; poverty, persistent institutional
ıcation, and the continued social
ıis country. Sooner or later orga-
itany of inequities, will no doubt
t to be preceded by a fundamental
o blacks, the mobilization of the
e black community, and the trans-
m and hopelessness into a shared
vision of collective political power.

Appendix 1: Methodology and Presentation of Coding Manual

Use of the annual *New York Times Index*, or newspapers in general, as a data source has been frequently criticized as methodologically problematic (Bagdikian, 1972; Breed, 1958; Danzger, 1975; Molotch and Lester, 1974). Consistent with some of the objections raised by critics, newspaper data would appear to be poorly suited to the study of various aspects of social insurgency. Specifically, the method is poorly suited to the study of subtle social-psychological processes or the effect of psychological conditions on the unfolding insurgent process (Gurr, 1972: 34). Nor does it seem that newspapers provide a suitable source of data for any but the most newsworthy insurgent challenges. Thus, to use the *Index* as the sole data source to analyze "gay" activism prior to 1965 would be problematic simply because such activity did not constitute "copy" until several years later. Finally, it would seem indefensible to use the technique to study aspects or forms of insurgency that are readily subject to reporter distortion. Here Tuchman's distinction between "hard" and "soft news" provides a useful guideline (Tuchman, 1973: 113). That is, newspaper accounts of the "hard" or factual aspects of an event are likely to be reliable. On the other hand, the interpretive or "soft" aspects of the story are particularly vulnerable to reporter distortion and thus logical candidates for exclusion from analysis. In support of this distinction, Danzger argues that "in a case of conflict whether an action was a march or a boycott, involved ten or one hundred, the police or the clergy, are all clear facts. The attitudes of rioters—i.e., are their actions part of a 'Christmas in August' looters' syndrome or are they trying to get a message through to the power structure; is an attempt to break up a mob intentional harassment or a reasonable action—all these are open to question. These are the kinds of facts which are easily subverted by bias and difficult to establish beyond question. Newspaper reports may be unreliable data sources here" (1975: 577).

At the same time, however, I strongly argue that several factors highly recommend the methodological technique of content coding for the historical analysis of insurgency. In the first place the technique allows for replication by others, as well as for the systematic formulation and testing of research hypotheses. Such advantages are hardly insignificant.

Second, the technique is ideally suited to provide rough measures of the sorts of broad macro-level processes that over time shape insurgency (Gurr, 1972: 34). Crucial facets of the unfolding conflict process otherwise resistant to quantification can be crudely measured. Such important aspects of insurgency as the rate of involvement of various groups over time, the different patterns of activity manifest by various parties to the conflict, the shifting geographic location of insurgent events and the interaction of various groups over time can all be given rough quantificative expression.

A final factor encouraging use of data drawn from newspapers is the extraordinary paucity of alternative data sources for those engaged in conflict research. Indeed, as Danzger notes, even some of these "alternative" sources are, in fact, drawn from newspaper accounts of insurgent events. As examples, he cites the *Congressional Quarterly's Civil Disorder Chronology*, the Lemberg Center's *Riot*

Data Review, and the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. As Danzger writes, "Although they appear to be a variety of sources, in reality they are all based on a single source of data, newspaper reports, and several of them are based on the *New York Times*" (Danzger, 1975: 572).

To exclude from use all newspaper data would thus seriously impair research into these important topics. No one is seriously suggesting this. Danzger, in his important article, is not so much criticizing the use of newspaper data as its utilization without any awareness of the limitations inherent in the source (Danzger, 1975: 573). In this study an effort was made to utilize *Index* data only when it was methodologically defensible to do so. As I argued above, newsworthiness, avoidance of social-psychological topics, and variables resistant to reporter distortion are necessary prerequisites for the viable use of the technique under discussion. The research reported here conforms to all three conditions.

