

Converging to a National Lynching Database: Recent Developments

Lisa D. Cook  
Department of Economics  
Michigan State University  
lisacook@msu.edu

© May 2011 Lisa D. Cook

Abstract

In tandem with a recent surge in interest in lynching in the U.S. in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, researchers in a number of fields have begun to use lynching data in new ways for a wide range of empirical investigations. A limited number of national lynching data series are available, have well-known flaws, but are nonetheless used. This paper analyzes and compares these series, summarizes recent efforts to address their shortcomings, and identifies extensions that could aid in the construction a national database of confirmed lynching victims, whose broader applications are just beginning to be explored.

**Keywords:** lynching, new national data source, new state data source, race, ethnicity, Reconstruction

Thousands of lynchings occurred in the U.S. in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Most victims were African American males, and most individuals were lynched in the South. Relative to size of population, Wyoming, Montana, Florida, Arizona, Mississippi, and Louisiana were the leading sites of lynchings with three persons to one person per 100,000 lynched between 1882 and 1903.<sup>1</sup> Only four states – Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island – had no lynchings recorded during this period.

In recent years, scholarly and popular interest in lynching has increased markedly. A host of scholars has extended the empirical research on lynching along at least two dimensions. In the first dimension, researchers have examined factors related to lynching and have sought to explain lynching as an outcome. Theories that have been tested to explain variation in lynching series relate to political, economic, and racial conditions, e.g., Beck, Tolnay, and Massey (1989); Beck and Tolnay (1990); Brundage (1993); Corzine, Creech, and Corzine (1983); Corzine, Huff-Corzine, and Creech (1988); Olzak (1990); Soule (1992); Tolnay and Beck (1992, 1995); Tolnay, Beck, and Massey (1989); and Tolnay, Deane, and Beck (1996). This research finds support for various covariates of lynching, including relatively large and immobile black population, depressed economic conditions among whites, perceived or real social or economic threat on the part of whites with respect to blacks, presence of a relatively more powerful Democratic Party, and inadequate legal sanctions for significant crimes.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Leonard's (2002) calculation based on Cutler (1905) data from Table A.3, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> This summary relies heavily on a rich description of lynching studies using lynching as the dependent variable and examining the motives for mob violence in Tolnay, Beck, et al. (2008).

In a number of cases, researchers have marshaled additional evidence on lynching victims, such as Census data, to elucidate mechanisms and common features, and hence potential motives. Darity and Price (2003) test the relation between racial stigma, or status as a former slave, and lynching activity and find that racial stigma is a relatively less important determinant of lynching activity than labor-market competition. Beck and Clark (2002) glean information from local and regional newspaper accounts and show that the 432 black victims of lynch mobs in Georgia between 1882 and 1930 were largely connected to their communities rather than strangers. In contrast, Bailey, Tolnay, Beck, and Laird (2011) analyze cases linked to Census and county data and show that lynching victims were typically not economically or socially connected to the communities in which they were lynched. Others have explored ethnic and geographic variation in lynching patterns, e.g., Carrigan and Webb (2003), who examine the number of Latinos lynched, and Pfeifer (2004), who examines lynching patterns across regions of the U.S. A few of these researchers and others have also extended the investigation of lynching beyond the typical postbellum period, e.g., extending the analysis to the antebellum and Civil-War periods as in Pfeifer (2011).

Along the second dimension, lynching data are being asked to explain other outcomes. Fryer and Levitt (2007) use lynching data in studying the effects of Ku Klux Klan activity. Cook (2009) uses lynching and riot data by state as a proxy for violence that would diminish economic activity among African Americans as measured by patent data. Carden (2007) takes the presence of lynching as a signal of insecure property rights to explain the relative underdevelopment of the postbellum South. Messner, Baller, and Zevenbergen (2005) use

lynching activity as a covariate of homicide levels to test their degree of substitutability and complementarity, and King, Messner, and Baller (2009) examine the effects of past lynching behavior on current hate-crime policing and prosecution.

Such a surge in interest in using these data as a proxy for the legal, political, and social environment and for other reasons in empirical research sheds light on issues related to quality and scope of the data. While national lynching series are required, available, and used, they are known to be flawed, e.g., with errors related to mis-, under-, and over-reporting. Yet, there has not been a systematic attempt to create a corrected national data set of confirmed lynching victims. Nonetheless, there have been growing efforts to revise and enhance local, state, and regional data in the last two decades that move us in the direction of being able to construct a credible national lynching data set. This seems to be an appropriate time to survey and assess these recent refinements of the data.

This paper makes two contributions to the literature. First, it provides an examination of the most commonly used lynching data sets, their merits and limitations. Second, it describes a number of ways by which data have been recently revised and collected and suggests how a national database of lynching victims might be constructed from recent efforts. While there is a fairly large literature that documents the fact that significant changes, especially racial, were taking place among African Americans following the Civil War and before the Great Migration, e.g., from Fogel and Engerman (1974), Litwack (1979, 1998), Margo (1990), Ransom and Sutch (2001), and Logan (2009), less systematic microeconomic evidence exists to elucidate these

changes and the mechanisms by which they occurred. This paper aids in the quest to add more data for empirical analysis of African American life in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and earlier 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

### *Lynching Data Sets*

While the definition of lynching can vary, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's (NAACP) definition is the one that is widely accepted and is used in this paper. It requires that four conditions obtain: (1) there must be evidence that a person was killed; (2) the person must have met death illegally; (3) a group of three or more persons must have participated in the killings (to rule out personal vendettas, etc.); and (4) the group must have acted under the pretext of protecting justice or tradition. Table 1 presents and compares the characteristics of commonly-used and new data sets related to lynching victims in the U.S.

