

Introductory note:

I wrote this paper in the fall semester of 2020 for HIST357: The Insurgent South, taught by Professor Nancy MacLean. Focusing on the Pullman porters, a group of predominantly African American sleeping car attendants, this paper seeks to explore the intersection of workers' rights and the struggle for dignity and agency in the racially stratified landscape of America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The Pullman porters were able to unionize under the leadership of A. Philip Randolph, becoming the first black-led union to gain recognition under the American Federation of Labor in 1935. The trailblazing spirit of these workers in the face of incredible barriers lent momentum to the Civil Rights Movement and contributed to the rise of the Black middle class, two developments that helped African Americans harness long-sought agency in a country plagued by systemic discrimination and violence against minorities. This paper focuses on the years before Pullman porter organization, examining the treatment that individual workers had to endure and the ways that these men reconfigured the conditions of their oppression into opportunities for hope. It is a story of grassroots, ground-level determination that highlights the potential for courageous resistance within systems intent on withholding equity and monopolizing power.

Duke University

Tipping the Scales of Power:

The Effect of Gratuities on Pullman Porter Agency in the Early 20th Century

Genevieve Beske

History 357: The Insurgent South

Professor Nancy MacLean

“What do you think of the social aspect of taking 6,500 men that are obviously a practically new race, struggling up from slavery, and putting them in a position, from practice or otherwise, where they are compelled not to stand independently as men, but to depend on receiving gratuities from another race for their livelihood; what do you think of that [as] a social matter in a country such as we have here?”

“I do not feel that I am competent to answer that question.”

- Exchange between Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the Commission on Industrial Relations, and L. S. Hungerford, general manager of the Pullman Company, during the Commission’s 1915 inquiry.¹

In 1867, two years after the conclusion of the Civil War, the Pullman Company introduced a “portering” service to accompany their luxury railcars.² Comprised exclusively of African Americans, many of whom were newly freed from slavery, Pullman porters crisscrossed the country by train, attending to passengers and maintaining the cars. Within decades, the Pullman Company became the largest employer of African Americans in the United States – and soon after, the Pullman porters organized to demand better conditions.³ In 1935, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters (BSCP), propelled by the leadership of A. Philip Randolph, became the first black-led labor organization to receive a charter from the American Federation of Labor. The BSCP’s vision was clear: “Our Goal,” proclaimed the letterhead at the beginning of Randolph’s official correspondence, “more wages; better hours; better working conditions; pay for overtime; pay for ‘preparation’ time; abolition of ‘doubling out’, conductor’s pay for conductor’s work when in charge and manhood rights.”⁴ This struggle for manhood and against oppression was manifest in the social dynamics between black Pullman porters and white passengers decades before the BSCP formed. For Pullman porters, I will argue, the practice of tipping – in which the passengers on Pullman cars, predominantly white, furnished over half of porter wages – was the battleground, enacting dramas of exploitation and equity, visibility and invisibility, degradation and dignity, all of which generated a resiliency in Pullman porters that they could convert into larger resistance in the BSCP.

As historian Patricia A. Schechter has shown, the protection of black “manhood” during the late 19th and early 20th centuries “evoked a historically specific set of male social functions (voting, economic independence, and protecting dependents) and symbolized the prestige of an entire community” – and was critically threatened during the decades-long Southern campaign of demonization, rape accusations, sexual violence, and lynching perpetrated by whites against

blacks.⁵ The acute suffering and terror that black people, particularly in the South, had to endure in this period should never be minimized or overshadowed – and that is not my intention here. However, the concept of manhood was unmistakably rooted in the consciousness of Pullman porters as well, perhaps to some extent *because* of the threat that white supremacist terror posed to black manhood in the South. Moreover, Pullman porters experienced a distinct liminality when it came to their own manhood – they were considered “leading men,” prominent members of the black middle class, but suffered prejudice and exploitation in the white-dominated arena of their work.⁶ The discussion of porter-passenger dynamics in newspaper clippings, magazine articles, oral histories, formal testimonies, and BSCP records reveal the ways in which white public opinions and habits, especially regarding tipping, threatened the agency of Pullman porters – and the ways in which Pullman porters converted these same circumstances into pride, power, and brotherhood.

