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Identity and violent death

Contextualizing lethal gun violence within the African American community of Dallas, TX (1900–1907)
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ABSTRACT
During the Freedman’s Cemetery Project of the 1990s, evidence of lethal gun violence was recovered archaeologically from several early twentieth century burials. Although lying in unmarked graves, those who died violently still have the chance of being identified through the very bullets that robbed them of their lives. Forensic identification of the bullets and other archaeological criteria are compared to descriptions of gunshot victims in newspaper accounts and other archival records, and individual as well as group identity is examined in the process. These moments of violence also provide a unique window into exploring the extent and underlying causes of violence perpetrated within and against the African American community of Dallas, Texas, in the first decade of the twentieth century,
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INTERLUDE

In the winter of 1902, Fred Washington, a 23-year-old African-American, was working at Mosher’s Iron Foundry in Dallas, Texas. A white 17-year-old co-worker named Henry Grasty was constantly ridiculing Washington, and he finally couldn’t take it any more. On the morning of 19 February, Washington took a shovel and struck the boy in the head, knocking him to the ground. Realizing what he had done by seriously assaulting a white boy, he knew things would go very badly for him. Washington fled to his tiny shack of a house near the Katy rail line, bolted the door and waited with a muzzle-loading shotgun for the authorities to come. Two policemen quickly followed Washington home, and kicked in the door; Washington raised the shotgun and pulled the trigger, but the percussion cap was defective, and the gun failed to fire. Deputy Constable Arch Cochran shot four times, with two bullets striking Fred Washington; one through the heart, lodging in his back, with the other passing through his left wrist (Dallas Times Herald, 19 February 1902).

Almost a hundred years later, on the morning of 28 May 1993, archaeologists in downtown Dallas exhumed Burial 653, containing the remains of an approximately 26-year-old man interred at the turn of the twentieth century in a pauper’s grave, lying face down and missing his left hand. One artifact recovered was a cylindrical lead object in the thorax, instantly recognizable as a bullet. Is Burial 653 actually Fred Washington? Perhaps.

INTRODUCTION

This is a search for identity navigated through the violence of early twentieth century Dallas. Our unique window into this past is derived from the Freedman’s Cemetery Project, formed by the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) due to the necessity of expansion of North Central Expressway. The focus was Freedman’s Cemetery, the principal burial ground for virtually every African American of Dallas between the years 1869 and 1907. Excavations within Freedman’s Cemetery encompassed nearly an acre, and between November 1991 and August 1994 resulted in the exhumation, documentation, and analysis of 1150 unmarked burials containing the remains of 1157 individuals (Condon et al., 1998; Davidson, 1999, 2004a; Davidson et al., 2002; Peter et al., 2000). Of these, 19 individuals were found in direct association with bullets or lead shot, with 17 suggestive of a cause of death.

Historic cemeteries began to be treated as archaeological resources in the 1970s, and several excavations have yielded bullets in association with human remains (Davidson, 2006; Earls et al., 1991; Ferguson et al., 1993;
Prior to this study, none have attempted to identify individuals through these ‘moments of violence’, or to contextualize such events in the greater web of social relations and group identity, despite the potential benefits (Crist, 2006; Walker, 2001).

Freedman’s Cemetery never had many commercial tombstones, but another kind of violence, and fundamental loss of identity, can be seen in their deliberate desecration. Calvary Avenue, forming the southern boundary of the cemetery, was first paved in the early 1920s (Davidson, 1999: 88). When Calvary’s pavement was pulled up in 1991, hundreds of tombstone fragments were found beneath the concrete, having been placed there during the initial paving of the road when the Ku Klux Klan was beginning its rise to power in the city as well as nationally. Standing tombstones were dragged from graves, broken up, and used as roadbed fill, an atrocity with echoes in the Nazis’ treatment of Jewish tombstones, using their fragments to pave the roads to Auschwitz and other death camps. In a graveyard already full of unknowns, this despicable act reduced a few identities to none (Davidson, 2004a: 96–8).

A common goal in forensic anthropology is the identification of anonymous human remains. In cases where traditional methods such as fingerprint identification are lacking, other innovative methods have been developed, including the use of dental records (Brkic et al., 1997; Stimson and Mertz, 1997), X-rays (Elliott, 1953; Lachman, 1959), and matching photographs with skulls (Sekharan, 1971). None of these techniques could be applied to the Freedman’s burials, but since the 1990s DNA has become the mainstay in identification studies. While successfully collected from nineteenth-century skeletal material (e.g. Katzenberg et al., 2005), however, no DNA samples were collected at Freedman’s Cemetery.

This lack of collection stems directly from the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TxDOT, the City of Dallas, and the African American community, signed in 1991 when DNA had not yet been successfully extracted from archaeological material. By 1993, technological advances made skeletal DNA an option, and TxDOT officials considered its potential collection, but Dr Mamie McKnight, the legal signatory representing the black community, declined to alter the existing MOU despite requests from actual descendants of individuals interred within Freedman’s Cemetery that such samples be collected (Dallas Morning News 16 August 1993).

So how can we know them, these nearly 1200? In an odd way, some of the more marginalized of this African American community have a chance of being identified through the very bullets that robbed them of their lives. Although bullets are key here, their recovery does beg the question, why did police investigations fail to retrieve the bullets as evidence? Actually, forensic techniques in the field of firearms were extremely simplistic in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was not until 1900 that
the first forensic study of rifling marks was published, and 1902 when they were first recognized legally. By the 1920s, such forensic techniques were typical (Cassidy, 1929; Hamby, 1999), but when the individuals in this study were interred these methods were experimental and essentially unknown to everyday law enforcement. The bullets were therefore left in the bodies of the deceased not so much out of a dereliction of duty, but out of a simple ignorance of their hidden potential.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this study of identity and violence, I mean two distinctly different but interrelated things by identity. First there is the forensic definition of identity: to demonstrate the possible means of identifying individuals within a historic mortuary context by putting a name and history to anonymous bones. The other definition of identity I wish to examine is social identity, of individuals, communities, and society as a whole. In turn-of-the-century Dallas, African American identity was being constantly defined and reinforced by the dominant white society, often to its detriment. Simultaneously, African Americans' own definitions of identity, both positive and negative, were being forged by their own individual sense of well-being through their immediate environment and individual neighborhoods. African Americans did not experience violence equally in Dallas. Rather, there were clear differences in the levels of violence between neighborhoods (as discussed below).

Just as with identity, it is useful to employ two perspectives in viewing violence: traditional definitions of violence at the interpersonal level, where individual actors inflict physical harm on others; and less direct forms of violence, including psychological and social injustice occurring at the societal level, but impacting the lives of individuals and often influencing actions. Although somewhat rare in cultural anthropology, Mary Jackman (2002) notes that violence has long been a central thread within sociology, and to a lesser extent, social history (e.g. Adler, 2006; Lane, 1986, 1999). Up until the 1980s such studies typically focused on collective group violence (e.g. lynching, riots), with this emphasis shifting toward individual violence, most typically involving homicide and firearms, in the late 1980s (Johnson, 1973; Leonard and Leonard, 2003; Moses, 1947; Schneider, 1980).

Despite sociology's focus on violence, Jackman (2002) points out that it lacks a single unifying definition of what violence is and, further, that existing definitions confine themselves almost exclusively to physical group violence or interpersonal violence, thus excluding ‘... psychological, material, and social injuries’, which can be critical in understanding the
greater content within which individual acts were constituted and committed (2002: 388).

Indirect forms of violence critical to this study are inferred, as in the local and national milieu of racism and intolerance that operate at every level of society, and measurable, through a documented lack of city services and the differential rates of violence observable racially and spatially within this city.

African American identity was formed as much through a veil of violence and oppression as it was by any other aspect of life. Certainly such violence was commonplace in Dallas from its founding in 1841; the first person executed in Dallas County was Jane Elkins, an African American accused of murdering her enslaver. Several hundred people traveled to Dallas just to see her die on the gallows in 1853 (*Dallas Times Herald*, 15 May 1905; Davidson, 2004a: 24–5; Prince, 1993: 10; Rogers, 1965: 92).