### *Historical National Data Sets*

The *Chicago Tribune* started collecting and publishing annual data on lynching victims in 1883. It has served as the basis for a number of other well-known works, including those of Ida Wells-Barnett, the anti-lynching advocate and founding member of the NAACP, in which she makes one of the earliest attempts to explain the causes of lynching by examining the empirical

record.<sup>3</sup> The *Tribune* series was recorded for 1882 to 1918. Collier (1905) [1969] reports these data in tabular form as an original series and as a slightly revised and corrected series that goes from 1882 to 1903.<sup>4</sup>

Tuskegee University began collecting lynching data in 1892. Monroe T. Work, a director of the Department of Records and Archives at Tuskegee University, collected information on lynchings and lynching victims from newspapers, including the *Tribune*. Jesse Guzman, a later director, published these data in Tuskegee's 1952 *Negro Year Book*, and another director, Daniel Williams, compiled these lists in the 1968 volume, *Amid the Gathering Multitude: The Story of Lynching in America. A Classified Listing*, which is available in summary tabular form on several web sites. Two tables provide the total number of victims by race of victim (black or white) by state of lynching and by year of lynching from 1882 to 1968. The lists of victims from which the tables are derived contain the victim's name, date and location of lynching, and alleged offense. Because of the length of its time series and accessibility, the Tuskegee data set is widely used and cited. The U.S. lynching series presented in Carter, et al.'s *Historical Statistics of the United States: Millennial Edition* (2006a), which also appears in Table 1, is the Tuskegee time series, combining data from the 1952 *Negro Year Book* for the years 1882 to 1951 and the subsequent Tuskegee data for the years 1952 to 1964.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See for example, Wells-Barnett [1892] (1969).

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 160-161. Collier revises data for the years 1890, 1891, 1894, 1895, 1897, and 1902.

<sup>5</sup> Eckberg (2006a), note to Table Ec251-253.

The NAACP data set was started in 1912. The NAACP data, which are for the years 1889 to 1918, are compiled in *Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918* in summary tables and as lists of occurrences with the victim's name, date and location of lynching, and alleged offense. The series is also at least partly based on the *Chicago Tribune* series, as well as on other contemporaneous newspaper reports, and on investigations conducted by the civil rights organization. The NAACP continued keeping records on lynching in annual reports through at least 1955, but these are not collected in one volume like the earlier lynchings.

In 1962, Ginzburg collected information from an historical search of newspapers, which seems less dependent on the *Tribune* series. Ginzburg's *One Hundred Years of Lynching* reports name of victim, date of lynching, and town by state of lynching and spans the years 1859 to 1955. Unlike the aforementioned volumes, data are only reported for black victims, and there are no data aggregated into tables and charts in the Ginzburg volume, which makes this source the least functional.<sup>6</sup>

The *Tribune*, NAACP, Tuskegee and Ginzburg compilations have a few well-known problems. First, errors arise in *Chicago Tribune* and other newspaper reporting that emerge in the collected data sets on which they are based. Among these errors are misidentification of victims, wrongly placed lynchings, and lynchings in which a death did not actually occur or did not meet the standard definition of lynching otherwise. When reviewing a combined list of the *Tribune*, NAACP, and Tuskegee data for southern states, Tolnay and Beck (1995) find that

---

<sup>6</sup> Ginzburg [1962] (1988) reports that it is a partial listing of lynching victims, and, therefore, the Ginzburg series has the fewest observations of the national series, which also limits its functionality.

roughly 17 percent of lynchings did not meet the criteria for lynching.<sup>7</sup> Second, estimates of lynchings are not uniform across these series. For a random year, 1902, the *Tribune* reports 96 total lynchings; the NAACP, 94; and Tuskegee, 83.<sup>8</sup> Others, e.g., Raveter (1927), also show that the NAACP estimates are higher than the Tuskegee estimates, and this finding is generally accepted in the literature.<sup>9</sup> A comparison of the Tuskegee and Ginzburg series for 23 non-southern states shows that data are identical only for Michigan and that there are large differences for 10 states, including Texas which is reported to have 352 lynching victims by the Tuskegee series and 96 by Ginzburg.<sup>10</sup> Using these series in estimation could yield significantly different results, as can be seen from summary statistics reported on each data set in Table 2. Another issue related to reporting is that Ginzburg sometimes records the date of the newspaper article rather than the date of the lynching.<sup>11</sup> Fourth, lynchings and lynching victims may be under-reported. If not deemed newsworthy by a newspaper used by one of these sources, i.e., a national or regional rather than local newspaper, lynching activity may have been missed. Tolnay and Beck (1995) argue that the number of obscure lynchings is probably low, given the frequency of reporting.<sup>12</sup> Some scholars have found lynchings not recorded by newspapers, e.g., Carrigan and Webb (2003), but this number seems relatively small. Fifth, the racial classification in the three data series is largely dichotomous, and victims are either

---

<sup>7</sup> Tolnay and Beck (1995), p. 262.