In regard to the first of these conditions, it seems safe to say that the extensive media attention devoted to the black movement was only an extension of the substantial coverage accorded blacks prior to the generation of widespread insurgency in the mid-1950s. A qualitative analysis of the stories contained in the *Index* for the years 1948–54 supports this assertion. The following examples drawn from those years serve to illustrate the point:

—Army and Navy Chaplains' Association held opposed to segregation (May 11, 1948)
—T.J. McKee, who lived forty-five years as a white man, dies (August 19, 1948)
—Abyssinian Baptist Church to send seventy-five Negro children to Vermont white families for vacations (April 24, 1948)
—Cross burned at home of L. Hutson, believed only Negro in Wall Township, New Jersey (June 13, 1948)
—Two Negroes jailed, Ozark, Alabama, for donning masks to scare two Negresses seen with white man (August 6, 1949)
—Cadet D. Campbell is first flight commander in Pensacola Naval Air Station preflight graduating class (October 22, 1950)
—White and Negro neighbors repair home of 109-year-old Negro woman, Jefferson, Georgia (March 26, 1950)
—Two white policemen, charged with beating Negro prisoner to death, Lafayette, Alabama, acquitted by white jury (March 23, 1950)

These few examples, which could be multiplied many times over, accurately convey a level of media awareness that suggests a receptivity to the general topic of black America significantly predating the movement. As a result, I feel confident in interpreting the findings reported here as reflective of actual social processes rather than as artificial by-products of increased media attention.

Moreover, the extreme importance attributed to the black struggle by the media would make it seem unlikely that the *Times* was guilty of failing to report a major story relevant to the movement. It is hard to believe that any major story involving a movement that had captured the imagination of the country, would have escaped the attention of the paper that has long prided itself on being the most comprehensive in the world. Indeed, 83 percent of all dated events between 1955 and 1962 (447 of 536), mentioned in nine descriptive accounts of the movement (Bergman, 1969; Brooks, 1974; Hughes, 1962; Keesing's Research Report, 1970; Killian, 1975; Muse, 1964; Oppenheimer, 1963; Woodward, 1966; Zinn, 1965), were reported in the *Times*. When the comparison is reversed, the descriptive accounts report only 9 percent (447 of 4,817) of all events contained in the *Index*.

Finally, in the choice of the basic variables utilized in this analysis, care was taken to omit those that seemed especially vulnerable to reporter distortion or misrepresentation. Thus, while newspaper accounts of events relevant to the movement (court actions, sit-ins, demonstrations, etc.) may systematically misinterpret the motives of the participants involved, it is unlikely that such accounts will contain inaccuracies as to the date and location of the event or the general identity of those involved, (black students, state police, etc.). In short, the selection of major variables reflects an acute awareness of the inability of newspaper accounts to depict accurately every aspect of a complex social event. Besides increasing confidence in the accuracy of the data under analysis, this careful selection of variables also resulted in impressive intercoder reliability coefficients. By way of conventional assurances, ratings for the coding of all variables were consistently around 90 percent. But in regard to the key variables utilized in the final analysis, coder reliability ratings were never below 95 percent.

The coding manual used in this research read as follows.

Coding Manual

I. *Introduction*

The basic aim of the analysis is to content code all story synopses relevant to the topic of black insurgency that are contained in the annual indexes of the *New York Times* corresponding to the years of the study period. Specifically, in the yearly indexes from 1948 to 1970, all story synopses listed under the two headings, "Negroes-U.S.-General," and "Education-U.S.-Racial Integration," are to be read and, if relevant, coded in accordance with the criteria and categories set forth below.

How summaries are to be coded. The first code is to be used in coding actions (riots, sit-ins, protest marches, etc.), while the second code is designed to handle all speeches and statements. The "speech code" consists of the following seven dimensions along which a synopsis can be coded:

1) date of event
2) initiating unit
3) direction of the event (pro or anti movement)
4) level of initiating unit (local, state, or national)
5) geographic target of the event
6) issue(s) at stake
7) racial identity of the initiating unit

The "action code" includes these same seven dimensions as well as the five additional categories listed below:

8) location of event (what state?)
9) size of locality (rural/urban)

10) nature of event
11) violence (yes/no)
12) resources (did the action involve the allocation of resources?)

It is hoped that together these two codes will afford rough measures of the sorts of broad macro-level processes that over time shape insurgency (interaction between various parties to the conflict, shifting substantive and geographic focus of insurgency, etc.).

II. *General Coding Instructions*

Perhaps the single most difficult determination in regard to any story is whether or not to code it in the first place. It is hoped that the following simple rules will help to eliminate some of the difficulties associated with this initial coding decision.

A) Only synopses relevant to the general topic of black insurgency are to be coded. No doubt you will find other story summaries under the two headings listed above that bear little or no relationship to the topic under study. For example, stories documenting the achievements of black athletes or entertainers are commonplace. To repeat, such stories should not be coded.

