



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

JILL OGLINE TITUS

LIVING ON THE FRONTLINES: BLACK TEENAGERS ON THE MOVE TO FREEDOM

This article analyzes a set of fifty-five interviews conducted with black teenagers during the summer of 1963 in Prince Edward County, Virginia: site of the nation's most determined attempt to circumvent the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education* through abandoning public education altogether. Caught up in currents larger than themselves, the teenagers' thoughts on subjects such as the term "black," the effectiveness of nonviolence, and the actions and motivations of white people offer a rare window into the minds of youth defining their own personhood against the backdrop of a rapidly changing world. Historians know relatively little about civil rights figures like the Prince Edward children, who were simultaneously protesters and victims. Many were thoroughly politicized by their experience, becoming either active resisters or thoughtful commentators on American race relations, while others remained unwitting participants in Prince Edward's civil rights drama.

In the summer of 1963, fifty-seven black adolescents in Prince Edward County, Virginia—many of whom rarely, if ever, shared their innermost thoughts with adults—sat down with an interviewer to talk about living on the frontlines of a civil rights struggle. Robbed of four years of education by local white segregationists determined to "massively resist" court-ordered integration of the schools by abolishing public education altogether, the Prince Edward teenagers bore the brunt of the nation's most insidious attempt to circumvent *Brown v. Board of Education* through bureaucratic means. They stood at the heart of a national drama of desegregation, born into a society rapidly transforming into a new social order yet still rigidly defined by the dictates of the past. Although originally charged only with gathering information on youths' attitudes toward returning to the classroom, interviewer Ruth Turner seized the opportunity to ask the kinds of broader questions that illuminate the concerns and convictions of rural, southern African American adolescents in the heyday of the mainstream civil rights movement. Caught up in currents larger than themselves, the teenagers' thoughts on subjects such as the term "black," the effectiveness of nonviolence, and the actions and motivations of white people

offer a rare window into the minds of youth defining their own personhood against the backdrop of a rapidly changing world.

Some spoke haltingly and awkwardly, in the interviewer's opinion, others rapidly and extensively, as though compelled to give verbal expression to ideas weighing heavily upon their minds. Many articulated a complicated attitude toward the South, balancing familial ties to the region and a sense of responsibility to the southern freedom struggle against an expanding desire to shed the chains of Jim Crow and see the world. Intimately acquainted with economic hardship, they described their low-level jobs as keeping their families "from no food at all" but simultaneously expressed their determination to someday return to school. When asked their greatest ambition, many answered, "Be President, so I could open up the schools." Despite these weighty concerns, interviewees also offered opinions on hairstyles, discussed members of the opposite sex, and expressed frustration with their parents, quickly transitioning back and forth between economics and politics and typical adolescent concerns. The ecumenical nature of their commentary suggests that teenagers' lived experience of the civil rights movement included a delicate balancing act between the serious and the social.¹

Prince Edward County is located approximately an hour and a half southwest of Richmond, in the heart of Virginia's politically and socially conservative Southside. Civil rights organizer Harry Boyte described the county in 1963 as "removed considerably from the mainstream of contemporary thought and activity."² Boyte's colleague Ruth Turner, the force behind the interviews, was a perceptive listener. An African American Ohioan who first came to Prince Edward the previous summer as a volunteer with the Summer College Educational Project, she was a recent graduate of the Harvard Graduate School of Education.³ Turner's refusal, as a member of the project staff, to accept compromises calculated to appease the local white community so impressed Harry Boyte that he praised her to his superiors at the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), who sent her back to Prince Edward in the summer of 1963 to fill a temporary gap in staffing.

The activist arm of the Religious Society of Friends, the AFSC maintained a Community Relations Program in the county from 1960 to 1965 devoted to serving the needs of the school-less children, pressing the federal government for intervention, and opening new channels of communication between black and white.⁴ Staff members originally conceived of Turner's primary assignment as preparing the community for a large-scale public—private educational program scheduled to launch in September 1963. The on-the-ground realities in Prince Edward and its county seat of Farmville, however, soon shifted her focus

to supporting emerging street demonstrations calling for reopened schools and an end to discrimination in hiring. Building upon her contacts with teenage picketers, she seized the opportunity to conduct in-depth sociological interviews with these students and their peers.⁵

It is impossible to know exactly how Turner's subjects perceived her. She was young, black, and known to be courageous. Arrested in late July with a group of demonstrators, she undoubtedly had a certain credibility with the teenage population. She was also northern, well-educated, and imbued with middle-class opinions on subjects such as personal appearance and family dynamics. All in all, however, the sheer amount of information they shared suggests that they found her a sympathetic listener. The fifty-seven interviews are all recorded in Turner's voice—typed summaries of her field notes—and include some direct quotes, some paraphrases, and some statements of her own opinion. Historians using this source necessarily encounter the teenagers through Turner's eyes, yet a careful reading of her notes still reveals a remarkably detailed picture of children largely unknown by history.

Prince Edward County's journey to national prominence began in April 1951 when black students at R. R. Moton High School contacted the legal staff of the Virginia State Conference NAACP for assistance in their strike for better facilities and an expanded curriculum. While initially hesitant to take a school case in the state's conservative rural heartland, impressed by the surprising solidarity and determination of the local black community, NAACP lawyers ultimately agreed to file suit on behalf of the students. Formally titled *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*,⁶ the Prince Edward case became one of the five later immortalized under the name *Brown v. Board of Education*.⁷

Within five years of the 1954 *Brown* decision, public schools ceased to exist in Prince Edward County. When the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in May 1959 that county schools must desegregate by September, Prince Edward's Board of Supervisors, in a move supported by at least ninety percent of the white community, responded by discontinuing all funding for public education. From 1959 to 1964, the padlocked school buildings stood as glaring testimonies to white Virginians' determination to "massively resist" integration of the public schools. As the only community in the nation to abolish public education altogether, Prince Edward's battle can rightly be seen as a barometer for both the depth of black commitment to desegregation and the intensity of southern white resistance to *Brown*.