Servitude, Not Service: Passenger Attitudes Towards Porters

The Pullman Company brand was defined by luxury, and the Pullman porter, a recognizable fixture, was designed to reinforce this sense of extravagance by playing to the racial generalizations of the day. In the early years of American railroads, passengers had to contend with stuffy cars, uncomfortable temperatures, dim lighting, crowded coaches, and general disrepair in stations and on trains.⁷ In the mid-19th century, paving the way for his sleeping car monopoly, engineer and businessman George Mortimer Pullman revolutionized rail travel, linking it to high-society opulence; an 1882 Pullman leaflet, for example, promised, “exteriorly [the railcars] will present the appearance of a block of artistically finished houses, while interiorly they will rival both in beauty and decoration, and in varied living conveniences, an elaborately finished and richly appointed city mansion.”⁸ Such decadent offerings set a new

standard, and by 1930, the Pullman Company could confidently boast in an advertisement, “Pullman service made land travel, for the first time in human experience, a pleasure and an opportunity rather than a grim infliction.”⁹ If the physical space was intended to evoke the homes of the wealthy, the experience was compounded by staff who were compelled to treat passengers like royalty. Scant years after the abolition of slavery, Pullman porters reinforced the “high class” experience associated with Pullman cars by attending to the beck and call of travelers, a role that intentionally harnessed racial prejudice: Pullman understood that passengers would be more comfortable with black men in a serving capacity than white men, especially in the intimate space of the sleeping car.¹⁰

For decades, to supply the experience of servitude, the Pullman Company tactically hired African Americans who were more experienced with systemic white supremacy and thus less likely to stand up to passenger prejudice. In 1915, testifying during an inquiry by the Commission of Industrial Relations (CIR), Pullman Company General Manager L. S. Hungerford remarked that he thought “the old southern colored man makes the best porter on the car” because “he is more adapted to waiting on the passenger and gives them better attention and has a better manner, that is more acceptable to them and more pleasant” than that of black people from “the slums of Chicago,” adding that the company’s Southern porters were “mostly house servants” before working with Pullman.¹¹ In other words, the Pullman Company favored men who had been trained to serve – particularly, to serve in the postbellum South, a region where whites violently, systematically, and routinely oppressed and intimidated black people. As historian W. Fitzhugh Brundage has shown, this Southern regime of terror transformed black resistance into subtle, non-confrontational insubordination and necessitated cultures of “pragmatic deference” – submission to white oppression as a calculated survival tactic.¹²

Southern Pullman porters, while the most “pleasant” to white passengers, were also perhaps the most experienced with the danger of defiance in the face of white supremacy. That this experience translated into success on the Pullman cars speaks volumes about the expectations and desires of passengers and the company.

Even non-Southern Pullman porters, with their unique travel opportunities and communication networks, had to withstand racism and violence – all without reaction or retaliation. Because Jim Crow segregation laws affected Pullman cars where they applied, porters in these regions had to witness and occasionally enforce refusal of service for black passengers.¹³ At times, their jobs entailed exposure to brutality and terror – in one instance, for example, porters serving a Pullman headed from Florida to Louisiana witnessed a black passenger who fled, pursued by a mob of whites, after he was confronted for sitting in the Pullman car instead of the Jim Crow car. The porters had to continue working; when they arrived in New Orleans, they reported to the black press what they had assumed – that the man had been lynched. The newspaper later reported, relieved, that the man was “NOT LYNCHED, BUT ONLY WHIPPED!”¹⁴ That porters had to witness such violence without ceasing service speaks to the pressure and injustice they were able to withstand – but it also speaks to their lack of agency within the social climate of the early 20th century. As porters knew, failure to enforce segregation or comply with a superior’s orders could cost them their jobs – a sacrifice most porters were unwilling to make, despite condemnation from the black press for the perceived disloyalty.¹⁵

