

LESTER MADDOX AND THE "LIBERAL" MAYORS

By Bradley R. Rice, Clayton Junior College

Liberalism becomes the protection for the farsighted conservative.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

The very fact that they are your enemies is plain proof that they are lost to God, while the fact that you have such men as enemies is plain proof that you yourselves are being saved by God.

Philippians 1:28
(J.B. Phillips translation)

From the late 1940s through the 1960s, city politics in Atlanta, Georgia, was controlled by an electoral coalition which pitted blacks and affluent whites against less-well-off whites with more provincial attitudes. This voting pattern (suggestive of the Bourbon strategy of the 1880s and 1890s) has been extensively studied by political scientists, historians, and the politicians themselves. Commentators have often portrayed this 25 year period in "liberal" versus "conservative" terms as in a 1981 article in Atlanta Magazine. Michael Hinkelman explained, "the political history of this city is that the black community voted effectively as a bloc against the conservative and for the liberal white."

In general the many studies of Atlanta political behavior have focused on the details of voter organization and the statistics of election returns rather than on the rhetoric of the campaigns. But to understand fully the politics of the era and the image that Atlanta and its leaders acquired, one must appreciate the charges, counter charges, and emotions that moved the passions of the voters and stirred them to action. Only then can one understand how men who were by most measures and by most national standards business-oriented conservatives became known as moderates and even liberals.

The leading "liberal whites" of the era were William B. Hartsfield, who served as mayor of Atlanta from 1937 to January 1962 (except for an eighteen month interlude during World War II), and Ivan Allen, Jr., who succeeded Hartsfield in City Hall for the next eight years. Their liberalism was, of course, a matter of context--the context of Atlanta's sister cities of the South such as Memphis, New Orleans, Birmingham, and Little Rock, where racial vitriol and violence seemed to abound, and in the context of local politics race was always the paramount, if unspoken, concern regardless of other issues. In 1957 and 1961 the local context was personified by Lester Maddox, the colorful segregationist fried-chicken entrepreneur turned mayoral candidate.

Although Bill Hartsfield began his political career as a fairly typical upper-crust segregationist, he ended it as what the dedicated integrationists would call a "Jim Crow liberal." As early as 1942 he foresaw that the federal government would someday force significant black political participation on the South. One of the reasons he worked so hard to get the city of Atlanta to expand its corporate boundaries was that he wanted to bring in white voters from the urban fringe to offset the potential black ballots.² Roy V. Harris, an Augusta politician turned editor, claimed that during the 1940s Hartsfield had met privately with him in the old Henry Grady Hotel to discuss ways to stave off black registration in Atlanta.³ But whatever his original feelings and for whatever reasons, when black political strength became a reality in the city, Hartsfield made the decision to capture that vote as his own. It was a calculated risk, for throughout the Hartsfield administration, black registration, as a result of the successful Plan of Improvement annexation in 1952, never exceeded 30 percent of the electorate.⁴ Hartsfield remained vulnerable to any candidate who could unite the white vote against him. But the gamble paid off. The affluent white voters stood by the mayor.

The first test came in 1949. Three years earlier the United States Supreme Court had declared the Democratic white primary to be unconstitutional and the door was opened for meaningful black voting. Black registration in the city climbed from about 3,000 in 1945 to over 20,000, constituting 27 percent of the total, by June 1946.⁵ The organizational work for this impressive registration drive laid the groundwork for the Atlanta Negro Voters League which effectively disciplined the city's black voters until the early 1960s.⁶

Hartsfield won the loyalty of the league in 1948 by naming the city's first black policemen (although they could not arrest whites) and by keeping the lines of communication open to his "kitchen cabinet" of black advisors. Professor Clarence A. Bacote of Atlanta University, one of the key actors in the black political establishment, wrote the mayor in 1950, "I hope that your administration continues along the progressive lines that it has taken in the past and, if it does, you can be assured of Negro support as long as you desire to remain a public servant."

