Liberty University

Gridiron Reconstruction:
The Struggle for the Soul of the Post-Civil War South as Embodied in the UGA vs Georgia Tech Rivalry

A Dissertation Submitted to

the Faculty of the School of History

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History

by

Wendi Pollard

Huntsville, Alabama

April 2023

Gridiron Reconstruction:

The Struggle for the Soul of the Post-Civil War South as Embodied in the UGA vs Georgia Tech Rivalry

by Wendi Pollard

A Dissertation Submitted to

the Faculty of the School of History

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2023

APPROVED BY:

Vance Kincade, Ph.D., Committee Chair

Samuel Smith, Ph.D., Committee Member

David Crum, Ph.D., Committee Member

Abstract

The conflict between the Old South and New South has been examined through multiple historical lenses: political, social, racial, and economic. While it has also been analyzed in cultural terms, a study of how a classic southern rivalry between the University of Georgia and the Georgia Institute of Technology reflects the strife which the South faced in its quest for a new identity - one that was acceptable to the world and a signal that the region was wanting to move on from its past. The University of Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry embodied the struggle that the South was facing. The University of Georgia, the epitome of Old South charm and grace, was immediately challenged after the Civil War by the creation of the Georgia Institute of Technology, the New South's answer to industrialization, engineering, and technology. As it was unlike any southern school that existed, Georgia Tech threatened the South's way of life, traditions, and identity.Particularly on the football field, the ebb and flow of the Old South vs. New South struggle was evident. The intense 150 year football rivalry reflects what was occurring culturally, politically, and economically in the South as the region attempted to determine its identity moving forward. By the end of the twentieth century, the dominance of the University of Georgia in this classic rivalry mirrors the South's chosen character, one that retains both classical elements of its past while incorporating the modern innovations that will make it a leader on the twenty-first century world stage.

To Scott, Ryan, and Katie

Contents

Introduction

In the American South, there are not many things more important than college football. Almost a religion in this region of the country, the intense rivalries between neighboring universities are a cultural experience, full of traditions and superstitions. The larger southern schools are defined by their programs, and financial resources seem endless for those that are successful. These rivalries, many lasting for over a century, not only represent the history of the area but can also symbolize the conflicts, struggles, and growth which have contributed to the identify of the area. One such rivalry exists between the University of Georgia (Georgia or UGA) and the Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech or Tech). While not an in-conference rivalry now, they have shared a conference in the past and have been tenacious opponents since 1893. Located a mere 70 miles apart, the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech have clashed repeatedly on the football field with both teams claiming undeniable successes over the other, such as UGA leading the series 70-41-5 but Georgia Tech holding the longest win streak of eight games. However, this rivalry means more than just a classic showdown over football. Beginning during the Reconstruction era, moving through the development of the New South, and embodying the present-day international status of Atlanta specifically yet also an identity that has been able to compromise old and new, the Georgia/Georgia Tech antagonism illustrates the transition of the South from the antebellum era to one of modernity and influence. These two universities represent the conflict which took place in the South during its century long transformation, both representing a critical part of southern culture and how it has been forced to compromise in order to create the New South.

While many college rivalries are based in a heritage that is unique to the area, they typically cannot be described as actually mirroring the social and political circumstances which have been going on around them. However, the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry, beginning at a time when the South was being forced out of its traditional posture into one that was more modern and progressive, ultimately ended up representing the conflicts, politics, and changing values that occurred during the twentieth century. The University of Georgia is located in Athens, Georgia, a small college town that still contains many remnants of the Old South in its architecture and landmarks and is reminiscent of an era when life was slower and times were simpler. Tradition is of utmost important at the university, from ringing the chapel bell to calling the Dawgs, and the magnolia trees and historic homes make one feel as if he is stepping back in time. The university symbolizes the way that the South used to be and the culture that many southerners want to continue. Georgia Tech, located in downtown Atlanta, contrasts with Georgia in almost every way. A university focused on science, technology, and engineering - and often referred to as the M.I.T. of the South - Georgia Tech is the South's contribution to the country in regards to technological education. Established in an ever-changing urban setting and under the auspice of the New South directives, this university has been and continues to be an important force in the development of modern technology. A school that has three times the number of international students as its closest rival,[1] Georgia Tech embodies the changes which the South was forced to make in order to emerge from its sheltered past. While it also has its traditions, they are not as deeply rooted in southern culture as Georgia's are; they are newer and more inclined to appeal to a S.T.E.M. focused student body. Even their beginnings, separated by one

---

[1] Georgia Institute of Technology - Main Campus International Student Report. collegefactual.com, accessed July 9, 2022. "International." University of Georgia Undergraduate Admissions. admissions.uga.edu, accessed July 9, 2022.

hundred years, contribute to how they approach their surroundings and understand progress. The University of Georgia, established in 1785, grew up with the antebellum south and became deeply rooted in the culture that surrounded it; Georgia Tech, opening in 1885, was created as part of Reconstruction plans intended to contribute to an industrial economy in the South following the Civil War. The eras into which they were introduced are still reflected in the traditions and values of the institutions; however, these differences - and how they interact - also mirror what has occurred over the past century and a half in the South as a whole. These two universities have been at odds since the late nineteenth century, and their rivalry has been a classic part of Georgia culture.