By 1859 the town contained 97 slaves out of a population of just 775; one year later, Dallas’s business district burned in a suspected (but never proven) slave rebellion, and three supposed slave ringleaders from whom ‘confessions’ were coerced were promptly lynched (Holmes and Saxon, 1992: 39; Kimball, 1927: 25). The Civil War came and went, and although Dallas did not experience the direct carnage of war, Reconstruction was an extremely brutal time for freedmen and women who were often targeted with rape and murder as retribution for the South’s loss. The Freedmen’s Bureau and federal troops arrived in Dallas in 1867, but violence continued seemingly unabated, including 13 murders in 1867 alone (Smith, 1989). Historian Barry Crouch (1984) calculated that between 1865 and 1868, whites murdered one percent of all black men between 15 and 49 years of age in the state.

In the fall of 1865 Dallas’s city council passed a Vagrants Ordinance specifically targeting freedmen and their families, with the express purpose of discouraging blacks from settling within the town (Davidson, 1999: 22–3). Despite these strictures, hundreds of blacks arrived in the vicinity of Dallas during Reconstruction (McDonald, 1978: 17). Instead of settling in Dallas proper, however, most formed a series of Freedman’s Towns that ringed the city’s limits. The largest of these was ‘Freedman’s Town’, later known as North Dallas Freedman’s Town, within which Freedman’s Cemetery would be established in 1869 (Davidson, 1999: 18–29).

Reconstruction formally ended in Dallas in November 1872 (Cochran, 1928/1966: 221; Davidson, 1998; Greene, 1973: 16–18; Prince, 1993: 17–20), although even after restoration of white rule, ‘everyday’ racially motivated oppressions were punctuated by occasional acts of terror, many lethal. At least nine known lynchings and quasi-legal hangings of African Americans occurred in the city between 1860 and 1910 (Davidson, 2004a: 24–6). In contrast, the first death sentence for a white man dates to 1891, despite at least 50 whites being accused or convicted of murder between 1885 and
1890 (Dallas Times Herald, 17 January 1891, 17 July 1891). Dallas’s last known lynching of a black man was inflicted in 1910 upon Allen Brooks. A photograph of the jubilant crowd and Brooks’ body hanging from the ‘Welcome to Dallas’ sign on Main Street was transformed into a popular penny postcard. People fought over souvenirs from the grisly event, including Brooks’ clothing (McDonald, 1978: 91; Williams and Shay, 1991: 45, 48–50). It was within this climate of casual violence acted out against African Americans that Frederick Washington (and others like him) lived and died; a better understanding is warranted of this time and these conditions.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT: FREEDMAN’S CEMETERY

Freedman’s Cemetery was founded on 29 April 1869 and closed on 26 July 1907 (Davidson, 1999). The cemetery’s burial population constitutes a representative sample of the inclusive living population, since it was the only cemetery open to African Americans in the city for 33 of its 39 years of use. With the social construction of race in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, anyone identified as ‘black’ or African American would have been interred there (Davidson, 1999: 39–41, 2004a: 388–9).

Since no in situ stones providing absolute dates of interment and established identities remained, a constructed burial chronology was necessary to contextualize individual graves. This chronology utilized land deeds, the law of superposition, temporal-diagnostic artifacts, a seriation of mortuary hardware based on United States Patent records and catalogues, and correlation of these data with local records. The burial chronology contains three major time periods termed simply Early (1869–1884), Middle (1885–1899), and Late (1900–1907; N = 884 individuals). For the 801 Late Period burials, a single estimated year of interment was possible (e.g. Burial 36 = circa 1900). While broadly accurate, individual dates are still estimates. While only one acre of the four-acre cemetery was excavated, the exhumed Late Period sample is particularly representative of the known number of interments made during this period (Davidson, 1999, 2000b).

One motivation in formulating a fine-grained chronology was the potential to identify individuals. Towards this goal, a correlation of archaeological and archival data on a case-by-case basis had to be achieved. Table 1 displays 17 variables, 16 of which are archival criteria that have eight archaeological equivalents. Additionally, there is one unique archaeological variable (clothing/disposition of remains) for which there is no archival equivalent. A comparison of these eight overlapping variables allows for possible identity, while the unique archival variables provide vital social context.
Nineteen individuals were found in association with bullets or lead shot, of which 18 date to the Late Period (1900–1907). The remaining gunshot victim dates to the Middle Period (Burial 1367). Because of the lack of appropriate pre-1900 archival records, this study focuses only on those 18 individuals associated with bullets and interred during the turn-of-the-century Late Period (Table 2).

**Gunshot burials, bullet identification, lethality of wounds**

The Late Period shooting victims are dominated by adult men (15 out of 18 individuals; 83.3%), with only two adult women (11.1%) and one male subadult aged 13.3 years (5.6%). Overall mean-age-at-death was 31.9 years (women, 25.75 years; men, 32.7 years).
Table 2  Forensic data for individuals and recovered bullets from Freedman’s Cemetery (Late Period; 1900–1907)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial #</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at death*</th>
<th>Bullet provenience</th>
<th>Height (cm)</th>
<th>Weight (grains)</th>
<th>Diameter (inches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.32 Smith &amp; Wesson (85 grains; .308” to .313”). Firearm introduced in 1878</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>embedded in cervical vertebra (C7)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38 Short Colt (125 to 130 grains; .372” to .378”). Firearm introduced in 1874</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>M?</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>in situ rt. abdomen</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>126.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>815</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>upper body fill (screening)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>0.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38 Smith &amp; Wesson (145 grains; .348” to .370”). Firearm introduced in 1876</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>M?</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>in situ in left thorax</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>M?</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>in situ in right thorax</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.366–0.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>653</td>
<td>M?</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>in situ in lower left thorax</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>upper body fill (screening)</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>143.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>thoracic/lumbar vertebrae (osteo wash)</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>144.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44 Webley (200 to 230 grains; .436” to .442”). Firearm introduced circa 1875</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>in situ in upper left thorax</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44 Bulldog (168–170 grains; .426” to .449”). Firearm introduced circa 1880</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>in thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>166.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>in situ in upper right thorax</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>168.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44 Smith &amp; Wesson Russian (145 grain “mid-range load”; .415” to .442”). Firearm introduced circa 1870.</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>in situ(?) adjacent to left knee</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45 Colt (250 to 255 grains; .436” to .454”). Firearm introduced in 1873</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>upper thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>241.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotgun (“B” birdshot)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>recovered in situ; maxilla/upper jaw</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Matches for Burials 672 and 865:

| .30 Short rim fire (55 to 60 grains; .288” to .294”). Firearm introduced in 1860 | 1181 | 1900 | M | 20.10 | in situ (?) | 1.69 | 150 | 0.35 |
| .30 Long rim fire (55 to 75 grains; .288” to .290”). Firearm introduced in 1873 | 542 | 1906 | M | 32.40 | upper thorax (osteo wash) | 1.84 | 241.4 | 0.445 |
| .32 Extra Short rim fire (55 to 60 grains; .306” to .317”). Firearm introduced in 1871 | 672 | M? | 20 to 60 | thorax (osteo wash) | 1.19 | 55.8 | 0.327 |
| .32 Smith & Wesson Long (98 grains; .300” to .319”). Firearm introduced in 1896. | 865 | 1903 | M? | 30.60 | embedded in situ in right femur shaft | 0.96 | 97.2 | na |

Notes: All cartridges are center fires, unless otherwise noted.
*Condon et al. (1998) formulated single year statistical summary ages, using multivariate statistics, instead of the standard five-year increment age ranges.
The presence of a bullet was the principal factor making this study possible, and the primary criterion of identification. It is through a bullet’s weight (in ‘grains’, one grain being equal to 0.0648 grams) and diameter (i.e. caliber) that the kind of firearm is potentially determinable. Remarkably, their combination is a kind of fingerprint, often narrowing literally dozens of calibers and types of firearms down to a single, particular kind of weapon. Table 2 identifies individual burials, the type of bullets (and inferred firearm), and associated information regarding each cartridge’s introduction and manufacturing date.