In the 1949 and 1953 elections, the race issue was comparatively silent. Hartsfield's opponent in both races, county commissioner Charlie Brown, appeared at black voter rallies in an unsuccessful attempt to make inroads into the Mayor's support. A rumor that Brown would overtly inject race and run a blatant white man's campaign in 1953 proved unfounded, so Hartsfield was spared having to face a tangle of white backlash.⁸

But before the next mayoral election, southern politics would change dramatically. After the United States Supreme Court's 1954 school desegregation decision it would be much more difficult to keep race an unspoken issue. Perhaps Hartsfield could have abandoned his black supporters and become a race baiter (after all whites still constituted over 70 percent of the electorate), but he did not. He and his backers in the white power structure remained convinced that racial moderation was a key to Atlanta's continued economic advancement. As the May 1957 primary approached, the mayor received many words of encouragement, but none was more revealing than this penciled scrawl from "a black friend:"

Mr. Mayor you have did our Race a Lots
of favor Douring your 20 years as Mayor
of Atlanta. And we negroes appreciate,

all the favors You has Did for us. Mr.
hartsfield Sir, if you Run you will Be
Elected again Because we Negroes are with
you one hundred per cent.

Hartsfield's opponent, Fulton County commissioner Archie Lindsey, interjected race to a greater extent than Charlie Brown had in the previous two contests. One of his tactics was to call the Mayor "The NAACP candidate." But the issue that he stressed most was alleged corruption in the police department. The United Church Women of Atlanta had made a special appeal for rhetorical calm, and apparently it was heeded. "The race issue," the Savannah Press reported from downstate, "has been soft-pedaled during the campaign by all candidates."¹⁰ The balloting was fairly close, but the mayor escaped 37,612 to 33,808. Roy Harris, the Augusta racist, declared that Lindsey lost because he "pussyfooted on the segregation question."¹¹ Apparently many white Atlantans agreed.

Normally the May win would have been tantamount to victory, and the December general election would have been a mere formality with only token opposition, if any at all. But in 1957 animosity toward Hartsfield and anxiety over the seeming attack on southern traditions led to a search for a serious December candidate. Disenchanted Democrats discussed holding a special convention to nominate a conservative standard bearer whose ideas would fit more closely the massive resistance ideology of the state party, but the effort collapsed. It was at this point that Lester Maddox entered the political picture. Maddox had acquired local note through the folksy sayings in the newspaper advertisements for his Pickrick Restaurant. Gradually "Pickrick says" got more and more political, and when Maddox decided to enter the race he had no trouble obtaining the necessary signatures to get on the ballot.¹²

Whereas Hartsfield had the nearly unanimous support of Atlanta's "community influentials," the Maddox supporters generally had not previously played any significant role in local decision making.¹³ Maddox's principal backing came from a group known as the Atlanta Civic Improvement Association, headed by fellow restaurateur Curry Bible. The association published the Atlanta Citizen's Weekly newspaper which constantly boosted Maddox. The wily old mayor had a spy in Bible's meetings, and he knew of their plans to distribute 40,000 papers each weekend, including one with pictures of Hartsfield socializing with blacks.¹⁴

In 1965 Maddox looked back and argued, "I did not get in the 1957 race because of the segregation issue at all." On the contrary, "law and order," he asserted, had been the main issue; and he challenged anyone to check his claim by going "back to the newspapers of that time."¹⁵ To be sure, Maddox did often stress crime and police corruption, but a close look at the newspapers refutes Maddox's selective memory. For example, in the November 29 Atlanta Constitution a Maddox advertisement declared, "THIS IS YOUR CITY. It is being run by a corrupt political machine controlled by NAACP and special interests." On December 3 another ad said that Hartsfield was "the candidate of the colored bloc vote."¹⁶ In one TV spot Maddox emphasized, "I am neither a liberal nor a moderate."¹⁷ We must throw off those who would bring integration through force.¹⁷ Earlier in the campaign a Maddox ad in the Atlanta Journal incited the ultimate fear of the southern racist.

