the sociological quarterly
Official Journal of the Midwest Sociological Society

The Sociological Quarterly ISSN 0038-0253

THE BODY AND CITIZENSHIP IN SOCIAL MOVEMENT RESEARCH: Embodied Performances and the Deracialized Self in the Black Civil Rights Movement 1961–1965

Randolph Hohle*
D'Youville College

In political and cultural theory, the body has been central to our understandings of political power, yet, the body remains absent in social movement research. This article examines the role of the body in social movements, focusing on how social movements shape bodily postures and techniques of affective self-mastery to represent idealized citizenship. Based on archival data and the concepts of performativity and performance, I use the cases of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's Citizenship Schools and Role-Playing Simulations and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's Community Centers to show how the deracialized body was materialization of liberal civic culture that sought to: (1) severe identification with the racial group in favor of identifying with an idealized national identity; and (2) change what counts as good citizenship to change who counts as good citizens. I analyze the movement's pedagogy focusing on the ritualized repetition of embodied movements that deracialized the black political body by embedding idealized citizenship into bodily postures, which increased the probability for a successful performance. Although the deracialized body was vital to the passage of the national legislation, it served to hide geographical and economic differences within the black population, producing the false correlation of national policy change with local change.

INTRODUCTION

The body is central to our understandings of political power, yet, has been conspicuously absent from social movement research. While the cultural turn in social movement studies shifted the analytical emphasis from instrumental gains, and state and political structures to consider the importance of cultural codes and identity for mobilization (Eyerman and Jamison 1991; Melucci 1996; Bernstein 1997; Jasper 1997; Polletta 1998; Steinberg 1999; Eyerman 2001), it has neglected the importance of the body. For marginalized groups, the only real sense of power is command and ownership of one's body. Unlike the case of the poor transforming their body or body parts into commodities through organ transplantation or involvement in sport (Wacquant 2004; Crowley-Matoka 2005), social movements mold and shape participant bodies for political purposes. Based on archival data (training manuals, workbooks, organizational material), this article uses the American black civil rights movement as an empirical case study to understand how the deracialized body was the product, effect, and materialization of

*Direct all correspondence to Randolph Hohle, Department of Liberal Arts, D'Youville College, Buffalo, NY 14201; e-mail: hohler@dyc.edu or rh2910@albany.edu

their struggle for racial and civic inclusion. I argue that the black civil rights movement deracialized ideas of good American citizenship by disassociating black stereotypes from black citizenship through shaping bodily postures and embodied affective responses while engaged in civic performances. For the civil rights movement, deracializing good citizenship broke individual identification with racial groups and attached them to an idealized civic culture. The consequences of deracializing citizenship attached the embodied "good black citizen" to the passage of the 1964 and 1968 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Yet, change and enforcement of federal laws on the local level varied and was scarce. The deracialized body vital to the passage of the national legislation served to hide geographical and economic differences within the black population, producing the false correlation of national change with local change. While the movement was successful at severing ideas of whiteness from good citizenship, it did so at the expense of narrowing the path of acceptable embodied civic practices for subsequent social movement struggles.

While it is general knowledge that the civil rights movement embraced nonviolence, scholars have not analyzed the movement pedagogy of how one became nonviolent for protests or the broader meanings and implications of nonviolence that were specific to black Americans. Drawing from the concepts of performativity and performance (Butler 1993, 1997; Alexander 2004; Alexander, Giesen, and Mast 2006), I analyze the movement's pedagogy focusing on the ritualized repetition of embodied movements that deracialized the black political body by embedding idealized citizenship into bodily postures, which increased the probability for a successful performance. In order to deracialize normative ideas of citizenship, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) used discourses of "good black citizenship" to shape bodily postures and instruct affective self-management. Although the civil rights movement made claims for equality for all, it is important not to universalize culture, or citizenship, and neglect accounts of cultural difference and stratification. Bodies are marked by physical racial attributes (skin color), gender attributes (masculine/feminine), labor practices (blue collar versus white collar), and geography (north/south divide). I propose that bringing in the body to social movement studies provides a better and more nuanced explanation of the importance of culture, how movements construct identities, and the social movement's broader impact on civil society and the state than the existing "framing" and "culture as strategy" approaches, which are limited because of their conception of culture in instrumental terms.

Empirically, this article compares SCLC's citizenship school pedagogy to SNCC's fieldwork training and Freedom Summer community centers. SCLC's citizenship school pedagogy instructed deracialized techniques of self that focused on how to master bodily postures and manage affective responses, for example, anger, hate, and so on, situated in lessons on good manners, listening skills, speaking skills, and good handwriting. They organized their citizenship schools in 1961, and ran them until 1966, when controversy surrounding the Summer Community Organization and Political Education (SCOPE) project and post-Voting Rights act recruiting difficulties ended the program. In 1962, SCLC reported that they held 263 classes, containing 2,330 number of attendees, and

2,464 registered black voters through the classes. Citizenship school trainees registered 13,266 blacks through community drives and voter canvasing.[1] By 1964, SCLC reported 225 active voter registration groups, 560 inactive voter registration groups, 216 SCLC affiliates, 219 active adult citizenship school classes (average 15 students each), and 1,060 inactive (temporarily) adult citizenship school classes that trained 12,271 students.[2]

In contrast, SNCC's fieldwork training began in 1962, shortly after the 1961 sit-ins, in relation to the limitations of SCLC's citizenship school pedagogy to account for problems faced by rural black communities. SCLC's overall focus was on creating rights at the national level, which they made at the expense of establishing a local presence in rural black areas. The extent of SCLC's local presence was limited to local organizations (the black church and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People [NAACP]) that fell under SCLC's organizational umbrella (Morris 1984). Indeed, tensions between the two groups proliferated as SNCC resented SCLC's practice of leaving town after a major demonstration, leaving local blacks to deal with the subsequent white backlash. While the citizenship school pedagogy enhanced existing black civic practices necessary for public and associational life, it did not extend into black domestic and economic life.[3] Thus, SNCC focused on organizing and building local black communities by deracializing the body in relation to ideals of good hygiene and good housekeeping practices. Thus, we can divide SNCC's pedagogy into two objectives: to make good organizers and to improve the immediate material conditions of the rural black population. Making good organizers included how to enter and map out an unfamiliar black community, how to run a political meeting, and how to establish relations with other civil rights groups. Meanwhile, SNCC's work in improving the material conditions, represented by 1964's Freedom Summer, targeted the needs of the rural black population. By July 1964, Freedom Summer featured 41 functioning schools dispersed throughout 20 Mississippi counties, totaling 2,135 students.[4] The final count listed 50 schools, 225 teachers, and 2,000 to 2,500 students.[5] SNCC divided freedom summer programs into three working parts—voting registration, freedom schools, and community centers. This article will focus on the importance of the community centers in addressing rural black dietary and medical needs. While both groups engaged in voter registration drives and participated in direct action, they differed in the objectives and rationalities of their pedagogy used to shape black populations that each group claimed only to represent—the immediate needs of local black populations versus federal rights of a national black polity.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP, THE BODY, AND ETHICS

Citizenship, the materialization of liberal democracy, is a juridical–normative system. It is a status, defined by laws, rights and minimal obligations (Marshall 1964) as well as normative, in that cultural norms organize how citizens perceive others as friends or enemies, who counts as full members and who are excluded at the margins of society (Young 1990; Alexander 1992). The normative dimensions of citizenship are illustrated in the debates over bloodlines, entitlement, and whose contributions are legitimate (see

Walzer 2005). The black civil rights movement appealed to the idealized notion of American citizenship, in that SCLC and SNCC drew from and contested both dimensions of citizenship. They made claims for additional rights under the instrumental gaze of the law. They also drew from ideas of what counts as good citizenship in order to change who counts as good citizens. Hence, I use the concept "symbolic citizenship" to refer to how specific social groups struggling for civic inclusion appeal to an idealized national citizenship when making claims for citizenship rights and equal opportunities. Idealized citizenship refers to how a nation prefers to see itself in relation to a set of universal and idealized cultural values and beliefs, which define who counts as the good citizen. Past research on citizenship and social movements considered how citizenship rights resulted from transformations in state structure (Tilly 1995), the importance of active participation (Licterman 1996), and how new social movements primarily struggle for the rights of others (Jasper 1997; Waters 1998). The idea of symbolic citizenship contributes to the existing citizenship and social movement literature because it highlights the discursive, performative, and embodied aspect of citizenship, as well as the impact of idealized citizenship on how social movements make claims for equality.