By allowing passengers to control porters’ wages, the tipping system capitalized on and reinforced this imbalance of power. Testifying before the CIR in 1915, one porter reported that he made between 75 and 80 dollars in tips each month, while his monthly wage, provided by the Pullman Company, was \$27.50 – the public provided almost 75% of his monthly earnings.¹⁶

Asked by the CIR whether he would continue working as a porter if tips were abolished and he only received \$27.50 from the company, he responded, “I would not, for you couldn’t live on it [...] there would be no porters on the cars.”¹⁷ The Pullman wage was not a “living wage” – and the public begrudgingly accepted the necessity of tipping through this perspective.¹⁸ Another porter, reporting similar earnings to the CIR, was asked whether the tips he received would be considered “ordinary,” and explained, “that depends very largely on the man that is on the car [...] And in the manner and in the way he gives service and in the manner he renders it.”¹⁹ In bestowing tips, the public controlled the wages that a porter received, cumulatively capable of making the difference between a porter’s financial stability or poverty based on potentially arbitrary judgments. The “skill” of the porter translated into his ability to earn tips – but the variability of outcome could be significant. In 1926, tallying the responses to questionnaires distributed amongst union members, BSCP found that 376 porters reported less than \$50 a month in tips, while 245 earned more. Five porters earned less than \$15 a month in tips, while two received over \$200 – and, as the BSCP explains, “Each porter had approximately the same duties, spent nearly equal time on the road, and rendered service on ‘poor’ as well as ‘rich’ runs.”²⁰

Passengers were aware that porters relied on gratuities and saw tips as generators of distance, removing porters from their own social lives even as they showed the porters vulnerability. George Henry Smock, a porter from 1935 to 1939, recalled two separate instances where he had to fetch bacon grease for a passenger’s hemorrhoids, and remembered fellow porters taking ill children off the hands of their mothers and soothing them by walking back and forth through the aisles.²¹ As Smock remarked, “Those are the things that hardly ever are known to the public so far as what [a porter’s] job and career called for.”²² Smock’s comment highlights

the extra mile that porters could go in order to aid passengers – but it also hints at the invisibility porters experienced despite their service. As Smock described, the porter could occupy a private, almost familial role in relation to the passenger, providing childcare as well as confidential assistance for passengers with potentially embarrassing ailments. The passenger making such requests undoubtedly trusted the porter’s responsibility and discretion, but such faith was not synonymous with respect. Porters and passengers were, after all, strangers – in order to trust a stranger with such private responsibilities, passengers viewed porters as a subordinated ‘other,’ occupying a separate and non-threatening social plane. Jack Santino, a folklorist who spent countless hours interviewing former Pullman porters, explains that the racial stratification in the early 20th century meant wealthy white passengers were unconcerned about their reputations around porters, confident that “no matter how close the relationship of a porter and a passenger on a train, whatever the porter witnessed, the passenger knew their paths would not cross when off.”²³

Tipping served as the mechanism through which passengers could generate and enforce this social distance; many saw it as an act that inscribed hierarchy. In an anti-tipping booklet published in 1916, William Scott Rufus claimed, “Tipping is the price of pride. It is what one American is willing to pay to induce another American to acknowledge inferiority.” Along similar lines, Southerner John Gilmer Speed wrote in 1902 about encountering white servants in New York for the first time, explaining, “Negroes take tips, of course; one expects that of them – it is a token of their inferiority. But to give money to a white man was embarrassing to me. I felt defiled by his debasement and servility.”²⁴ At the turn of the century, then, tipping was publicly equated with hierarchies of race and class. The act of giving and receiving a tip was imbued

with social significance, capable of subordinating and distancing a server in the eyes of a customer.

For some, tipping was the price of privilege. Writing in defense of tipping in 1928, journalist B. C. Forbes (founder of *Forbes* magazine) complained about an experience he had aboard a Pullman car – he asked for lunch and the white steward denied him, stating “rather gruffly” that lunch was not ready. After Forbes threatened to write a letter to the steward’s manager, the steward apologized. Forbes added, “I have found, and doubtless you have found, that where efforts are being made to earn a tip, the service usually is either fairly good or very good, whereas the attitude of many employees who are not in the tip-earning class is often indifferent, not to say high-handed.”²⁵ Consciously or unconsciously, Forbes saw tipping as a rule-bending mechanism, one which placed him, the passenger, in a position of authority over the employee. He wanted lunch, but lunch was not ready – and the steward, who expected no tip, did nothing to accommodate him. Lacking power over the steward, he resorted to threats to exert control – but with porters, who relied on tips, such passenger privilege was inherent in the service relationship.