B) Besides this general criteria of relevance, summaries are to be coded only if they are judged to be unambiguous with regard to 1) the identification of the event; 2) its location (where relevant); and 3) the individual(s) or group(s) who were responsible for initiating the event.

C) All *New York Times*-generated stories will not be coded. This rule will apply to all letters (lr), comments, Sunday opinion-type stories (designated by Roman numerals), surveys, ads, and editorials (ed).

D) Two separate codings on one story should only occur when the activities in question are discrete. That is, a given speech or action will usually generate only one coding. For example, no matter how many different points a speaker should make, the speech itself should only be coded once.

E) On stories that hinge on a preceding event, code the present activity and only if it warrants coding under the criteria set out earlier. For example:

> "Two 18 year old white youths arrested in connection with the shooting death of a civil rights worker a week ago."

In this case the arrest would be coded, *not* the shooting itself.

III. Black Insurgency Codes

A. *Action Code*

13–18 Dates of action

19–22 Pages in *Index*

23–24 Area (Where did the action take place?)

00	No specific location	27	Nebraska
01	Alabama*	28	Nevada

02	Alaska	29	New Hampshire
03	Arizona	30	New Jersey
04	Arkansas*	31	New Mexico
05	California	32	New York
06	Colorado	33	North Carolina*
07	Connecticut	34	North Dakota
08	Delaware	35	Ohio
09	Florida*	36	Oklahoma*
10	Georgia*	37	Oregon
11	Hawaii	38	Pennsylvania
12	Idaho	39	Rhode Island
13	Illinois	40	South Carolina*
14	Indiana	41	South Dakota
15	Iowa	42	Tennessee*
16	Kansas	43	Texas*
17	Kentucky*	44	Utah
18	Louisiana*	45	Vermont
19	Maine	46	Virginia*
20	Maryland*	47	Washington
21	Massachusetts	48	West Virginia*
22	Michigan	49	Wisconsin
23	Minnesota	50	Wyoming
24	Mississippi*	51	NYC Metropolitan area
25	Missouri*	52	District of Columbia (local)*
26	Montana	53	District of Columbia (national)

25 Size of Locality (Where did the event take place?)
- 1 Urban
- 2 Rural

26 Target Area
- 0 No specific target
- 1 North
- 2 South
- 3 Regional
- 4 National
- 5 Federal

27 Unit Level (Importance or "level" of those involved)
- 1 Local
- 2 State
- 3 Regional
- 4 National

28–29 Initiating Unit

Political
- 11 Candidates (explicitly acknowledged)
- 12 Party spokespersons
- 18 2 or more candidates

Governmental
21 Executive head
22 Executive body, agency, or official (including cabinet members)
23 Legislator
24 Legislative body
25 Individual jurist
26 Judicial body
27 Law enforcement personnel
28 Multiple gov. figures, bodies, etc.
29 U.S. Civil Rights Commission

Religious
31 Protestant spokesperson or body
32 Catholic spokesperson or body
33 Jewish spokesperson or body
34 Other religious spokesperson or body
38 Multiple religious spokespersons or groups

Labor & Professional Bodies
41 Labor spokespersons
42 Business spokespersons
43 Medical personnel or associations
44 Social scientist
45 Legal profession
46 Educational associations (school boards, etc.)
47 Human relations councils
48 Multiple labor or professional spokespersons or associations
49 Foundations

Interest or "Reactionary" Groups
51 Miscellaneous interest groups
52 KKK
53 John Birch Society
54 Citizens Council
55 Other white Supremacist groups
56 "Leftist" groups
57 Other sociocultural organizations
58 Multiple interest or "reactionary" groups
59 Sports commission or authority

Media
61 Newspaper
62 Television
63 Artists/actors

Education
71 Black colleges (administrative spokesperson)
72 White or interracial colleges (administrative spokesperson)
73 Black students and/or faculty

74 White students and/or faculty
75 Interracial group of students and/or faculty
78 Multiple educational units

Movement Groups
81 NAACP
82 The Black Muslims
83 CORE
84 SNCC
85 SCLC
86 Panthers
87 Martin Luther King
88 Multiple movement groups or spokespersons
89 Other specifically identified movement groups or spokespersons