The 1960s moved the battle beyond the courts into the streets, buildings, and homes of Farmville as the black community organized itself into a political force and outside organizations flocked to the county to conduct emergency

educational projects, encourage dialogue between blacks and whites, and cultivate an interracial pro-public schools constituency.⁸ In the summer of 1963, the Prince Edward NAACP Youth Council, with the enthusiastic support of the black community's foremost leader, Baptist minister L. Francis Griffin, undertook an ambitious direct-action campaign blending pickets, sit-ins, pray-ins, and a boycott of Farmville stores. Police arrested nearly fifty people, the vast majority of them teenagers, before the campaign petered out in August.

Historians don't know much about civil rights figures like the Prince Edward children, who were simultaneously protesters and victims. Though they picketed, sat in, and resisted white attempts to turn back the clock to the days of quiescence, they never quite succeeded in wresting the offensive out of the hands of county leaders. Robbed of traditional channels of intellectual and personal growth, fighting a pitched battle to restore a right few had ever seriously imagined could be taken away, they were eternally on the defensive. Events outside their control brought them into the movement. Unlike their contemporaries in McComb, Mississippi, who voluntarily boycotted Burgland High in response to the principal's decision to expel all students involved in a civil rights march, or their older brothers and sisters who walked out of the old Moton High in 1951, members of the closings generation found themselves out of school due to the actions of others. When these students marched, they carried placards reading "We aren't dropouts . . . we are lockouts."⁹

While many of the lockouts were thoroughly politicized by the experience, becoming either active resisters or thoughtful commentators on American race relations, others remained unwitting participants in Prince Edward's civil rights drama. While the majority of the 1963 demonstrators were young people, their numbers were small in relation to the overall teenage population. A number of factors limited their participation, most notably distance, lack of transportation, parental disapproval, and economic constraints that made fourteen- and fifteen-year-olds' paychecks as important to the survival of their families as those of full-grown adults. Less easily documented but equally significant was the breakdown of standard communication networks. Far more than merely places of learning, schools are sites of socialization and exchange. In the hallways of a school, students swap ideas, build friendships, and hatch plans. They link themselves to groups, trends, and causes outside their own existence.

Scholars from Aldon Morris to Charles Payne have observed that people are primarily drawn into social movements by other people: parents, children, friends, co-workers, and neighbors.¹⁰ Lacking regular contact with the majority of their peers, Prince Edward teenagers struggled to maintain the ties that bound them to each other. Some had become so isolated that they were almost

completely unaware of the plans for protest. Others knew the agenda but lacking a direct pull from a friend or classmate, remained on the sidelines. As a group, they refused to resign themselves to the situation, but they played on a court not of their own making. When Ruth Turner—and her notebook—entered their lives in the summer of 1963, they had been out of school nearly four years.¹¹

Turner's fifty-seven interviewees included thirty-two boys and twenty-five girls, ranging from age fourteen to twenty-one. One had completed four years of high school, seven three years, sixteen two years, seven one year, and twenty-six less than one year or none at all. Several had attempted to enroll for classes in surrounding counties but had been turned away due to overcrowding in neighboring districts. Many were members of large families—one young man was one of twenty-one siblings—and at least eight resided with a family member other than a parent. While death, poverty, and employment outside the county precipitated most of these living situations, two of the interviewees had recently left their mother's house to move in with an older brother who supported their decision to participate in the demonstrations.¹²

The vast majority of interviewees came from impoverished or working-class homes. While some resided in the county seat of Farmville, the majority were farm kids from the rural areas of the county. Many were bound by strong family ties that powerfully shaped their experience of the closings. Families with financially and emotionally stable members in other locales often sent their children away during the school year. But ties of affection worked both ways, keeping several students in the county despite opportunities to board elsewhere. They remained in Prince Edward at high cost to themselves because they refused to leave their mothers alone.

Older siblings often felt tremendous responsibility for the younger ones. Twenty-year-old John Hicks, whose family sent him away from the county three of the four years, enabling him to graduate from high school in New Jersey, and eighteen-year-old Oland Smith joined the demonstrations in hopes of reopening the schools for their younger siblings. Out of school since 1959, Oland promised his mother on her deathbed that he would graduate. He told Turner that, "I have to do the best I can to maybe get my sister and brother into school. I'll try anything once."¹³

Other homes were more unstable. The combination of poverty, racism, difficult home life, and the hopelessness engendered by the closed schools produced behavior in some teenagers that concerned Turner. Her notes are full of notations such as "underprivileged" and "home is in very poor condition." She worried over the sixteen-year-old whom she believed had been

drinking before meeting with her, over the seventeen-year-old preparing for a wedding, and over the teenage parents whose interrupted education had ill-prepared them for life. Several responded to the closings by isolating themselves from others, telling Turner, "I'm all for myself," withdrawing into a state of disinterest in everything and everybody, or turning to hostility and violence, sometimes black on white, other times black on black. Some, such as Oland Smith, attempted to channel their anger into constructive political activity, while others turned to fast cars and street brawls as mechanisms for dealing with the situation.

In hindsight, Turner's typically broad questions and respondents' generally thoughtful answers provide a wealth of sociological data about rural southern black youth in a time of great transition. Her interviews echo the American Council on Education studies of the 1930s, documenting both the continuity and change in young people's attitudes during the intervening years. Between 1935 and 1940, the American Council on Education, flush with New Deal concern for the long-term welfare of the nation's youth, commissioned several studies on personality development and minority group identification among black adolescents. The two most influential, Fisk University sociologist Charles S. Johnson's *Growing up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South* and Howard sociology chair E. Franklin Frazier's *Negro Youth at the Crossways: Their Personality Development in the Middle States*, provide an eye-opening, often surprising glimpse into the internal lives of young people struggling to define their own place in a society quick to assign them a standard role based on race and class. In probing these teenagers' racial attitudes, values, reactions to skin color differences among blacks, and attitudes toward education, religion, sex, marriage, the future, and southern life, Johnson and Frazier bring to light the personal hopes, fears, and convictions of individuals generally portrayed as a faceless mass.¹⁴

Turner's interviews do the same. In compiling and comparing the attitudes of fifty-seven Virginia teenagers at a shared moment in their development, she forces both observers and historians of the school closing crisis to acknowledge the futility of attempting to pinpoint the "definitive" meaning or impact of the events in the county. Each of the young people interviewed by Turner interpreted the events differently, drew varied lessons from the crisis, and reacted in ways determined not only by the events themselves, but by personal, familial, and temperamental factors as well. With all the unpredictability and inconsistency of real adolescents, they searched for meaning in their individual experiences. Their common age, racial classification, and Prince Edward nativity did not give them identical dreams, desires, or convictions about how the world should operate.

