders searched for a strategy to assert their rights, and protect themselves. The NAACP (founded in 1909) engaged in many of the same strategies that their aboltionist forebears had: petitioning legislatures, publishing and propaganda. But they were hemmed in by certain realities. Direct action, such as civil disobedience was unthinkable, given the concentration of power in white America.

Litigation worked through the courts and involved potentially only one litigant, thus minimizing risk to civil rights leaders and the community at large. Black lawyers were also officers of the court, giving them some measure of protection.

Litigation could also rally communities. Charles Hamilton Houston, an honors graduate from Harvard Law School in 1923, wrote a memo for the NAACP in 1937 that stressed how the objective of litigation ought to be "to arouse and strengthen the will of local communities." Litigation was a form of active rights seeking, one in which accomplished black attorneys, such as Charles Houston and Thurgood Marshall, would articulate powerful messages of equality and dare the legal system to ignore their pleas for justice. Litigation had one other big advantage. Constitutional law must have at least the appearance of being consistent and coherent in order to have the force of authority. The Supreme Court had staked the constitutionality of Jim Crow on the idea of "formal equality." What they meant was that the law had to treat black people more or less equally with white people in order to be valid. Charles Hamilton Houston devised a litigation strategy for the NAACP that sought to expose formal equality to withering examination.

It was a bold strategy, and it paid off. Southern states had long segregated higher education, providing only the most minimal of services for people of color. Black universities typically had no graduate or professional education, unlike whites only state schools. This was a flagrant violation of "formal equality." Southern states had gotten around this by claiming they would need time to provide for such services, and in the meantime would send black graduate and professional students out of state for their education. In *Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada* (1938), the NAACP scored one of its earliest large-scale victories when the Supreme Court invalidated such programs and demanded that southern segregated states either provide such services or integrate their higher education.

Some Jim Crow states did their best to keep higher education segregated. The state of Texas established a black law school to try and satisfy "formal equality" requirements. But the law school they established was obviously inferior. Its library was smaller, it had fewer instructors, and fewer opportunities for students. In *Sweatt v. Painter* (1950), the Supreme Court ruled that this did not satisfy the "formal equality" requirements of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The same year, the Supreme Court declared in *McLaurin v. Oklahoma* that segregated facilities inside of universities also violated the doctrine of formal equality.

While the Supreme Court had not overruled *Plessy v. Ferguson* in these higher education cases, they had made two quite powerful innovations. The first was that they began to require more of "formal equality." The second was that they began to look behind the formal law to the

realities beneath it. One might say that having two separate law schools met the formal requirement of separate but equal. It was another thing entirely to require that the instruction, library, and student opportunities also should be equal. The formal equality doctrine was becoming more "realist" in its conception.

The NAACP's litigation strategy extended to forms of private discrimination as well. The Supreme Court invalidated segregation in interstate commerce in a series of cases in the 1940s, culminating with *Henderson v. United States* (1950). *Henderson* was significant because it touched private companies rather than any state actor. It did so because Congress's Interstate Commerce Act forbade any company transporting people across state lines from subjecting "any particular person . . . to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage." Congress's power to regulate interstate commerce flowed from the Commerce Clause, and the Supreme Court was now interpreting federal law much more expansively than it had back in the Civil Rights Cases of 1883.

A second kind of private discrimination involved property law. In *Shelley v. Kraemer* (1948), the Supreme Court declared that racially restrictive covenants could not be enforced by courts. Restrictive covenants were a common feature of property law. On private home lots in cities, they might regulate how high you could build your house, what color you might paint it, and even what kind of plants you could put in the front yard. Many lots also had restrictive covenants that prevented homeowners (current and future) from selling homes to people of color. Racially restrictive covenants kept people of color out of certain neighborhoods, particularly in northern cities. The courts had enforced racially restrictive covenants on the grounds that they were private, not public, forms of discrimination. Put another way, because the state had not passed a law, it had not acted, and thus racially restrictive covenants were entirely legal. In *Shelley v. Kraemer* (1948), the Supreme Court declared that the courts were state actors, and their enforcement of racially restrictive covenants was state action.

By the time of the famous *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Supreme Court had all but destroyed the *Plessy* doctrine of "separate but equal," largely thanks to the persistent advocacy of the NAACP's litigation strategy. In *Brown*, the Supreme Court took the final step of overruling the *Plessy* doctrine without specifically naming it. In its unanimous opinion, the Supreme Court declared that separate was inherently unequal. Segregation had lost its last, legal edifice.