Others
91 Black aggregate
92 White aggregate
93 Interracial aggregate
94 Other aggregates (racial composition unknown)
95 Unknown notables
96 Known notables
97 Individual actor
98 Black cultural organization
99 Multiple units cross-categories

30 Racial Composition of Initiating Unit
1 Black
2 White
3 Mixed

31–34 Issue
11 Segregation-integration
12 Equality under the law
13 Political power
14 Economic power/jobs/poverty
15 Black culture/black pride
16 Racism (black)
17 Racism (white)
18 Separtism/self determination
19 Internal dissent
21 Organizational concerns
22 Black extremism
23 The general plight of the black American
24 Impoverished sociocultural environment/ghettos
25 Voter registration
27 Police brutality
28 Riots/law and order

35–36 Issue Area
- 11 Public facilities and accommodations
- 12 Public transportation
- 13 Housing
- 14 Education
- 15 Military
- 16 Labor/the economy/employment
- 17 Administration of justice
- 18 Politics
- 19 Media
- 21 Sports
- 22 Health and medicine
- 23 Religion
- 24 Business
- 25 The arts
- 26 The family

37 Specificity
- 1 Identification of specific issue

38–39 Event
- 11 Institutionalized government action (passage of bill, institution of new program, executive actions, elections, appointments, or formation of new committees, commissions, etc.).
- 12 Private group materially aids the movement/foundation grants.
- 21 Internal dynamics of black movement (formation of new group, leadership changes, mergers, conventions, conferences, etc.).
- 22 Internal dynamics of white supremacy movement.
- 31 Institutionalized insurgency (i.e., campaign to enact legislation, elect a public official, register voters, petition campaign, etc.).
- 32 Threat or warning made by a group or individual who possess the resources to carry out the threat, mentioning specific target and date.
- 33 Movement group materially aides local population.
- 34 Court action (either its initiation or resolution).
- 35 Desegregation of facility, event, or organization.
- 36 Continued segregation of facility (attempt at desegregation fails).
- 41 Boycott/strikes (except school boycott).
- 42 Mass action (sit-in, protest march, demonstration, rally, etc.).
- 44 Harassment or intimidation of blacks or their supporters by antimovement forces.
- 45 Other illegal acts.

- 46 Violent action (riot, lynching, murder, etc.).
- 47 State control (arrests, jailings, convictions, indictments, fines, suspensions, subpoenas, etc.).
- 48 Freedom Ride
- 49 Black cultural event
- 50 School boycott
- 51 Termination of aid to insurgent group.

40 Violence
- 0 The event wasn't violent
- 1 The event was violent

41 Direction
- 0 Ambiguous
- 1 Pro-integration
- 2 Pro–"black power"
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Anti-integration
- 5 Anti–"black power"

42 Resources
- 1 Legislation
- 2 Money
- 3 Program
- 4 Combination of 2 and 3
- 5 Jobs/physical facility
- 6 Other

43 Related Movement Connections
- 1 Gay movement
- 2 Peace movement
- 3 Women's movement
- 4 Other minority movement
- 5 Other leftist movement

B. *Speech Code*

13–18 Date of speech

19–22 Page in *Index*

45–46 Initiating Unit
(same as "Initiating Unit" in Action Code)

47 Direction
(same as "Direction" in Action Code)

48 Unit Level
(same as "Unit Level" in Action Code)

49 Target Area
(same as "Target Area" in Action Code)

50–53 Issue
(same as "Issue" in Action Code)

54–55 Issue Area
(same as "Issue Area" in Action Code)

56 Rhetoric

1 Segregation-integration
2 Discrimination
3 Civil rights
4 Racism
5 Separatism
6 Extremism
7 Nationalism

57 Racial Composition
(same as "Racial Composition" in Action Code)

IV. *Explanation of Code Categories*

(Listed below are explanations for those code categories that would seem to be less than self-explanatory. The general categories are listed by column number with the specific codes within each category listed in accordance with the numbers assigned them above.)

13–22 *Date and Page of the Article*

23–24 *Area*—The code would appear to be self-evident except for the last three categories.

51 *NYC Metropolitan Area*—refers only to actions that occur within the immediate NYC Metropolitan area.

52 *Dist. of Colum. (local)*—refers specifically to those related movement activities that are concerned with conditions in the District of Columbia as a place of habitation rather than as the seat of national government.

53 *Dist. of Colum. (national)*—refers to any story that deals with the workings of national government.