In fact, these teenagers envisioned very different futures for themselves. Some aspired to reform Prince Edward County and settle comfortably into quiet rural lives. Others could hardly wait to shake the Farmville dirt from their shoes, dreaming of cities, careers in the fine arts, and a revolutionized American political system. Some spoke of practicing nonviolence and maintaining the moral high ground, others of seizing the mechanisms of power. Cultural commentator June Jordan could have been speaking of these children when she wrote:

Much organizational grief could be avoided if people understood that partnership in misery does not necessarily provide for partnership for change. When we get the monsters off our backs all of us may want to run in very different directions.¹⁵

Jordan points out “the difference between a common identity that has been imposed and the individual identity any one of us will choose, once she gains that chance.” Caught up in the movement to freedom, Turner’s interviewees grappled with the continuities and changes accompanying people in transition. Yet even in struggling to define themselves as individuals, they demonstrated the endurance of the ideas, values, and concerns that defined southern black youth twenty years earlier in Johnson and Frazier’s studies.

The teenagers sought “escape” from the humiliations and injustices of Jim Crow: many through education, some through active protest, some through geographical exodus from the South, some through financial success and social mobility, and others through gang affiliation and physical violence. They almost universally decried the boredom and isolation of rural life and endowed education with quasi-magical powers to transform their own lives and to collapse the inequalities between rich and poor and black and white. They yearned for professional careers, college educations, good wages, excitement and social activities, opportunities to leave the county, and chances to turn the tables upon whites. St. Clair Drake’s introduction to the 1967 edition of *Growing up in the Black Belt* accurately describes the 1963 interviews as well as the 1930s ones when he notes:

Cries of anguish frequently burst out from these pages as well as caustic criticisms by the youth of a world they never made, and bitterness over the legacy of the past bequeathed to them by a hostile white society and by impotent Negro institutions . . . They reveal the thoughts of young people groping for a feeling of dignity within a social system that makes them ambivalent toward themselves and other Negroes. But persistently they search for their identity, full of irrepressible vitality and animated by a drive to escape.¹⁶

The fifty-seven teenagers who shared their thoughts with Turner grappled with the typical physical and emotional changes of adolescence. They struggled to differentiate themselves from their families, define their own personalities, and develop dreams and goals to provide their lives meaning. They derived identity from relationships with their peers. Some exhibited elements of typical teenage rebelliousness, such as brawling, petty crime, flouting parental authority, and experimentation with alcohol and sex. But coming of age in Prince Edward County in the early 1960s also placed them at the center of a national drama, in the crossfire between the forces of change and the forces of resistance. These teenagers forfeited formative educational years and suffered the splintering of the social networks that traditionally accompany formal schooling.

They inhabited a world of contradictory messages and conflicting ideas. Raised under the traditional racial mores of the rural South, they now found themselves playing a role in a national desegregation drama challenging the foundations of white supremacy. NAACP leaders from state Executive Secretary Lester Banks to national Executive Secretary Roy Wilkins encouraged them to maintain faith in the lawsuit, reject white attempts at manipulation, and assert their rights clearly and consistently. Many of the other outside groups operating in the county throughout the crisis years sent similar messages. The televisions in their living rooms exposed them to powerful images of the mushrooming national freedom movement: strong, articulate black leaders demanding a radical restructuring of American racial politics and masses of young people putting their bodies on the line for change.

Local leader Reverend L. Francis Griffin, often described by contemporaries as “fearless,” consistently pushed Prince Edward blacks to abandon their historic posture of accommodation and employ confrontational tactics to resolve the schools issue and bring equality to Farmville. In the ten years since the 1951 strike that plunged Prince Edward into civil rights activism, Griffin’s leadership had exerted a profound impact on the community, inculcating many residents with a willingness to take risks they would have previously considered unthinkable. Teenagers acknowledged the increased politicization of the older generation but nevertheless wrestled with profound frustration over what they considered lingering conservatism among their elders. Some battled their own parents over this issue, struggling to reconcile calls for direct action with parental concerns for safety and/or job security. Others found their parents and grandparents supportive of their desire to challenge the white power structure and assert pride in black identity. Surrounded by conflicting influences—the “dos and don’ts” of segregation that characterized their childhoods, the demands for change that characterized their adolescence, and the

personal suffering that accompanied their interrupted education—these teenagers offer a compelling window into the intellectual and emotional processes of youth in transition.

The majority of Turner's interviewees strongly supported the local picket lines, commenting that the demonstrations would "make the whites take notice," that they enhanced black "togetherness," and that they evidenced willingness to "fight for our rights." Motivation to join the protests came from different directions. Most of the teenage picketers listed opening the schools as their primary concern. But forcing an opening of new jobs to African Americans ran a close second. Protesters hoped to soon see blacks working in Farmville businesses, in restaurants, construction, teaching, medicine, and in shipping and transportation. Others joined in hopes of securing increased wages in the jobs they already held, in stemming the flow of young people from the county (noting that the exodus of teenagers made remaining in Prince Edward tedious), and in achieving the broader goals of "freedom" and "equality."¹⁷

Many expressed significant frustration with the older generation's response to the crisis. Twenty-year-old McCarthy Eanes, an active participant, considered a challenge to white domination long overdue but thought older people lacked the courage to mount one. "We need freedom," he told Turner. "There is no use in keeping on like the old people." A seventeen-year-old who had spent the previous three years in an integrated school in Baltimore blamed some young people's willingness to accept the status quo on parents and grandparents who had taught them "that the white man is some god." He considered many of the older folks so accustomed to segregation that they assumed "the white man is going to do what he wants to anyway," an attitude that sapped their spirit to fight. His commitment to the demonstrations sprang from a desire to reopen the schools on an integrated basis "so that children can get to know for themselves what white people are like instead of being influenced by older people."¹⁸