<sup>8</sup> Cutler [1905] (1969), p. 161, NAACP (1919), p. 29, and Tuskegee data set.

<sup>9</sup> Raveter compared lynching data for 1914 from each source. The Tuskegee data report 52 lynchings; the *Tribune* data, 54; and the NAACP, 74. This comparison appears in Gibson (2011). In the literature, it has been argued that systematic over-counting of lynching victims by the NAACP is due to its role as the leading civil rights advocacy group in the country at the time.

<sup>10</sup> Author's comparison. It can be reasonably assumed that the data are for approximately the same period, since there are few lynchings after 1955, when the Ginzburg newspaper clippings end.

<sup>11</sup> See Frazier (2009), pp. 213-214, for problems with the Ginzburg data on Missouri victims, which seem to be representative of problems found in the series generally.

<sup>12</sup> See Tolnay and Beck (1995), pp. 261-265 for a rich discussion of issues relate to under- and over-counting.

categorized as black or white. Each non-black victim, i.e., white, Chinese, Hispanic, Italian, or Native American, was recorded as “white.”<sup>13</sup> This is problematic generally, but, in particular, in Western states where these populations were larger. Analysis involving race or ethnicity and using lynching data on victims reported to be white would require extra caution in estimation and in interpretation using these series. Sixth, nearly all series begin in 1882. However, it is known that lynching was widespread before this time, particularly in the years immediately following the Civil War. There is some evidence that the postbellum period was the most violent. Wright (1990) shows that nearly 40 percent of persons lynched in Kentucky between 1860 and 1939 were lynched between 1860 and 1879. For blacks and for whites in Kentucky, the period 1870 to 1879 was only second to the period 1890 to 1899 in terms of lynching violence.<sup>14</sup> Empirical analysis using national lynching data would largely miss the important era of Reconstruction. Finally, the functional and publicly available data sets contain only a fraction of the actual data recorded. The Tuskegee data are available on the web by year and race or by state and race for the entire period but not by state, year, race, and victim’s name. The same is true for the data contained in NAACP (1919). This would make matching names to Census and other data and estimation using panel data, e.g., random or fixed-effects models, difficult without adding further information from the underlying records. Similarly, *Tribune* data are reviewed and summarized in a series of tables in Cutler [1905] (1969) through 1903. Not only are the data arranged similar to those in the Tuskegee and NAACP data sets, i.e., by state or by

---

<sup>13</sup> Cutler [1905] (1969) separates out “Others,” which includes people of Mexican origin, Native Americans, and foreigners in some of the *Tribune* data presented. While a small number of Jews are known to have been lynched, religion is not recorded in any national data set.

<sup>14</sup> Author’s calculation from data on p. 71.

year, they stop at 1903. This sample is biased upwards, because it captures the years of greatest lynching activity for black and white victims.

### *Corrections and Revisions of Historical Data Sets*

The innovation underlying the seminal work of Tolnay and Beck (1995) was a meticulous analysis of the *Tribune*, NAACP, and Tuskegee data for states in the South, i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.<sup>15</sup> Newspaper stories were used to evaluate each case in the combined list and to add cases previously unreported in the data. There are 2,805 observations of confirmed lynching victims in the resulting data set, which includes not only the type of data found in the Tuskegee data set but also gender of victim, race of the mob in some cases, alleged offense, and county in which the lynching took place.<sup>16</sup> The Project HAL data set is closely related to that of Tolnay and Beck (1995). It is web-based and open source to allow contributors to verify cases and to add other incidents.

The Tolnay and Beck (1995) data have been extended to include more characteristics of the victims and of the community to further examine common features of lynching victims, their households, and communities. Tolnay, Beck, Bailey, Roberts, and Wong (2008) describe in

---

<sup>15</sup> The Beck and Tolnay 1997 inventory, which is the basis for Tolnay and Beck (1995), was provided to the author, and these are the data analyzed in Tables 1 and 2. Subsequent Beck and Tolnay data are extracted from related publications and also appear in Tables 1 and 2.

<sup>16</sup> In addition to 17 percent of cases in the master list not meeting the definition of lynching, a further 225 cases remained unreconciled (p. 260).

detail the process of matching existing data on lynching victims to Census records and historical county data.<sup>17</sup>

### *Extensions and Other Efforts*

Given the quality improvements and enhancements related to lynching victims in the South, what about the rest of the country? What about other races? With existing data, researchers desiring to systematically study regional and racial or ethnic differences in lynching or to use lynching activity as an explanatory variable, e.g., as a proxy for the property-rights environment within the U.S., would face the unpalatable choice of either confining their investigation to the South or using knowingly flawed data.