I AM OPPOSED to integration of white and negro children in public schools. I believe that integration of white and negro children in the South's primary schools would open the gates to widespread racial amalgamation . . . I feel if God wanted such a race He would have created such . . . Keeping our races pure had contributed much to making the United States the world's greatest nation. WHEN ELECTED MAYOR OF ATLANTA I will do as I do in private life, and that is to do all I can for all our people and our community. I will not be restricted in my actions by race, color or creed. I HAVE MANY NEGRO FRIENDS.¹⁸

In the middle of the 1957 campaign one of the most significant events of the Civil Rights revolution was occurring, as President Dwight Eisenhower sent in federal troops to enforce school integration in Arkansas' capital city. The pro-Maddox Atlanta Citizens Weekly headlined, "STORM TROOPERS TAKE LITTLE ROCK."¹⁹ Hartsfield was able to counter with his contextual liberalism. In an election eve television broadcast the mayor asked rhetorically, "You must choose between progress and discord. Do you want another Little Rock, another Montgomery and Birmingham in Atlanta?"²⁰ Banking that the affluent whites would agree with him, Hartsfield lashed out at his opponent's racist appeals charging that Maddox's "whole campaign has been based on one thing: trying to create strife between the people who live in Atlanta." To the League of Women Voters he promised "a continuance of the progressive and sensible policies which have resulted in Atlanta's unprecedented growth."²¹

Hartsfield was victorious, and the voting split along the expected lines with the mayor receiving virtually unanimous support in the black community and substantial white backing from the more affluent precincts. His victory, the mayor asserted, proved that "the people of Atlanta don't want Atlanta's growth and prosperity to be stopped by racial controversy." Maddox's concession statement was direct: "The colored bloc vote is insurmountable." The total vote was 41,300 for Hartsfield and 23,987 for Maddox, but in the 58 precincts (out of 79) that were predominately white, the mayor's margin was only 4,000 votes.²² Closer analysis by Hartsfield strategists revealed that Maddox had actually won a majority of the white vote.²³

It was this race against Lester Maddox's strident racism that made Hartsfield look like a liberal, and it was the administration which followed that made Atlanta look like a "city too busy to hate." In her excellent and widely cited article in the Fall 1972 issue of Phylon, Virginia Hein dated the beginning of the "too busy to hate" reputation with Hartsfield's handling of the 1961 school desegregation crisis.²⁴ Certainly that episode was a key in the perpetuation and enhancement of the Atlanta image, but the concept had been four years in the making and was already national in scope.

"Thriving Atlanta", Time magazine wrote after Hartsfield's win in the May 1957 primary, "is still a Jim Crow city, but it is on the whole ashamed of the violent racial prejudice that is the stock in trade of such wool-hat-minded Georgia politicians as Herman Talmadge and Governor Marvin Griffin." The article called the city an "Oasis of Tolerance." In the fall of that year, as the general election campaign raged, Fortune named

Hartsfield as one of the nation's nine best mayors; and the following spring Readers' Digest carried a piece that credited Atlanta with "the best race relations of any city in the deep south." The Digest's millions of subscribers read a line that Hartsfield had used in his December 1957 victory statement: "When you hate, you stop all constructive work."²⁵ Soon the line was refined into its better known form. The first use was for a speech to the National Toastmasters Club,²⁶ and the initial national publication of the famous dictum came in October 1959. "We're too busy to hate," Hartsfield told Newsweek. "Our aim in life is to make no business, no industry, no educational or social organization ashamed of the dateline 'Atlanta'!"²⁷