Some were quite sharp in their criticisms. Fourteen-year-old Carlton Terry insisted that the schools would have reopened before 1963 had blacks launched an immediate protest in 1959. "The older people just don't want to move," he complained to Turner. "They think they are living just fine." A fifteen-year-old who spent three years outside the county lamented that "Negroes won't do anything, they are even scared to put their names on paper because they might lose their jobs." Nevertheless, he remained hopeful that the growing spirit of confrontation might encourage some older blacks to take action "to get the white man off their backs."¹⁹

The generation gap profoundly strained relationships in the county that summer, as it did in other movement communities. While some teenagers

recognized the older generation's reasons for avoiding direct confrontation, others ridiculed their elders as cowardly Uncle Toms. Unlike their comrades in Mississippi, white authorities in Prince Edward did not imprison juvenile protesters or sentence them to terms in reform school. Rather, they released them into the custody of their parents on \$1,000 bonds, confident that a substantial increase in the size of the police force and a change in the town picketing code would prevent them from returning to the streets. Rather than assaulting demonstrators, authorities focused on finding legal and bureaucratic avenues to circumvent protest. The Farmville Town Council approved a new ordinance requiring persons planning to picket on town sidewalks to state their reasons for demonstration before being granted a parade permit. Deeming this an outright effort to intimidate black protesters, L. F. Griffin immediately sent Farmville mayor William Watkins a letter protesting this attempt to "discourage . . . participation in demonstrations and peaceful picketing."²⁰

The low levels of physical violence that characterized the Prince Edward struggle did render street protest less immediately dangerous than it was in much of the South. But older residents knew their white neighbors well enough to anticipate other avenues of retaliation. As heads of household, adults recognized their economic vulnerability in a white-dominated society. They feared the real power their white employers had over them. Nineteen-year-old Frances Hayes, one of the demonstrators, blamed the low levels of adult participation on the fact that "they work for the whites and don't want to be involved."²¹ Many willing to take other actions in the struggle drew the line at so explicitly flouting the Virginian traditions of subtlety and indirectness.

Though many Prince Edward teenagers worked full time and bore significant financial responsibility for supporting their families, their young age shielded them from some of the repercussions adults would have endured. Some employers accepted their young workers' involvement in the demonstrations, either attributing it to youthful rebellion or ruefully acknowledging the fact that they did not possess the leverage necessary to demand their withdrawal. Others, however, fired teenage workers over their participation in the struggle. The majority of those let go, however, secured new positions more easily than unemployed adults.

Some parents gave their blessing to their children's activism or joined them on the picket lines, either already inclined toward protest or won over by reasoning such as that offered by a fifteen-year-old who reminded his grandmother that "we will live here after you are gone." Nineteen-year-old Bessie Reed, who graduated from Holyoke High School (Holyoke, Massachusetts) in May 1963 under the auspices of an AFSC-sponsored placement program,

saw the demonstrations as “the only way to get what we want.” Arrested in July for her participation, she spent fifty-five hours in jail with Ruth Turner. Her parents feared for her safety but nevertheless supported her decision to march. A few, such as the grandmother of nineteen-year-old Howard Harris, Jr., opposed street protest but did not attempt to prevent their children from participating.²²

Anticipating the repercussions that might follow, some parents flatly refused to allow their children to be involved in any way. Two interviews in particular shed light on this reaction. A sixteen-year-old boy who participated in a day of demonstrations told Turner that his parents did not oppose his involvement, but his work schedule severely limited his availability. A girl she interviewed later that day, however, insisted that the boy’s parents had forbidden him to participate. His explanation about schedule constraints may have been a cover for a sense of embarrassment. Some teenagers found ways around their parents’ disapproval. A sixteen-year-old whose mother told her “that if I got in jail, she wouldn’t come and get me” got around that problem by moving in with an older brother who supported her actions. But Prince Edward, like many rural areas, was a place where parental authority was not often flaunted, and the majority of teenagers whose parents refused their permission remained on the sidelines.²³

Though economic constraints were an issue for all participants, some found themselves more severely limited than others. A sixteen-year-old girl from a large family wanted to participate but could not afford to quit her job ironing at Star Cleaners. As she told Turner, “We are rather poor and I have to help out.” A perceptive observer of the situation in the county, she deeply resented the fact that her employers paid a white co-worker a substantially higher salary and allowed her to wait on customers, while she was relegated exclusively to ironing. But unable to jeopardize even this meager salary through participation, her protest against the situation is recorded only in the pages of Ruth Turner’s notes.²⁴

Stories such as this young woman’s remind us of the importance of Turner’s work in the county. In recording the thoughts, convictions, and dreams of individuals who possessed few other opportunities to make their voices heard, she ensured that their experience of—and response to—injustice would not be unknown to history, allowing future generations to see more clearly the multiplicity of ways racism affected the lives of Prince Edward’s most vulnerable residents.

Interviewees were divided. The majority vehemently opposed segregation, but not all considered school integration an important goal. Some had had no

schooling for four years and were willing to accept any offer to re-establish public education. Twenty-year-old George Holmes considered the pre-1959 schools adequate, noting that “integration is all right, but if they didn’t want to integrate with us, why bother?” Phillip Walker termed integration “okay,” but noted that he had no problem with a dual school system. A seventeen-year-old girl went even further, admitting that she fundamentally disliked the idea of integrated schools but would attend if necessary. It is interesting to note that when all three of these teenagers were interviewed, they had been deprived of schooling for four years. Thus, for them, open public schools—even if segregated and strapped for resources—seemed better than no schools at all.²⁵

Conversely, many of the students who boarded away from the county and experienced integrated and/or northern schools expressed sharper criticism of the segregated status quo. Bessie Reed, who graduated from high school in Massachusetts, criticized her former Prince Edward teachers for not moving on to a new topic until everyone understood the material, a practice that often left half of the textbook unfinished at the end of the school year. A boy who spent three years in an integrated school in Baltimore observed that his new school provided better courses and more advantages for black pupils. He marveled at the way an integrated school could collapse the strict social boundaries of his childhood, noting that many of his Baltimore friends were white. A girl who lived with host families in New York and Washington, D.C. felt that white students in integrated schools were friendlier—in her words, “they laugh and talk like average children.”²⁶