Segregationists did not go quietly. The first protest to Brown came in the form of the *Southern Manifesto*, a document decrying the Supreme Court's opinion and claiming a fervent states' rights position. It was signed by 101 U.S. Senators and Representatives, all from the southern states that had once comprised the Confederacy. The *Southern Manifesto* stood on the old ground of federalism, claiming that education was always a subject that had fallen to the states to determine, and that the Supreme Court had usurped the states' right to govern education. The Manifesto urged southern whites to use all lawful means to repudiate the Supreme Court's new doctrine of equality. Segregationists organized "massive resistance" to desegregation, rallying huge crowds, mobbing desegregation efforts, and violently attacking civil rights workers.

Southern states also passed laws and amended their state constitutions to require segregation. In Little Rock, Arkansas, Governor Orval Faubus defied a federal court order requiring

integration of the local high school. The case went to the Supreme Court in 1958 as *Cooper v. Aaron*. In a per curiam decision, the Supreme Court insisted that *Brown v. Board* was the law of the land, and that no state legislature, officer, or governor could resist it.

Civil Rights and Constitutional Law in 1960

Cooper v. Aaron was not the end of Jim Crow, but it was the end of Jim Crow's constitutional pretentions. The legal doctrines that the Supreme Court of the 1880s and 90s had used to limit the reach of the Fourteenth Amendment had been transformed. In the 1890s, the doctrine of "state action" had meant direct and explicit discriminatory action by the state. By 1960, the Supreme Court broadly interpreted the actions of state police officers, courts, and even judges as a kind of state action. In the 1890s, the legal doctrine of "formal equality" meant that the law only had to state on its face that it was equally applied to pass constitutional muster. This allowed for the *Plessy* doctrine of "separate but equal" to be the law of the land. By 1960, the Supreme Court had gone beyond the form of the law to look at the reality underneath. Inequality in practice could be enough to invalidate segregation. And by the time of *Brown v. Board of Education*, the whole doctrine of "separate but equal" had been changed into "separate is inherently unequal."

Private discrimination was still an open question. The Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection and due process was laded with the phrase "no state shall," thus making it hard to argue that it forbade private discrimination. The Supreme Court had made at least two important inroads on private discrimination. One was through the Interstate Commerce Clause. Private companies that provided transportation in interstate commerce had to provide real equality in services to their customers (Henderson v. United States). Another was in property law. Courts could not enforce racially restrictive covenants (Shelley v. Kraemer). But it was doubtful that the courts, even the Supreme Court, would extend these doctrines any further than they already had. Nor had the NAACP's litigation strategy of the early twentieth century extended to private discrimination. It had always focused on state policy in education, transportation, and legal protection.

Direct Action Protest

Upon accepting the Nobel Peace Prize in December 1964, Dr. King began his speech by acknowledging the sacrifices of millions of ordinary citizens, whom he called "the real heroes of the freedom struggle."

> I experience this high and joyous moment not for myself alone but for those devotees of nonviolence who have moved so courageously against the ramparts of racial injustice and who in the process have acquired a new estimate of their own human worth. Many of them are young and cultured. Others are middle aged and middle class. The majority are poor and untutored. But they are all united in the quiet conviction that it is better to suffer in dignity than to accept segregation in humiliation. These are the real heroes of the freedom struggle: they are the noble people for whom I accept the Nobel Peace Prize.

The student leaders of the sit-in movement, whom King acknowledged as the "young and cultured," were grassroots activists in the long civil rights movement to secure constitutional rights denied to African Americans since the end of Reconstruction. They used tactics developed by activists in earlier eras to challenge racial, economic and gender injustice.

In 1892, journalist Ida B. Wells used her *Free Speech* newspaper to launch an anti-lynching campaign following the lynching of her close friend, Thomas Moss and his business partners, Henry Stewart and Calvin McDowell in Memphis, Tennessee. After writing a scathing editorial condemning the lynch mob, Wells moved to New York and eventually to Chicago, where she used the black press to investigate and publicize lynchings. She encouraged African Americans to migrate out of the South and employ economic boycotts, along with armed self-defense, in order to challenge racial violence.

[Add paragraph re: Washington & DuBois: economic development vs. political agitation]

In the 1930s, Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. gained prominence as a political activist and pastor of Abyssinian Baptist Church in Harlem. He later served for 25 years in Congress, where he earned the moniker "Mr. Civil Rights," because he added an anti-discrimination clause to so many pieces of legislation that it became known as the Powell Amendment. His amendment became part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which denied federal funding to any programs that discriminated on the basis of race, color or national origin. During the Depression, Powell led "Don't Buy Where You Can't Work" campaigns, boycotting and picketing utility companies, department stores, bus lines and hospitals that refused to hire African Americans. Their goal was not simply to secure more jobs for African Americans, but also to raise awareness about the collective buying power of the black community. Harlem housewives consolidated their economic power through directed spending campaigns that secured an estimated 10,000 jobs for African Americans and inspired Fannie B. Peck to organize the Housewives League of Detroit.