In many ways Hartsfield was an easy liberal. Atlanta was, as Time had noted, "still a Jim Crow city" in 1958. Of the city's public facilities only the golf courses were open to blacks. (Hartsfield could handle this since there was no separate course available and since few blacks, and for that matter few working class whites from rural backgrounds, played golf anyway.) An Alabama editor explained simply, "The mayor is no race mixing visionary."²⁸ Like so many among the southern gentry, Hartsfield believed, "In this field of race relations you can't push progress too fast." But unlike some of his more conservative contemporaries, the mayor realized, "you can never put a stop to Negro ambition."²⁹ Hartsfield's long-time police chief Herbert Jenkins recalled it succinctly: "He was just as liberal as necessary to get the black vote."³⁰

In the last two years of his twenty-four years as chief executive, Hartsfield faced his greatest challenges. First the buses, then the schools, and finally the downtown lunch counters and department stores were desegregated. But the city remained calm. Even President John Kennedy praised Atlanta's efforts. The mayor and chief Jenkins worked hard, as they had so often in the past, to manage the situation and keep the lines of communication to the black community open. In his January, 1962 valedictory address to the Board of Aldermen, Hartsfield patted himself and his city on the back: "Many sections of our southland have tried to stop the inexorable clock of time and progress, but without success and at great cost to themselves. Atlanta's mature and friendly approach to the problems of racial change has earned for us the respect of the nation."³¹

Atlanta's actions may have earned the respect of the nation, but they earned the animosity of a majority of white Atlantans who continued to be unyielding segregationists. Once again Lester Maddox would carry their banner. This time the opponent would not be old Bill Hartsfield but Ivan Allen, Jr., the wealthy office supply heir who as Chamber of Commerce president had helped engineer the peaceful solution to the department store-lunch counter crisis and who had led the chamber in its massive "Forward Atlanta" booster program. Maddox and Allen were joined in the primary by state legislators "Muggsy" Smith and Charlie Brown (Hartsfield's opponent in 1949 and 1953) and by county commissioner James Aldridge. From the beginning, however, it was clear that the real race was between Allen and Maddox. Smith challenged Allen for the black vote, especially among the younger militants, but the old leaders in the Atlanta Negro Voters League (the Auburn Avenue crowd) held the line for Allen. Austin T. Walden, the league's patriarch, told the crowd at one rally that if they allowed the black vote to split they would "get that Maddox man and you know what that means." Another league official put it more bluntly by saying, "a vote against Ivan Allen is a vote for Lester

Maddox."³² Allen received about two-thirds of the black vote in the primary, and that was enough for him to lead the pack but not enough to avoid a runoff with Maddox.

Since the 1957 election, Maddox had kept his name in the public eye through his politically-oriented "Pickrick Says" ads for his restaurant. He established and headed Georgians Unwilling to Surrender (GUTS), one of the state's many massive resistance organizations which sprang up to fight school integration. His 1961 campaign, especially in the runoff, amounted to one long anti-integration tirade. He said that school integration had been forced on the people of Atlanta by leadership that had "surrendered and compromised." The peaceful acceptance of the token integration had been, he argued, like the peace in a prison--imposed by force on an unwilling population. He favored continuing the practices of marking hospital blood by race and prohibiting black policemen from arresting whites. "If you permit a Negro officer to arrest a white person," he predicted, "you would cause a racial problem in the city like we have yet to have." He promised to sell the city's public swimming pools rather than allow them to be integrated. He tried to wrap his own cause in Americanism and patriotism while tarring Allen with alleged radicalism. "I can work," he pledged in one ad, "to reverse the present trend toward socialism, conformity, and the destruction of liberty, freedom, and constitutional government." In another broadside he pleaded with the voters to ignore the Atlanta daily newspapers' endorsement of Allen. "You must not," he pleaded, "let the so-called race-mixing liberals influence your vote." Constitution publisher Ralph McGill and editor Eugene Patterson were in Maddox's view "left wing" and "socialistic." On TV he said that if Allen were elected, "Auburn Avenue and Hartsfield will run your city. The NAACP, CORE, the socialists and the communists will run the city." The Allen forces had hosted an interracial victory party the night of the primary, and Maddox called it "disgusting." He said it "brought shame" to the city. One of his newspaper ads ran a large photograph of the gathering as a scare tactic. The caption read: "This is what Atlanta can expect if Ivan Allen, Jr., is elected! Are you ready for this?"