All bullets were metallic cartridges created for handguns; all were lead projectiles, with none metal jacketed. All bullet tips were conical in form, with either round nose or flat nose (none hollow pointed), and all bases were flat or slightly concave (White and Munhall, 1950: 3–7). Firearm types range in size and power from the .32 Smith & Wesson to a .45 Colt revolver, with one burial associated with shot from a shotgun blast.

One assumption is that save for two individuals (Burials 865 and 1109) with bullet wounds exhibiting bone remodeling, the remaining 16 Late Period individuals associated with bullets or lead shot all died as a direct result of these shootings. This is grounded in the preponderance of bullets recovered from the thorax or abdomen and the lethality of these wounds during this time period (LaGarde, 1916: 229–30, 260). For those shot in the USA today, one in four still die of their wounds (Beeghley, 2003: 9).

THE ARCHIVAL RECORD: VICTIMS, PERPETRATORS, AND MOTIVATIONS

While burial data are important, the stories of those who died must be known before there can be any attempt at identity. For this purpose, city directories and newspaper articles, and death records derived from Dallas City Hall, newspapers, and private funeral homes were examined. In all, 1433 death records recorded between 1 January 1900 and 26 July 1907 were compiled (Davidson, 1999).

Dallas during this period had several papers including two white dailies, the Morning News and Times Herald, and the black-owned weekly Express. The Times Herald was the primary source for this analysis. The black Express would have been ideal, but earliest extant copies date to 1918. To obtain all accounts, every page of the daily Times Herald from 1 January 1900 to 26 July 1907 was visually scanned from microfilm. Although gaps from every source exist, it is unlikely that many lethal shootings were missed because of the redundancy from other sources. Newspaper accounts offer vivid and compelling details, but it should never be forgotten that these accounts might not be accurate on all details or even broadly ‘true’.
The *Times Herald* was a white newspaper with a majority white readership in a major Southern city. Any reporting on African American issues, regardless of good intentions, was certainly filtered through a milieu of racism that pervaded every aspect of society. Accused perpetrators and alleged motivations may be suspect.

Any African American fatal gunshot victim was included if the event took place within or immediately adjacent to Dallas, or if the body was interred (or possibly interred) in the city. Within these parameters, 55 African Americans died of gunshot wounds between 1 January 1900 and 26 July 1907. A unique sequential number was assigned to each individual (hereafter referred to as the Case Number; Table 3). Each shooting was unique, but six major categories (gunshot type in brackets) were defined:

- Accidental – both self inflicted (1); and
- Accidental – shot by another (2);
- Murder – as perpetrated by a white (3 w), black (3 b) or unknown assailant (3 u);
- Suicide (4);
- Shot by police or night watchmen, all white (5);
- Self-defense, either by a white (6 w) or a black defender (6 b);

Three shootings were designated as ‘Unknown Circumstances’ (U) when the archival record lacked any detailed accounting of the event.

**Types of shootings**

**Accidents** Four of the 55 gunshot fatalities were accidental (7%). These include three accidental self-inflicted shootings involving 13–14-year-old boys and shotguns (Case Nos 1, 12, 32). The other accidental shooting was not self-inflicted; a young man by the name of Collin Jones was ‘horse-playing’ with a pistol while washing dishes with young Maggie Porter (Case No. 26). Not knowing the gun was loaded, he ‘... playfully snapped it in the face of the girl’, killing her instantly (*Dallas Times Herald*, 14 January 1904).

**Murder** Murder is believed to have accounted for 40 of the 55 cases (73%), with eight rationalized by the perpetrator as self-defense. Thirty-three cases had black perpetrators or suspects (82.5% of all murders); one had a white suspect or perpetrator, while six had an unknown perpetrator. Many cases involved the most trivial of circumstances; a dispute between neighbors involving chickens (Case No. 44), or a quarrel over a card or dice game (Case Nos 10, 17, 36). Some are perhaps more understandable; seven were crimes of passion involving love or jealousy (Case Nos 3, 11, 34, 42, 46, 52, 55).
Table 3  Selected demographic variables of all African American fatal gunshot deaths in Dallas, TX, (1 January 1900–26 July 1907)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Date of death</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at death</th>
<th>Gunshot type</th>
<th>Alleged motivation for shooting</th>
<th>Firearm type</th>
<th>Indigent</th>
<th>Freedman’s burial</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jan 11, 1900</td>
<td>Josiah Adams</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>shotgun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 6, 1901</td>
<td>Henrietta Giles</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>June 13, 1901</td>
<td>Dave Williams</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>alienation of affection</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oct 7, 1901</td>
<td>Wilkin Watson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oct 7, 1901</td>
<td>Tom Neal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nov 7, 1901</td>
<td>Louis Jones</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>stolen bicycle</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nov 23, 1901</td>
<td>Tom Bougus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk (self defense?)</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dec 24, 1901</td>
<td>Hamp Nelson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>drunken brawl</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Feb 19, 1902</td>
<td>Fred Washington</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>resisting arrest</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mar 30, 1902</td>
<td>Rolland J. Marshall</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>quarrel after card game</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>April 5, 1902</td>
<td>Archie Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>‘difficulty over a woman’</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>May 23, 1902</td>
<td>Oscar Ephram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>shotgun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>July 3, 1902</td>
<td>Joe Coombes</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>July 12, 1902</td>
<td>Tom Purvis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk (possible revenge)</td>
<td>rifle or pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>July 23, 1902</td>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sept 2, 1902</td>
<td>Abe White</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>.38 pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dec 18, 1902</td>
<td>Robert Stigal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>dispute over crap game</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jan 10, 1903</td>
<td>Harry Hendricks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jan 27, 1903</td>
<td>‘Maud’ Daugherty</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>resisting arrest</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>April 19, 1903</td>
<td>Green Rollard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>‘Colt double revolver’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>May 6, 1903</td>
<td>Andrew Bosley</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>‘revolver’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>July 12, 1903</td>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 (w?)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>shotgun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sept 4, 1903</td>
<td>Jordan J. Johnson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>revolver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Oct 11, 1903</td>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dec 12, 1903</td>
<td>Charles Butler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39 (or 47)</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>shotgun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jan 13, 1904</td>
<td>Maggie Porter</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>accident</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jan 18, 1904</td>
<td>Luther Collins</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6 (w)</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No.</td>
<td>Date of death</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age at death</td>
<td>Gunshot type</td>
<td>Alleged motivation for shooting</td>
<td>Firearm type</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>Freedman's Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Feb 8, 1904</td>
<td>Willis Glover</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>May 3, 1904</td>
<td>Lige Milton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>May 29, 1904</td>
<td>Henry Givens</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>July 5, 1904</td>
<td>W. M. Hunter</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Aug 28, 1904</td>
<td>Willie Linsecum</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>shotgun</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Oct 16, 1904</td>
<td>Henry G. W. Robinson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>large caliber pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dec 18, 1904</td>
<td>Ida Harris</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>alienation of affection</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>June 21, 1905</td>
<td>Louise McKenzie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>delay in cooking dinner</td>
<td>.45 revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>June 27, 1905</td>
<td>Robert Hailer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>‘trouble over a crap game’</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Aug 23, 1905</td>
<td>Unknown Male</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>pistols</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Oct 10, 1905</td>
<td>Jackson Turner</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Oct 10, 1905</td>
<td>Leticia Bradford</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>self defense (mistaken identity)</td>
<td>shotgun</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Oct 17, 1905</td>
<td>Johnnie Childers (Childress)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Oct 30, 1905</td>
<td>Charley Barkley (Barclay)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>.45 Colt’s revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Nov 5, 1905</td>
<td>Griffin Fowler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>‘trouble over woman’</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mar 1, 1906</td>
<td>Jonathan Lewis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>April 11, 1906</td>
<td>James Avery</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>dispute over chickens</td>
<td>.38 Winchester rifle</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>July 10, 1906</td>
<td>Joseph Hudson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>‘26’</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>self defense</td>
<td>.39 Colt’s revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>July 25, 1906</td>
<td>Laura Oliver</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>alienation of affection</td>
<td>.38 revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Aug 10, 1906</td>
<td>Scott Owens (Allen?)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Oct 7, 1906</td>
<td>Laura Griffin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Oct 21, 1906</td>
<td>Chester Collins</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6 (b)</td>
<td>self defense; forced entry of residence</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nov 2, 1906</td>
<td>Ida Buckner</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>mistaken mother for daughter</td>
<td>revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Dec 24, 1906</td>
<td>George Magee</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Jan 7, 1907</td>
<td>Pearl Hooper</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>alienation of affection</td>
<td>.45 revolver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jan 7, 1907</td>
<td>Tucker Harris</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>alienation of affection</td>
<td>.45 revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>April 10, 1907</td>
<td>Willie Sayles</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>May 18, 1907</td>
<td>Ned Choice</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3 (b)</td>
<td>‘trouble over a woman’</td>
<td>.41 revolver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: na = not applicable; unk = unknown
The most common motivation was a frustrating ‘unknown’ \((N = 17)\). Either the article lacked details, or more often the body was found with no witnesses. For example, Abe White was fatally shot through a window while sitting up in a chair one night (Case No. 16) \((Dallas Times Herald, 2 September 1902)\).