There are conceptual difficulties when trying to incorporate the existing debates on the body into social movement research. For instance, the civil rights pedagogy used disciplinary techniques to shape bodily postures for the purpose of shaping a political black identity. However, unlike the disciplinary techniques that organize states and state institutions, whose aim was to isolate, contain, and separate populations, reform-based social movements seek to open up space, combine groups, and produce new forms of civic inclusion. Thus, for social movements, the body is more active than in a Foucaudian conceptual framework of disciplinary power (Foucault 2007). In the disciplinary perspective, culture constrains the body, whereas social movements attempt to overcome the limits imposed on the body by using and manipulating civic norms. Yet, the political body is also not a celebration of agency as used in the embodiment debates of postindustrial culture (Schilling 1993; Turner 1996). While the degree and intensity that blacks did, could, or wanted to master deracialized techniques of self varied, agency in a political field is much less than agency in a field of consumer choices. The consequences of being racially threatening had dire political consequences. For instance, the black nationalists, who embraced the embodied racially threatening self by growing out their hair, changing their dietary practices by abstaining from pork products and wearing African clothing, brought increased police and Federal Bureau of Investigation surveillance, as well as increased white resistance, to the movement. Thus, the dominance of liberalism in American civic life organized guidelines for the acceptable levels of the embodied racial self while struggling for racial and civic inclusion.

Therefore, to highlight the active political body of social movements, a political body that is both power and empowering, and its political consequences, I draw from and combine the concepts of performativity and performance. First, I use performativity to consider how social movements construct embodied practices through ritualized components that shape both individual and collective identities. Through ritualized repetition of bodily movements and postures, normalized codes are reproduced by defining

and limiting an identity (Butler 1993, 1997). Social movements learn to stylize bodily gestures, postures, grammar, and physical appearances to construct and project idealized citizenship. In the case of reform-based social movements, dominant citizenship codes embedded in the discourse of civil society are reproduced through embodied movements. Bodies, and subsequently identity, are the effects, not cause, of performance. Embodied movements include care of the self and sites of connections with other bodies that link individuals with places and collective identities because they involve processes of being and belonging (Bell 2007).

Second, I draw from the structural idea of performance in order to map out the political consequences of such embodied performances by distinguishing successful from unsuccessful performances. Whereas performativity links civic norms to the individual and collective identities, performance captures how performances, as a form of symbolic communication, integrate parts or whole groups into the larger civic and symbolic order (Alexander et al. 2006). Social movement scholars have long noted the use of public performances in contentious politics (Eyerman 2006; Tilly 2008). Yet, it is not just the use or presence of a performance that is important, but as Alexander (2004) argues, that we distinguish successful performances from unsuccessful performances. A performance is successful when it is convincing and links the actors with the audience. In contrast, a performance is unsuccessful when the audience interprets the performance as inauthentic and fails to connect to the actors. A successful performance does not have to lead to instrumental gains. A successful performance is a performance that achieves re-fusion by connecting the performers to the audience, which indicates that the symbolic message was received and correctly interpreted by the audience. Thus, by drawing from the concepts of performativity and performance, I show how embodied performances organized successful performance for parts of the black polity that reflected idealized citizenship.

The civil rights movement situated embodied performances in an ethical field that simultaneously sought to limit specific bodily postures and affective responses while enhancing and optimizing the quality of black citizenship in order to achieve their objectives of racial and civic integration. While public discourse often conflates ethics with a value statement, sociologically, ethics refers to the procedures, regulations, and guidance that direct how people do things appropriately (see Foucault 1986; Rose 1999). I use ethics to refer to how political groups set limits within a political context of how one should act, via rhetoric and practice, which limits/defines/stabilizes a unitary political agent. In this case, SCLC's citizenship pedagogy and SNCC's leadership training and community centers' programs were situated in the ethical field corresponding to idealized citizenship that shaped three dimensions of the deracializing self: personal, social, and civic ethics. Personal ethics referred to the relations blacks had with the self, which included how one spoke, walked, and presented the body in public. Social ethics required mastering personal ethics while engaged in public and associational life, in order to minimize emotional responses when debating matters of public concern to ensure that public relations remained cordial. Civic ethics required mastering personal and social ethics when directly engaging in public performances to ensure that blacks

represented the idea of good black citizenship. Therefore, ethics ties together emotions and cognition through the body by providing quasi-structural guidelines for movement pedagogy and embodied performances.

Bringing in the body to the study of social movements builds on and expands the contributions of the cultural turn in social movement studies in two ways. First, the body is the effect and outcome of mobilization, including resources, strategies, and discourse. This improves on the present social movement approaches, illustrated by the framing approach, which understand culture and discourse as another resource used to further their strategic objectives. Frame analysis is based on the idea that the fundamental aspect of social movement strategy is how activists use cognitive frames to help the larger public make sense of a given social movements' demands (see Snow et al. 1986; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996). The cultural turn, in contrast, has criticized the framing argument because frame analysts cannot explain how frames are constructed, their assumptions about the stability of frames, the life of frames, and the audiences' ability to interpret the frame correctly (Polletta 1998; Steinberg 1998). Framing is an act, not an activity, where the interpretation of communicative messages is an assumption. Embodied performances, by contrast, consider the transmission and reception of symbolic messages as a ritualized act involving both performers and audience.

Second, it overcomes the mind/body and cognitive/affective divide regarding the importance of identity in social movements. The cognitive argument has demonstrated that social movement actors form political identities as a way to understand how they are part of a group, and how their shared understandings inform subsequent political action and strategies (Eyerman and Jamison 1991; Taylor and Whittier 1992). The emotions argument emphasized the role of affect in building a sense of community, solidarity bonds between members, moral shocks for recruitment, role of audience emotions in a performance, as well as how emotions can lead to a movement's decline (Blee 1998; Jasper 1998; Hercus 1999; Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2000; Klatch 2004; Reed 2004; Reger 2004; Eyerman 2006). The cognitive and emotional approaches both reproduce the mind/body binary and fail to explain how knowledge is learned and mastered, the discursive and embodied aspects of emotions, and what happens to emotions after their initial use. As I show below, both SCLC and SNCC used discourses of good black citizenship to shape bodily postures in order to master affective responses. For successful performances, both groups sought to limit the expression of emotion because of the power of black stereotypes that they could not control their emotions. In the context of meetings, SNCC used emotions to recruit local blacks, and then transferred the heightened emotional sentiment into organizational positions, so that subsequent embodied performances of SNCC programs conjured up sentiment.

SCLC'S CITIZENSHIP SCHOOLS AND ROLE-PLAYING

Normative ideas of "good citizenship" have a history and continuity in American civil society and public discourse. Although the civil rights movement resisted racialized citizenship, idealized good American citizenship still shaped how the civil rights

movement sought civic inclusion. For black citizenship, scientific theories on race and the system of slavery attached idealized good citizenship with whiteness and economic self-mastery, thereby denying blacks with associations of good citizenship (see Shklar 1991). In addition to associations with economic self-mastery, mastering bodily pleasures of what one ate and drank, and the social space frequented, associated civility and good temperament with ideas of good citizenship (see Wiebe 1995; Berkovitch 2002). Black stereotypes were constructed in relation to the cultural codes of civility. This article isolates how the affective relations of power and citizenship produced racialized bodies by linking blacks with the idea that they could not manage their emotions. Similar to female/feminine citizenship historically attributed to white women, which was associated with hysteria, embodied in nature, and subject to passion and desire (Lister 1997), black citizenship was also marginalized by its associations with affect: emotional, angry, and oversexualized. However, the association of blacks, specifically black men with the irrationality of emotion and desire, produced the idea that they were prone to violence and were dangerous, whereas affective associations organized the perception that women were programmed for domestic and childcare labor. Thus, the ideas of good citizenship and affective self-mastery produced specific black stereotypes that: (1) were embedded in bodily postures, desires, and pleasures and (2) provided the point of resistance for the civil rights movement's deracializing strategy that sought to disassociate black stereotypes from black citizenship.