Maddox wanted to make sure that the voters understood the context in the terms in which he perceived it himself, so he put the issue clearly: "If you would like to work to keep the schools, the residential neighborhoods, the city's swimming pools, the hotels, churches, etc., separated and segregated--and would like to protect your family, children and grandchildren from integration then you should vote for Lester Maddox." The alternative was equally clear in his mind: "If you are ready to accept total integration in everything, VOTE FOR IVAN ALLEN, JR.!"

Maddox tried to portray Allen as a silver spoon hypocrite "whose only story of success comes through inheritance." He identified the Achilles' heel of the easy white liberals of the early 1960s. The voters should not believe the sincerity of Allen and his silk-stocking supporters, Maddox argued, until such point as they hired black executives in their own banks and businesses, until they sent their own children to mixed schools, or until they regularly went swimming with blacks. "Their stand for integration," Maddox cried to his working class constituency, "is for YOU and not THEM."³³ Maddox was, of course, right. The power structure had not given the blacks anything more than respect, attention, symbols, and tokens, but these were still much more than Maddox was willing to offer.

When the 1961 runoff votes came in, it was clear that the coalition had prevailed again. Allen won with virtually unanimous black support and with strong endorsement from the northside upper income whites. The results were strikingly similar to 1957. Maddox led among white voters by a margin of 3,000, but the blacks, who turned out in higher percentages, gave Allen ten times that many ballots for a winning margin of over 27,000. Historian Numan V. Bartley divided white Atlanta voters into five categories from poor to affluent to measure the coalition vote. In the 1957 general and 1961 runoff elections, Maddox received from 57 to 75 percent of the vote in all of the lower four categories. But among those voters classified as "affluent" he got only 28.6 percent in 1957 and 26.4 percent in 1961. The middle and lower class whites were not just against Allen and Hartsfield, they opposed the whole sophisticated lifestyle that the two mayors represented. M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Zeigler found that the pro-Maddox voter was likely to oppose such urban ideas as a bond issue for cultural facilities and referendum for legalized liquor. The two political scientists found "a common thread of distrust and apprehension of what the new politics--with its increased taxes, equality for the races, and liberal sounding leadership--has done and will do."³⁴

Maddox was not only plagued by the black bloc and the northside sophisticates, he was also undercut by the fact that his potential constituency was literally moving away in a rush of white flight. The suburbs already outnumbered Atlanta proper, and Maddox could not translate suburban sympathy into city votes. The fall, 1961, school controversy and election campaign were watched closely by suburbanites, and many of them were appalled.

An editor in the southside community of Forest Park challenged the elite prescription for metropolitan success: "Atlanta officials have said that acceptance of desegregation would be good for industry and business growth. We'll see, as time goes on, how wrong they are. It will have nothing whatever to do with location of plants or growth of business. You can mark these words well. See for yourself."³⁵ The Court is actually bringing about a Congo on the Chattahoochee." A housewife in nearby Riverdale wrote the Constitution a testimony about her own white flight: "You see, we aren't going to fall to the black plague. I don't want the government to own my two daughters. They will never be sent to school with Negroes . . . I hope Lester Maddox gets to be mayor of Atlanta. I'm sure glad I moved out of Atlanta or I would have lost my dignity."³⁶