In the eyes of white passengers, then, tipping signified superiority, allowing them to elevate themselves in relation to black porters and transfer agency on the train from the porters to themselves. In this sense, tipping could be seen as a threat to a porter’s sense of manhood and dignity – even at his own place of work he was exploited by white passengers who, clinging to a sense of ownership and entitlement, could force the porter to kowtow for a living wage. But, even in these circumstances, Pullman porters did not fade into servile background noise – they remained respectable members of the black community and featured prominently in white consciousness. More importantly, they never accepted the idea that they were subordinate. As the

porters and the public knew, a job as a Pullman porter signified much about a person: it was one of the better-paying jobs available to black men, and it required intelligence, social acumen, and responsibility.²⁶ But in understanding how porters were able to preserve this sense of dignity in the face of daily disrespect, historian W. Fitzhugh Brundage again proves useful.

“Strictly Confidence”: Pullman Porters Shift the Narrative²⁷

Making sense of porter resilience first requires acknowledging that, as demonstrated, white passengers attempted to use the tipping system for Pullman porters as a means of systemic subordination. Brundage proposes that “systemic subordination inevitably elicits a desire among the victims of that subordination to speak back to or strike out against their oppressors.”²⁸ This, too, is undoubtedly true – the formation of the BSCP, which included in its primary goals “a living wage from the Pullman Company which would permit the abolition of the tipping system,” could be seen as Pullman porters striking out against oppression.²⁹ As Brundage notes, though, this resistance does not need to be highly visible to constitute protest. Borrowing a term from anthropologist James C. Scott, Brundage describes “infrapolitics” as “daily acts of insubordination and the culture that sustains them,” even when giving “appearances of consent.”³⁰ Though the white public assumed that porters were submitting to hierarchies in order to receive tips, a closer analysis of the strategies and rationalizations employed by Pullman porters reveals the ways they retained agency and pride within the tipping system, rejecting subordination while still providing for themselves.

The first step for many porters involved mentally reframing the terms of their employment so that tipping represented an economic exchange – goods for services. As one porter explained to a newspaper, “It is all well enough to say that the company furnishes the porter for the traveler’s convenience, but the company doesn’t expect the porter to become the

personal servant of every man and woman in the car. If we choose to do it and the public accepts us in that light we have a right to extra compensation.”³¹ This explanation hits upon an important principle within porter gratuities. The Pullman Company justified the tipping system, in part, by leaving certain tasks out of the porter’s official rules. Shoe shining, for example, was present in porter guidelines but not porter rules; a porter was expected, but not required, to polish passengers’ shoes each night, although how optional this practice truly was remained debatable.³² Regardless, because it was not a specific company policy, porters bought their own shoe polish for this task – thus porters, providing an entirely discretionary service, expected tips in exchange for shining shoes and could avoid the shoes of known non-tippers.³³ The same applied for brushing passengers’ clothes and carrying their suitcases on and off of the railroad platforms.³⁴ In this understanding, the public was not signaling a porter’s inferiority by giving him tips – they were paying for an extra service.

As another tactic for retaining manhood while receiving tips, porters pursued what one might call ethical earning – maximizing tips while minimizing exploitation. To cajole a reluctant public into tipping, porter tactics blended genuine service with strategy. For some porters, this meant paying attention to all passengers, not just those who appeared wealthy. Explained one porter, “It makes a porter feel mean to get a good tip from a man that he hasn’t shown any particular attention to. [...] The best way is to use ‘em all alike. You’ll make more and feel better about it.”³⁵ This language reveals the extent to which the power dynamics of tipping depended on perspective: the porter, concerned about exploiting passengers by receiving payment for work he did not do, instead opts for a win-win, easing his conscience by attending to all of his passengers while simultaneously angling for a larger total payoff. Notably, the porter is not ashamed by the act of receiving tips; his main concern is the guilt of receiving tips without