Galvanizing the spending power of black women, the organization grew into the National Housewives' League of America with chapters in 25 cities. The Housewives' League affiliated with the National Negro Business League, founded by Booker T. Washington in 1900 to promote African American financial development. The Housewives' League patronized black-owned businesses and those establishments that employed African Americans in various positions according to their abilities. Additionally, members conducted research to measure the success of their directed-spending campaigns and focused on financial literacy and consumer education. Their campaigns secured an estimated 75,000 new jobs for African Americans in the 1930s.

By 1940, military spending during World War II began lifting the U.S. out of the Great Depression. While President Roosevelt declared the U.S. was fighting to preserve the Four Freedoms abroad, the military enlisted African Americans but relegated them to service duties in segregated units, where they faced discrimination and humiliation. Additionally, African American civilians were largely barred from employment within the expanding defense industries. In early 1941, labor union activist A. Philip Randolph called for 50,000 African Americans to march on Washington, under the slogan "We loyal Negro American citizens demand the right to work and fight for our country." Demanding to be free from want, free

from fear and free from Jim Crow, the campaign highlighted the hypocrisy of FDR's Four Freedoms. To prevent the negative publicity of the march, Roosevelt passed Executive Order 8802, which banned discriminatory hiring in the defense industries and opened new economic opportunities to 100,000s of African Americans during the war. The following year, the *Pittsburg Courier* launched a Double V Campaign, calling on African Americans to fight for victory over fascism abroad and victory over racism at home. African American veterans returned home with a broader view of the world and a transformed sense of what was possible in America. Heroism abroad and activism at home laid the foundation for the civil rights movement.

In the decade prior to the Montgomery bus boycott, a series of highly publicized sexual assaults encouraged African American women to mobilize campaigns for racial justice. On September 3, 1944, six armed white men kidnapped and raped 24-year-old Recy Taylor. After surviving the brutal attack, Taylor bravely resisted by telling her story to her family and the local sheriff. The Montgomery NAACP sent its best investigator, Rosa Parks, to document Taylor's testimony so that the organization could seek justice on behalf of Taylor and countless other black women whose sexual assaults had gone unreported. From Montgomery to Harlem, Chicago and Washington, D.C., a coalition of civil rights organizations, women's groups, labor activists, and leftist youth formed the Committee for Equal Justice for Mrs. Recy Taylor. Within months they had chapters in 16 states and a board of distinguished activists including W.E.B. DuBois and Mary Church Terrell. Members fundraised, held mass meetings, and coordinated letter writing and national media campaigns to raise publicity for the case and force a trial. The Chicago Defender called it "the strongest campaign for racial justice for Negroes to be seen in a decade." Despite the strength of the committee's activism, a grand jury failed to indict the assailants and Taylor did not receive justice. The fight for justice is long, however, and the campaign inspired African American women activists in Montgomery to form the Women's Political Council in 1949 to increase the political power of the black community. Days after the Supreme Court struck down "separate but equal" in *Brown v. Board*, JoAnn Robinson, the president of the Women's Political Council wrote a letter to the mayor of Montgomery, Gayle, threatening a boycott of the city buses if African American patrons were not treated fairly. Although several women and girls were subsequently arrested for refusing to give up their seats to white passengers, Robinson and the Women's Political Council chose to wait for a member of the community who would be seen as respectable by the broader community. A year and a half later, when Rosa Parks was arrested in December 1955, Robinson put the plan into action, calling on African American residents to stay off the buses in protest of Parks's arrest.

Three months before Parks refused to give up her seat on the bus in Montgomery, white men in Money, Mississippi brutally murdered fourteen-year-old Emmet Till for allegedly flirting with a white woman in a store. The boy's body was found three days later, beaten beyond recognition and decomposing in the Tallahachie River. His uncle, Mose Wright, was able to identify the body only by a ring bearing his father's initials. Till's mother, Mamie Till Bradley, invited *Jet Magazine* to publish photographs of her son's open casket funeral because she "wanted the whole world to see what they did to my boy." She demanded justice for her son, speaking publically, writing President Eisenhower, and demanding a trial. A jury of 12 white men would

acquit Till's murderers, Roy Bryant and J. W. Milam, who later confessed the crime in a story they sold to *Look Magazine*. The haunting images of Till's mutilated body and the denial of justice would galvanize an entire generation of young African Americans to fight for racial justice.