Some of these “migrants” clearly struggled with the idea that they would someday have to relinquish the opportunities offered them in their new schools when they returned to Prince Edward. A fifteen-year-old who had sought out every opportunity possible to stay in school, spending three years in other parts of Virginia, joined the demonstrations to reopen the Prince Edward schools but foresaw enormous problems on the horizon.²⁷ Anticipating chaos in the reopened classrooms, he predicted that older students would balk at being assigned to classes with much younger children. Dreaming of becoming a teacher himself, he took his studies seriously and admitted that if the schools were to reopen, he would prefer to continue to board outside the county. He appreciated many things about Farmville, particularly its size and quiet atmosphere, but he could not accept the fact that “there are no places for Negroes to go,” commenting that he would prefer to live in the North.²⁸

A seventeen-year-old girl exhibited a similar hesitancy to jeopardize her own education. After three years with an aunt in Cambridge, Massachusetts, she recognized that her urban high school offered opportunities that a

reopened Moton High would not. Her hopes of becoming a secretary made the Cambridge program, which offered summer internships for honor students taking the commercial course, difficult to resist. She declined to comment on whether she would ever consider returning to Prince Edward on a permanent basis but emphasized that she planned to join the demonstrations, noting that "Negroes should stick together."²⁹ Both found themselves torn between a deep loyalty to those at home and a desire to take advantage of the opportunities their experiences away from Prince Edward had provided. It is interesting to note that both chose to protest (or stated a definite intention to do so), perhaps at least partially as an expression of solidarity with those whom they may have felt they were abandoning.

All but one of the fifty-seven interviewees expressed interest in returning to school. A significant number, however, probably underestimated the potential obstacles in their way: loss of income, diminished academic skills, severe frustration, and acute embarrassment. The vast majority said they expected no special problems in returning to the classroom, either an honest statement of opinion or an attempt at positive thinking. A few, however, volunteered additional information. One young woman recognized that the loss of her wages would put a strain on her family but hoped to return anyway, envisioning that perhaps she could attend school in the winter and work in the summer to earn money for clothing and books. One seventeen-year-old boy from a large family had assumed responsibility for running the family farm, freeing his father to hire himself out for wages. He admitted uncertainty as to whether returning to school was a realistic possibility, vacillating between "I think so" and "for certain."³⁰

A sixteen-year-old in school two years out of the four thought she would have no particular problems returning to Moton High but commented that "other older children would have to get adjusted with younger children." This young woman, who hoped to become a secretary, predicted that quite a few would not return, explaining that many of the older girls had already begun to raise families and many of the boys had lost interest. One seventeen-year-old boy's return to school hinged upon whether or not he would be able to make arrangements for the support of his newborn child. Perhaps alluding to his own experience, he observed that "plenty of girls would not be pregnant" if the schools had remained open. Turner's interviews shed little light on the thoughts of the girls so affected, but do indicate that at least two teenage mothers expressed an interest in returning to school. Unfortunately, they did not elaborate on the kinds of arrangements they envisioned might make this a possibility.³¹

Twenty-year-old George Holmes remained out of school all four years. Though not employed at the time of his conversation with Turner, he trusted his job skills and candidly admitted that he had no desire to return to school, where he would be far behind his classmates. McCarthy Eanes, on the other hand, also twenty, possessed a strong desire to return to school and learn a trade. McCarthy and his twenty siblings all remained in the county throughout the long years of closed schools, as his parents refused to send some of their children away for an education and deny it to others. He spent the four years working in the tobacco fields, searching for an opportunity to create a life beyond the farm. Convinced that school was the answer, he leapt at the opportunity to return to the classroom when the privately-financed Prince Edward Free Schools opened in September 1963. Though closely identified with the Kennedy administration, the Free Schools relied on private foundations and sympathetic citizens for their financial solvency and on Virginia politicians for their bureaucratic survival. In their one-year term, they served approximately 1,560 students, including eight whites. Refusing to consider his age an impediment, McCarthy enrolled for classes and took a job driving a school bus to supplement the family income.³²

Much of the literature on the civil rights movement, with the significant exception of memoirs such as Melba Patillo Beals's *Warriors Don't Cry* and Anne Moody's *Coming of Age in Mississippi*, admirably documents teenagers' transformation into political actors but rarely touches on the emotional, intellectual, and hormonal dimensions of adolescence or their impact on young activists' perceptions of themselves, their neighbors, and the region around them. Turner's interviews, on the other hand, probe these issues deeply. Since they address similar questions, they provide an instructive comparison to Johnson and Frazier's New Deal-era studies.

Johnson and Frazier's southern black youth overwhelmingly condemned life in the rural South, investing northern cities with the power to deliver them from a life of drudgery and subservience.³³ A good number of Turner's interviewees echoed these thoughts, vowing that they would not settle in a place lacking "freedom," which they predominately defined as equal access to education, good jobs, and public accommodations, as well as respect from whites and an end to the humiliations of Jim Crow. Residents of a state in which racial terrorism rarely took violent form, they did not mention cessation of cross burnings, lynchings, or fire bombings as indicators of freedom.³⁴

Many, however, despite their rough treatment at the hands of Prince Edward policymakers, expressed significant affection for their native county, describing it as peaceful and beautiful. They pointed to segregation, lack of

jobs, and the school situation as the county's biggest problems but insisted they would choose to settle in Prince Edward if the schools reopened and more employment opportunities opened to African Americans. Many mentioned the pull of one's hometown, proximity to family members, and the beauty of the landscape as reasons to remain.