rendering services. Addressing a parallel situation, one porter, testifying before the CIR, was asked whether he felt “disgraced or humiliated” in receiving tips; he said he did not, explaining, “the degradation [*sic*] would be if we did not get them.”³⁶ Porters performed tasks to receive tips; a passenger violating this de facto contract by refusing to tip for service was tantamount to labor exploitation – more dehumanizing than working for gratuities, especially in the shadow of slavery. Viewed together, the ideologies of these two porters may indicate that tips were considered fair when they represented an *exchange*, rather than a passenger’s charity or a porter’s exploitation.

That said, porters still occasionally had to use overt pressure to secure gratuities – in these instances, porters could devise strategies that took full advantage of their power in the car. As briefly mentioned with shoe shining, porters were willing to stiff passengers who stiffed them. As one news correspondent noted, “It has become so customary to [tip the Pullman porter] that the passenger who neglects it will find that he is not receiving proper attention from that powerful functionary of the Pullman company.”³⁷ The author recognized the power in the porter’s ability to withhold service – once again, in an inversion of assumed porter-passenger dynamics, the porter could dictate a passenger’s visibility or invisibility. Porter H. N. Hall, recalling his time working the late-night run from Chicago to Detroit, said the passengers made a habit of sneaking off the train before giving tips. The porters held “caucus after caucus” to figure out how to stop the escapees, finally landing on the tactic of closing the heavy train doors on wet towels, jamming them shut. As Hall explained, “It’s funny now to see [passengers] walk by and get their brush-off after they have tried to open the back door and failed.”³⁸ Here, porters could exercise authority in their role as “host” of the Pullman car – they had access to towels and could control the use of train doors. Hall, finding humor in the sheepishness of the failed tip-skipper,

hints at a sense of pride, perhaps superiority – the passenger was bested by porter antics. Perhaps most importantly, this anecdote demonstrates porters working toward tips as part of a common interest, successfully coordinating to secure sufficient payment.

In another manipulation of visibility, interactions that forced a passenger to notice a porter could increase a porter's sway over a passenger. Shining shoes, a porter recalled, required a follow-up confrontation: "You shine his shoes, he feels cheap if he ain't going to give you anything for it. So you're going to shine his shoes, and you're going to be sure to see when he gets off."³⁹ By making sure to reconnect with the passenger before he departed, the porter could lean on the passenger's desire to appear high-class. In this manner, porters could capitalize on the power differential that passengers assumed tipping implied. Porters were able to apply such pressure because tipping was a performative exchange, often carried out within open view of fellow passengers – and its relative novelty led to heightened social import. When the Pullman porter service was initially introduced in 1867, tipping was considered a European institution, relatively novel in the United States.⁴⁰ As the practice grew, passengers, unclear on the customs of tipping, were insecure about the amounts they should tip in exchange for services. One 1913 newspaper article reported official government tipping allotments for travel. "For the service of sleeping car porters he may spend 25 cents a day and of chair car porters 15 cents a day," the article explained, and added, "It may comfort [passengers] somewhat to know that the treasury itself parcels out the tips with a considerable degree of prudence."⁴¹ Tight-fisted tippers had to walk a fine line between saving money and saving face. A 1907 news article complained, "There is no doubt that the tipping habit has become a great nuisance and entails an expense quite often that cannot be afforded, but is submitted to by many rather than be placed in the stingy class."⁴² Tipping represented a public display of wealth and generosity for the passenger. Porters,

understanding the social weight it carried for passengers, could use an audience as a tool to apply pressure.