SCLC used discourses of good black citizenship to design pedagogical techniques for the citizenship schools to instruct blacks on how to manage affective responses and exhibit good bodily postures. In part, the emphasis on citizenship schools was made in relation to the low literacy rates in the black population. In the late 1950s, adult education was limited to the General Educational Development tests, which at first were restricted to veterans, but gradually expanded to nonveterans in 1947. What distinguished SCLC's citizenship schools from voter registration drives was how literacy instruction was embedded with civic norms of good citizenship. The citizenship school pedagogy consisted of embodied performances of handwriting lessons, phonology and word comprehension, as well as speaking styles and tones that produced deracialized bodies representing good black citizens.

SCLC did not formally organize their citizenship schools until 1961. After the Montgomery Movement desegregated the buses, SCLC's initial citizenship drives from 1958 to 1961 sought to register blacks to vote and were void of pedagogical techniques. A typical voter registration drive is illustrated by an attempt in Shreveport, Louisiana, where the United Christian Movement, a local SCLC affiliate, sent letters urging blacks to show up at the Caddo Parrish Courthouse on March 19th to register to vote.[6] Although 250 blacks attended, only 46 were interviewed, and 15 registered.[7] Despite fulfilling their active citizenship duties of forming and participating in civic organizations, as well as paying taxes and military service, it proved active citizenship was not enough to overcome the racial ascriptions that denied blacks access to the benefits of citizenship.

Ella Baker spearheaded SCLC's shift from voter registration to organizing citizenship schools by incorporating good citizen pedagogy. SCLC's other programs, like the "Crusade for Citizenship," sought to set up a network of citizenship schools, workshops, and clinics. The initial 1958 memorandum stated the Crusade intended "to set up voting clinics and workshops in local communities. There is a concrete job for you to do—giving out leaflets, or going with a friend to register, or visiting your neighbors, or helping people in your block learn how to fill out registration forms."[8] Baker wanted SCLC to work with churches, masons, and sororities to provide adult education classes to instruct blacks how to read and write.[9] Ideally, the citizenship schools would centralize and combine the various agents in black civic culture into a common place that served as the point to shape a unified black political identity. Yet, it was not until Baker brought in a pedagogical program and focus did the citizenship schools materialize. Drawing from ideas popularized by the Adult Education Association, an organization formed in 1951 that approached adult education for the purpose of improving American citizenship, Baker initiated contact with Edward Brice at the Federal Department of Education, Health and Welfare in October 1959. Brice, who specialized in the department's "Fundamental and Literacy Education" program, approached adult education as not just an acquirement of literacy skills, but as a technique to sever representations of bad citizenship from marginalized groups: "These under educated Americans become hostile, bitter, socially inhibited, cheated in life, with a strong guilt sense over in abilities and limitations. They are prejudiced, superstitious, unwanted."[10]

Brice recoded the problem of illiteracy in the black population to the problem that black Americans embodied bad citizenship because they have not mastered the required ethics associated with idealized citizenship. Brice suggested to Baker an educational idea of "development through enlightenment" that would "secure for our masses basic literacy such as: occupational literacy, social literacy, civic literacy, personal literacy, which are so necessary for a survival and extension in the world social order."[11] Through her correspondence with Brice, Baker began the process of developing a pedagogical component to SCLC's deracializing focus. The important shift was the move away from measuring black citizenship in terms of number of blacks registered to vote to providing blacks with the implicit lessons of good citizenship embedded in formal educational training.

Despite Baker's urging, SCLC did not adopt a systematic citizenship school model until 1961, after Baker left SCLC to advise SNCC, and after SCLC incorporated the Highlander School model (see Garrow 1986:150–1). The Highlander model is significant for influencing how SCLC selected teachers, spatially and temporally organized the classes, and developed pedagogical material. SCLC drew heavily from the Highlander's 1960 text "Proposed Citizenship School Training Program."[12] Indeed, SCLC modeled their subsequent citizenship schools verbatim from this document. The only modifications were replacing the name "Highlander" with "SCLC" and the differences in the logistics in the set up of a "typical day." The Highlander model provided SCLC with a way to distinguish their movement programs from the NAACP. The NAACP already fought legal exclusions, like poll taxes, literacy tests and segregation, and

focused on producing juridical rights and fighting legal discrimination. SCLC, in contrast, used the citizenship schools to challenge the normative political representation of good citizenship.

The Citizenship Schools

The citizenship schools represented a broader cultural change focused on deracializing good citizenship by instructing blacks how to master good bodily practices. Thus, we cannot judge the citizenship schools' success or merit based on how many or how few blacks SCLC registered to vote. I used SCLC's "citizenship workbook" and other pedagogy materials to analyze how instruction was made through ritualized embodied performances. The embodied performances fixated idealized citizenship into the deracialized black body through good handwriting and word pronunciation, and the style, tone, pace, and exchange of speech in public discourse.

First, the citizenship schools embedded personal ethics in the embodied performance of good handwriting and phonology of a civic vocabulary. The importance of mastering good handwriting and pronunciation was expanding civic vocabulary and attaching an overall sense of cleanliness and neatness to good black citizenship. First, the workbook explicitly linked good handwriting with good citizenship, "It is important to have a handwriting that others can read. A strong, sure handwriting shows that you are a strong person. All of our first class citizens should have a first class handwriting."[13] The ritualized repetition of good penmanship, writing neatly and legibly, produced a confident and rational political agent who was neat, clean, and organized. In contrast, it was important to limit bad handwriting because it embodied bad cultural ideals of sloppy, unlearnt and uncommitted, which consequently reproduced black stereotypes.

In addition to good handwriting, blacks also practiced the correct pronunciation of political words in relation to mastering a civic vocabulary. The idea behind mastering a civic vocabulary was to provide blacks with a way to limit the amount of frustration and anger they felt when interacting with whites during a performance. Building a civic vocabulary through spoken discourse limited emotional outbursts by attaching a rational form of argumentation to the embodied performance. A supplemental SCLC pedagogy handout "Helpful Hints in Teaching Citizenship Classes" suggested paying special attention to the pronunciation of words used in demonstrations: "Pronounce and define the following words. Make sentences from each. Larceny, Commissioner, Register, Congressman, Bonafide, Affidavit, Signature, Elector, Residence, Applicant."[14] Articulate speech signified a well-mannered and good black political agent. In contrast, stumbling over or mispronouncing words represented blacks as unsure of themselves. Ensuring the pronunciation of key words when attempting to register to vote deracialized the association of race with intelligence levels. The consequence of improper pronunciations was an unsuccessful public performance. Whites used mispronounced words as an indication that blacks were not ready and did not deserve rights. Blacks who used words they could not pronounce appeared as if they were being used by political "outsiders" and did not comprehend their actions.