It would be challenging to extend the Tolnay and Beck (1995) data, the most extensive collection of confirmed lynching victims, to one with national coverage. Texas alone would require examination of 687 cases from the Tuskegee and NAACP data sets. The Tuskegee and Ginzburg [1962] (1988) series have sometimes been used to extend the Tolnay and Beck (1995) data to construct a national series, e.g., Cook (2004, 2009). This, however, would be a second-best solution due to the aforementioned measurement error in the Ginzburg and Tuskegee series. Such a series would not allow precise comparison, for example, of the property-rights

---

<sup>17</sup> In Tables 1 and 2, the Beck and Tolnay 1997 and 2004 inventories are the data used in Tolnay and Beck (1995, 2008).

environment faced by blacks and whites, because lynching victims may have been mis- or over-identified and because white lynchings are typically reported with other non-black races.

An alternative tack has been taken that may increase the quality and scope of lynching data. Recently, researchers have scrutinized existing lynching data by state to glean more accurate information and discovered previously unreported data. Brundage (1993) uses data on Georgia and Virginia to explain within-South variation in lynching. In the *Historical Statistics of the United States: Millennial Edition*, the Brundage data for Virginia have been added to the Tolnay and Beck (1995) data to construct a series of lynching victims in the South.<sup>18</sup> Wright (1990) studies data on lynching victims in Kentucky and attempts to explain variation in lynching activity by county and region. Frazier (2009) extends the *Chicago Tribune* data on Missouri back to 1803 and corrects the data for the period 1882 to 1918. Among the sources used for verification are in-state newspapers, county histories, and state and federal court records. Beck and Clark (2002) examine and add community characteristics to the Beck Georgia Lynching Project data. Leonard (2002) offers new data on people lynched in Colorado and compares them to data on legal executions. A number of state archives and historical societies, e.g., the Maryland State Archives (described in Table 1), have researched lynchings that occurred in states also using local sources for verification and extension. A plethora of local case studies

---

<sup>18</sup> See Carter et al. (2006), Table Ec254-289.

has also emerged, e.g., Fedo (2000) who examines the lynchings in Duluth, MN in 1920, using similar sources and methods.<sup>19</sup>

Rather than focusing on one or two states, Pfeifer (2004) examines and collects lynching data from all regions of the U.S., i.e., on Alaska, California, Iowa, Louisiana, New York, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. He verifies and updates data using court records, local newspapers, and other primary sources. In addition, apart from this work, he has made available data on Delaware, Minnesota, and Missouri on his web site.<sup>20</sup>

Gonzalez-Day (2006) investigates lynchings in California from 1850 to 1935. In doing so, he also offers the most extensive corrections to and information on racial and national-origin classifications of lynching victims in the Tuskegee data, which reported race as either black or white. Similarly, Carrigan and Webb (2003) seek to identify people of Mexican descent who were lynched in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In reviewing the Tuskegee data for New Mexico, they find that, of 36 people reported lynched in New Mexico between 1882 and 1968, 33 were reported as “white” and 3 “black.” They find that nine of 33 whites were of Mexican descent, and one was Native American.<sup>21</sup> Using accounts from diplomatic correspondence, English- and Spanish-language newspapers, and other primary sources, in total, they find that 597 people of Mexican descent were lynched in 13 states between 1848 and 1928. These data and similar efforts make it possible to credibly incorporate race, ethnicity, and national origin in estimation.

---

<sup>19</sup> There has been a significant proliferation of local case studies on lynching victims, like Fedo (2000). While these provide rich detail and are important, particularly in contributing to data gathered on states, the focus of this paper is the state-level data useful in constructing a national data base on confirmed lynching victims.

<sup>20</sup> See Pfeifer (2011).

<sup>21</sup> Gonzalez-Day (2006), p. 38.

Similar to Tolnay and Beck (1995), new researchers' findings differ from those of the *Tribune*, NAACP, and Tuskegee data. Leonard's (2002) data on confirmed victims in Colorado suggest that the number of lynching victims is underestimated by the NAACP data and overestimated by the *Tribune* data. For the years 1882 to 1918, he finds 54 lynching victims, while the NAACP finds 18 victims, and the *Tribune* finds 64 victims.<sup>22</sup> The Louisiana data compiled by Pfeifer (2004) are comparable to Tolnay and Beck's (1995) Louisiana data. However, he finds that the number of lynching victims for Iowa reported in the Tuskegee data were considerably underestimated, i.e., two versus 25.<sup>23</sup> Maryland's state archivists found 22 people confirmed to have been lynched between 1882 and 1931, all but one of whom were black. In contrast, the *Tribune* finds two whites and 18 blacks lynched, the NAACP finds two whites and 15 blacks lynched, and Tuskegee finds two whites and 27 blacks lynched.<sup>24</sup> These data are presented in Table 1, and summary statistics are reported in Table 2. The foregoing examples point again to significantly different outcomes that may arise in estimation, whether the number of lynching victims is used as a dependent or independent variable, depending on the data set used.