A few months after the Emmett Till case, on December 1, 1955 Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on the bus to a white man, sparking the Montgomery bus boycott. The following day, the Women's Political Council distributed 30,000 fliers calling for a bus boycott to black-owned businesses and schools. Fifty thousand black residents of Montgomery stayed off the buses the following Monday, in protest of Parks's arrest. That evening they gathered at Holt Street Baptist Church and organized the Montgomery Improvement Association to coordinate boycott and selected 26-year-old Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as president. The MIA sustained the boycott for 381 days, organizing a carpool of 200 vehicles and leading fundraisers to raise money for the drivers. The boycott cut 65% of the bus company's revenue but the city government refused to settle. The MIA filed a lawsuit, arguing that segregated seating on the buses violated their 14th Amendment rights to equal protection. The Supreme Court ordered the buses to be desegregated in December 1956 and the bus company agreed to end segregation, hire African American drivers and respect all passengers.

Atlanta

On March 9, 1960, African-American students at the Atlanta University Center published "An Appeal for Human Rights." This proclamation, which appeared in every daily newspaper in the city, demanded the total and immediate end of racial segregation and discrimination in Georgia. Most of the state's white elected officials ignored or dismissed the document, or responded to it with hostility. But Atlanta's mayor, William B. Hartsfield, cautiously praised its young authors. Noting the violence surrounding civil rights protests in other southern cities, he also praised his own, declaring Atlanta to be the kind of city "that proudly proclaims to the world that it is too busy making progress to tear itself apart in bitter hatreds, recriminations, or any destructive violence." (1:08-1:22) By the time Hartsfield left office in 1962, he had compressed his statement into a catchy slogan: Atlanta was "a city too busy to hate."

Squeezed into this catchphrase are two concepts that have been central to the city's image since Reconstruction. The first, often referred to as "the Atlanta Spirit," is economic: Atlanta is focused on commercial expansion above all other things, and the growth of its business sector is of benefit to all. The second, known as "the Atlanta Way," is political and moral: in Atlanta, according to this idea, racial moderates run the show, and black and white leaders work together to ensure opportunity and upward mobility for all. These two axioms entwined around each other for more than a century, creating opportunities for self-congratulation by Atlanta's civic boosters – though often proving hollow upon closer examination, as slogans usually do. In order to understand Atlanta's history, it's important to know how "the Atlanta Spirit" and "the Atlanta Way" have shaped the city.

Atlanta's history reaches back to the 1830s. After the forced removal of Native American tribes from the southeast, the discovery of gold in the north Georgia mountains, and an influx of

white settlement, state legislators sponsored a railroad route connecting Savannah's ports to inland markets. A stake marking the planned end of the railroad line was planted in 1837. That stake was known as "Terminus," as was the settlement of homes, stores, and saloons that grew around it. After a brief stint as Marthasville, in honor of the daughter of Georgia's governor, it was incorporated as a town in 1847 and renamed Atlanta. It quickly became a regional shipping and transportation hub; during the Civil War, Atlanta was so crucial to Confederate military strategy that Union general William T. Sherman decided to destroy it. In 1864, the Union army commenced its "March to the Sea" by burning Atlanta nearly to the ground and wrecking its railroad lines.

But the railroads were the reason for Atlanta's existence, and they would not remain wrecked for long. By 1868, when Atlanta was made the state capitol, five rail lines passed through the city, moving hundreds of trainloads of goods and people around the region every week. Within a few decades, Atlanta was known as "the Gate City of the New South" – according to Atlanta *Constitution* editor Henry Grady, the best place in the South for northern companies to invest their capital and establish their regional branch offices. The "Atlanta Spirit" had become the city's governing philosophy, and Atlanta's seemingly unstoppable growth seemed to confirm its inherent wisdom.

Atlanta's population had grown, too, from 22,000 in 1870 to almost 90,000 in 1900. At the turn of the century, the city's African-American residents comprised around 40% of the total. Drawn to the city by economic and educational opportunities, yet handicapped by racial segregation and bigotry, black Atlantans established neighborhoods, institutions, and business communities of their own. Their neighborhoods were often relegated to low-lying, flood-prone areas, and their institutions only received a fraction of the funding received by similar white institutions. Even so, Atlanta University, founded in 1865, was by 1900 one of several prestigious schools in the city dedicated to the education of young black men and women; it also became a national center for scholarship on race and "Negro" social conditions in the United States, after historian and sociologist W.E.B. DuBois was hired as a member of the university faculty.

Compared to most other southern cities, Atlanta's black middle class was fairly large, composed primarily of entrepreneurs, educators, civil servants, and communal leaders. Some middle-class African Americans had faith in the "Atlanta Spirit," too. Their position was most famously articulated by Booker T. Washington, when he came to Atlanta in 1895 to deliver an address at the city's Cotton Exposition. Now known as the "Atlanta Compromise" speech, Washington argued that blacks should strive for economic success and upward mobility, rather than political or social equality. DuBois vehemently disagreed, writing that African Americans could not fight white supremacy by accommodating to it. This debate created an ideological rift in Atlanta's black community, where Washingtonian proponents of vocational education and entrepreneurial self-reliance clashed DuBois and his allies in the Niagara Movement, who advocated a political and legal fight for black civil rights.