Domestic violence was far from absent in the past (Peterson, 1992). In nineteenth-century Texas, husbands had the legal right to physically restrain or ‘correct’ the behavior of their wives, and domestic violence has been identified as a significant factor in nineteenth-century homicides (Adler, 1997: 259–61; Boswell, 1999: 140). The most extreme case of domestic violence involves Louise McKenzie (Case No. 35) and her husband, Essex, who shot and killed Louise over a ‘... delay in cooking dinner’ \((Dallas Times Herald, 19 June 1905)\). A reversal of roles is seen in the death of John Williams (Case No. 15), who in the summer of 1902 was shot three times in the head while asleep in his bed. The primary suspect in his killing was his wife, Gertie \((Dallas Times Herald, 23 July 1902; Dallas Morning News, 24 July 1902)\).

**Suicide**  
Suicide was extremely rare, accounting for only one of the 55 cases – Tucker Harris (Case No. 53), whose murder of Pearl Hooper and subsequent suicide was unique for Dallas during this period.

**Police shootings/vigilantism**  
From newspaper accounts, only four deaths \((7\%)\) can be attributed to police (Case Nos 9, 13, 19, 37), all cast in the guise of self-defense or resisting arrest. A fifth death was an act of vigilantism by a white night watchman at the Katy railyards (Case No. 6; *Dallas Times Herald, 8 Nov 1901*).

Dallas had a small police force, relative to population. In 1899, there were only 34 police officers \((Dallas Times Herald, 8 Dec 1901)\), and by 1904 the force had increased to 75 (Stowers, 1983: 30, 38). Between 1900 and 1907 all of these lawmen were white. As early as 1896 there was a lone African American officer named William McDuff, but he was shot and killed that same year by two black assailants (Elwonger, 2002: 13).

**Self-defense**  
Only two fatal shootings were clearly designated as self-defense (Case Nos 27, 49), exclusive of police shootings. However, eight of the 40 shootings identified as murder had extenuating circumstances or were argued by the primary suspect as being cases of self-defense (Case Nos 7, 20, 23, 29, 38, 43, 44, 45).

**Unknown circumstances**  
Of the 55 fatal shootings in the archival sample, there are three cases for which no detailed accounting of their deaths is known (Case Nos 18, 40, 48), save for basic demographic variables.
Demography and other key variables

The archival demography is very similar to the archaeological (Table 3); most are male (44 out of 55; 80%). This includes anyone regardless of age since gender is known a priori. This sex ratio is essentially identical to that seen in a modern (2000) accounting of all homicides in Dallas County (males, 81%; females, 19%) (Anonymous, 2000). In the archival sample, victim ages range from nine (Laura Griffin; Case No. 48) to 54 years (Ned Choice; Case No. 55). Their mean age-at-death was 25.7 years, in contrast to the combined archaeological sample (31.9 years). The archival mean age is lower because five individuals between the ages of 9 and 14 died by gun violence, while only one individual of this age (Burial 90) was observed archaeologically.

In the archival sample, there were 11 females: 10 adults (between 17 and 53 years), and one nine-year-old girl. Female mean age-at-death (excluding the nine-year-old) was 26.2 years. Including the little girl, the total average was 24.5 years of age. These mean ages are very similar to that derived archaeologically (25.75 years). Of the 44 archival males, 15 were referred to only as ‘adult’, with four additional individuals under the age of 15 years. Their combined mean age-at-death was 27.2 years, which is slightly younger overall compared to the archaeological sample’s average age of 32.7 years (even including the 13.3 year old). This age pattern (i.e. 25 to 29 years) for fatal shooting victims is typical of virtually all populations including the modern era (Beeghley, 2003: 6; Blumstein and Rosenfeld, 1998: 1180–4; Blumstein et al., 2000: 508).

The gunshot victims’ relatively low socioeconomic levels can be demonstrated by how many lay in a pauper’s grave. Twenty of the 55 gunshot victims were interred as indigents at city expense (36% of total; Table 3). An equal number ($N = 20$) had estates, relatives or friends to pay at least minimal funeral expenses (36%). For 15 cases, the disposition of the remains is unknown (27%). Eight of the 18 Late Period gunshot burials were indigents (44.4%) or a rate similar to that seen archivally (36%; Table 3; Davidson, 1999: 128–9).

As part of my dissertation (Davidson, 2004a), I calculated the wholesale coffin hardware costs of the Freedman’s burials as a means to examine relative measures of investments in the funeral event, which stand as a proxy for individual socioeconomic levels. The average wholesale cost of coffin trimmings for all the gunshot victims was $1.42 for men and 84 cents for women. This is contrasted with the Late Period generally, which averages $3.09 for men and $3.61 for women (2004a: 234–5). These disparities in funeral costs can in part be traced to a greater proportion of indigent burials in the gunshot sample. However, even when indigents are excluded, the remaining victims exhibit average costs of $2.52 for men ($N = 9$), and $1.68 for women ($N = 1$), which are still lower than the Late Period generally.
Why do the gunshot victims have consistently smaller investments in their funeral event, compared to the rest of the African American community? The sudden and unexpected nature of their death at relatively young ages may have been a real factor, with family members unable to muster sufficient funds for just such an out-of-pocket expense. Certainly most jobs held by African Americans were predominately low paying and required heavy labor. In 1909, the job categories of cook, domestic, and laundress accounted for over 90 percent of all women. For men, nearly two-thirds were classified as ‘day laborers’ or worked at heavy manual labor; as a result, black annual incomes were not substantial, but they were relatively stable for many (Davidson et al., 2002).

With economic stability, it was possible to plan for the future and invest small sums towards membership in various fraternal or sororital lodges, such as the Masons, the benefits of which included burial insurance. During the 1900–1907 period, approximately one-third of adult black funerals in Dallas were paid for by some kind of lodge-based burial insurance (Davidson, 2004a: 198). Such insurance required forethought; monthly dues – typically 45 cents to $1.00 – had to be paid for five years before a member would be eligible for insurance, averaging $500 for this period (Davidson, 2004a: 203–4). Although many gunshot victims had the same low-paying jobs and economic levels typical of African Americans in general, what separates the majority of them was that, in life, they were apparently unable or unwilling to make these long-term investments in their funeral event.

IDENTIFICATIONS

While similarities may abound, each shooting was unique. Delineating these unique circumstances makes a potential correlation of the archaeological and the archival possible, and ‘identification’ tenable. To achieve this, the best strategy was to exclude possible ‘suspects’ from the gunshot victims in the archival record.