Were Bill Hartsfield and Ivan Allen liberals? If liberalism must entail an attack on economic orthodoxy, they were not. But if men are known by their enemies, if liberals are in fact far-sighted conservatives, they were. If liberals are people who see the need for change, albeit gradual, and accommodate to it, the two mayors fit the mold. On the eve of the 1961 runoff, Allen struggled for the right terminology and ended up telling a television audience that he "would be classified as a liberal conservative." Yet the degree of change over which he presided during his eight years in office surprised even Allen himself. "There is no doubt in my mind," he wrote in his 1971 autobiography, "that I was turning a little more liberal every day."³⁷ Hartsfield left no memoirs and apparently eschewed the word liberal, but in 1970, about a year before his death, he did recall with considerable pride and not too much hyperbole that during his administration, "Atlanta became a lighthouse of racial justice for the entire South."³⁸ The mayors had the liberal image, but when it came to supplying votes--the bottom line of politics--Bartley stated it best: "Negroes were the Georgia liberals."³⁹

Was Atlanta "too busy to hate?" Or was it, as Mayor Maynard Jackson questioned in his 1973 inaugural address, "too busy to love?"⁴⁰ Certainly the business-boosting power structure was too busy for either. Hate was expensive and tacky. Love would have required a serious rethinking of values, and that was inefficient. Certainly had not the black community been "too busy to hate," as Virginia Hein has pointed out, Atlanta could have never acquired its reputation as an "oasis of tolerance." But election returns constitute hard evidence that a majority of Atlanta's white citizens of the late 1950s and early 1960s were not too busy to cast ballots for campaigns based on racism and laced with hate. Nor did the whites in the suburban noose around Atlanta seem too busy to assail the very city that was the heart of the metropolitan area that served them so well. Nor were the people of Georgia in 1966 (with a final nudge from the General Assembly) too busy to choose as governor a man who twice had failed to ride racism and segregation into the Atlanta City Hall.⁴¹

NOTES

¹Michael Hinkelman, "A Tale of Two Cities," Atlanta, 21(Sept. 1981): 98. See Clarence A. Bacote, "The Negro in Atlanta Politics," Phylon, 16 (Winter 1955): 335-350; Stephen Burman, "The Illusion of Progress: Race and Politics in Atlanta, Georgia," Ethnic and Racial Studies (United Kingdom), 2 (Oct. 1979): 441-454; Alton Hornsby, Jr., "The Negro in Atlanta Politics, 1961-1973," Atlanta Historical Bulletin, 21 (Spring 1977): 7-33; Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Duncan R. Jamieson, "Maynard Jackson's 1973 Election as Mayor of Atlanta," Midwest Quarterly, 18 (1976): 7-26; M. Kent Jennings, Community Influentials: The Elites of Atlanta (London, Free Press of Glencoe, 1964); Mack H. Jones, "Black Political Empowerment in Atlanta: Myth and Reality," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 439 (Sept. 1978): 90-117; Richard Murray and Arnold Vedlitz, "Racial Voting Patterns in the South: An Analysis of Major Elections from 1960 to 1977 in Five Cities," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 439 (Sept. 1978): 29-39; Jack Walker, "Negro Voting in Atlanta: 1954-1961," Phylon, 24 (Winter 1963): 379-387.

²Harold D. Martin, William Berry Hartsfield: Mayor of Atlanta (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1978), p. 42.

³Augusta Courier, 8 Aug. 1957.

⁴Walker, "Negro Voting," p. 380.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Hornsby, "The Negro," 8-9.

⁷Bacote to Hartsfield, 19 Jan. 1950. Clarence A. Bacote Papers, Atlanta University Library, Special Collections.

⁸Martin, Hartsfield, pp. 51, 72, 94-95.