After the Civil War, the South was faced with a choice - begin the process of modernizing to become more fully integrated with the United States as a whole or face the prospect of losing all facets of its former identity by force. The "New South," as it was dubbed during Reconstruction, called for the rejection of the economy and traditions of the Old South, especially in regards to the slavery-based plantation system. While it would take southerners over a century to alter many of its long held practices, and even today change is taking place begrudgingly in some parts of the region, the process did begin, albeit slowly. Using the Industrial Revolution as a model, the plan was for the South to start shifting from its predominantly agrarian society into one that was forward-thinking, economically sound, and able to contribute to the country's future. While there were many issues that needed to be addressed in order for this to happen, such as racial harmony and sectional reconciliation, the focus on economic rejuvenation was initially of utmost importance. To accomplish this, however, a change would be required in all aspects of the antebellum south. Although the starting point was

the economy, once this component began to succeed, it would affect other areas of society, including race relations, social hierarchy, and career opportunities. During the 20th century, all of these elements of society would be modified in some way, ultimately resulting in a South, specifically Atlanta, that would become influential on the international stage. When considering Atlanta as the model for how the South would change after the Civil War, it is interesting to note that it is this city in which Georgia Tech is located and to which the University of Georgia is in close proximity, clearly juxtaposing how the two universities reacted to the changing South and how each of them is still able to hold onto their own identities today. The southern city which has unarguably changed the most from the days when it was burned by Sherman, Atlanta is also a city that's history - mirroring the conflicts, struggles, and growth of the South as a whole - can be better understood by the rivalry between Georgia and Georgia Tech. Although Atlanta is clearly the leading southern city, its characteristics are not necessarily indicative of the identity of the rest of the South, drawing into question as to whether or not Georgia Tech's ambition to answer the New South call has truly succeeded in changing the South's reputation. On the other hand, UGA seems to be growing stronger as a university, even considered competitive academically with other top rated universities in the nation. Two colleges, both having a different relationship with the region in which they are located, depict the different identities of the South - the old and the new, the traditional and the modern, the agrarian and the industrial, the past and the future.

While the birth of the New South is a popular topic for historical consideration, analyzing it based on an intense college rivalry is both unique but also as valid as other cultural and political considerations, especially considering the importance of football to the region. In

looking at how each university symbolizes a different identity of the South, the conflict, animosity, and tenacity with which they approach their rivalry mirrors the different conflicts which have materialized in the rebirth of this area of the United States, and, in the end, ultimately determining a new identity in typifying the modern southerner. Even today these universities are polar opposites - one depicting the South's attempt to reconcile its past with its future and wanting to stay true to the traditions and values to which many southerners still proudly cling while the other understands the influential role it can play moving forward. Both are still strong, successful universities - although in very different areas - begging the question as to whether or not the two identities can coexist in this new era? Or will one ultimately have to prevail, relegating the past to a memory that can never be recovered? An intense rivalry for most of the twentieth century, it is interesting to note that, since the turn of the twenty-first century, the hostility is not as intense as it used to be and the football games not as even - suggesting that either, symbolically, one of them has prevailed in determining the future of the South or that the other has successfully been able to modernize while still retaining its traditional status. Does this change in the magnitude of the rivalry indicate that a compromise has been reached, or has there been a victor? Looking at these questions in relation to Atlanta, there is a clear answer. Demonstrated in part by Georgia Tech, the city has succeeded in redefining itself in terms of the modern world, with little identification with the old South. It has chosen to take its place on the international stage, relegating the past to where many feel it belongs. However, when considered in regards to the South as a whole, Georgia could be considered the best representation of the region's progress during the past century, showing how continuity of traditional beliefs has been able to blend with the features required to attain modernity. Neither identity has been completely

negated; in fact, both universities represent the complex nature of the South, always at odds with themselves and each other.