Because passenger and porter interactions were punctuated by the exchange of tips, stereotypes of the money-hungry porter abounded – yet such criticisms, closely examined, in fact reveal how attuned passengers were to porter influence. Newspapers called the act of expectantly awaiting a tip “a holdup” and “blackmail.”⁴³ Other articles attached characterizations to porters that lampooned their acceptance of tips: porters were “putative train robbers,” “natural born gamblers,” and “pests.”⁴⁴ Insulting as they seem, the negative connotations in these complaints mask what they fundamentally seem to describe – the porter’s ability to exercise power over the passenger. Such descriptors suggest an uneasy vulnerability in passenger self-concept, perhaps even a reluctant recognition of the agency-reversal at work. Porters’ own terms for tip-getting evoke a similar sense of influence – according to one porter, a day on the job was a day of “hustling”; as another explained, “you had to con a lot of them [passengers], get inside them and make them feel like they were the boss.”⁴⁵ Neither porter attached shame or stigma to these descriptions – it was simply part of the job. By adopting the language of exploitation alongside the white public, porters could reframe the role they played, acknowledging the performative demands of working for tips without accepting the role of beggar or thief.

In a peculiar link, porter tactics increased passengers’ agitation with tips to the extent that, seemingly unconsciously, they both took issue with a bigger enemy: the Pullman Company. Newspapers, dissatisfied with tipping, began to spread the blame. One article, deriding porters’ work, argued, “The porter does not render any particular service. [...] Only about once in sixteen times does the porter clean the passenger’s shoes, and when he does so he usually leaves them in a worse state than he found them. [...] The porter’s noisy manipulation of his whiskbroom

merely is notice to you to give money to him.” The article goes on to criticize the Pullman Company for making the porter “a beggar and a grafter” who “does not get enough money from the Pullman Company to live as a decent, honest, self-respecting man should.”⁴⁶ This pattern is typical: the public, reluctant to pay additional fees, criticized the porter for pressure to tip. But it goes further, choosing to blame the Pullman Company for the necessity of tipping. Explains another article, “Thus one of the wealthiest corporations on earth [the Pullman Company] forces the public or rather the traveler to pay its servants from their own pockets.”⁴⁷ Ironically, the public’s displeasure with the porter’s “hustle” actually heightened the porter’s public visibility and spread an awareness of the Pullman Company’s exploitation – two goals of the BSCP.⁴⁸

Porters, by cultivating agency within the tipping system, showed a remarkable ability to derive agency from a demeaning situation. Because of the racism and injustice in early 20th century society, black men were hard-pressed to find jobs that both paid well and afforded them manhood rights. Though tips from entitled passengers could represent humiliation or exploitation, porters often found ways to flip this narrative, retaining and emphasizing their own skill and dignity in a form of subtle retaliation. Tipping was certainly not the only factor that prompted the BSCP’s unprecedented organizational success; nor was the struggle for hard-earned manhood and dignity the only strength that porters brought to the union. However, in a feat of psychological resilience, porters met the indignity and abuse linked to the tipping system with ingenuity and a sense of pride. Porters knew that they deserved better treatment as workers, as men, and as people. But the victories they found within a social landscape of overwhelming injustice perhaps helped them generate the confidence necessary to take on the paternalism of the Pullman Company.