25 *Size of Locality*—in coding size of locality, the coder should refer to the attached sheets for a list of the major cities in each state. For the purposes of this study, cities with a population of 10,000 or more in 1960 will be referred to as "urban" while all others will be coded "rural."

26 *Target Area*—refers to the geographical target that is implied in movement and movement-related events. In other words that geographical area that the relevant actors are concerned with affecting. For example:

> "650 marchers hold prayer services on the steps of City Hall, Birmingham, Alabama, to protest continued harassment of those blacks seeking to register to vote."

The demonstrators are clearly concerned with conditions in Birmingham, or more generally, the South. Therefore, the target area is the "South."

Those states under the general coding category "Area" that are followed by an asterisk will be coded as "South" while all others will be designated as "North."

The target area "National" refers not to a specific geographical area but rather to the United States as a whole. "Federal" will be coded only in regard to statements or actions that involve the federal government as the focus or target of the event.

28–29 *Initiating Unit*—refers to the individual or individuals whose actions or statments have prompted the story. For the most part, all coding categories would appear to be self-evident, except for the following:

11 *Candidate*—refers to any person explicitly designated as a candidate in the *Index*. If the person is an elected official but identified as a candidate in the synopsis, he should be coded as a candidate.

71 *Black Colleges*

72 *White or Interracial Colleges*—in both these cases I refer to the actions or statements by administrators and/or faculty members acting, not as individuals, but as spokespersons for the school itself.

73 *Black Students and/or Faculty*

74 *White Students and/or Faculty*

75 *Interracial Group of Students and/or Faculty*

The above categories refer to the statements or activities of students and/or faculty members acting autonomously from their respective educational institutions.

91 *Black aggregate*

92 *White aggregate*

93 *Interracial aggregate*

94 *Other aggregate*

In the above categories, an aggregate refers to a collection of people who act in consort, but who nevertheless are not specifically identified as a formally constituted group.

95 *Unknown notables*—refers to those individuals, unknown to the coder, who are listed in the *Index* without additional identifying information.

30 *Racial Composition of Initiating Unit*—In many cases it will be difficult to ascertain the racial composition of the initiating unit. This especially is true in reference to activities generated by the various movement organizations. In this determination the coder must, of necessity, rely on the information contained in the story itself.

31–34 *Issue*—It should first be noted that four columns have been set aside for the coding of issues rather than two. This permits the coder to identify two issues per story and thus enables us to handle the bulk of multiple issue stories. As one might expect, if the story deals with only one issue, columns 33 and 34 will be marked 0.

An examination of the specific coding categories listed under this heading reveals a set of vague, general issues whose coding

criteria are too complex to be clearly stated here. The specifics of each issue remain to be transmitted from author to coder during his/her training period. A general feel for each issue, however, may be gained by reading the following short summaries:

11 *Segregation-Integration*—concerns the general question of the institutional separation of blacks and whites in America, with reference to such specific spheres of everyday life as housing, education, public accommodations, and transportation.

12 *Equality under the law*—involves the demand that the rights and responsibilities of black Americans be adequately legislated *and* enforced. For example:

> "600 blacks picket the White House to demand federal protection for beleaguered voter registrars in the Deep South."

13 *Political power*—the recognition of the importance of political power as a tool to facilitate the socioeconomic advancement of blacks.

14 *Economic power/jobs/poverty*—an explicit focus on the economic problems (jobs, poverty, etc.) confronting blacks or the need to generate greater economic power to facilitate the realization of movement goals (i.e., black capitalism).

15 *Black culture*—represents a concern for the preservation and perpetuation of black culture. Implicit in this concern is the belief that the black cultural heritage has been systematically suppressed and denigrated by the dominant white society and that blacks must recover their lost heritage if they are to maintain a sense of collective identity.

16 *Black racism*—refers to the charge made by some movement opponents in the late 60s that the "wilder excesses" of the black movement had fostered a reverse racism in which blacks were prejudiced against whites (frequently Jews).

17 *White racism*—Rejecting the reformist ideology of the early movement, white racism represents a more comprehensive indictment of American society in which discrimination and racial prejudice are seen as inextricably woven into the institutional fabric of everyday life.

18 *Separatism/self-determination*—As with segregation-integration this issue concerns the general question of the institutional relationship between blacks and whites in America. In this case, however, the preferred relationship involves the maintenance of separate institutions (or perhaps even whole communities or nations) rather than the integration of same.