New efforts to revise state data on lynchings mentioned here are meant to be representative but are not exhaustive. Scholars have also extended coverage temporally and racially in the

---

<sup>22</sup> Leonard (2002), Table A.2, pp. 173-174; NAACP (1919), p. 30; and Cutler, p. 180. The *Tribune* data reported in Cutler (1905) [1969] are for 1882 to 1903, which suggests that the difference between the *Tribune* and Leonard data is even greater.

<sup>23</sup> The Pfeifer (2004) data for Iowa are from Black (1912) and for the period 1883 to 1907. The Tuskegee data are for 1882 to 1968.

<sup>24</sup> Maryland State Archives (2007); Tuskegee (1969); NAACP (1919), Table3, p. 31; Cutler (1905) [1969], p.179. Tuskegee data are for 1882 to 1968, NAACP data are for 1882 to 1918, and *Tribune* (Cutler) data are for 1882 to 1903.

process of gleaning more information by state. Modifications to the *Chicago Tribune*, Tuskegee, and NAACP data have proceeded almost continuously since the early 1990's but have necessarily been piecemeal, given the onerous task of consulting a multitude of local primary and secondary sources to evaluate old and report previously unknown lynching cases. Nonetheless, all states of the U.S. have not yet been covered, and a U.S. data set of confirmed lynching victims does not yet exist.

### *Future Research*

A full national data set should be the goal of data extension, and the kind of work that has recently been done for several states should be executed for all. Given the aforementioned problems in the national data sets, the objectives of extension would be three-fold.

First, the national data sets should be verified and corrected for the states not yet examined. The state with one of the largest numbers of lynching victims, Texas, has not been (re-)examined like others, which is an important oversight. The Beck and Tolnay approach of combining existing national data sets, including the Ginzburg data, to begin examination with a master list would likely be the best approach. As Tolnay and Beck (1995), Frazier (2009), and Gonzalez-Day (2006) report, it will be important to record existing cases from the master list that cannot be confirmed or reconciled.<sup>25</sup> Further, these data should be revised to include the proper racial or ethnic classification. Gonzalez-Day's separation of California's victims by race,

---

<sup>25</sup> Researchers using lynching data in estimation would want to be informed of selection or truncation issues, i.e., whether the reports of unconfirmed and near-lynchings in a given state systematically differ from those that are confirmed. Frazier (2009) provides a model for such data collection in Appendix 2, which also gives data on near-lynchings and on unconfirmed lynchings that are reported by the *Chicago Tribune* or NAACP (1919). Gonzalez-Day codes cases that match (or do not match) the Tuskegee data, which would be useful to report for other states.

ethnicity, and national origin would be useful for other states. Second, data should be collected by state to capture previously unrecorded lynchings and lynching victims. This research should rely most heavily on state and local primary and secondary sources. In addition to collecting data series that appear in the Beck and Tolnay (1997) inventory, for example, it would be useful to obtain more information on mobs, e.g., estimated size, as is reported in Leonard (2002), to capture more information on the property-rights environment. In the course of construction, creators of newer state data sets have often extended the period of coverage, e.g., from the state's inception as a state or territory, and this would be important to do deliberately in future efforts.<sup>26</sup> As aforementioned, there may be a significant number of missing observations from the postbellum period. Third, the existing data that have been verified and new verified data should be merged to create a national database with uniform series, tabulated, and made publicly available.<sup>27</sup> Of course, matching these data to other data sets, e.g., Census data, would be ideal but not fundamental in obtaining a verified, consistent, and balanced national data set. Nonetheless, such a national data set would add considerable richness to the systematic analysis of various aspects of African American life, and American life more generally, in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

---

<sup>26</sup> Most data sources mentioned in the paper collect data on gender. While the number of female lynching victims small and largely do not appear in tabular form, it would be important to continue collecting these data for statistical estimation purposes.

<sup>27</sup> We can anticipate at least a few problems with the creation of a national data set as proposed. While a common source is state and local newspapers for new state data sets, other primary and secondary sources vary greatly and may produce different estimates of lynchings and information on lynching victims. Several researchers have compiled data on the same states, but the data are not identical, e.g., Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, and California. Careful decisions will need to be made with respect to inclusion of one series rather than another (or others). The resulting data set would be an unbalanced panel, since states enter the Union at different times and begin recording lynchings for other reasons at different times.

References

Bailey, Amy K., Stewart E. Tolnay, E.M. Beck, "Was Anyone Safe? Individual and Household Characteristics of Lynch Victims in the American South, 1882-1930," forthcoming, *American Sociological Review*.

\_\_\_\_\_, et al. "Personalizing Lynch Victims: A New Database to Support the Study of Mob Violence," *Historical Methods* 41 (Winter): 47-61, 2008.

Beck, E.M. and Timothy Clark. "Strangers, Community Miscreants, or Locals: Who Were the Black Victims of Mob Violence?" *Historical Methods* 35 (Spring): 1-6, 2002.

Beck, E. M., J. L. Massey, and S. E. Tolnay, "The Gallows, the Mob, the Vote: Lethal Sanctioning of Blacks in North Carolina and Georgia, 1882 to 1930," *Law & Society Review* 23:317-31, 1989.