Ronald Ward, who finished his senior year at Kittrell College, an AME Zion school in North Carolina, before joining the U.S. Navy, remarked that despite his preference for small towns over cities, he would never return to Prince Edward because it offered no future for educated blacks. A veteran of an AFSC placement program that sent students to study in northern and Midwestern communities sounded a similar chord, predicting that reopening the schools would not change the fact that "there is no future in terms of higher education and better jobs." "I wouldn't live in Farmville for nothing," he noted in disgust. Another, who nurtured hopes of becoming an art teacher, desired proximity to her family but recognized the slim chances of making a living as a black artist in Prince Edward County. Others disliked country- and small-town life in general, noting that "there is too much hard work to do on the farm," "there is nothing here," and "everyone knows everyone."³⁵

Many held opinions on why whites had closed the schools, the majority of which were insightful, carefully considered, and at times self-critical. One young woman who finished seventh grade in 1959 felt that white residents opposed integration because "some of the colored mothers don't care about their kids; therefore they think they are better than even those Negroes who are clean and well-mannered." Another ascribed the problem to old traditions and beliefs that characterized blacks as lazy and undeserving. A third observed that many of the whites most ardently opposed to integration were older people responsible for the care of their grandchildren. "They think we will bother or fight them if they go to school with us," he commented, going on to say that more than a few older members of the black community held similar concerns.³⁶

Some interviewees thought that whites closed the schools out of jealousy over the fact that the new Moton High (completed in 1953 in the wake of the 1951 student strike) outshone the white school, Farmville High. Another ascribed the entire situation to economics. "Sometimes I try to put myself in their place," he commented. "If I had someone to work for me, cook my meals, and could know that his son would never compete with mine for a job, I guess I would fight to keep it, too." One sixteen-year-old girl suggested that whites still preferred to think of blacks as slaves out of fear that someday the tables might turn and cast them into the subordinate position. One of the placement students elaborated on this theme, explaining that "they oppose our going to school

together because then we would receive the same education, the same jobs, and the same amount of money, and they wouldn't be better than we are."³⁷

Most expressed a significant amount of anger toward whites, but only one threatened actual violence, expressing a desire to "kill them all." Another, described as "a handsome boy with dancing eyes," refused to befriend whites, commenting that "if we're not decent enough to eat [in local restaurants], we're not decent enough to be friends." A boy from working class Ely Street regularly engaged in small-scale battles with a group of white teenagers who rode through his neighborhood throwing bricks at pedestrians—he and his friends retaliated by throwing bricks at white-driven cars. Some termed white residents "right rough and hateful," commenting that "anybody will stick a knife in your back."³⁸

Despite these feelings, a few expressed a pragmatic desire for lighter skin in order to break free of the constraints that confined them. One boy yearned for a skin color that would provide "all the things and privileges he [a white man] has of doing things." In a comment guaranteed to strike fear into the hearts of many white supremacists, a sixteen-year-old admitted that his friends sometimes wished to be white in order to date the girls at Longwood College, the local all-white state teachers' college. "Sometimes I agree," he reflected. "Sometimes whites look like they have more looks than the colored."³⁹

The majority, however, possessed a strong sense of black identity. One boy cherished his African heritage because he thought whites were "kind of weak" and more likely to "do something to themselves" (i.e., commit suicide) in difficult times. Another interviewee commented that she took pride in the fact that many young white women constantly attempted to darken their skin through sunbathing and dark stockings. A young woman who stated that she hated all whites noted emphatically that "Negroes can do anything better." The majority, however, expressed their opinions more matter-of-factly, stating that color could not be changed or that "that's what God made me." One seventeen-year-old explained that although whites "can do more," blacks could do just as much if provided similar opportunities.⁴⁰

These interviews took place just before the explosion of the black consciousness movement engendered a major shift in racial terminology and cultural identification. In 1963 the vast majority of interviewees preferred the terms "Negro" or "colored" to "black," which they deemed crude and demeaning. One boy described the term as "not exactly real bad, but not proper." If reference to race proved absolutely necessary, he preferred "colored"; but ultimately, he noted wryly, "I have a name." Some equated "black" with "nigger," deeming both cruel insults. Several stated that they would not mind being called "black"

in African American company but would take it as an insult in the presence of a white person, even if the term was used by another African American. Others stated that the designation would anger them no matter who used it. Within two to three years, the black consciousness movement would profoundly alter the language of racial self-identification, offering the term “black” as a means of repudiating white-assigned terminology and asserting pan-African solidarity. But in 1963 rural teenagers still bristled at the word, no doubt influenced—whether consciously or not—by the complicated relationship between skin color, status, and social mobility dating back to slavery.⁴¹

As the 60s progressed, the separatist ideals of the Nation of Islam—and its most charismatic apostle, Malcolm X—found increasing support among both northern and southern blacks. In 1963, however, the majority of the interviewees condemned the Nation, deeming the idea of a separate black state impractical and not worth the effort. Uncomfortable with the Black Muslims’ emphasis on segregation, they commented that “they want something we shouldn’t have . . . segregation is not what we’re working for.” Bessie Reed noted in frustration that “Black supremacy is what we’re fighting against. No one on earth is supreme to any other; we should leave that to God.” Some deemed the Muslims “sick” or suspected that “something is wrong with them,” a reaction undoubtedly linked to hostile media coverage as well as genuine opposition to their political and religious convictions.⁴²

Lawrence Reid, who emigrated to New York to pursue an education, agreed that “the emphasis on the Negro losing his identity was good” but found the Fruit of Islam security forces eerily reminiscent of the Nazis. He thought the framework of a separate state encouraged corruption and feared that an all-black political community would ultimately prove isolating. He derided Malcolm X as an ex-convict who “couldn’t lead us anywhere,” commenting that he possessed little understanding of “what the Negro wants.” As a model for black leadership, Reid preferred Jomo Kenyatta and James Baldwin. “He [Baldwin] has good ideas and he is not exactly nonviolent,” he reflected, “but he is not violent either. He appeals to the intellect, but uses common sense. He thinks before going out and obviously knows what he is talking about. He knows Harlem and knows what the Negro wants.”⁴³

Only students who had resided outside the county during the school shutdown offered opinions on the Nation of Islam. They undoubtedly had greater exposure to the national civil rights scene, the Muslim communities in large cities (at least one girl attended a Nation rally in Boston), and the philosophical question of segregation than their peers who remained in the county. Yet in reality, students who stayed in Prince Edward may have had more personal

interaction with Black Muslims than their emigrant peers. A Muslim group from Philadelphia established a small community in the Green Bay section of the county during the early years of the crisis. The community preached the gospel of self-sufficiency, arguing that the closed schools constituted a blessing in disguise, providing blacks an opportunity to establish their own community-controlled institutions. It did not thrive, and residents eventually moved on without shaking the foundations of the Farmville economy. Yet it is surprising that none of the interviewees mentioned their presence. Perhaps these men and women did not fit the image of Black Muslims they saw on television, or perhaps the Green Bay community simply had little contact with the county's teenage population.⁴⁴