In addition to conveying a sense of neatness, black participants practiced writing words and constructing narratives in relation to mastering a civic vocabulary. Social movements use narratives to assign meaning to their experience (Polletta 1998). Rather than write basic or root words like "cat," "sat," "mat," "pat," and so on used in early primary education instruction, the workbook supplied a sample list of words for blacks to use while scripting narratives that defined blacks' experience in the civil rights struggles. The sample word list included:

a attorney—amendments—abridged—alderman
c Chatham—congressional—county—circuit—citizen—constitution
e exercises—election—elect—executive—electorate
r representatives—rebellion—register—resident—regulation
w whites—workshop—world—white house[15]

The movement provided the words and context for the participants to script the "preferred" way to proceed for racial equality and civic inclusion. The words were set up, for the black students to emphasize or deemphasize key characters depending on each local culture. Some narratives could be heroic and emphasize the role of blacks in desegregating trains or buses. Other narratives could emphasize the role of a repressive state in denying blacks' rights. Either way, what was important was the repetitive embodied performance of writing, speaking, and scripting that limited anger and frustration of not understanding what was happening, thus, deracializing the black self by disassociating black stereotypes from black citizenship.

In addition to mastering the personal ethics of good citizenship, SCLC used the citizenship schools to train the body on how to master social ethics. Social ethics regulated how blacks interacted with whites and other blacks. SCLC placed the burden of practicing good manners and maintaining a level of politeness on blacks to ensure they appeared well mannered in all black groups, especially public associations, and when interacting with whites, to challenge black stereotypes that blacks were bad mannered and uncivilized. SCLC used discourses of good black citizenship to instruct blacks how to exhibit good manners by having blacks perform the roles of "the good listener" and "the good speaker." In order to be a good listener, the workbook presented an example of how to be attentive and show interests in others: "When other people are talking, I listen. Harry likes me to listen when he talks. She likes me to listen when she talks. One has good manners if he listens when others talk. When I talk I want other people to hear me."[16] Mastering techniques of attentiveness required, in part, mastering bodily forms of communication. The good listener positions the body to face the speaker, looking the speaker in the eye when the speaker speaks. In contrast, the bad listener exhibits an embodied show of disrespect, disgust, and rudeness by shaking his/her head, looking away while another speaks, or interrupting the others' thought in midsentence.

To complement good listening, the citizenship schools trained blacks how to be good speakers. In addition to mastering a civic vocabulary that emphasized the pronunciation of words, good speakers mastered a style and tone of speech based on what was considered appropriate conversational levels. Good citizens do not appear trite or boring, nor

do they want to appear domineering or braggart. The workbook instructed how good speakers managed their conversations with others:

> I talk about things my friends are interested in. I speak so that everyone can understand me. It is not polite to do all the talking. Everyone likes to talk some . . . My friends like to tell me about their jobs. They like me to discuss their community problems with me. I like to tell them about my job and my children . . . It is not polite to interrupt. Everyone likes people who listen when he talks.[17]

An ideal conversation exchange should flow back and forth between speakers. Good speakers did not interrupt or talk over another by raising his or her voice. They should manage their tone and pace of speech to limit overexcitement, which made one prone to misspeak and confuse a listening audience. Additionally, SCLC wanted blacks to avoid slang words or swearing because it associated blacks with "street" cultures. Consequently, good manners assured that intergroup relations, specifically black–white interactions, would be civil and cordial to limit racial tensions. Good manners also ensured cordial intragroup or black–black relations, which was important for networking, organizing, and mobilizing Southern black communities. The performativity of speaking styles fixated a pace, substance, and tone of conversation that debunked black stereotypes of being unintelligent and having unarticulated speech. It provided a way for blacks to discuss matters of public concern and contentious issues of race, without emotionally charged rhetoric, which in turn, limited affective responses in times of disagreement. In short, it was a way to bracket out affect from public debate, ensuring that blacks embodied a rational demeanor and good manners even in trying circumstances.

Role-Playing and Simulation: Embodied Performances and Civic Ethics

In contrast to the citizenship schools, SCLC held workshops that situated good citizen pedagogy in role-playing to instruct blacks on how to master their affective responses while engaged in public performances. The limit to the citizenship schools was it confined civic ethics to the level of the broader ideological and philosophical underpinnings of nonviolence. Although SCLC taught nonviolence as the defining civic ethic, they were not naive enough to believe blacks could confront violent whites and remain nonviolent. SCLC required blacks to complete some form of citizenship training before permitting them to partake in public protests and demonstrations (King [1963] 1986). The simulations were role-playing games where blacks performed the roles of activist and police in order to understand the probable responses of both sides. The simulations were guided by normative civic ethics that produced space for the performitivity of good black citizenship. SCLC placed movement volunteers in the roles of good blacks (protagonist/performer) and bad whites (antagonist/audience) to simulate typical situations that blacks encountered. Yet, there was room to experiment in role-playing. Role-playing exemplifies how performativity differs from disciplinary forms of power. Activists took on different roles and experimented with a range of responses. The empowered political body was flexible and mobile. Blacks learned to master different intensities of the deracialized self that prepared them for all kinds of political encounters and everyday life. To illustrate, I use *Manual for Direct Action* by Oppenheimer and

Lackey (1965), which was a compilation and history of teachings of the civil rights movement. The text was produced primarily to instruct activists and volunteers entering the movement on how to perform and set up the role-playing simulations that the civil rights movement had been using.[18]

The role-playing simulations provided instruction on how to best master one's emotions while engaged in an embodied performance, as well as performing the mundane aspects of social movement organizing. It provided an outlet for blacks to manage the immediate problems of emotion (management during the protest) as well as the activists' emotional stability over time. The manual noted that role-playing provided an outlet for the right way to:

> Get rid of tensions. It is important, when in action, to keep tensions under control. . . . People "crack" under strain and "blow up." After a while, some begin to suffer the equivalent of "battle fatigue." Obviously this presents a real danger if it takes place in an actual situation. In the workshop the opportunity is created to get rid of tensions before the action. (Oppenheimer and Lackey 1965:54)

Role-playing sought to guard against long-term emotional and bodily fatigue. The tired body, or the physically beaten and exhausted body, was susceptible to mistakes and jeopardized the success of the demonstration. Therefore, role-playing was advantageous for both the novice and seasoned veteran civil rights workers. For the novice, it was a technique to keep tensions, anger, outrage, and resentment from entering the public performance. For the civil rights veteran, it was a way to express tensions, by either playing the role of the bad white, expelling their emotional outbursts in scripted yelling and/or hitting, or switching to the observer role in order to battle burnout and fatigue. Scripted ritualized affective control performances inscribed good black citizenship in the body, which provided a mobile site and place to recall the movement's collective identity.

The objective of the role-playing simulations was to prepare blacks for a range of potential responses from whites to ensure a successful outcome. A successful outcome meant that regardless of the degree of white violence, black political practice was to reflect idealized citizenship. In order to master good black civic ethics, the manual emphasized: (1) bodily postures; and (2) training the body on the best way to absorb physical punishment. First, when marching or picketing, participants must appear neat and orderly at all times by exhibiting the proper postures when picketing. "Expect participants to walk erectly and not slouch, call out, laugh loudly, or use profanity; smoking may be ruled out in some situations" (Oppenheimer and Lackey 1965:75). The embodied performance of picketing linked the demonstration with good citizenship. While picketing, bad bodily postures like slouching, improper language, and volume of speaking should be limited because it represented the disorganized, sloppy, and uncommitted bad citizen. To ensure the march appeared orderly, the manual also recommended assembling the volunteers somewhere other than the place where the picket line or march was being held. Once assembled, it was important to arrive at the designated site as a group to "avoid unnecessary scurrying about" (Oppenheimer and Lackey 1965:75). Bodies should remain in the designated

geographical space to convey purposeful political action and limit loitering, which signified a lack of purpose.