19 *Internal dissent*—To code this issue the event in question must involve either a clear-cut instance of dissension between movement groups or a discussion of the phenomenon itself. The following two examples will illustrate both types of events.

> "Rap Brown brands Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young as Uncle Toms; says two pose greater threat to black interests than George Wallace."

> "Martin Luther King, in speech to National Student Association, says, 'internal divisiveness' is eroding previously strong civil rights coalition; calls for renewed unity."

21 *Organizational concerns*—involves any explicit concern with the organizational dynamics of movement or movement-related groups. For example:

> "Roy Wilkins, Executive Director of the NAACP, cites 'mistaken belief that the crusade is over' as reason for drop in organization's membership."

22 *Black extremism*—involves the explicit approval of tactics or strategies more extreme than those advocated during the era of nonviolent direct action. Thus, any story dealing with the debate over the desirability of these "extreme" tactics will be coded 22.

23 *The general plight of the black American*—A catchall, this category is designed to handle those movement-related stories in which no specific issue is identified. For example:

> "Nelson Rockefeller, in speech before joint session of NY legislature, reports that he 'deplores the general plight of the black American,' and pledges his continued support for further civil rights legislation."

24 *Impoverished sociocultural environment*—involves the explicit recognition of the sociocultural disadvantages imposed on blacks by means of the institutional arrangements of American society.

25 *Voter registration*—would appear to be self-explanatory.

27 *Police brutality*—would appear to be self-evident.

28 *Riots/law and order*—involves any explicit discussion of the urban riots as a phenomenon or the numerous calls for "law and order" in the face of those riots.

35–36 *Issue Area*—The general coding category, *Issue Area*, will be used in two distinct ways:

1) In some instances it will be impossible to identify one of the 16 specific issues listed under the coding category *Issue* but possible to identify a specific issue area. For example:

> "In an outbreak of racial hostilities, 50 black and white sailors clash aboard the U.S.S. Enterprise."

Issue: too vague to be coded
Issue Area: Military

2) For the most part, however, the *Issue Area* code will be used in conjunction with the specific issues of Segregation-Integration, Black and White Racism, and Equality Under the Law as listed under the coding category *Issue*. That is, the *Issue Area* code will be used to provide more specific information in regard to stories involving the issues mentioned above. For example:

> "100 black demonstrators converge on the Albany, Georgia, City Hall to protest alleged segregation in municipal bus service."

Issue: Segregation-Integration
Issue Area: Public transportation

37 *Specificity*—A story will be coded specific if it is tied to a *local* effort to deal with it. This effort may be either pro- or anti-movement. For example:

> "Eleven black students stage lunch counter sit-in, Fayetteville, North Carolina, in effort to force desegregation of city's public facilities."

> "Threats of violence by white citizens force discontinuation of integrated church services, Greenwood, Mississippi."

38–39 *Event*—For the most part the event code is self-explanatory. Several coding categories, however, demand further explanation.

11 *Institutionalized government action*—This first coding category includes all those events listed in the code plus their converses. In other words, not only is the passage of a bill coded number 11, but the *defeat* of a bill, as well.

12 *Private group materially aids the movement*—This category will be used to code those stories involving private contributions designed to benefit the movement. For example:

> "Fund for the Republic contributes $150,000 to Southern Regional Council to help support current inter-racial programs."

31 *Institutionalized insurgency*—This coding category seeks to capture those instances in which *movement participants* engage in institutionalized political action. Thus only those campaigns in which blacks are reported to be actively involved will be coded 31.

32 *Threat or warning*—Two conditions must be satisfied before a threat or warning can be coded. First of all, the individual or group issuing the threat must be in a position to carry it out. If not, the threat is not likely to provoke a reaction from the opposition. Secondly, the threat must make reference to a specific target. By insisting on this condition we hope to eliminate the rash of vague threats that proliferate in all instances of social conflict. Examples:

> "Bobby Seale issues warning to white America to expect 'protracted guerrilla warfare' if economic exploitation of black masses continues much longer."

> "Lyndon Johnson issues statment in which he threatens 'non-cooperation' on impending legislation unless Voter Rights Bill is on his desk by mid-September."

In the above examples, only the second story should be coded.