Female identifications

In all there were 11 females in the archival record who died of gunshot wounds between 1 January 1900 and 26 July 1907. Excluding individuals interred in other cemeteries and those with widely differing ages or with weapon wounds inconsistent with recovered examples, only three candidates remain to be correlated with the two women exhumed at Freedman’s Cemetery in association with bullets (Table 4). For the sake of brevity, only one case is discussed in detail.
Table 4  Possible matches between female burials and fatal gunshot wounds in death records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Identifications</th>
<th>Date of death</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at death</th>
<th>Firearm</th>
<th># of shots</th>
<th>Place on body</th>
<th>Undertaker</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 34</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Ida Harris</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>rt. breast; rt. side of abdomen</td>
<td>B, B &amp; Co</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Burial 1510</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>.38 Short Colt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>‘Peoples?’</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 46</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Laura Oliver</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.38 revolver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left breast</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Burial 355</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>.38 Smith &amp; Wesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thorax (osteo wash)</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other potential match for</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Johnnie Childers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>B, B &amp; Co</td>
<td>Freedman's?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial 355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table created using data from death records at UNIV OF FLORIDA Smathers Libraries on September 11, 2008
Burial 1510: Ida Harris (Case No. 34), aged 24 years, was at a late night gathering in a home on 17 December 1904. Around midnight she was shot three times by an unnamed black assailant armed with a pistol. One shot penetrated her right breast, while two bullets entered her right abdomen. One hour later Dr James Smart operated on Ms. Harris at Parkland Hospital, removing the bullets from the abdomen and discovering that the bowel had been perforated some 10 times, necessitating the removal of 12 inches of intestine. The bullet that struck her right breast was lodged in the body but was not believed to have penetrated her lung. Since it was a non-penetrating wound, Dr Smart did not probe for the bullet. Harris subsequently died one day later of her wounds, and was interred in Freedman’s Cemetery (Dallas Times Herald, 17 December 1904).

Archaeological variables for Burial 1510 correlate well with the account of Harris’s death. Harris was shot three times, although only one bullet remained in her body (right breast) at the time of her death. Burial 1510 also had a single bullet, recovered with elements of the thorax. Her age at death (24 years) is an excellent match for Burial 1510’s estimated 23.2 years, and the year she died, 1904, is compatible with the estimated 1902 date of interment (within the larger 1900–1907 Late Period temporal range). While newspaper accounts fail to identify the murder weapon, the round recovered from Burial 1510 was from a .38 Short Colt, a rather underpowered pistol consistent with the creation of serious wounds, yet with insufficient velocity to exit the body.

Male identifications

Because of the greater number of males recorded as dying of gunshot wounds in the archaeological (N = 16) as well as archival (N = 44) records, the number of variables is necessarily greater. Excluding those interred in other cemeteries, or shot with weapons inconsistent with the recovered remains or the age of individuals, it is possible to reduce the number of candidates to 19 individuals who could have been interred in Freedman’s Cemetery with a bullet or bullets still lodged within them and matching known criteria from the exhumed sample. These 19 individuals were compared to the 14 males associated with bullets recovered archaeologically at Freedman’s Cemetery and believed fatal, with the best matches given in Table 5. For brevity, only one case will be discussed.

Burial 653: Burial 653 is probably Fred Washington (Case No. 9), the 23-year-old discussed above (Dallas Times Herald, 19 February 1902). Burial 653 had a bullet in the thorax, and the body was missing the left hand, despite excellent bone preservation. Due to a point blank gunshot wound to the wrist, Washington’s left hand would have been severely mangled and possibly partially or all but completely severed; the hand may have been
**Table 5**  Possible matches between male burials and fatal gunshot wounds in death records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age at death</th>
<th>Firearm</th>
<th># of shots</th>
<th>Place on body</th>
<th>Undertaker</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Fred Washington</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td>2 (1 exited)</td>
<td>left wrist; heart</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Freedman's ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900-07</td>
<td>Burial 653</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.38 Smith &amp; Wesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thorax; missing left hand</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Lige Milton</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.45 pistol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left breast</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Freedman's ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Burial 542</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>.45 Colt Revolver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thorax</td>
<td>'Peoples'</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Tucker Harris</td>
<td>adult</td>
<td>.45 revolver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Burial 1188</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>.45 Colt Revolver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>thorax</td>
<td>'Peoples'</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Oscar Ephram</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shotgun</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>Freedman's ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Burial 90</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Shotgun ('B' birdshot)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>maxilla</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Abe White</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.38 pistol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>below his heart</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900-07</td>
<td>Burial 520</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.38 Smith &amp; Wesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>in situ left thorax</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Ned Choice</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.41 revolver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td>Loudermilk</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Burial 499</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>.38 Smith &amp; Wesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>upper body</td>
<td>'Peoples'</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Robert Stigal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>Loudermilk</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Burial 1465</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>.32 Short Colt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>in situ upper abdomen</td>
<td>'Peoples'</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Joseph Hudson</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.39 Colt revolver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>left side/thorax</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>Freedman's ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Burial 1110</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>.44 Bulldog</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>thorax</td>
<td>'Peoples'?</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Chester Collins</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>pistol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left breast; heart</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>Freedman's ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900-07</td>
<td>Burial 1134</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>.38 Smith &amp; Wesson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>right thorax</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Henry Givens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>pistol?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900-07</td>
<td>Burial 815</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>.32 Short Colt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>upper body</td>
<td>Indigent</td>
<td>Freedman's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
removed by Justice Edwards (county coroner) or by the Dunn Funeral Home before interment in a pauper’s grave. There is also the possibility that his hand was taken as a grizzly trophy or souvenir by one of the policemen, which was actually commonplace in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Patterson, 1998). The bullet recovered from Burial 653 is a .38 Smith & Wesson revolver-round, weighing 140 grains, while newspaper accounts describe Deputy Cochran firing a ‘45-calibre revolver’ (*Dallas Times Herald*, 19 February 1902). It is possible that this one point is in error, a detail inserted into the narrative without regard to accuracy. Certainly other newspaper accounts have erroneous weapon details (e.g. Case Nos 45, 55). The left hand was definitely missing from this individual at the time of interment, and there were no descriptions of fatal shootings of any one-handed black men in the newspapers. The loss of the hand during the assault is the easiest interpretation, and only Fred Washington suffered a wound in the left wrist at point blank range.

Beyond the missing hand, the most striking detail is that the body was in a prone position, i.e. facedown. Burial 653 was one of only two burials in the entire cemetery interred in this manner (the other being Burial 558–2, one of the two identified remains of medical cadavers; Davidson, 2007). This disposition suggests the body was unceremoniously dumped into the coffin with little fanfare and enough contempt for the dead man to deny him a position consistent with core Christian beliefs. As early as the Middle Ages a prone burial was reserved for those who had severely transgressed against society; typically suicides and people accused of witchcraft were placed with their bodies facing downward, presumably toward Hell and their fate (Cox, 1998: 119–20; Puckle, 1926: 151). Finally, Burial 653 was not recovered with clothing elements indicative of a hospital gown or shroud (e.g. a single button or safety pin), nor was it associated with normal street clothes. Rather, four metal rivet stud buttons (typical of a ‘jean’ jacket or reefer) were clustered together lying on top of elements of the thorax. Clearly in situ, this suggests that articles of clothing – possibly still bloody – were simply tossed in on top of the nude body.

**SOCIETAL IMPACTS AND IMPLICATIONS OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE**

The lethal consequences of gun violence on the lives of individuals have been examined, but what of the greater societal impacts and root causes? Annual death rates are typically presented as a ratio of total deaths per 100,000 individuals of a given population. Employing this technique, the rate of fatal black shootings by any means has been calculated for Dallas’s African American population, using the 1900 census and extrapolating
population estimates for 1901 through 1906 (e.g. Schneider, 1980: 167). Except for 1900 (with a rate of only 10.7 per 100,000), the data reveal a very high rate of gunshot deaths in the years 1900 to 1906, ranging from a low of 58.5 deaths per 100,000 in 1905 to a high of 81.5 deaths per 100,000 in 1902 (Table 6). Robert Dykstra (2003) argues that death rates calculated as a ratio of 100,000 population can be misleading, especially if the living population is small. That is why this study also relies on the number of fatal gunshot victims compared to the total number of recorded deaths (Table 6).