Second, role-playing instructed blacks on the best ways to brace the body to absorb pain without lashing out violently or hysterically. Although yelling out in pain or agony may seem like an acceptable response, the logic of racial stereotyping codes and cites all expressions of anger as the confirmation of black stereotypes. Therefore, practicing how to respond to police violence had two dimensions. The first was physical safety. The second, and politically more important, was to limit affective outbursts to minimize panic, violence, and so on that jeopardized a successful performance. SCLC prepared blacks how to prepare for two forms of Southern police violence. The first form of police violence was the impersonal "crowd control" techniques, where police shot tear gas, used water hoses, or unleashed police dogs on black protesters. If the police used tear gas, the manual suggested blacks "Retreat in an orderly fashion from the scene. . . . Clothing permeated with fumes should be changed. Persons affected by gas attack should face into the wind (assuming there is no further gas) and/or wash eyes and face in water (stick your head in a bucketful, if possible)" (Oppenheimer and Lackey 1965:91). Tear gas burns the eyes, affecting the body's visual, which produces some directional disorientation. Since the body's first response when getting something in its eye is to attempt to rub it out, volunteers should practice not to touch their eyes so as not to make it worse. In the 1965 Selma Movement, SCLC used medical doctors to instruct activists how to protect the body and eyes from tear gas, and even how to grab the reins of a horse, in order to prevent being trampled by police horses.[19] Thus, a successful performance required bodily mastery over all possible elements because of the need to maintain civic order while ensuring that the civil rights protesters were always in control of the performance.

The second technique used by Southern police was intimate forms of police violence. In contrast to impersonal police practices, where there were distance and anonymity between police and protester, intimate forms of police violence meant body-to-body contact, which directly linked blacks to racial discrimination and abuse. Consequently, blacks had to prepare the body for police nightsticks, bats, electric cattle prods, or fists. With intimate police violence, there was the greater probability that activists would interpret it personally, therefore, placing more responsibility on the activists to master their physical and affective responses. The manual relays a lesson from James Lawson, who proposed two nonviolent responses to physical attacks: "stand up to it and try to make eye contact with the attackers; the other is to fall down and cover up" (Oppenheimer and Lackey 1965:93). Lawson urged civil rights activists to follow the second technique of "covering up." Covering up was a technique of absorbing physical blows to limit the amount of physical punishment. For reasons of physical safety, Lawson emphasized protecting the head, and absorbing the blows with the "meat" of the arms or back. However, knowing how to take and absorb physical punishment limited bodily damage and blunted the pain, thus, making it easier to master physical and affective restraint. The performativity of "covering up" protected the physical body, but was a technique to absorb blows to minimize affect outbursts, thus, ensuring idealized citizenship was embodied in all performances.

SNCC'S LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND COMMUNITY CENTERS

In relation to the limits and objectives of SCLC's racial and civic integration on a national scale, SNCC sought immediate improvements on the local scale. Although the two groups primarily worked in different populations, they both used discourses of good black citizenship. Local blacks still had to confront black stereotypes, and thus, sought to deracialize citizenship at the county and state levels. SNCC's objective was to organize black political communities into independent cells, each capable of performing autonomous political organizing in the local community, but with the flexibility to support other civil rights groups. In their pamphlets, SNCC expressed their approach:

> Build indigenous, trained leadership . . . on college and high school campuses, and in local communities . . . SNCC workers have organized and guided local protest movements which are never identified as SNCC projects. This is part of its program of developing, building and strengthening indigenous leadership.[20]

SNCC's grassroots approach sought to organize and mobilize the black population that SCLC could not, specifically rural blacks and blacks that are not part of the black church. Specifically, it meant physically going to places where the black populations lived that would not benefit from a national civil rights referendum. Rural blacks had a different set of concerns—like physical safety from Klan violence and fair trade on crops—than urban blacks who were more likely to have worked industrial and domestic jobs and dealt with white citizens' councils.

SNCC's training programs had the dual emphasis of instructing blacks how to organize a black community as well as reproducing their membership ranks. Each task required the performativity and mastery of personal and social ethics. In the context of organizing on the local level, SNCC shaped their pedagogy in relation to three questions. First was the best way to enter and establish operations in an unfamiliar black community. Second was how to produce local leaders. Third was how to produce affective and emotional feelings in the local black population in order to motivate them to join the civil rights struggles.

How to Enter an Unfamiliar Black Community

The SNCC training booklets, one prepared by Charles Sherrod, simply entitled "Non-Violence"[21] and another prepared by Charles McLaurin titled "Notes on Organizing"[22] outlined how fieldworkers should enter and set up operations in an unfamiliar local black community. Both manuals placed the responsibility on SNCC fieldworkers to convince rural blacks that change was possible. In particular, the manuals emphasized the embodied performances of everyday organizing and the differences of being invited or not being invited to a local community. When invited, McLaurin argues that activists should spend the majority of their time developing networks and contacts through the family that invited them. In order to accomplish this task, McLaurin emphasized the embodied good black personal and social ethics:

> You are there to do a job at which at this time is undefined; so you act friendly, smiling and greeting the ladies as they approach you. Then, with your warm, friendly

face you say to the people "I want to do something for this community" that afternoon you're asked out to someone's home for dinner. Remember, try to answer all questions asked of you at this point, because you are on trial. You must impress as well as express.[23]

The invited activist should practice a nonthreatening demeanor (personal ethics) and good manners (social ethics) because it provided the best way to produce new networks and connections in the black community. McLaurin emphasized bodily postures that presented one as caring and interested. Although the families provided access to the black community, mastering good black bodily postures made SNCC activists credible in unfamiliar black political communities, thus legitimating their place as local activists.

In contrast to being invited to a community, which was rare for SNCC, Sherrod suggested that the proper way, meaning safest and most effective way, of entering an unfamiliar black community first required the collection of "macro-information" that provided "objective" knowledge of the population. That is, knowledge of a local community that indicated how easy or difficult it would be for SNCC to enter. The specific types of macro-information to obtain were: which local civil rights groups were friendly, which were antagonistic, and what were the local demographics, in order to understand the local civic culture. Activists should also pay attention to the "changes in thinking and loyalties of people toward various images."[24] The best way to identify local cultural changes was to interview local blacks, focusing on "gossip" or subjective knowledge of the black community. This included interviewing grocers on the "spending on food, clothing and general household supplies; gossip," local repairmen on any "changes in spending for farm equipment," barbers and beauticians on important "local issues" and more "gossip," and local blacks whose employment positions placed them in the company of whites, especially railroad porters, to find out "what white folks say, maids, cab drivers, known Toms. . . . These persons, so close to whites in some ways, may be approached indirectly."[25] Since SNCC produced semiautonomous political cells, rather than networking through existing black churches, it was vital for them to collect information to map out local black communities in order to provide a framework for understanding the local civic culture.

Once activists mapped out the unfamiliar black community, McLaurin's training manual instructed SNCC leaders on the social ethics necessary for young black activists to interact with locals, specifically with black professionals and the local families that housed them. If no local families were available to house activists, rooming houses and board houses were acceptable alternatives.[26] Regardless of where activists stayed, the most important thing was staying in the community and maintaining a public presence, which differed from SCLC's approach of holding demonstrations in a community and then leaving. Since the vast majority of SNCC volunteers were college students working in the South during summer breaks, coupled with the limited monetary resources for housing costs, local families adopted volunteers as part of their family. SNCC referred to the homes of local black families who housed them as "freedom houses." The Sherrod manual instructed SNCC activists to refer to the host families "as mom and pop, and

relate to what our professional peers [sic] be preaching for ministers; playing chess, discussing medicine, politics, insurance, education, business, etc."[27] The embodied speech performance used a language of kinship and family to connect the activists to the family and local community, while the subject matter on public concerns associated the students as legitimate political actors in the local community. The social ethics for interacting with black professionals emphasized producing intimate and affective bonds between activists and the local community, rather than practicing good manners used to establish broader social and political networking in public associational life.