If those polled about their feelings on the Nation of Islam exhibited near unanimity, those asked about their commitment to the philosophy and practice of nonviolence provided widely divergent reactions. One girl stated that, "I don't think I could take but so much; if they were my size, I might fight back," while another termed nonviolence "wonderful" in theory, but completely unhelpful if one were to meet a man with a gun on a dark night. One boy remarked that "nonviolence don't sound right—they will keep taking advantage of you." Some recognized the importance of remaining nonviolent while on the picket lines—agreeing that any kind of violence could provoke a riot—but others found it difficult to restrain themselves when insulted. Profoundly irritated when a white man winked at her, one hot-tempered picketer retorted that he should "go wink at his mother."⁴⁵

More than one of the interviewees tangled with local white youths that summer. A sixteen-year-old who retaliated by throwing rocks when taunted from a car admitted that he did not feel bound by the strictures of nonviolence outside the demonstrations. George Holmes, who threw a bottle at another heckler's car, noted that "it might not be the best way, but I couldn't take nobody spitting in my face." Oland Smith, lately involved with a Jersey City gang, agreed to "put up with" nonviolence but admitted that he did not find it personally convincing, commenting, "I have been in Jersey City and they don't take nothing." Many found nonviolence an unwelcome constraint on the spontaneous actions, impulsive judgments, and dramatic mood swings that often accompany adolescence.⁴⁶

A few recognized a strategic value in nonviolence, commenting that it scares and shames whites and "keeps them worrying." One boy pointed out that violent protest counterproductively sidelined injured demonstrators. Another observed that his attendance at SNCC-operated nonviolence workshops effectively convinced him that protecting oneself proved easier than hitting back.

One of the AFSC-sponsored students adamantly insisted that hopes of a peaceful future rested on nonviolence, commenting that “violence simply leads to more fighting.” Another thought that passive resistance put pressure on the institutions of government but that more importantly, “If we don’t adopt non-violence, we will be no better than they.”⁴⁷

None of the respondents—even those who had attended Quaker schools or lived with Quaker families—spoke of the “ethic of love” that had so intrigued the early SNCC activists or the Christian/Gandhian principles that shaped Martin Luther King, Jr.’s philosophy of nonviolence. By and large, their attitudes were forged by pragmatic concerns. The students served by the American Friends Service Committee—those closer to the Quaker “peace testimony”—however, did by and large place more confidence in the strategic value of passive resistance than their peers who had stayed at home. They also expressed more concern over the effects of violence and the importance of maintaining a higher standard than one’s opponents. Nonetheless, the émigré students ultimately approached nonviolence as a tool for demonstrations rather than a way of life.

Far from the mass confrontations of Selma and Birmingham, the Prince Edward teenagers, numerically outnumbered by their opponents, had few opportunities to witness nonviolence’s power to create utter chaos. White leaders in Prince Edward generally preferred procedural violence to physical, a strategy that made it difficult for African American activists to use nonviolence as a potent political strategy. But tempers flared as the struggle wore on, and fistfights and acts of vandalism became more common. Whites and blacks alike credited Rev. Griffin, himself the victim of several death threats, with preventing an escalating cycle of violence, successfully channeling youth anger into organized protest rather than retaliatory violence.⁴⁸

The fifty-seven teenagers who shared their thoughts with Ruth Turner echoed many of the sentiments expressed by participants in the American Council on Education studies thirty years earlier. The majority longed to leave the South and pursue a better life elsewhere, often idealizing the North as a sort of “promised land” for African Americans. They chafed against restrictive racial codes, spinning more expansive dreams for their own lives that ranged from practical (driving a truck) to high-flying (making a living as an artist). They looked to their peers for companionship and personal validation and alternatively respected and resented their elders.

Yet the events of the intervening decades altered the experience of growing up in the South enough to ensure some differences as well. Living in a civil rights battleground, the Prince Edward respondents were deeply influenced by

the rhetoric and action of the mushrooming movement; thus they offered a more politicized view of the world than their earlier counterparts. They weighed the risks and benefits of publicly challenging white supremacy, openly questioned the older generation's methods of "getting ahead," and at times clashed with their own parents and guardians over their commitment to direct action. Their interrupted educational experience caused many to invest education with the power to deliver them from Prince Edward and others to underestimate the academic and economic difficulties that would accompany their return to school.

Ultimately, the respondents struggled to make sense of the conflicting messages surrounding them: vivid reminders of the enduring power of white supremacy and increasing calls to topple the foundation of American race relations. Though some useful generalizations emerge from their responses, the enormous variety of their reactions serves as a powerful reminder of the individuality of persons often lumped together by history. The diversity of their attitudes, goals, and interpretations of the situation that confronted them powerfully supports June Jordan's observation that "when we get the monsters off our backs all of us may want to run in very different directions." Even allies may not be in agreement about the definition of freedom and the best way to achieve it.

NOTES

1. Number 11, Interview with Ruth Turner, 1963 Box, Folder 38558, Prince Edward County Collection, American Friends Service Committee Archives, Philadelphia, PA (hereafter AFSC Archives); Interview with Ruth Turner Numbers 12, 7, 13, 15.
2. Harry Boyte, "Prince Edward Story," January 1963, p. 7, 1963 Box, Folder 38552, PEC Collection, AFSC Archives.
3. Sponsored by the Student Christian Movement of New England, the Summer College Educational Program offered Prince Edward children seven weeks of remedial coursework, primarily in reading and arithmetic. The twelve project volunteers—ten whites and two African Americans—provided valuable service to their pupils but struggled to define and achieve an "appropriate" relationship with the surrounding community.
4. Established in 1917 to provide alternatives to military service for conscientious objectors, the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) threw itself into campaigns for racial justice in the 1950s. Deeply rooted in Quaker theology and Christian idealism, AFSC embraced the concept of "speaking truth to power," encouraging its employees to "be the vehicles that disrupt the lives of others." The organization's involvement in the county centered around three fundamental goals: serving the educational and social needs of the over two thousand black children displaced from school by cooperating with grassroots efforts organized by the black community, pressing the federal government for intervention in the crisis, and building interracial understanding through emboldening moderates and opening channels of communication between whites and blacks.
5. In citing these interviews, I will provide names for those individuals over the age of eighteen at the time of the interview and withhold those of interviewees under the age of