Beginning in 1889 the city’s health officer summarized the deaths for the previous fiscal year. Typically, fiscal years began in April (Davidson, 1999); all data presented in Table 6, however, follow a calendrical (not fiscal) accounting. Through the health officer’s annual report for the 1906 fiscal year, which provides the total number of lethal shootings in the city regardless of race, it is possible to compare black and white lethal shootings. In the 1906 fiscal year, there were 15 fatal shootings out of a total of 906 deaths. From this perspective alone, the rate of lethal gun violence appears quite low overall, accounting for just 1.7 percent of deaths. But when these data are viewed by race, the numbers become something quite different; African Americans were victims of gun violence in grossly disproportionate numbers.

Of 131 black deaths recorded from all sources in the 1906 fiscal year, 10 were by gun violence. When individuals 15 years or older are considered (N = 93 deaths), gunshot wounds accounted for one in 10 black deaths (N = 9) and were the third leading cause of death, just behind tuberculosis (N = 18; 19.40%) and heart disease (N = 12; 12.90%). The rate of fatal black shootings by any means in the 1906 fiscal year was 65.1 per 100,000, while whites experienced just five fatal shootings out of 775 total deaths, or around eight fatal shootings per 100,000 (based on a white population of 62,311). As a measure of population, the rate of black deaths by gun violence was eight times that of whites. A similar difference was observed nationally even into the late 1920s, when African American homicide rates were seven times that of whites (Brearley, 1930). As a modern comparison, the rate of all lethal shootings involving African Americans in Texas for 2000 was 10.7 per 100,000, or six times less than in Dallas during the 1906 fiscal year.

Although most of these deaths can be simplistically described as black-on-black crime (Table 3), what was the underlying cause? Examining violence spatially has been fruitful in other contexts (Johnson, 1973; Schneider, 1980), and, towards this goal, the racial residential patterns, derived from the 1907 Dallas City Directory street directory listings, are superimposed on a base map of Dallas (Cram, 1896: 120) (Figure 1). The bold gray lines indicate African American residences, while undifferentiated roads are white residences or commercial properties. In Figure 1, the known locations of all lethal shootings of African Americans are plotted by their
Table 6  Summary of black deaths, rates of shootings, lethal and non-lethal assaults in Dallas, TX (1900–1907)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated black population of Dallas</th>
<th>Total # of black deaths</th>
<th>All fatal shootings (includes accidental, etc.)</th>
<th>Fatality rate per 100,000 population</th>
<th>Homicide Shootings</th>
<th>Stabbings</th>
<th>All homicides (shootings &amp; stabbings)</th>
<th>Homicide rate per 100,000 population</th>
<th>Non-fatal assaults</th>
<th>Stabbings</th>
<th>Shootings</th>
<th>Lethal and non-lethal</th>
<th>Armed assault rate per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>9,305</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>10,177</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>265.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>11,049</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>208.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>11,921</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>12,793</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>132.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>13,665</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>14,537</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907*</td>
<td>15,367</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cemetery closed 26 July 1907; data for the entire year of 1907 are incomplete

Source for population data:
1900 U.S. Census; J.F. Worley 1907 Census (City directory publisher) (Dallas Times Herald 31 May 1907)
Population figures for 1901–1905 are estimates, assuming a constant rate of increase between 1900 and 1907

Table 6 indicates the summary of black deaths, rates of shootings, lethal and non-lethal assaults in Dallas, TX (1900–1907). The table includes the year, estimated black population, total number of black deaths, all fatal shootings (including accidental, etc.), fatality rate per 100,000 population, homicide shootings, stabbings, all homicides (shootings & stabbings), homicide rate per 100,000 population, non-fatal assaults, and all armed assaults.
Of the 55 fatal shootings in the sample, 32 were mapped. Accidental shootings (Case Nos 1, 12, 26, 32) and those with unknown locations ($N = 19$) were excluded.

**Figure 1** Known locations of shootings and stabbings (both lethal and non-lethal) of African Americans in Dallas, Texas (1 January 1900 to 26 July 1907). African American residential streets are denoted in dashed-gray lines, with key districts or boundaries demarcated (drafted by Edward Tennant).
To better demonstrate this pattern of violence, three additional types of assaults on African Americans were calculated: non-fatal shootings, fatal stabbings and cuttings, and non-fatal cuttings and stabbings (Figure 1). First, all non-fatal shootings were identified through the *Times Herald* (N = 44), and of these, 27 had a discernable location. Finally, all lethal and non-lethal stabbings or ‘cuttings’ were identified through accounts published in the *Times Herald*. Five of 15 lethal stabbings could be spatially identified. For the non-lethal stabbings (N = 37), 24 events could be mapped.

In addition to individual black residences, Figure 1 also delineates the major boundaries or neighborhood divisions in the city: the Saloon District, ‘The Reservation’ or red light district, North Dallas Freedman’s Town (the largest African American enclave in the city), and Stringtown, a largely black, linear settlement of wooden shacks that lined the Houston and Texas Central railroad and cut through the North Dallas community (Davidson, 1999: 78; McDonald, 1978: 179). Deep Ellum, a more nebulous residential and commercial district, is located to the southeast of the North Dallas neighborhood.

Although Dallas in the early twentieth century was heavily segregated, the level of separation was not as great as argued by previous researchers (Prior and Schulte, 2000). While there were two major areas of black population – North Dallas Freedman’s Town and ‘Deep Ellum’ – there were also many pockets of black residences surrounded by white homes. A spatial analysis of violent assaults reveals a great deal. First, the pattern for non-fatal shootings and stabbings involving African Americans as victims is extremely similar to that for lethal shootings. This general trend is predicated on the second critical observation; most of these moments of violence occurred at the interface of black and white neighborhoods, or in exclusively white controlled areas, and, importantly, were all but nonexistent within North Dallas Freedman’s Town, the largest black neighborhood and locus for an emerging black middle class (Davidson, 2004b and below).

W.E.B. Dubois (1899/1996: 269–86), writing of nineteenth-century Philadelphia, noted that poverty and alcoholism were primary factors contributing to the high rates of crime perpetrated by and against African Americans in that city. Alcohol was certainly a major factor in Dallas, in two ways. Seven lethal shootings occurred between one or more drunken parties or in relation to saloons, and one-fourth of the mapped shootings (N = 8) occurred within the saloon district, where drunken armed men, both black and white, would commonly be found. The most obviously contested space was Young Street where five lethal shootings (Case Nos 2, 11, 14, 29, 30), three non-lethal shootings, two fatal stabbings, and one non-fatal stabbing occurred between 1900 and 1907. This nexus of violence was a legally sanctioned red-light district known in contemporary accounts as ‘Boggy Bayou’, the ‘South End’, or ‘The Reservation’ (*Dallas Times Herald*, 1900–1907).
29 December 1905; McDonald, 1978: 24–6). It contained commercial buildings, white brothels, and black residences. Here African Americans lived within a continually liminal state, perpetually stuck between black and white worlds – worlds involving prostitution, alcohol, gambling, and a breakdown in the usual rules of conduct for both groups.

Alcohol not only broke down social mores, it clouded judgment. For example, Hamp Nelson (Case No. 8) was shot and killed by his friend Joe Jones, a 24-year-old black man. Jones explained that:

... he did not remember the shooting very distinctly as he was very drunk. He says that he had a .45-calibre pistol which he had discharged several times as he supposed into the air. He claims that he and Nelson were good friends and had never had any trouble. (*Dallas Times Herald*, 25 December 1901)

Joe Jones didn’t carry the pistol to kill his friend, but, rather, to fulfill a deep psychological need for protection from the unseen harm all around him; harm that was both real and unpredictable. But the pistol was there, and in an instant, his friend was dead.

The largest concentration of black residences, North Dallas Freedman’s Town, paradoxically experienced the lowest rates of interpersonal violence. A recent archival study of a single block of North Dallas – Juliette Street – (Davidson, 2004b) examined household composition and stability, among other factors, between 1900 and 1910. Juliette Street was a desirable residential space in Dallas’s nineteenth and early twentieth-century African American community. Incorporated into the city limits in 1874, the block contained 16 residences, two churches, and two stores. Seventy-one individuals lived there in 1900; household size ranged from two to eight individuals, and virtually all were composed of nuclear families (Davidson, 2004b).