-
- ¹ *Final Report and Testimony Submitted to Congress by the Commission on Industrial Relations*, vol. 10 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 64th Congress, 1st session. Senate document no. 415 (hereafter *CIR Final Report and Testimony*), 9561.
- ² Eric Arnesen, *Brotherhoods of Color: Black Railroad Workers and the Struggle for Equality*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 17.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ See, for example, A. Philip Randolph to M. P. Webster, May 5, 1926, *Records of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters*, Chicago Historical Society and Newberry Library, Series A-1, Reel 1.
- ⁵ Patricia A. Schechter, "Unsettled Business: Ida B. Wells against Lynching, or, How Antilynching Got Its Gender," in *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching in the South*, Ed. W. Fitzhugh Brundage (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 295.
- ⁶ Beth Tompkins Bates, *Pullman Porters and the Rise of Protest Politics in Black America, 1925-1945*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 24.
- ⁷ Arnesen, *Brotherhoods of Color*, 14.
- ⁸ *Atlantic Coast Line: Vestibuled Train to Florida* (New York: Press of Fleming, Brewster & Alley, 1887), University of Florida, George A. Smathers Libraries.
- ⁹ *What the Pullman Company Offers to Travelers* (Chicago: The Pullman Company, 1930), Newberry Library, Pullman Company Archives.
- ¹⁰ Bates, *Pullman Porters and the Rise of Protest Politics*, 22.
- ¹¹ *CIR Final Report and Testimony*, pp. 9553-9554.
- ¹² W. Fitzhugh Brundage, "Roar on the Other Side of Silence: Black Resistance and White Violence in the American South, 1880-1940," in *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching in the South*, Ed. W. Fitzhugh Brundage (University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 273-274.
- ¹³ Arnesen, *Brotherhoods of Color*, 22.
- ¹⁴ "Green Not Lynched, but Only Whipped," *Plaindealer*, June 6, 1913, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ¹⁵ Arnesen, *Brotherhoods of Color*, 22.
- ¹⁶ *CIR Final Report and Testimony*, 9649.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., 9651.
- ¹⁸ "Your Porter's Pay," *Billings Daily Gazette*, Nov. 1, 1913, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ¹⁹ *CIR Final Report and Testimony*, 9646.
- ²⁰ *The Pullman Porter* (New York: Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, 1926), Newberry Library, Pullman Company Archives, 12.
- ²¹ George Henry Smock interview, in David D. Perata, *Those Pullman Blues: An Oral History of the African American Railroad Attendant*. (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996), 8-9.
- ²² Ibid., 9.
- ²³ Jack Santino, *Miles of Smiles, Years of Struggle: Stories of Black Pullman Porters*. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 81-82.
- ²⁴ John Gilmer Speed, "Tips and Commissions," *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* 69, no. 414 (1902), 748.
- ²⁵ B. C. Forbes, "Should Tips Be Abolished and Higher Wages Paid? Service Important Factor," *Chicago Herald-Examiner*, August 1, 1928, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ²⁶ Santino, *Miles of Smiles, Years of Struggle*, 10.
- ²⁷ Ibid., 73. Quote from former porter about how he fostered passenger satisfaction ("It was strictly confidence all the way!")
- ²⁸ Brundage, "Roar on the Other Side of Silence," 272.
- ²⁹ *The Pullman Porter*, 5.
- ³⁰ Brundage, "Roar on the Other Side of Silence," 273.
- ³¹ "Plump Pullman Porter Pleads Poverty," *Boston Journal*, Dec. 27, 1903, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ³² *CIR Final Report and Testimony*, 9558-9559.
- ³³ Santino, *Miles of Smiles, Years of Struggle*, 74.
- ³⁴ "Tips vs. Wages for Pullman Porters," *Outlook*, May 19, 1915, Proquest, 121.
- ³⁵ "Plump Pullman Porter Pleads Poverty."
- ³⁶ *CIR Final Report and Testimony*, 9654.
- ³⁷ "Portland to Paris: Experiences of a Traveler," *Oregonian*, Dec. 11, 1892, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers, 18.

-
- ³⁸ H. N. Hall, "The Art of the Pullman Porter," *The American Mercury* 23, no. 91 (July 1931), 332.
- ³⁹ Santino, *Miles of Smiles, Years of Struggle*, 74.
- ⁴⁰ Ian Ayres, Fredrick E. Vars, and Nasser Zakariya, "To Insure Prejudice: Racial Disparities in Taxicab Tipping," *Yale Law Journal* 114, no. 7 (May 2005): 1621.
- ⁴¹ "Uncle Sam's Scale of Tips," *Cleveland Gazette*, February 1, 1913, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ⁴² "Tipping," *Winston-Salem Journal*, Feb. 13, 1907, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers, 4.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*; "Wolfe City Sun: Representative Thomas of Fannin County has introduced a bill making it unlawful to tip Pullman car porters, waiters, etc.," *Dallas Morning News*, February 12, 1907, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ⁴⁴ "Tipping the Porter," *Morning Star*, January 24, 1911, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers, 4; "Negro Railway Help Will Back Johnson," *Trenton Evening Times*, March 6, 1910, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers; "Pests that Travelers Meet," *Savannah Tribune*, Mar. 16, 1912, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ⁴⁵ Virgil Orite Smock interview, in David D. Perata, *Those Pullman Blues: An Oral History of the African American Railroad Attendant*. (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996), 25; Santino, *Miles of Smiles, Years of Struggle*, 71.
- ⁴⁶ "Graft of the Porter Abroad in the Land," *Macon Telegraph*, Oct. 25, 1911, Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- ⁴⁷ "Wolfe City Sun."
- ⁴⁸ *The Pullman Porter*, 5; 12.