Beck, E. M., and S. E. Tolnay, "The Killing Fields of the Deep South: The Market for Cotton and the Lynching of Blacks, 1882-1930," *American Sociological Review* 55:526-39, 1990.

Black, Paul Walton, "Lynchings in Iowa," *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* 10 (1912), 151-254.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *Lynching in the New South: Georgia and Virginia, 1880-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Carden, Art. *Institutions and Southern Development: Lynching as a Signal of Insecure Property Rights*. Dissertation, Washington University.

Carrigan, William and Clive Webb, "The Lynching of Persons of Mexican Origin or Descent in the United States, 1848 to 1928," *Journal of Social History*, Volume 37, Number 2, Winter 2003, pp. 411-438.

Cook, Lisa D., National Lynching Data Series, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Violence and Economic Activity: Evidence from African American Inventors, 1870-1940," Michigan State University, unpublished manuscript, 2009.

Corzine, Jay, J. Creech, and L. Corzine, "Black Concentration and Lynchings in the South: Testing Blalock's Power-Threat Hypothesis," *Social Forces* 61:774-96, 1983.

Corzine, Jay, L. Huff-Corzine, and J. Creech, "The Tenant Labor Market and Lynching in the South: A Test of the Split Labor Market Theory," *Sociological Quarterly* 58:261-78, 1988.

Cutler, James Elbert. *Lynch-law: An Investigation into the History of Lynching in the United States*. New York, London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1905.

Darity, Willam, Jr. and Gregory Price, "Can Racial Stigma Explain Black Lynchings?" North Carolina A&T State University Working Papers in Economics, 2003.

Eckberg, Douglas, “ Reported victims of lynching, by race: 1882–1964,” Table Ec251-253 in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Earliest Times to the Present: Millennial Edition*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006a.

\_\_\_\_\_, “ Known victims of lynching in eleven Southern states, by race: 1882–1930 .” Table Ec254-289 in *Historical Statistics of the United States, Earliest Times to the Present: Millennial Edition*, edited by Susan B. Carter, Scott Sigmund Gartner, Michael R. Haines, Alan L. Olmstead, Richard Sutch, and Gavin Wright. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006b.

Fedo, Michael. *The Lynchings in Duluth*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2000.

Fogel, Robert William and Stanley L. Engerman. *Time of the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974.

Frazier, Harriet. *Lynchings in Missouri, 1803-1981*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland Publishers, 2009.

Fryer, Roland G. and Steven Levitt, “Hatred and Profits: Getting under the Hood of the Ku Klux Klan,” *NBER Working Papers* 13417, 2007.

Ginzburg, Ralph. *One Hundred Years of Lynching*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press, [1962] 1988.

Gonzalez-Day, Ken. *Lynchings in the West, 1850-1935*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.

Guzman, Jesse, ed. *The Negro Year Book: A Review of Events Affecting Negro Life, 1952*. Tuskegee: Tuskegee Institute, 1953.

King, Ryan D., Steven F. Messner, and Robert Baller, “Contemporary Hate Crimes, Law Enforcement, and the Legacy of Racial Violence,” *American Sociological Review* 74: 291-315, 2009.

Leonard, Stephen J. *Lynchings in Colorado, 1859-1919*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Press, 2002.

Litwack, Leon F. *Been in the Storm so Long: The Aftermath of Slavery*. New York: Knopf, 1979.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Trouble in Mind: Black Southerners in the Age of Jim Crow*. New York: Knopf, 1998.

Logan, Trevon D., “Health, Human Capital, and African American Migration Before 1910,” *Explorations in Economic History*, Elsevier, vol. 46(2), pages 169-185.

Margo, Robert A., “Accumulation of Property by Southern Blacks before World War I: Comment,” *American Economic Review* 74: 768-776 (1984).

Maryland data, “Judge Lynch’s Court: Mob Justice in Maryland during the Age of Jim Crow, 1860s-1930’s”:

<http://www.msa.md.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc5300/sc5339/000070/000000/000044/restricted/0006.html>, last accessed May 9, 2011.

Messner, Steven F., Robert Baller, and Matthew P. Zevenbergen, "The Legacy of Lynching and Southern Homicide," *American Sociological Review*, 70(4):633-655, 2005.

Pfeifer, Michael J. *Rough Justice: Lynching and American Society, 1847-1947*. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Northern United States and the Genesis of Racial Lynching: The Lynching of African Americans in the Civil War Era," *Journal of American History*, Volume 97, Issue 3, pp. 621-635.

NAACP, *Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918*. New York: NAACP, April 1919.

Olzak, S., "The Political Context of Competition: Lynching and Urban Racial Violence," *Social Forces* 69:395-421, 1990.

Project HAL Data Collection Project, <http://people.uncw.edu/hinese/HAL/HAL%20Web%20Page.htm>, last accessed 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Reading Sources," <http://people.uncw.edu/hinese/HAL/HAL%20Web%20Page.htm>, last accessed May 25, 2011.

Ransom, Roger L. and Richard Sutch. *One Kind of Freedom: The Economic Consequences of Emancipation*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Rever, Edward B. *The American Race Problem*. New York: [X], 1927 cited in Gibson, Robert A., *The Negro Holocaust: Lynching and Race Riots in the United States, 1880-1950*, <http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/1979/2/79.02.04.x.html>, last accessed May 9, 2011.