But distinctions between these ideological positions seemed to disintegrate in the face of an especially terrible incident of anti-black violence. This violence did not come from nowhere; white animosity against the local black population had been simmering for decades, as working-class whites found themselves competing with blacks for jobs and public space, increasingly

anxious about their status in the city's social and economic hierarchy as the local black middle class grew. Throughout the summer of 1906, local newspapers published multiple stories every week – sometimes every day – alleging an epidemic of sexual assaults against white women by black men. Meanwhile, the candidates for that year's gubernatorial election argued for increased racial segregation and for black disenfranchisement. On September 22, a mob of several thousand white men swarmed into a section of downtown known as a black business district, smashing windows and assaulting black people. The Atlanta Race Riot, as it has come to be known, lasted for three days; city officials claimed that ten African Americans had been killed, but scholars estimate that the real count was higher, perhaps as high as forty.

The riot shaped Atlanta in several ways. Jim Crow laws enacted in the years following the riot further segregated the city by race, and put greater constrictions on black social and economic mobility and political agency. Hoke Smith, the winner of that year's election for governor, ushered through the state legislature and signed into law the removal of blacks from Georgia's voter rolls. Black businesses abandoned mixed-race commercial and residential districts, increasingly clustering in black neighborhoods like Sweet Auburn. At the same time, the riot occasioned a cooperative effort between black and white leaders, who feared continued racial violence and its impact on the city's national (and international) reputation. This interracial cooperation between black leadership, the white business elite, and municipal officials (who were almost all white until the late twentieth century), which came to be known as "the Atlanta Way," was of little benefit to the majority of black residents and institutions. Until the 1950s, it was far more frequently brandished by white leaders as proof of the city's progressive approach to race relations.

Claims of racial moderation might have been undermined by the nearby lynching of Leo Frank, a Jewish factory manager, in 1915, or the revival of the Ku Klux Klan on Stone Mountain, about thirteen miles east of downtown Atlanta, a few months later. Historians estimate that by the early 1920s, the Klan could boast 15,000 local members, and Atlanta had been designated the Imperial City of the white supremacist organization. Nevertheless, throughout the 1920s, Atlanta continued to rise as one of the region's economic stars. Adding to its railway infrastructure, the city began to build what would become an extensive network of roads and highways, and so was favorably situated as the automobile and shipping truck became preferred modes of transportation for people and goods. With the expansion of roads and car ownership came the proliferation of suburban developments. In most of these suburbs, homeownership was restricted to whites, and some to white Protestants; but African-American real estate developers established black suburbs, too, on the city's west side.

The Game

Major Issues for Debate

The central focus of the game is to create a plan that will bring down Jim Crow segregation. But this is complicated, with many factors to consider. Activist students have to articulate a plan

that will win consensus in the community. Atlanta's civil rights leaders have their own ideas about the purpose (and boundaries) of protest.

The major issues may stay the same from game session to game session, but the historical circumstances will shift as the game develops. Arguments may shift!

Public or Private?

A big issue is whether protests should focus on public services. This was the lynchpin of the NAACP's litigation strategy, and it was shaped by the Supreme Court's state action doctrine. The Greensboro Four sat down at a private lunch counter. Business owners are not "state actors," they are private citizens. But what about a private citizen who runs a lunch counter in the municipal courthouse? In other words, somebody who holds a lease that is granted from a state actor?

More importantly, does it matter? Is segregation any less harmful because it is conducted by private citizens? Or should people be allowed to choose who are their customers?

Membership

Is this a student movement? Is this a youth movement? Should adults and students lock arms and protest together? What about sympathetic northerners who want to help out—should they be a part of this movement as well? There may be good reasons for limiting the movement, not the least of which might be to protect people who are vulnerable to retaliation by pro-segregation forces.

Deciding who gets to be a part of the movement is only half of the battle. You also have to build support. If you define a movement narrowly, you might not have enough people to show up to protest.

Tactics

There are a multitude of tactics to choose from. Will you sit quietly? What will you do when the police arrive? Do you resist arrest, or do you go peacefully? Do you arrange for bail to be paid, or do you refuse bail? Deciding on tactics requires some forethought!

Public Relations

The press is America's Fourth Estate, and it helps shape public opinion. Access to it is difficult, so you will have to decide how to communicate your plans. Do you establish your own newspaper? Who funds it? Do you befriend members of the press? Do you trust the press? What message do you put together?