- majority. Carlton Terry is the only exception to this rule. Although only fourteen at the time of his conversation with Turner, he spoke extensively with reporters that summer.
6. 103 F.Supp. 337 (D.C.Va.1952).
 7. 347 U.S. 483 (1954). The five cases included *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (KS), *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County* (VA), *Briggs v. Elliott* (SC), *Gebhart v. Belton* (DE), and *Bolling v. Sharpe* (DC).
 8. The school closing case, *Griffin v. Prince Edward County* (377 U.S. 218 [1964]), did not reach the U.S. Supreme Court until March 1964. In May the High Court finally ruled the closings racially motivated and consequently unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment. The ruling in *Griffin* effectively invalidated school closings as an avenue for circumventing *Brown* and forced the reopening of the county schools in September 1964. Prince Edward municipal leaders, however, successfully continued their opposition toward quality public education for blacks by refusing to provide adequate funding for the county schools until forced to in the mid-1970s by a statewide “minimum standards of quality” policy.
 9. For more about the Burgland High boycott, see John Dittmer, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 110–15. See Neil V. Sullivan, *Bound for Freedom: An Educator’s Adventures in Prince Edward County, Virginia* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1965), 8, for a description of picketers’ signs.
 10. For more, see Aldon D. Morris, *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change* (New York: The Free Press, 1984) and Charles M. Payne, *I’ve Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
 11. Jean Fairfax to Bill Bagwell, 18 June 1963, 1963 Box, Folder 38544, PEC Collection, AFSC Archives.
 12. Ruth Turner, Interviews with Youth, 1963 Box, Folder 38558, PEC Collection, AFSC Archives.
 13. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 43, 47.
 14. See Charles S. Johnson, *Growing up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South* (Washington, DC: The American Council on Education, 1941; reprint, New York: Schocken Books, 1967) and E. Franklin Frazier, *Negro Youth at the Crossways: Their Personality Development in the Middle States* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1940).
 15. June Jordan, “Report from the Bahamas,” in *On Call: Political Essays* (Boston: South End Press, 1985), 39–49.
 16. St. Clair Drake, “Introduction to the 1967 Edition,” forward to Johnson, *Growing Up in the Black Belt*, xv. For more on the culture of segregated society, see Bertram W. Doyle, *The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South: A Study in Social Control* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937) and Charles S. Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1943).
 17. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 6, 12, 7, 8, 9, 15.
 18. Interview with Ruth Turner Numbers 12, 21.

19. R.C. Smith, *They Closed Their Schools: Prince Edward County, Virginia, 1951–1964*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965; Reprint, Farmville, VA: Martha E. Forrester Council of Women, 1996), 233–35; Carlton Terry; Interview with Ruth Turner, Number 30.
20. Board of Supervisors' Minutes, 17 June 1963, Supervisors' Records, Vol. 9, Prince Edward County Courthouse; "Prince Edward NAACP Gives Farmville Mayor Request List," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 22 October 1963, clipping, Box 1, "1963 Prince Edward County Folder," S.W. Tucker Papers, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia.
21. Interview with Ruth Turner, Number 11.
22. Interview with Ruth Turner Numbers 9, 30, 29, 23.
23. Interview with Ruth Turner Numbers 16, 15, 6.
24. Interview with Ruth Turner, Number 15.
25. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 51, 55, 2.
26. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 29, 21, 49.
27. The state's professional association of black teachers, the Virginia Teachers Association, sponsored two summer "crash programs" in Prince Edward, operated a placement program throughout 1962–63, and helped the county's black teachers find new positions in the wake of the closings. For more on the VTA, see J. Rupert Picott, *History of the Virginia Teachers Association* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1975).
28. Interview with Ruth Turner, Number 30.
29. Interview with Ruth Turner, Number 32.
30. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 15, 25.
31. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 36, 48, 45, 2.
32. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 51, 12; Paul Nussbaum and Annette John-Hall, "Fight for School Equality Still Leaves Scars for Many," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 12 May 2004; Sullivan, *Bound for Freedom*, 96–98.
33. See Charles S. Johnson, *Growing Up in the Black Belt* and E. Franklin Frazier, *Negro Youth at the Crossways*.
34. Virginia had the lowest level of recorded lynchings in the South. The number of lynchings in Georgia during the single year of 1919 exceeded the number recorded in Virginia throughout the entire twentieth century. One-half of the state's counties never experienced an episode of deadly racial violence. Fewer than twenty-five percent were sites of more than one incident between 1880–1930. By 1910 lynchings were as rare in this former Confederate state as in Illinois or Arizona. Elite Virginians wholeheartedly supported segregation and disfranchisement but largely shunned vigilante violence and naked racial domination as uncouth and threatening to social stability. For more on this, see J. Douglas Smith, *Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002) and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880–1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993).
35. Interview with Ruth Turner Numbers 34, 39, 11.

36. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 7, 21, 14.
37. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 34, 37, 56.
38. Interview with Ruth Turner Numbers 51, 13, 19, 12, 20.
39. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 14, 52.
40. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 8, 15, 45, 57.
41. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 20, 1, 19. For more on this, see Ira Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: The New Press, 1974); Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World The Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972); and Patrick Rael, *Black Identity and Black Protest in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).
42. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 42, 29, 39
43. Interview with Ruth Turner, Number 33.
44. Smith, *They Closed Their Schools*, 203–204.
45. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 3, 4, 5, 10.
46. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 19, 51, 47.
47. Interview with Ruth Turner, Numbers 12, 30, 23, 39, 56.
48. Transcript, Edward Morton interview, 25 September 1992, “Not Our Children” Oral History Collection, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, VA; Transcript, Charles Herndon interview, 20 August 1992, “Not Our Children.”