In order to establish how each of these schools identity with a different southern identity, a sweeping range of historiography must be considered. While a more comprehensive examination of the primary sources depicting how the South developed will be discussed in chapter 1 (and then later how it can be viewed through athletic rivalry), laying the groundwork for the analogy is essential in depicting how the South has viewed itself over the past century. Historiography concerning the New South is extensive and diverse, starting with Reconstruction, moving towards Civil Rights, and then examining the new role of the South in a global world. The interpretations work together in order to prove a more comprehensive picture of what has occurred over the past century and a half, and events can be analyzed culturally as well as politically and racially. Reconstruction historiography is the most extensive, encompassing all of the South's history since the Civil War, not just the last few decades of the nineteenth century. Historians of the New South accurately view these events as the beginning of the region's new identity, one event leading to another. Reconstruction historiography initially hailed the Redeemers as heroes, then was revised to view them as villains, and now synthesizes the views to create a more comprehensive picture of what has taken place in the South's transformation. The earliest Reconstruction analysis focused on the corruption and sordidness of politicians, both in the North and South, immediately following the Civil War. Examining the actions of the southern Redeemers, William A. Dunning, creator of the influential Dunning School, argued that the radical Republicans, as corrupt as the scalawags and carpetbaggers, exploited those in need of help and was ineffective in fixing the problems following the Civil War and causing additional

chaos instead.[2] British historian Adam Fairclough, in explaining this original historiography, summarizes the Dunning School's analysis as an argument where

> [t]he sympathies of the "Dunningite" historians lay with the white Southerners who resisted Congressional Reconstruction: whites who, organizing under the banner of the Conservative or Democratic Party, used legal opposition and extralegal violence to oust the Republicans from state power . . . From start to finish, they argued, Congressional Reconstruction - often dubbed "Radical reconstruction" - lacked political wisdom and legitimacy."[3]

Eric Foner, one of the most influential contemporary historians of the era, continued Fairclough's assessment and argued that

> [t]he traditional or Dunning School of Reconstruction was not just an interpretation of history. It was part of the edifice of the Jim Crow System. It was an explanation for and justification of taking the right to vote away from black people on the grounds that they completely abused it during ReconstructionIt was a justification for the white South resisting outside efforts in changing race relations because of the worry of having another Reconstruction.[4]

In his book *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln,* Claude Bowers, greatly influenced by the Dunning School, took this idea even further and asserted that a mutually beneficial social readjustment should have been constructed by the white masters and their former slaves, not outside powers; he then blamed the Radical Republicans for this failure in destroying the peace that should have occurred naturally.[5]

---

[2] Mark L. Bradley, *Bluecoats and Tar Heels: Soldiers and Civilians in Reconstruction North Carolina* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2009), 268.

[3] Adam Fairclough, "Was the Grant of Black Suffrage a Political Error? Reconsidering the Views of John W. Burgess, William A. Dunning, and Eric Foner on Congressional Reconstruction," *Journal of The Historical Society* (June 2012): 155.

[4] Mike Konczal, "How Radical Change Occurs: An Interview with Historian Eric Foner," *The Nation* (February 3, 2015).

[5] Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln* (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1929), 198.

During the 1920s and 1930s, Charles Beard and Howard Beale presented the first Revisionist view of Reconstruction, examining the era through an economic lens and blaming the lack of industrialization and other economic problems as more detrimental to the South than the immorality of slavery.[6] Advocating a more Marxist approach in their historiography, they asserted that it was northern capitalists, thwarting the attempts of southern whites in their attempts to stabilize their economy, who were the true villains of Reconstruction. However, this interpretation of the economic issues and industrialists fell apart when challenged by historians Robert P. Sharkey and Stanley Cohen in the 1950s as they were able to explain that there was no conspiracy attempting to manipulate the American economic system. C. Vann Woodward is the most influential of the Reconstruction revisionist historians, challenging the traditional view of the era's events. Arguably the most influential piece of post Civil War southern history was presented by Woodward in his analysis entitled *Origins of the New South*. Before the publishing of this book, most of the historiography concerning the South focused on either the economic or racial issues resulting from the Civil War and Reconstruction. However, while Woodward does address these concerns, he also turns the attention to cultural aspects in the region that were changing - and these cultural aspects are key to understanding how a seemingly insignificant football rivalry can reflect what is happening in an entire region. Examining the status of the South during the mid-20th century, Woodward argued that all markers of southern distinctiveness -"the one-horse farmer, one-crop agriculture, one-party politics, the sharecropper, the poll tax, the white primary, the Jim Crow car, the lynching bee"—had been either destroyed or were "on

---

[6] Charles W. Ramsdell, "The Changing Interpretation of the Civil War," *Journal of Southern History* 3, no. 1 (1937): 16.

their way towards vanishing."[7] Woodward was the first to focus on the "divided mind," which was his "interpretation of the revolution in southern values, the sense of inferiority felt by Southerners, [and the]romanticism"[8] that was being experienced by Southerners. In the article "The Search for Southern Identity," Woodward poses the question of whether or not there is any point for a Southern to identify himself as such, or is this identity just a comfortable habit when one is in the South but needs to be discarded when leaving the bastion of his upbringing.[9] This confusion, then, could lend itself to conflict between two universities, both schools hoping to provide the answer to Woodward's question. Addressing the cultural issues of the South demonstrated more fully the conflicts which the region was facing in order to leave its past behind, and Woodward's fresh way of addressing the South's history allows cultural constructs - such as college football - to contribute to the analysis of how the region has changed.