SNCC also differed from SCLC on the use of public emotion. SNCC instructed activists to produce and use affective responses to recruit local blacks.[28] However, this practice was limited to mass meetings. Sherrod wrote that SNCC organizers must learn to entice, manage, and make use of the audiences' heightened emotions: "Plan development of emotional peak in meeting or some kind of development—may be intentional development but you may intend to be unintentional."[29] One suggested way of creating an emotional peak in the audience was emphasizing how students situated their bodies in relation to bad whites: "our best selling point is that we are students with nothing but our bodies and minds, fearlessly standing before the monster who killed our mothers and castrated our fathers—yet we stand with love."[30] The Sherrod manual suggested situating the body in emotionally charged rhetoric, then placing the rhetoric into heroic, tragic, and redemptive narratives to produce "moral shocks," which they used to recruit local blacks into civil rights groups. However, with any ritual, the roused emotions during the mass meeting are only temporary (see Durkheim [1912] 1995). It was important to transfer these affective sentiments into permanent positions. Therefore, the McLaurin manual instructed activists to "Elect a chairmen to chair the meetings; you should not do this after the first meeting. Each meeting gives more and more of the responsibilities to this group. And as the group grows, form committees so as to invite more of the people."[31] Thus, it was through the process of producing heightened affective response to injustices suffered by blacks then transferring the heightened emotional state into newly created positions, reenacted through subsequent embodied local performances, which allowed SNCC to organize, produce, and sustain local black political communities.

Community Centers and Embodied Public Hygiene

Freedom Summer was a response to the expansion and influence of SNCC's local mobilizations efforts. Sociological and historical accounts of Freedom Summer have noted how it challenged and changed ideas of racism, sexual mores, musical styles, foreign policy and citizenship (Belfrage 1965; Zinn [1965] 2002; McAdam 1988; Carson 1994; Eyerman and Jamison 1998; Rachel 1998; Hogan 2007), as well as to develop theoretical models for why people join social movements, activist networks, and social ties (McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Fernandez and McAdam 1988). Most of the Freedom Summer literature has focused on the Freedom Schools. Here, I want to isolate how SNCC used their community centers to embed idealized citizenship into the performitivity of self-care practices.

Similar to SCLC's citizenship schools, the idea behind Freedom Summer was to set up alternative schools that provided blacks with instruction on mastering personal ethics in order to get them to a point where they could organize and sustain autonomous black political communities. SNCC was the dominant member in the Mississippi Council of Federated Organizations (COFO). COFO was a conglomerate of all nation civil rights groups, local civil rights groups, and fraternal organizations operating in Mississippi. COFO formed after SNCC workers began voter registration drives in 1961. In 1962, white anti-civil rights sentiment forced SNCC to focus its political activities in the Northern Mississippi Delta region and Greenwood.[32] SNCC moved its operations to the Mississippi Delta because they believed that the "vague antipathy of the hill folk for the rich planters" provided better opportunities for interracial political organizing, since blacks and poor whites "shared" impoverished social and geographical space.[33] That is, SNCC believed that blacks and whites could organize around the idea of sharing a common geopolitical territory and economic positioning. In Greenwood, SNCC began to network with local groups, the "Holmes County Voters League" and the "Ruleville Citizenship Group," as well as SCLC citizenship schools, which provided the structure and pedagogy of the freedom schools.[34]

The community centers provided the most expansive attempt of what the civil rights movement perceived as possible by linking the healthy body with good citizenship. In part, the community centers were a continuation of the biopolitical roles of indigenous black organizations, where improving the health of the black population was an object of political power. Historically, other black groups have also tried to improve black public health in the South. The Tuskegee institute organized "movable schools" to provide adult education, agricultural training, domestic training, and good hygienic practices (see Morais 1967). However, situated in Booker T. Washington's ideas of black assimilation through hard work, the movable school cemented rural blacks to their place on the margins of rural life. The SNCC community centers differed from the movable schools because they used discourses of good black citizenship to make hygiene and good health a moral imperative. Indeed, SNCC leaders applied their practice of obtaining and mapping out objective knowledge of black communities to publish and distribute booklets like "The General Condition of the Mississippi Negro" in October 1963, where they detailed birth rates, death rates, and infant mortality rates of the Southern black population.[35] Unlike SCLC's use of universal citizenship in their citizenship pedagogy, SNCCs gendered their community center training. Community centers trained adult black women how to provide prenatal care, infant care, and general hygiene.[36] They also included "classes on childcare, health programs, adult education and negro history classes, music, drama, and arts and crafts workshops."[37] Workshops for black men focused on "family relations, federal service programs, [and] home improvements."[38] The idea was to organize a set of ethics that instructed blacks how to inspect the health of bodies—self, family, and friends—to ensure that black bodies did not conform to the black stereotypes of the dirty and unkempt self.

The community centers used discourses of good black citizenship to produce clean and healthy bodies by: (1) arguing for the expansion of state medical and public health

services; and (2) using ideas of public hygiene to deracialize the physical body. This distinguished the community centers from the citizenship schools and leadership training because it emphasized the presentation of the physical body, not its cognitive or affective communicative practices toward others, to deracialize black citizenship. Although the community centers did not directly instruct civic ethics, the cleansing of the physical body was a necessary prerequisite for rural blacks before they could enter the mainstream political arena. SNCC developed community center pedagogy in relation to questions of who was responsible for the body's care and the limits of state authority over an individual's body. They sought to expand and deracialize the deployment of medical services to the rural black community. Preventive medical treatment could improve the quality of life in parts of rural black Mississippi that did not have access to health care, and in places where rural blacks may have never seen a physician. This meant more black physicians and nurses, as well as having the state provide authoritative medical services to inspect and provide surveillance over the body. COFO argued that increased state surveillance should include "mobile units, chest x-rays, semi-annually and check up at least once a year by licensed doctors, the local health department, or a clinic should be provided by the local or state government."[39] The expansion of state medical services accompanied claims for the elimination of medical–political bodily punishments, such as sterilization, and teacher brutality.[40] In 1964, white Mississippians attempted to pass legislation that proposed "Prison or sterilization for [anyone with] more than one illegitimate child."[41] While COFO viewed the care of the body as the responsibility of citizens and government, they also sought to impose limits on the state's monopoly of violence over the body. The state's biopolitical role was to ensure the health and well-being of its population. However, good citizens owned their body, and teacher brutality and medical–political punishments violated this right.

SNCC sought to deracialize the visible body by instructing personal ethics of self-care practices, specifically what constituted a good diet and providing clean clothes. Good citizens are clean, healthy, strong, and fit rather than dirty, sick, weak, and fat. COFO's challenge was changing the unhealthy cultural practices embodied in black Mississippians that resulted from living in conditions of extreme poverty. COFO described a typical rural black diet as "Surviving off one meal a day, adults going without so that children may eat—in short, it meant starving. . . . Even when people get enough feed, it is largely starches and fats. There is great reliance on corn, bread, sweet potatoes, rice and fat or side pork."[42] The community centers instructed what constituted a good diet, in relation to appropriate levels of protein, fat and carbohydrates, the difference between caloric intake and nutritional levels, as well as how to obtain public food assistance. COFO concluded that, "Malnutrition can be cut down by distribution of a few food commodities and massive distribution of inexpensive vitamins."[43] Improving the body's food and nutritional intake placed the responsibility for the care of the self as that of individual and government. The deracialized healthy body was the effect of changing self-care practices to "clean" the body.

Additionally, COFO focused on how the black body was fashioned. Regarding fashion, SCLC argued that blacks should avoid flashy styles of dress associated with

street cultures in favor of a more conservative look.[44] For COFO, however, the problem was the dirty and ragged clothes worn by rural blacks who could not afford additional clothes. For instance, a COFO noted the reason for their focus on the body's appearance:

> Mothers do not go around the house in dirty robes or ragged dresses or even their slips because they are basically unclean, but because they have nothing to change into. Fathers don't lounge around on the filthy smelly overalls they work in during the day because they are too lazy to change their clothes, but because they have nothing else to put on.[45]

Thus, COFO organized clothing programs to provide black Mississippians with clean clothes, and clothes for different social contexts (e.g., church, work, home, shopping, etc.). It was one thing to get dirty from a hard day's work; however, to remain in the dirty clothes cited black stereotypes of laziness. Thus, fashioning the body with clean clothes disassociated black stereotypes by projecting a physical image of good citizenship.