- ⁹"A black friend" to Hartsfield. William Berry Hartsfield Papers, Special Collections, Robert W. Woodruff Library for Advanced Studies, Emory University, Atlanta. Hereafter cited as Hartsfield Papers.
- ¹⁰Savannah Press, 4 May 1957, clipping in the Hartsfield Papers.
- ¹¹Augusta Courier, 3 June 1952.
- ¹²Bruce Galphin, The Riddle of Lester Maddox (Atlanta: Camelot Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 20-28; Martin, Hartsfield, pp. 128-129.
- ¹³Jennings, Community Influentials, pp. 130-140.
- ¹⁴Undated typed memo, Box 14, Hartsfield Papers. "Miss Bullard" (Helen), is penciled on the top. At the bottom is the revealing penciled line, "We have a man in these meetings. H." Helen Bullard was the campaign coordinator.
- ¹⁵Galphin, Riddle, p. 28.
- ¹⁶Atlanta Constitution (Hereafter Constitution), 29 Nov. 3-4 Dec. 1957.
- ¹⁷Galphin, Riddle, 29.
- ¹⁸Atlanta Journal, 16 Sept. 1957, clipping in the Hartsfield Papers.
- ¹⁹Atlanta Citizens Weekly, 3 Oct., 1957, in the Hartsfield Papers.
- ²⁰Constitution, 4 Dec., 1957.
- ²¹Ibid., 3 Dec., 1957.
- ²²Ibid., 5 Dec., 1957.
- ²³Martin, Hartsfield, p. 145.
- ²⁴Virginia H. Hein, "The Image of 'A City Too Busy to Hate': Atlanta in the 1960s," Phylon, 33 (Fall 1972): 207.
- ²⁵"Oasis of Tolerance," Time, 20 May 1957, p. 31; "New Strength in City Hall," Fortune, November 1957, 156+. Atlanta was not one of the 10 best governed cities. Ross Irwin, "Mayor Hartsfield Uses the Light Touch," Reader's Digest, June 1958, p. 206 (Originally published in the New Leader, 28 April 1958). In Hartsfield's victory statement the line was, "when you stop to hate, you stop all constructive work" Constitution, 5 December 1957.
- ²⁶Constitution, 18 Jan. 1970.
- ²⁷William A. Emerson, Jr., "Where the Paper Clips Jump," Newsweek, 19 October, 1959, p. 96.
- ²⁸Montgomery Advertiser, undated clipping [1957], Hartsfield Papers.
- ²⁹Irwin, "Mayor Hartsfield," p. 206.

³⁰Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 18 January, 1981.

³¹George J. Lankevich, comp. and ed., Atlanta: A Chronological and Documentary History (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1978), p. 128. For good accounts of the 1961 integrations see Hornsby, "The Negro;" Hein, "The Image;" and Alton Hornsby, Jr., "A City That Was Too Busy to Hate," in Elizabeth Jacoway and David R. Colburn, eds., Southern Businessmen and Desegregation (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), pp. 120-136.

³²Constitution, 6 September, 1961.

³³All above quotations from Constitution, 1-21 September 1961.

³⁴Numan V. Bartley, From Thurmond to Wallace: Political Tendencies in Georgia, 1948-1968. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), p. 47; M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Zeigler, "Class, Party and Race in Four Types of Elections: The Case of Atlanta," Journal of Politics, 28 (May 1966): 402-403. See also on the 1961 results Ivan Allen (with Paul Hemphill), Mayor: Notes on the Sixties (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1971), p. 60; Lester Garfield Maddox, Speaking Out: The Autobiography of Lester Garfield Maddox (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1975), p. 44; Walker, "Negro Voting," pp. 381-382.

³⁵Forest Park Free Press, 6 September, 1961, Jack Troy, editor.

³⁶Constitution, 8 September, 1961, B. Jones to editor. Clayton County Schools did not desegregate until 1968.

³⁷Ibid., 21 September, 1961; Allen, Mayor, p. 87.

³⁸Ibid., 18 January, 1970.

³⁹Bartley, From Thurmond to Wallace, p. 46.

⁴⁰Lankevich, ed., Atlanta, p. 137.

⁴¹In the 1966 governor's race Bo Callaway actually received more votes than Maddox, but since he did not receive a majority because of a third candidate, the race went to the legislature which chose Maddox the Democrat. Hein, "The Image," p. 221.