Soule, S. A., "Populism and Black lynching in Georgia, 1890-1900," *Social Forces* 71:431-49, 1992.

Tolnay, S. E., and E. M. Beck, "Racial Violence and Black Migration in the American South, 1910 to 1930," *American Sociological Review* 57:103-16, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882-1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995.

Tolnay, S. E., E. M. Beck, and J. L. Massey, "Black Lynchings: The Power Threat Hypothesis Revisited," *Social Forces* 67:605-23, 1989.

Tolnay, S. E., G. Deane, and E. M. Beck, "Vicarious Violence: Spatial Effects on Southern Lynchings, 1890-1919," *American Journal of Sociology* 102:788-815, 1996.

"Lynchings: By State and Race, 1882-1968," Tuskegee University Library and Archives, <http://www.electricprint.com/academic/departments/AandL/AAS/ANNOUNCE/vra/lynch/lynchstats.html>, last accessed May 25, 2011.

Wells-Barnett, Ida B. *On Lynchings: Southern Horrors, A Red Record, Mob Rule in New Orleans*. New York: Arno Press, [1892] 1969.

Williams, Daniel. *Amid the Gathering Multitude: The Story of Lynching in America. A Classified Listing.* Tuskegee: Tuskegee University, 1968.

Wright, G. C. *Racial violence in Kentucky, 1865–1940: Lynchings, Mob Rule, and “Legal Lynchings.”* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990.

Table 1. Lynching Data Sets Compared

| Data Set                        | Period    | N    | Coverage   | Victim Data | Accused Data | Alleged Offense | Location | Lynching Date | Principal Sources |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|----------|---------------|-------------------|
| <i>Chicago Tribune</i> *        | 1882-1918 | 3337 | U.S.       | R           | na           | Y               | C,S      | Y             | NW                |
| Tuskegee University*            | 1882-1968 | 4743 | U.S.       | R           | na           | Y               | C,S      | Y             | CT,NW,TU          |
| NAACP (1919)*                   | 1889-1918 | 3224 | U.S.       | R           | na           | Y               | C,T,S    | D,M,Y         | CT,NW,I           |
| Cook (2004)*                    | 1882-1940 | 4418 | U.S.       | R           | na           | na              | S        | Y             | TU,BT             |
| Carter, et al. (2006a)*         | 1882-1964 | 4745 | U.S.       | R           | na           | na              | na       | Y             | TU                |
| Ginzburg [1962] (1988)          | 1859-1960 | 2412 | U.S.       | N           | R            | Y               | T,S      | D,M,Y         | NW                |
| Pfeifer (2004)*                 | 1874-1947 | 724  | U.S.       | N,R         | na           | Y               | C,S      | D,M,Y         | NW,BGA,V          |
| Carrigan and Webb (2003)*       | 1848-1928 | 597  | U.S.       | NO          | na           | Y               | Y        | Y             | NW,V              |
| Project HAL (2004)*             | 1882-1930 | 2806 | South      | G,N,R       | R            | Y               | C,S      | D,M,Y         | BT,OTH            |
| Tolnay and Beck (1997)*         | 1882-1930 | 2805 | South      | G,N,R       | R            | y               | C,S      | D,M,Y         | CT,NAACP,TU, NW   |
| Tolnay, Beck, et al. (2004)*    | 1882-1930 | 2483 | South      | A,B,G,N,R   | R            | Y               | C,S      | D,M,Y         | BT, CE            |
| Bailey, Beck, and Tolnay (2011) | 1882-1929 | 900  | South      | A,B,G,N,R   | R            | Y               | C,T,S    | D,M,Y         | BT, CE            |
| Carter, et al. (2006b)*         | 1882-1930 | 2886 | South      | R           | na           | na              | S        | Y             | BT, BR            |
| Pfeifer (2011)                  | 1836-1981 | 100  | MN,MO,DE   | N,R         | RE           | Y               | C,S      | D,M,Y         | NW,V              |
| Brundage (1993)*                | 1880-1930 | 546  | GA, VA     | R           | R            | Y               | C [S]    | D,M,Y         | V                 |
| Gonzalez-Day (2006)*            | 1850-1935 | 352  | CA         | N,NO,R      | na           | Y               | C,T [S]  | D,M,Y         | NW, V             |
| Leonard (2002)*                 | 1859-1919 | 194  | CO         | R           | SZ           | Y               | C [S]    | M,Y           | NW, V             |
| Beck and Clark (2002)*          | 1882-1930 | 435  | GA         | A,G,N,R     | R            | Y               | C [S]    | D,M,Y         | BT, NW            |
| Wright (1990)*                  | 1860-1939 | 353  | KY         | N,R         | na           | Y               | C [S]    | M,Y           | NW                |
| MD State Archives (2007)*       | 1854-1933 | 22   | MD         | N,B,R       | G,R          | Y               | C,T [S]  | D,M,Y         | NW                |
| Frazier (2009)                  | 1803-1981 | 229  | MO         | B,G,N,R     | RE           | Y               | C [S]    | D,M,Y         | NW                |
| Fedo (2000)                     | 1920      | 3    | Duluth, MN | A,B,G,N,R   | RE           | Y               | [T,S]    | D,M,Y         | I,NW,V            |

\*All or part of data are available in tabular form.