Game Sessions

The game is divided into "sessions." The Game Master will publish the date and time where one session ends and the next session begins. There will be one formally scheduled "public meeting" during each session. Some game actions occur during the public meeting, some actions occur outside of the public meeting (more on that later).

At the end of the game session, the Game Master will enter all of the players' and factions' actions into the historical generator which will produce results from the players' actions. The results will be announced, and a new game session begins. The Game Master will also indicate the length of time that has transpired. The cycle then repeats itself for as many sessions as the Game Master has indicated you will play. Most games feature at least three sessions.

Rules and Procedures for Public Meetings

If a game session is a "public meeting," then there are a set of formal rules that will apply in all cases.

The Chairman

Each meeting has a formal session, and each session has a chairman. The chair has certain powers that they can exercise during the meeting.

1. The chair will bang the gavel to start the meeting.
2. The chair speaks first.
3. The chair determines when and how the vote will be taken.
    a. Best practice is to announce the time in which the vote will be taken (e.g.: "we will hold a vote at 10:45 a.m. We can hear from speakers until that time) at the beginning of the game session. The vote must be taken before the end of the class period and with enough time to count the votes.
    b. The chair can decide whether a vote will be by acclamation (each student raising their hands) or by turning in sheets of paper.
4. The chair can call on people to speak. No one can speak without the chair's permission. However, the chair cannot prevent anyone from speaking and should keep a list of the order in which speakers would like to be recognized.
    a. Best practice: The chair should make sure to prioritize anyone who has not spoken during debate, so that everyone gets a chance to speak once before anyone speaks twice.
    b. Best practice: keep a list of speakers!
5. The chair may discipline disruptive members. If a member is speaking out of order or disrupting someone else's speech, the chair can intervene and ask the disruptive member to come to order. If the disruptive behavior persists, the chair can expel the member.
    a. If a member is expelled, then they must go sit in the part of the room designated for "outsiders" which may include the press, parents, or other people not entitled to speak at the meeting. Expelled members are not allowed to speak or to vote at the end of the class. They can return for the next meeting, however.
6. The chair may put the meeting in recess in order to allow factions to confer with each other in private. If the chair puts the meeting in recess, the chair must say how long the recess will be, and then promptly call the meeting back together at the appropriate time.

Meeting Etiquette

Each of the formal game sessions is a public meeting, and is conducted loosely according to Robert's Rules of Order. The following are the "rules" that govern the meeting. Make sure to check your role sheet for specific instructions about what to present at game sessions.

1. You must have "the floor" to speak. Practically, this means that the chair must recognize you to speak. You are not allowed to speak unless the chair recognizes you.
2. You should be attentive to all speakers while they are speaking. Some speakers may encourage the crowd to respond during a speech, and it is appropriate to respond during speeches in such cases.
3. If you disrupt the proceedings, the chair may order to be silent, and may expel you from the meeting. If a member is expelled, then they must go sit in the part of the room designated for "outsiders" which may include the press, parents, or other people not entitled to speak at the meeting. Expelled members are not allowed to speak or to vote at the conclusion of the meeting. They can return for the next meeting, however.
4. At any time, you can request a recess to have faction discussions.

Recess

Any member of a meeting may request a recess. The recess just allows you to huddle in private with other members of your faction, or members of another faction, in case you need to revise your plans or propose a compromise plan. The chair may choose to grant a recess, or refuse to grant a recess, entirely at their discretion.

Formal Voting

By the end of the meeting, a vote has to be taken on the final proposal. The chair will determine how the vote is to be taken.

Each player in the game "controls" 100 students. When a player votes, they can indicate the measure of support they are giving by dividing up their vote. (e.g.: "I commit 60 students to this proposal," or "I commit 20 students to this proposal."

Some players in the game do not control students, but have other factors that impact the results. A. T. Walden, for instance, is well connected in the mayor's office. C. A. Scott has connections to the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. Whoever is chairing the meeting will have to keep a tally of total student support and record how those individuals vote. It will be up to those individuals to indicate their name and how they are voting.

Multiple Proposals in a Public Meeting

It is possible that multiple proposals will be presented at the meetings. This can be confusing! The chair will be responsible for keeping order and making sure that everybody knows what is happening. If there are multiple formal proposals, there are several possible outcomes.

1. **Vote on the first proposal only**. The first proposal will always take precedence, and the chair can insist on having a vote on the first proposal and then declare the meeting over without taking a vote on the second or third proposal.
2. **Amend the first proposal**. The sponsor of the first proposal may choose to amend that proposal, in order to incorporate elements of subsequent proposals. Such amendments may result in subsequent proposals being withdrawn.
3. **Straw vote**. The chair could ask for an informal "straw vote" (a show of hands) to choose between proposals. The winner of the straw vote would then advance for a formal vote. (n.b., if there are more than two proposals before the body, the chair may determine which two proposals are being considered for a straw vote.)