In 1900, although the heads of 10 of the 16 households were homeowners, the block also saw a measure of instability; on average, a family would vacate their home and a new family would move in every 2.5 years between 1900 and 1910. Even stable homeowners still experienced occupation changes from year to year; for example, James Thomas was a laborer, buggy washer, hostler, driver for a transfer company, porter, or watchman all between 1903 and 1910. Relatively affluent households were not isolated from poorer households. Doc Rowen, who owned a large home and thriving grocery and real estate business, was one of the richest black men in Dallas, but he lived adjacent to Jane Reese, residing in the smallest house and who most often gave her occupation as washerwoman (Davidson, 2004b).

Within the temporal range of this study, only one fatal shooting occurred in North Dallas Freedman’s Town proper (Case No. 23), and one along its border (Case No. 7); the former involved Jordan Johnson, who was shot and killed by his stepson in a case of self-defense (*Dallas Times Herald*, 1907).
19 June 1905). Finally, there were two fatal shootings (Case Nos 33, 41) that, while lying within North Dallas, actually took place within ‘Stringtown’, a separate, linear, and largely (though not exclusively) black enclave consisting of substandard housing (Kimball, 1927), lining the right-of-way of the Houston and Texas Central Rail line. Both ‘Stringtown’ shootings were adjacent to or directly associated with white saloons (Dallas City Directory, 1907).

What can account for the almost total lack of serious or fatal interpersonal violence within North Dallas Freedman’s Town? The Juliette Street study reveals that both black middle class and working poor lived within the enclave, but the difference between Jane Reese, the washerwoman on Juliette Street who never experienced any documented extreme violence, and Laura Oliver (Case No. 46), the washerwoman who was shot and killed while ironing clothes one night in her home, is one of space. A general lack of interpersonal violence in North Dallas was arguably due to a more formidable buffer or formal separation from the greater white community, a formal separation from the saloon and vice districts, and a resulting sense of community and belonging that was lacking within the more isolated black enclaves.

Those African Americans living outside the safety of North Dallas, in their tiny islands of black domesticity surrounded by an indifferent or even openly hostile white majority, were at much greater disadvantage in the logistics of everyday living. Even something as simple as walking a few blocks to buy groceries would have risked exposure to hostility.

To explain the differences in aspects of interpersonal violence in Dallas, the concept of ‘social capital’ is useful (Lochner et al., 1999). This concept originated in sociology, and explains how certain communities work cooperatively to overcome outside threats. Lochner et al. (1999) delineate how social capital can measure population responses to aspects of health, and specifically focus on four constructs: collective efficacy, psychological sense of community, neighborhood cohesion, and community competence. These aspects would have been undoubtedly recognized and shared by black residents of North Dallas Freedman’s Town.

The numerous and often lethal assaults that took place within the red light district or ‘Reservation’ were noticed by Dallas’s City Council, who examined various options to better regulate this vice district (Dallas Times Herald, 9 December 1904, 10 December 1904, 29 December 1905). In 1906 city officials proposed moving the ‘Reservation’ to the north, which would have encompassed portions of North Dallas Freedman’s Town, but residents there mounted such vocal opposition that the proposal was quickly dropped (Dallas Times Herald, 19 August 1906). Arguably, the North Dallas community acted collectively for the common good of the ‘membership’ as a whole, employing their social capital (Lochner et al., 1999) as a means of self-preservation against this legislative threat to their very survival.
RACE, IDENTITY AND SOCIAL VIOLENCE

Historian Richard Lane (1986, 1999) linked two nineteenth-century trends to at least partially explain the rise of gun violence in black Philadelphia – an ever-increasing environment of racism and intolerance, coupled with the advent of cheap firearms. Overt racism was certainly a dominant factor in many episodes of interpersonal violence in Dallas. For example, the first five fatal shootings of Dallas police officers (between 1892 and 1912) all had underlying racial motivations (Elwonger, 2002; Leonardatos et al., 2001).

By Jackman’s (2002) broad and inclusive definition of violence, African Americans in Dallas, on a societal level, experienced daily and continuous psychological, material, and social injuries. One fundamental social injury can be directly observed by measuring the impacts felt by the active denial of essential city services for African Americans by the city’s all white government. These assaults were grossly manifested by a complete lack of paved roads in black sections of the city, an additional absence of sanitary sewers, and a lack of adequate health care. One example of the cumulative measure of the deleterious effects of these ‘assaults’ can be viewed in the bio-archaeological analysis of the skeletal material (Davidson et al., 2002).

Cribra orbitalia and porotic hyperostosis are both conditions associated with iron anemia. Cribra orbitalia is pitting on the bone surface and expansion of the marrow-containing portion of bone within the eye sockets. Porotic hyperostosis is pitting of the surface and thickening of the cranial bones caused by a similar expansion of the marrow-containing portion of the bone. Overall, iron anemia levels greatly increase from the Early to Late Periods in all segments of the Freedman’s population, and have been attributed primarily to an increase of individuals suffering from internal parasites, such as hookworms, tapeworms and pinworms, which are contained within animal or human feces, and commonly enter the body through the mouth or through cuts or scrapes on the bottoms of bare feet; an etiology exasperated through barefoot children, unpaved roads, and the accumulation of pathogens in the soils (Chandler, 1940). During this period Dallas experienced huge population increases, in combination with a well-documented lag in establishing an adequate public health infrastructure. The African American population, located in cramped, poorly drained, and segregated communities, would have suffered the worst under such conditions, where free-roaming livestock, unpaved streets, standing water, and backyard privies were commonplace, creating ideal conditions for parasitism to occur (Davidson et al., 2002).

Psychological violence on the black psyche, both individually and as a ‘race’, was also pervasive and insidious in the United States since the beginnings of slave importation in the 1600s. By the late nineteenth century, a daily onslaught of racist actions, words, and metaphors in the popular culture of the day all took their toll on the self-esteem of community and
individual. These actions took many forms: racist cartoons in the local daily
newspapers; degrading comical ‘coon’ dialogues on wax cylinders and 78
rpm records; ‘Darkie’ songs and sheet music illustrating the worst form of
stereotypes; and even three-dimensional stereoscope views of blacks
performing such staged stereotypical acts as stealing chickens or water-

Reactions to these social and psychological assaults on community and
self brought immediate repercussions in two ways. It emboldened elements
within the white community to turn racist thought into deed, and second,
in a reactionary sense, some blacks armed themselves to provide some
measure of psychic assurance of protection from all forms of violence, be
it physical, social, psychological, or material. Those who lived in isolation
from kindred black families, and were instead surrounded by hostile whites
at every turn, were ridiculed on the streets and at work; it was here that the
powerless armed themselves to gather some measure of control back into
their own hands. These black men and women were most often the victims
and most often the perpetrators of physical violence, many times against
one another. Anthropologist Hortense Powdermaker (1943: 753) recog-
nized in the 1940s that African American violence directed upon itself was
due in part to racism inflicted upon them by white society; an observation
that likely also holds true for many of the violent assaults in Dallas.

In 1871 the Texas state legislature made it a crime to carry firearms,
punishable by a fine of not less than $25 or more than $100 as well as
forfeiture of the weapon (Leonardatos et al., 2001). Dallas also had a gun
ordinance, punishable by a fine up to $200, which would have equated to
considerable jail time if this large sum could not be raised (Dallas Times
Herald, 28 October 1901; Dallas Times Herald, 19 April 1901). Many blacks
risked fine or imprisonment to maintain that sense of protection that
weapons provided, however false it was in reality. As evidenced by the lack
of shootings within its borders, blacks living in North Dallas apparently
armed themselves only when they left the safety of their own neighborhood
and ventured out into the white majority city, while for those African
Americans who lived in the smaller pockets of black homes engulfed by
white neighborhoods the carrying of weapons was demonstrably much
more commonplace.