CONCLUSION

This article used concepts of citizenship and the body to expand our conceptual understandings of the importance of performances and ethics for social movement research. For social movement research, the body provides a point to analyze the materialization and effect of political culture and ethics. Idealized citizenship, then, is not just a text embedded with an ethics of what constitutes the good citizen, but was used by civil rights protesters to deracialize bodily postures, affective responses, and embodied civic performances involved in the struggle for civic and racial inclusion. Democratic and liberal civic ethics and norms constrained the extent SCLC and SNCC could organize effective social movement performances. Yet, the very act of recognizing and using what counts as good citizenship illustrates a capacity for agency of empowering the body for political action within the ethical limitations of liberal democracies. Deracializing the body debunked black stereotypes and opened up new possibilities for black civic performances. Thus, it was through embodied performances guided by normative civic ethics of idealized citizenship that SCLC and SNCC deracialized good black citizenship.

Empirically, I examined two civil rights groups, SCLC and SNCC, to illustrate the constitutive aspects of good black citizenship and the deracialized self. In complex societies, we should expect variation of performances even with relatively homogenous groups (Alexander 2004). Although their objectives differed over organizing on the national or local level, SCLC and SNCC both sought to deracialize the body. Their differences are highlighted by the different objectives of the citizenship schools and community centers. SCLC's Citizenship Schools deracialized personal and social ethics through the ritualized and repetitive training of handwriting, phonology of words, and the mastery of a civic vocabulary. SCLC used role-playing to provide practice runs on performing a successful civic performance. Additionally, simulations provided space for experimentation with roles of performer and audience, as well as providing an outlet to express emotions, to master bodily postures and affective responses in a range of settings. Thus, the successful embodied performance was more than being nonviolent. It

meant representing good citizenship through mastering the appropriate affective responses and bodily postures that organized the deracialized self while engaged in nonviolent civic practices. By mastering affective and physical restraint, civil rights protests accounted for actions of whites and incorporated them into the performance.

In contrast, SNCC embedded personal, social, and civic ethics into the body in relation to organizing blacks on the local level. Although SNCC participated in civic performances in Birmingham and Selma, their everyday organizing work in Mississippi required a different deracialized performance. Because SNCC sought to organize local communities, they emphasized mastering good manners for the purposes of political networking, whereas SCLC used social ethics to debunk black stereotypes while engaged in racially homogenous and racially heterogeneous groups in public associational life. SNCC also differed from SCLC on the use of emotions. Whereas SCLC used citizenship schools and role-playing simulations to limit the show of emotions in civic performances, SNCC purposely sought to arouse emotional sentiment for the purposes of recruiting reluctant blacks into the civil rights struggles. SCLC was careful about citing black stereotypes in public, especially with an opportunistic white audience. However, SNCC created the heightened emotional sense then transferred it into organizational positions. This allowed the subsequent performativity of organizing to recall and reconnect SNCC organizers with a common collective sentiment while geographically dispersed throughout the rural South. Finally, SNCC's community centers sought to deracialize the physical body through instruction on the personal ethics of good dietary, domestic, and self-care practices. Good citizens were clean, healthy and fit, and thus, mastered the techniques of projecting a neat, clean, and healthy body. This differed from SCLC's focus on training an urban black population affiliated with the black church, where SCLC sought to deracialize black styles of speech, dress, and handwriting to debunk black stereotypes.

The effect of good citizenship and the deracialized self on the civil rights movement was twofold. On the one hand, it provided for the expansion of and entry point for the civil rights movement into the national and white-dominated public spheres, something the NAACP and social democrats of the 1940s could not do. However, this cemented the deracialized black self with black citizenship and the passage of federal policy, and, in essence, homogenizes the black population by masking differences on the national level. Since the idea of the good black citizen was implicit in the new legislation, there is an ethical obligation to deracialize political action, limiting the possibility of specialized "black rights" to address the needs of marginalized black citizens. In effect, the boundaries between struggles on the national and local levels compound the problems in urban and rural areas, while producing change for a limited subset of blacks who reflect the deracialized self.

Conceptualizing the body with performativity and performances also helps answer the question as to why social movements improve only some aspects of the marginalized and aggrieved populations. This article argued that social movements make symbolic citizenship claims by drawing from dominant civic norms to construct representations of the populations they claim only to represent. Symbolic citizenship claims are

normative political claims that define how citizens should be, reinforcing dominant civic norms, and hardening the boundaries between what constitutes good and bad citizenship. In essence, social movements create the representations of the population they are representing by embodying normative ethics into their civic performances and attaching it to the movement's collective identity. Normative ideas of citizenship function as a form of exclusion, and these forms of exclusion are present in the embodied performances. While the probability of a successful performance rests on the capacity of the social movement to project, and audiences' recognition of the "sacred" values of good citizenship, sociologists have to be mindful of the real intended and unintended consequences of embodied performances. Future research on embodied performances should consider the impact of competing racializing and deracializing techniques on racial and ethnic struggles, as well as how embodied performances affect new social movements, where materialization of movement culture on the body is not the result of challenging meanings attached to biological selves.

NOTES

[1]"Summary of Citizenship Schools" located in SCLC 4-2.

[2]"Letter from Hosea Williams to Andrew Young" located in WF 27-18.

[3]Although beyond the scope of this single article, other discourses, narratives, and ideologies arose in relation to this limitation, including black nationalism and black capitalism.

[4]"Freedom School Data" published by Council of Federated Organizations (COFO) located in CC 1-2 and RS 1-5.

[5]"Freedom Schools—Final Report, 1964" located in SAV 47-5.

[6]"Mass Letter to black residents (register voter) March 14, 1959. Sent by the United Christian Movement, Inc in Conjunction with SCLC" located in EB 5-1.

[7](EB 5-2).

[8]"Memorandum—Crusade for Citizenship, Sponsored by SCLC" dated February 4, 1958, located EB 5-1.

[9]"Minutes of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference at first Calvery Baptist Church, Columbia, SC" located in EB 5-1.

[10]"Letter from Department of Education, Health and Welfare dated October 29, 1959" located in EB 5-1.

[11]"Letter from Department of Education, Health and Welfare dated October 29, 1959" located in EB 5-1.

[12]Proposed Citizenship School Training Program: Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee, December 1960 located in SCLC 4-2.

[13]"The SCLC Citizenship Workbook" located in CC 3-2 and WF 29-13.

[14]"Helpful Hints in Teaching Citizenship Classes" located in CC 3-2.

[15]"The SCLC Citizenship Workbook" located in CC 3-2 and WF 29-13.

[16]"The SCLC Citizenship Workbook" located in CC 3-2 and WF 29-13.

[17]"The SCLC Citizenship Workbook" located in CC 3-2 and WF 29-13.

[18]Most of the lessons on mastering nonviolence, especially through the workshops, were transmitted orally and bodily, as activists taught these techniques through demonstration to other activists. This manual put these lessons into a recorded collection.