36 *Continued segregation of facility, event, or organization*—Under increased pressure to desegregate, a continued refusal to do so becomes noteworthy. Thus the continued segregation of any facility (public park), event (Memorial Day Parade), or organization (Lions Club) will be coded 36 under the Event code. Again, an example may prove helpful:

> "Lyric Theatre, Baltimore, closes when local black leaders fail to reach a satisfactory agreement with management regarding racial admissions policies."

46 *Violent action*—refers to those events which are *exclusively violent*. By this criterion, then, a peaceful march, marred by violence, would not be coded.

51 *Termination of aide to insurgent group*—represents the converse of 12. Here private groups withdraw, reduce, or suspend resource support they earlier granted movement groups.

40 *Violence*—An event will be coded violent if violence is in any way associated with it. For instance, a peaceful march, marred by violence, would be coded under this category.

41 *Direction*—refers to the actors intent on undertaking the activity in question. That is, regardless of the ultimate impact of the event on the movement, so long as it was intended to promote the aims of the movement it will be coded Pro.

In this code, however, the movement is not presumed to be monolithic but rather to consist of two main divisions. The first is the traditional civil rights coalition stressing integration as its goal and nonviolent direct action as its means. The second "wing" of the movement are the "Black Power" proponents distinguished not so much by specific goals or means but rather by their rejection of integration as a viable goal and nonviolence

as *the* only means. The direction code has been drafted in such a way as to reflect this division. Movement related activities can be either Pro or Anti "Black Power."

Finally, a Neutral activity refers to any noncommital stance in regard to the movement. This particular category will most often be used to code statements of condition, as in the following example:

> "Economist Herbert Stein cites recent gain in black per capita income as evidence of economic progress."

42 *Resources*

1 *Legislation*—The enactment of a piece of legislation designed primarily to benefit black Americans.
2 *Money*—The allocation of a significant monetary sum (over $5,000) designed in some way to benefit black Americans.
3 *Program*—The institution or continuation of some program designed to benefit black Americans.
4 *Combination of 2 and 3*—Refers to any story involving the allocation of a significant monetary sum in conjunction with a specific program designed to benefit black Americans.
5 *Jobs/physical facility*—would appear to be self-evident.

43 *Related movement connections*—here I am concerned with capturing those events where a clear connection between the black movement and the various insurgent challenges listed under this category is indicated. For example:

> "Huey Newton meets with representatives of the anti-war movement; afterwards issues call for the establishment of closer ties between all elements working to 'defeat' American imperialism at home and abroad."

53 *Rhetoric*—This code is designed to measure, however crudely, the shifts in movement rhetoric from 1948 to 1970, and will be employed only when the story summary indicates that the speaker in question used one of the seven words listed under this coding category. For example:

> "Eldridge Cleaver attacks what he terms diseased, racist society, at press conference in Oakland, California."
> Rhetoric Code: Racism

Appendix 2: Chronology of Sit-in Demonstrations, February 1–March 31, 1960

Date	*Location*
February 1	Greensboro, North Carolina
February 8	Durham, North Carolina
	Winston-Salem, North Carolina
February 9	Charlotte, North Carolina
	Fayetteville, North Carolina
February 10	Raleigh, North Carolina
February 11	Elizabeth City, North Carolina
	Hampton, Virginia
	High Point, North Carolina
February 12	Concord, North Carolina
	Portsmouth, Virginia
	Deland, Florida
	Norfolk, Virginia
	Rock Hill, South Carolina
February 13	Nashville, Tennessee
	Tallahassee, Florida
February 16	Salisbury, North Carolina
February 17	Chapel Hill, North Carolina
February 18	Suffolk, Virginia
	Shelby, North Carolina
February 19	Chattanooga, Tennessee
February 20	Richmond, Virginia
	Baltimore, Maryland
February 22	Whaleyville, Virginia
	Frankfort, Kentucky
	Newport News, Virginia
February 25	Montgomery, Alabama
	Orangeburg, South Carolina
	Henderson, North Carolina
	Charleston, South Carolina
February 27	Lexington, Kentucky
	Petersburg, Virginia
	Tuskegee, Alabama
February 29	Denmark, South Carolina
	Tampa, Florida
March 1	Monroe, North Carolina
March 2	St. Petersburg, Florida
	Daytona Beach, Florida
	Columbia, South Carolina
	Sarasota, Florida