If a Public Meeting ends without a Proposal…

It is possible that a public meeting ends without a formal proposal. This could happen if none of the students take initiative, or a chair bungles the meeting rules and no vote is taken. If this happens, it happens! Remember, proposals for protests can be submitted outside of public meetings as well.

Rules and Procedures outside of Public Meetings

The game doesn't stop when the public meeting is over. Some characters have special powers that they can exercise in between public meetings. Players may also need to take other actions, such as submitting articles for publication or distributing handbills, in connection with their protest plan. And any player can contact other players and hold their own, unofficial meetings at any time. They might decide to submit their own plan for protest!

Submission of a Plan outside of a Public Meeting

If you have an alternative plan for a protest, you must contact the Game Master with that plan. The plan must be substantially different from the plan that was adopted at the Public Meeting (if one was indeed adopted). You must clearly indicate which characters in the game support your plan. The game master will give you specific instructions on how to submit the plan (email, dropbox, assignment folder; whatever it may be!)

Support for Plans outside of a Public Meeting

Inside the Public Meetings, each game player "controls" 100 students. Outside the Public Meeting, however, each game player "controls" 10 students. Players who commit to plans outside of public meetings may indicate how many of their 10 students commit.

A game player may only commit to one plan during a game session. If the player commits to more than one plan, then their support will be withdrawn from both, and they will lose the game. However, a player may switch their support. If the player wishes to switch his or her support from one plan to another, they must make a formal, public announcement. Then they have to inform the Game Master that they are switching their support.

Character Special Powers

Some characters have special powers that they exercise outside of public meetings. Very few players have special powers, so don't be surprised if your character has one. If you do have a special power, you may want to guard it. Others may pressure you to use it if they know that you have it. They can't ask if they don't know…

So, you've just participated in a sit in. What happens now?

At the end of a game session, the Game Master will announce the results of the sit in protests and all character actions from that session. Here are a couple of things to keep in mind.

First, you may be surprised by the size of the sit ins. The number of students who participate might go up or down based on external factors. To take an example, 600 students may have pledged their support during the public meeting. But a lack of planning and communication on the part of the protest leaders might dull turnout when the appointed time arrives, and only 300 students turn up.

Second, some things may happen because game characters act behind the scenes. *You* may not know all of the character actions that took place, because some of them might have been in private. To take an example—if one of the game results is that Mayor Hartsfield voices support for the protest, it might be because a character in the game has the power to call the mayor's office and ask for support, and used that power. (Maybe. Or maybe it happened because the mayor felt like taking a stand. Not every game result will be because of character actions.)

The results of the sit ins will also include several possible results for players.

You're in Jail

Sit ins are largely predicated on breaking the law. You may be arrested, and that puts you in jail. Do you have a lawyer? Do you have money for bail? If not, you may find yourself staying in jail and missing your midterm exams.

In game terms, three things can happen if you are arrested:

1. You are charged with criminal trespass.
    a. If you have **legal help** (from A. T. Walden or Donald Lee Hollowell), then you will be out on bail during the next game session, with a criminal case pending.
    b. If you don't have legal help, or if you **refuse bail**, then you will be **convicted**. You will return for the next game session, but with a criminal trespass conviction on your record. (Check your role sheet for other consequences!)
2. You are charged with assault and battery.
    a. If you have **legal help**, then you will be out on bail during the next game session, with a criminal case pending.
    b. If you don't have legal help, or if you **refuse bail**, then you will be in jail during the next game session. You have to sit in the "outside" section during the public meeting, and you cannot participate. You can communicate with your peers, however, outside the public meeting. and work from jail.

Check your role sheet for the consequences you face if you are arrested and jailed. They differ based on the character.

You're Hurt, or even Killed

Sit ins inflame the passions. It is always possible that your protest was met by counter-protestors who came armed and attacked you. There is the possibility that your character was hurt or killed in such a confrontation. It is also possible that the police beat you and then arrested you, which means that you are hurt *and* you are in jail.

Check your role sheet for the consequences you face if you are hurt, or killed. They differ based on the character.

You force desegregation

It is also possible that your protest will have an immediate impact on Atlanta. Maybe a business owner promises to desegregate, or desegregates on the spot. Or maybe the city agrees to desegregate.