[19]"COFO news—notes from Selma" located in SAV 48-13.
[20]Pamphlet titled: "SNCC" dated 1963 located in SAV box 46 titled SNCC Publications.
[21]Training Booklet Titled "Non-Violence" prepared by Charles Sherrod located in EB 6-14.
[22]"Notes on Organizing by Charles McLaurin" located in SAV 46-2.
[23]"Notes on Organizing by Charles McLaurin" located in SAV 46-2.
[24]Training Booklet Titled "Non-Violence" prepared by Charles Sherrod located in EB 6-14.
[25]Training Booklet Titled "Non-Violence" prepared by Charles Sherrod located in EB 6-14.
[26]"Notes on Organizing by Charles McLaurin" located in SAV 46-2.
[27]Training Booklet Titled "Non-Violence" prepared by Charles Sherrod located in EB 6-14.
[28]On occasions when King gave a speech, SCLC did use warm-up acts. However, they used speakers, like SCLC vice president Ralph Abernathy, to loosen up the audience with humor rather than getting the enticing and emotional response with outrage and anger.
[29]Training Booklet Titled "Non-Violence" prepared by Charles Sherrod located in EB 6-14.
[30]Training Booklet Titled "Non-Violence" prepared by Charles Sherrod located in EB 6-14.
[31]"Notes on Organizing by Charles McLaurin" located in SAV 46-2.
[32]"What Is COFO? Mississippi: The Structure of the Movement and Present Operations." COFO Publication #6 located in CC 1-1 and RS 1-3.
[33]"Overview of Political Program" located in CC 1-3.
[34]"Overview of Political Program" located in CC 1-3.
[35]"The General Condition of the Mississippi Negro" COFO publication #1 October 1963 located in CC 1-1.
[36]"Some Proposals for a Mississippi Project—Summary of Freedom Schools for COFO project" located in SCLC 4-2.
[37]"Prospectus for the Mississippi Freedom Summer" located in CC 1-1.
[38]"Prospectus for the Mississippi Freedom Summer" located in CC 1-1.
[39]"1964 Platform of the Mississippi Freedom School Convention" located in RS 1-4.
[40]"1964 Platform of the Mississippi Freedom School Convention" located in RS 1-4.
[41]See SNCC Booklet "Genocide in Mississippi" located in SAV 48-7 and " 'Passage of Genocide Bill'—passed house March 11, 1964" located in SAV 47-10.
[42]"What Is COFO? Mississippi: The Structure of the Movement and Present Operations." COFO Publication #6 located in CC 1-1 and RS 1-3.
[43]"What Is COFO? Mississippi: The Structure of the Movement and Present Operations." COFO Publication #6 located in CC 1-1 and RS 1-33.
[44]SCLC attempted to implement similar programs to improve hygiene in relation to their ill-fated SCOPE program in 1965–1966, including birth control (see Garrow 1986:440–2) and "Proposed SCOPE project for Choctaw County" located in CC 3-3.
[45]"What Is COFO? Mississippi: The Structure of the Movement and Present Operations." COFO Publication #6 located in CC 1-1 and RS 1-3.

REFERENCES

Archival Sources:

Gellman Library, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Walter Fauntroy Papers (WF).
Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture New York Public Library, Catherine Clark Papers (CC).
Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture New York Public Library, Ella Baker Papers (EB).

Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library, Records of The Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), 1954–1970 (microform).

Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture New York Public Library, Ruth Schein Papers Collection (RS).

Wisconsin Historical Society Archives, Social Action Vertical File, Boxes 46, 47, and 48 (SAV).

Alexander, Jeffery C. 1992. "Citizen and Enemy as Symbolic Classifications: On the Polarizing Discourse of Civil Society." Pp. 289–308 in *Where Culture Talks: Exclusion and the Making of Civil Society*, edited by M. Fournier and M. Lamont. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2004. "Cultural Pragmatics: Social Performance between Ritual and Strategy." *Sociological Theory* 22:527–73.

Alexander, Jeffery C., Bernhard Giesen, and Jason L. Mast, eds. 2006. *Social Performance: Symbolic Action, Cultural Pragmatics, and Ritual*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Belfrage, Sally. 1965. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Viking Press.

Bell, Vicki. 2007. *Culture and Performance: The Challenge of Ethics, Politics and Feminist Theory*. Oxford, England: Berg.

Berkovitch, Nitza. 2002. *From Motherhood to Citizenship: Women's Rights and International Organizations*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:531–65.

Blee, Kathless M. 1998. "White Knuckle Research: Emotional Dynamics in Fieldwork with Racist Activists." *Qualitative Sociology* 21(4):381–99.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.

Carson, Clayborne. 1994. *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Crowley-Matoka, Megan. 2005. "Desperately Seeking 'Normal': The Promise and Perils of Living with Kidney Transplantation." *Social Science and Medicine* 61:821–31.

Durkheim, Emile. [1912] 1995. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. New York: Free Press.

Eyerman, Ron. 2001. *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2006. "Performing Opposition or, How Social Movements Move." Pp. 193–217 in *Social Performance: Symbolic Action, Cultural Pragmatics, and Ritual*, edited by J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, and J. L. Mast. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison. 1991. *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

———. 1998. *Music and Social Movements: Mobilizing Traditions in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Fernandez, Roberto M. and Doug McAdam. 1988. "Social Networks and Social Movements: Multiorganizational Fields and Recruitment to Mississippi Freedom Summer." *Sociological Forum* 3:357–82.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 3. Translated by R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.

———. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–78*, edited by M. Senellart. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Garrow, David. 1986. *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King Jr., and the Southern Conference Leadership Council*. New York: Quill.

Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polletta. 2000. "The Return of the Repressed: The Fall and Rise of Emotions in Social Movement Theory." *Mobilization* 1:65–84.

Hercus, Cheryl. 1999. "Identity, Emotion, and Feminist Collective Action." *Gender and Society* 13(1):34–55.

Hogan, Wesley C. 2007. *Many Minds, One Heart: SNCC's Dream for a New America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1998. "The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and around Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 13:397–424.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. [1963] 1986. "Kenneth B. Clark Interview." Pp. 331–9 in *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr*, edited by J. M. Washington. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Klatch, Rebecca. 2004. "The Underside of Social Movements: The Effects of Destructive Affective Ties." *Qualitative Sociology* 27:487–509.

Licterman, Paul. 1996. *The Search for Political Community: American Activists Reinventing Commitment*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lister, Ruth. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.

McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, eds. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framing*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, Doug and Ronnelle Paulsen. 1993. "Specifiying the Relationship between Social Ties and Activism." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:640–67.

Marshall, Thomas Humphrey. 1964. *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development: Essays*. New York: Doubleday.

Melucci, Alberto. 1996. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Morais, Herbert M. 1967. *The History of the Negro in Medicine* (International Library of Negro Life and History). New York: Publishers Company.

Morris, Aldon D. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.

Oppenheimer, Martin and George Lackey. 1965. *A Manual for Direct Action: Strategies and Tactics for Civil Rights and All Other Nonviolent Protest Movements*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books.

Polletta, Francesca. 1998. " 'It Was Like a Fever . . .' Narrative and Identity in Social Protest." *Social Problems* 45:137–59.

Rachel, John R. 1998. " 'We'll Never Turn Back': Adult Education and the Struggle for Citizenship in Mississippi's Freedom Summer." *American Education Research Journal* 35:167–98.

Reed, Jean-Pierre. 2004. "Emotions in Context: Revolutionary Accelerators, Hope, Moral Outrage, and Other Emotions in the Making of Nicaragua's Revolution." *Theory and Society* 33:653–703.

Reger, Jo. 2004. "Organizational 'Emotion Work' through Consciousness Raising: An Analysis of a Feminist organization." *Qualitative Sociology* 27(2):205–22.

Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Schilling, Chris. 1993. *The Body and Social Theory*. London, England: Sage.
Shklar, Judith. 1991. *American Citizenship: The Question for Inclusion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51:464–82.
Steinberg, Marc. 1998. "Tilting the Frame: Considerations on Collective Action Framing from a Discursive Turn." *Theory and Society* 27:845–72.
———. 1999. "The Talk and Back Talk of Collective Action: A Dialogic Analysis of Repertoires of Discourse among Nineteenth-Century English Cotton Spinners." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:736–80.
Taylor, Verta and Nancy Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp. 104–30 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. McClurg. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Tilly, Charles. 1995. *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758–1834*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
———. 2008. *Contentious Performances*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
Turner, Bryan S. 1996. *The Body and Society*. 2nd ed. London, England: Sage.
Wacquant, Loci. 2004. *Body and Soul: Notebooks of an Apprentice Boxer*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
Walzer, Michael. 2005. *Obligations: Essays on Disobedience, War and Citizenship*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Waters, Sarah. 1998. "New Social Movements Politics in France: The Rise of Civic Forms of Mobilization." *West European Politics* 21:170–87.
Wiebe, Robert. 1995. *Self Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Zinn, Howard. [1965] 2002. *SNCC: The New Abolitionists*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.