Bibliography

- Arnesen, Eric. *Brotherhoods of Color: Black Railroad Workers and the Struggle for Equality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Atlantic Coast Line: Vestibuled Train to Florida*. New York: Press of Fleming, Brewster & Alley, 1887. University of Florida, George A. Smathers Libraries.
- Ayres, Ian, Fredrick E. Vars, and Nasser Zakariya. "To Insure Prejudice: Racial Disparities in Taxicab Tipping." *Yale Law Journal* 114, no. 7, May 2005, 1613-1674.
- Bates, Beth Tompkins. *Pullman Porters and the Rise of Protest Politics in Black America, 1925-1945*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Billings Daily Gazette*. "Your Porter's Pay." Nov. 1, 1913. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- Boston Journal*. "Plump Pullman Porter Pleads Poverty." Dec. 27, 1903. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. "Roar on the Other Side of Silence: Black Resistance and White Violence in the American South, 1880-1940." In *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching in the South*, edited by W. Fitzhugh Brundage, 271-291. University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Cleveland Gazette*. "Uncle Sam's Scale of Tips." February 1, 1913. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.
- Dallas Morning News*. "Wolfe City Sun: Representative Thomas of Fannin County has introduced a bill making it unlawful to tip Pullman car porters, waiters, etc." February 12, 1907. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

Final Report and Testimony Submitted to Congress by the Commission on Industrial Relations,

vol. 10 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1916), 64th Congress, 1st session. Senate document no. 415.

Forbes, B. C. "Should Tips Be Abolished and Higher Wages Paid? Service Important Factor."

Chicago Herald-Examiner, August 1, 1928. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

Hall, H. N. "The Art of the Pullman Porter." *The American Mercury* 23, no. 91, July 1931.

Macon Telegraph. "Graft of the Porter Abroad in the Land." Oct. 25, 1911. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

Morning Star. "Tipping the Porter." January 24, 1911. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

Oregonian. "Portland to Paris: Experiences of a Traveler." Dec. 11, 1892. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

Outlook. "Tips vs. Wages for Pullman Porters." May 19, 1915. Proquest.

Plaindealer. "Green Not Lynched, but Only Whipped." June 6, 1913. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

The Pullman Porter. New York: Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, 1926. Newberry Library, Pullman Company Archives.

Randolph, A. Philip. A. Philip. Randolph to M. P. Webster, May 5, 1926. *Records of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters*, Chicago Historical Society and Newberry Library, Series A-1, Reel 1.

Santino, Jack. *Miles of Smiles, Years of Struggle: Stories of Black Pullman Porters*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989.

Savannah Tribune. "Pests that Travelers Meet." Mar. 16, 1912. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

Schechter, Patricia A. "Unsettled Business: Ida B. Wells against Lynching, or, How Antilynching Got Its Gender." In *Under Sentence of Death: Lynching in the South*, edited by W. Fitzhugh Brundage, 292-317. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Smock, George Henry. Interviewed by David D. Perata in *Those Pullman Blues: An Oral History of the African American Railroad Attendant*, 1-19. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996.

Smock, Virgil Orite. Interviewed by David D. Perata in *Those Pullman Blues: An Oral History of the African American Railroad Attendant*, 21-39. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1996.

Speed, John Gilmer. "Tips and Commissions." *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* 69, no. 414, 1902.

Trenton Evening Times. "Negro Railway Help Will Back Johnson." March 6, 1910. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.

What the Pullman Company Offers to Travelers. Chicago: The Pullman Company, 1930. Newberry Library, Pullman Company Archives.

Winston-Salem Journal. "Tipping." Feb. 13, 1907. Readex: America's Historical Newspapers.