The perception that owning a firearm will precipitate a greater feeling
of safety is well established. One modern study revealed that 89 percent of
gun owners felt safer because they had guns, but individual decisions to own
a firearm can have implications for the greater community, and sometimes
the net result was an overall community feeling of greater danger
(Hemenway et al., 1995: 121). Within any historical African American
community, the presence of firearms to provide some measure of personal
safety could potentially have immediate and real negative impacts on
society as a whole.
Horace Redfield, a nineteenth-century journalist, published an 1880 study entitled *Homicide, North and South* (1880/2000). Redfield was the first to systematically study patterns of gun violence in the USA, noting that homicide rates were much higher in the South than the North. The primary criterion Redfield offered for this disparity was the very commonplace practice in the South of carrying concealed weapons on one’s person in public life (1880/2000: 194). Even those who did not routinely carry weapons would do so when they thought their lives were in danger, or ‘... if they expected a “difficulty”’, and would only discontinue the practice when the perceived danger had passed. Using 1870s data, Redfield calculated that more than half of the homicides in Texas, Kentucky, and South Carolina were the direct result of carrying concealed weapons in public. Redfield even documented a state official in Austin, Texas, and the governor of Tennessee both brandishing loaded pistols on capital grounds (Redfield, 1880/2000: 195–6). If a Tennessee governor and a Texas congressmen felt the need to carry a concealed weapon on the grounds of their state capitals, black men without white privilege or such high status would have probably felt an even greater need to arm themselves.

The sociologist Earl Moses (1947) compared immigrant whites and African Americans of similar economic circumstances in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1940, or some 33 years after the last death in this Dallas study, and found that homicides were higher amongst blacks. Although recognizing it as a stereotype, Moses noted (1947: 419–20):

> One alleged mode of behavior among Negroes is that of carrying knives and guns. If one accepts this as widespread, one accepts the accompanying alleged attitude of ‘security’ borne of having a weapon. The presence of weapons often leads to their use, more than likely resulting in higher homicide rates.

Alex Bradley, the African American who shot and killed Joseph Hudson (Case No. 45), expressed this rationale when apprehended (*Dallas Times Herald*, 10 July 1906):

> ... asked why he had carried the gun this morning. (Bradley) stated he was sure he would get killed, as Hudson had threatened his life. He was then asked why he went to the restaurant when he knew that Hudson was there, and he said he wasn’t afraid of him, when he had his gun with him.

In this vein, consider the inner musings of Bigger in Richard Wright’s novel, *Native Son*, for insight into the hard choices he had to make while negotiating his way through white sections of Chicago, and how easily he could rationalize carrying a pistol (1940: 43):

> Inside his shirt he felt the cold metal of the gun resting against his naked skin; he ought to put it back between the mattresses. No! He would keep it. He would take it with him to the Dalton place. He felt that he would be safer if he took it. He was not planning to use it and there was nothing in particular that he was afraid of, but there was in him an uneasiness and
distrust that made him feel that he ought to have it along. He was going among white people, so he would take his knife and his gun; it would make him feel that he was the equal of them, give him a sense of completeness. Then he thought of a good reason why he should take it; in order to get to the Dalton place, he had to go through a white neighborhood. He had not heard of any Negroes being molested recently, but he felt that it was always possible.

Similar thoughts could probably be mapped onto any number of these Dallas shootings (e.g. Case Nos 21, 24), with lamentably fatal results. Certainly unprovoked white assaults on blacks were commonplace. For example, on Christmas Eve of 1904, John Brown was assaulted by a group of white boys and beaten severely. Brown stated ‘. . . he had not exchanged any words with the boys and claims that the assault upon him was unprovoked’ (*Dallas Times Herald*, 25 December 1904). One year later ‘Columbus Moory, a young Negro, was set upon by a crowd of white boys . . . and severely beaten with sticks’, an additional unnamed black boy was assaulted and beaten about his head and body, and two black woman were knocked down and assaulted (*Dallas Times Herald*, 25 December 1905). All of these events were written up in the press as simple incidences of ‘good clean fun’. For example, for the boy who suffered severe blows to the head, the article was entitled, ‘Negro Boy Discovers Bump’ (*Dallas Times Herald*, 25 December 1905).

The black attorney A.J. McCauley wrote an open letter to the *Times Herald*, protesting these vicious attacks and pleading to the better conscience of the city (*Dallas Times Herald*, 25 December 1905): ‘Miniature Russia was turned loose on the blacks and they were indiscriminately knocked, beaten, and slashed – utterly terrified – by bands of whites, whose only excuse was that their victims were “niggers”.’

Perhaps in retaliation to this letter, a month later McCauley was assaulted and severely beaten by a mob of 20 white men wielding snow-balls packed with rocks. As an educated man, his response was to write yet another letter to the *Times Herald* (23 January 1906) complaining of this behavior, but even this extremely articulate and well-educated man resorted to any form of self-protection possible:

I was driven to the extreme measure of returning to my home and arming myself with a six-shooter, which I carried in my hand to the office, to save myself from death or serious bodily injury. Now I can prove by thousands of the best people in this state, white and black, that I never give provocation for trouble with anybody; and yet, had it become necessary in defense of my life, to have used that pistol, then in all likelihood I would have been published to the world as ‘a desperate Negro,’ and punished as the law directs in the case of hardened, desperate criminals.

Ironically, A.J. McCauley had already survived a pistol wound inflicted some three years before he wrote these words. The person who shot him
was not a white hoodlum, but rather his black stepson after a heated argument (Dallas Times Herald, 25 September 1903). Pushed to such extremes, a college-educated black man carried a pistol. For the majority of black Americans, without the advantage, however slight, of education and social standing, such choices were far easier and of more dire necessity. With Dallas an armed and racially divided camp, is it any wonder that there were casualties?

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

In a perceptive essay on the historiography of violence, Leonard and Leonard (2003) chart research trends over the past 50 years, noting that many factors have been offered to explain the extraordinary levels of violence in America, with general agreement that race (and racism) has been the primary contributing factor, commensurate with other contributing factors (2003: 121–3). While many social scientists have made careful diachronic studies of violence in America, very few have been able to articulate the fundamental reason(s), at any level, beyond underlying factors such as poverty and race (2003: 133).

While I may not have provided any additional insight into the study of violence in general, there is a value in documenting this violence in turn-of-the-century Dallas, exposing its pervasiveness and its devastating impacts on the lives of individuals. In part, this revelation offers greater insight into other aspects of this lived experience. The revelation of just how commonplace violence in turn-of-the-century black Dallas really was, and how it was strategically focused in certain areas of the city, allows us to see why the North Dallas Freedman’s Town district was so vital to the formation of Dallas’s black middle class, and why it is remembered so vividly and fondly today (Prince, 1993). Many of those in North Dallas had the same low-paying, menial jobs as those blacks living in the more dangerous enclaves in the city, had to endure similar daily acts of racism, and live as a seemingly perpetual underclass. But, at home, they found a buffer to the white world. Segregation was a horrible tool within the greater system of oppression, but in large neighborhoods it also provided a psychological refuge against daily slights and petty outrages.

While it is possible to demonstrate some of the contributing factors and stressors that underlie these moments of violence, each individual act is unique, as were the people who died. The potential for identification of these anonymous remains is great, and the simple methods utilized here could be applied to any archaeological context with adequate archival correlates. The acts of violence directed against African Americans in Dallas, at the societal level, also included the desecration of Freedman’s...
Cemetery, and the literal destruction of hundreds of individual identities in the form of broken tombstones ripped from graves and buried beneath Calvary Avenue. Thus group social violence and individual identity collide. The restoration of even a handful of identities is a laudable goal as partial recompense for past injustice.

In a strictly medico-legal sense, however, the identifications presented here are admittedly weak. Forensic analyses of war dead recovered from battlefields (Sledge, 2005) have raised the legal threshold of identification to a high standard. We cannot hope to achieve this level of confidence; for these cases, too much time has passed and the evidences of these past crimes is too muted and spare to bear the weight of absolutes.

So in the final sum, is Burial 653 Fred Washington? Perhaps. Is Burial 1510 really Ida Harris? Maybe. No matter how many facts or arguments are brought to bear on the matter, establishing identity in an irrefutable sense can never truly be achieved, which is a frustrating final thought. But I think the attempt has a value in and of itself. To illuminate the experiences of these once forgotten men, women, and children, who died in any number of senseless ways, brings a better understanding – both of their deaths, and of the context of their lives.
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