Objectives and Victory Conditions

Student Activists, members of the Committee on the Appeal for Human Rights (COAHR)

Student activists want to end segregation. But they have different ideas about how this will be accomplished. If the students can force desegregation by the end of the game sessions, they automatically win. If they can at least force partial desegregation, then they may win. If their tactics result in mixed results, or occasion violence, or otherwise slow down Atlanta's progress in race relations, then they may win or lose depending on their character.

Student Indeterminates

Student indeterminates want to end segregation. Some of them lean towards direct action, others do not. Many have responsibilities outside of affecting great social change that might take up more of their time and be more of a priority. Still, if they can force desegregation by the end of the game sessions, they automatically win. If they can at least force partial desegregation, then they may win. Specific results from sit ins may impact their ability to win, especially being arrested, jailed, or hurt.

Atlanta's Civil Rights Leaders, members of the Student-Adult Liaison Committee (SALC)

Atlanta has an established civil rights community. These are lawyers, journalists, businessmen, educators, and preachers. They also want to end segregation. Indeed, they have been fighting their whole lives against segregation. If they can force desegregation by the end of the game sessions, they automatically win. But they have irons in the fire, so to speak. They are currently negotiating with city leaders to end segregation in the schools peacefully. They have integrated the Atlanta police force, and won some hard fought battles to increase public housing and increase public services for African Americans in Atlanta. The sit ins might threaten future plans or past gains.

Basic Outline of the Game

Setup sessions.

During setup sessions, you will read the game book. The game master will assign you a role. You will receive a character sheet, and begin preparing. You will have an opportunity to meet other members of your faction, and you can begin preparing for the game sessions. This is a perfect opportunity to make sure that you understand all of the background. Knowledge is power! The better prepared you are, the better you will do in the game.

The last setup session usually includes a social mixer where all the characters introduce themselves and say a little bit about who they are. Your game master will give you the guidelines, but the major idea is for you to have a chance to get to know people not just in your own faction, but other players as well. Networking is key to success in this game! Get to know people.

Session 1.

Game session 1 begins immediately after the Committee on the Appeal for Human Rights (COAHR) published the Appeal for Human Rights, in **March 1960**. The members of the committee had wanted to begin sit ins right away, but the college presidents of the Atlanta University Center pleaded with the students to at least publish their complaints so that civic and business leaders would have an opportunity to respond.

Elder members of the Atlanta civil rights community (SALC) have called a public meeting and have asked the students to come. A. T. Walden, Atlanta's very first civil rights lawyer, will chair the meeting.

Session 2

If session 1 ended with a plan (or plans) for protests, then the results of those protests will be announced, and session 2 begins. If no protests occurred, then news from around the country will be announced, and session 2 begins. Session 2 takes place in **September, 1960**, after classes have resumed at the Atlanta University Center.

This public meeting has been called by Lonnie King, and Lonnie King will chair the meeting. All parties, including members of SALC, will be attending.

Session 3

If session 2 ended with a plan (or plans) for protests, then the results of those protests will be announced, and session 3 begins. If no protests occurred, then news from around the country will be announced, and session 2 begins. Session 3 takes place in **September, 1961**, after classes have resumed at the Atlanta University Center.

This public meeting has been called jointly by Lonnie King and Benjamin Mays, and Benjamin Mays will chair the meeting.

Debriefing

After session 3 ends, the results from any protests will be announced. Then, students and teacher will engage in a debriefing. In the debriefing, students will discuss what happened and why. Students may reveal special powers that their characters had, or actions that they took behind the scenes. The teacher will lay out the history of the Atlanta Sit In movement, and the class can discuss how and why things unfolded differently in the game.

Assignments

Tip: check your role sheet for specific assignments!

Tip: your instructor might change the parameters of written and spoken assignments for your game. Make sure that you confirm the specifics.

There will be two formal, written assignments that you must hand in during the game. At the same time, game play may require other work.

Assignment 1: Speech

All members of the COAHR and SALC factions must give one **2-3 minute speech** during one of the public meetings. The role sheet may specify *when* you are to give a speech, but you may elect to change this, if your faction agrees.

Ordinarily, these speeches will be accompanied by a **1000-1500 word essay** on the same topic. The essay should reference at least three of the core texts.

Most indeterminate students will also have to give one speech. Some, however, may have alternative assignments.

Alternative Assignment 1

Some indeterminate students might have an alternative written assignment, specified in their role sheet. This might be writing an opinion piece and submitting it for publication in a major newspaper, or starting your own student newspaper and soliciting written pieces for it. Check your role sheet!

Assignment 2: Reflective Essay

At the conclusion of the game, everyone must write a reflective essay of **1000-1200 words**. The reflective essay is a first-person piece, written in character. You will reflect on what happened in the game, and why, and what your character would think about it. You should bring your reflective essay to the debriefing sessions.

Core Texts

Players should read all core texts before the game starts.