Sources: *Chicago Tribune* data -- Cutler [1905] (1969). The Beck and Tolnay (1997) data are the underlying data for Tolnay and Beck (1995).

Other sources are described in the text.

Note: Number of observations in Ginzburg [1962] (1988) data is estimated, and coverage is only of African American victims.

Cutler/Tribune data span 1882 to 1903.

A=age; G=gender; N=name; NO=national origin; R=race, ethnicity; SZ=size or type of lynching group

B=biographical data; RE=relationship; Y=yes; N=no; C=county; S=state; T=town, city; D=day; M=month; Y=year

I=interviews; NW=newspapers; OTH=other contributors; V=various

CE=Census; CT=Chicago Tribune; BT=Beck and Tolnay; TU=Tuskegee University; BGA=Beck, GA Lynching Project

Table 2. Summary Statistics

| Data Set                        | Period    | Unit | N    | Mean<br>State, County | Mean<br>Year      | Estimation<br>Type |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------|------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Chicago Tribune</i>          | 1882-1903 | Y    | 3337 | na                    | 151.68<br>(38.56) | --                 |
| Tuskegee University             | 1882-1968 | S    | 51   | 107.80<br>(150.67)    | 93.61<br>(55.58)  | CS,[PL],T          |
| NAACP (1919)                    | 1889-1918 | S    | 44   | 65.80<br>(109.60)     | 107.47<br>(47.38) | CS [PL]            |
| Carter, et al. (2006a)          | 1882-1964 | Y    | 51   | na                    | 93.57<br>(55.61)  | T                  |
| Cook (2004)                     | 1882-1940 | S    | 51   | 11.93<br>(23.71)      | 90.17<br>(29.10)  | PL,T               |
| Project HAL (2004)              | 1882-1930 | S    | 10   | 280.50<br>(129.85)    | 57.24<br>(29.03)  | PL,T               |
| Carrigan and Webb (2003)        | 1848-1928 | S    | 13   | 45.92<br>(84.76)      | 6.84<br>(58.66)   | CS,[PL],T          |
| Pfeifer (2004)                  | 1874-1947 | S    | 11   | 65.82<br>(115.92)     | 1.03<br>(1.64)    | [PL,T]             |
| Beck and Tolnay (1997)          | 1882-1930 | S    | 10   | 246.30<br>(129.9)     | 57.27<br>(29.10)  | PL,T               |
| Beck and Tolnay (2004)          | 1882-1930 | S    | 10   | 248.30<br>(115.10)    | 45.42<br>(20.52)  | [PL,T]             |
| Bailey, Beck, and Tolnay (2011) | 1882-1929 | S,Y  | 10   | 9.00                  | 58.44             | [PL,T]             |
| Carter, et al. (2006b)          | 1882-1930 | S    | 11   | 9.82<br>(15.63)       | 58.90<br>(30.56)  | PL,T               |
| Pfeifer (2011)                  | 1836-1981 | S    | 3    | 33.33<br>(41.56)      | 0.28<br>(0.25)    | [PL,T]             |
| Brundage (1993)                 | 1880-1930 | S,Y  | 2    | 273.00                | 11.29             | [PL] T             |
| Gonzalez-Day (2006)             | 1850-1935 | C,Y  | 55   | 6.40                  | 4.09              | PL,T               |
| Leonard (2002)                  | 1859-1919 | Y    | 61   | na                    | 3.25<br>(4.03)    | [PL] T             |
| Beck and Clark (2002)           | 1882-1930 | Y    | 1    | na                    | 8.88              | [PL,T]             |
| Wright (1990)                   | 1860-1939 | R    | 7    | 50.43<br>(35.79)      | 44.13<br>(31.30)  | [PL,T]             |
| MD State Archives (2007)        | 1854-1933 | C    | 24   | 0.88<br>(0.00)        | 0.45<br>(0.822)   | [PL,T]             |
| Frazier (2009)                  | 1803-1981 | C,Y  | 114  | 2.01                  | 2.90              | [PL,T]             |

Sources: *Chicago Tribune* data -- Cutler [1905] (1969). The Beck and Tolnay (1997) data are the underlying data for Tolnay and Beck (1995). If data are available in tabular form, both averages and standard deviations (in parentheses) are reported. Summary statistics are reported for the years 1882 to 1930 for NAACP, Tuskegee, Cook, Carter, et al., and Project HAL data. Averages for Pfeifer (2004, 2011), Beck and Tolnay (2004), Beck and Clark (2002), and Wright (1990) are from decadal or period averages derived from data reported by sources. Possible estimation types are reported for data currently available. These types appear in brackets if data are not in tabular form, if a minimal number of units is available for a given type of estimation, or if the data are not available.

C=county; R=region; S=state; Y=year

CS=cross section; PL=panel; T=time series