Entering the contemporary era, Numan V. Bartley and Dan T. Carter have responded to Woodward's arguments, acknowledging that even if they aren't quite accurate, they have contributed to developing new avenues of thought when analyzing the New South. James C. Cobb, in his article "Beyond Planters and Industrialists: A New Perspective on the New South," asserts that "region wide generalizations concerning the South is one of both continuity and change, with each of these powerful forces pulling in different directions."[10] American historian

---

[7] Sheldon Hackney, "Origins of the New South in Retrospect," *The Journal of Southern History* 38, no. 2 (1972): 216.

[8] Dewey W. Grantham, "Southern Historiography and a History of the South," *American Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1953): 267.

[9] C. Vann Woodward, "The Search for Southern Identity," *The Virginia Quarterly Review* 34, no. 3 (1958): 321.

[10] Nancy Smith Midgette, "What Students Need to Know about the New South," *OAH Magazine of History* 4, no. 1 (1989): 53.

Edward Ayers, in his book *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction,* explores every aspect of politics, the economy, and society of the New South in order to demonstrate a land of extraordinary contrasts attempting to move beyond its past. Gaines M. Foster suggests that, in attempting to resolve the idea of the New South with the suggestion that many southerners are trying to maintain elements of the Old South, it is not that modern southerners are unreconciled and vengeful in moving into the present, but that in continuing elements of their heritage they are actually easing their transition from the past into the reality of the future. He contends that most southerners are too realistic to let old memories interfere with the rebuilding of their society; they just want to preserve the traditions that made them "southern."[11] So moving through the historiography of Reconstruction into the development of a New South, it is clear that what began as simply a rebuilding of the economic structure of the former Confederate states (symbolized by Georgia Tech) became a challenge, and fundamentally a conflict, to redefine the entire region (with which UGA struggled).

The fight as to which cultural traditions should remain also played an important role in the development of the New South - customs such as southern hospitality, Friday night football, church revivals, debutante balls, shrimp and grits, and sweet tea, while innocuous, are important in allowing southerners to preserve elements of their past that they feel make them unique. The traditional southern university was also an important part of southern culture, and none exemplified that more than the University of Georgia. Thomas Dyer, in his look at the University of Georgia as the school celebrated its bicentennial, examines the importance of the university to

---

[11] Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

the development of higher education in the South but also discusses how this evolution faced many stressful turning points which would bring the old nature of the school into conflict with the changes that were taking place only seventy miles away. In *The University of Georgia: Under Sixteen Administrations 1785-1955*, Robert Preston Brooks provides a look at sixteen different Georgia administrations from the school's inception through 1955, highlighting - up until that point - some of the pivotal moments that contributed to the its influence in the South. And Carrol Dadisman compiled excerpts from the UGA student newspaper, *The Red and Black,* in order to explain how important southern culture was - and still is - to the university's student body. Other sources also address the University of Georgia in the context of old meeting new and how the school was able to realize a compromise that mirrors how so many southerners want to be seen.

Race relations, also a focus early on, became even more important in the South's struggle to create a new identity as many social practices were based on race. While many southerners recognized the need to move away from the chivalrous, yet racist, antebellum period, there was also a large number who wanted to maintain at least some semblance of the South's glory days, arguing that their culture should not be completely eradicated, that some parts were unique to the region and defined who they are as a people. This hearkening to the past existed well into the twenty-first century when the Interfraternity Council and UGA Panhellenic Council finally banned the practice of dressing in antebellum costumes for annual parades; in particular, this affected the Kappa Alpha Fraternity's Old South Week and Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity's Magnolia Parade. While many students understood the decision, they viewed these events as merely celebrating southern tradition, not a political statement.[12] Kappa Alpha, in particular, was

---

[12] "Changes to UGA's 'Old South Tradition," Grady Newsource (March 26, 2015), accessed January 21, 2023.

remiss to give up their social events as the fraternity claimed Confederate General Robert E. Lee as their "spiritual founder" and was arguably the most "southern" in how it approached its roots.[13] Because of this, there was constant conflict at the University of Georgia on how the past and the present could be reconciled and which elements could be assimilated into an acceptable new version of the South.

On the other hand, Georgia Tech did not have this problem. They were a completely new entity that represented exactly what the New South advocates desired for the South moving past the Civil War and antebellum era. However, much of what they did was the catalyst for what the University of Georgia would be required to do during the twentieth century in order to remain relevant and respected. Their primary struggle would be the traditional South actually accepting their presence in Atlanta. The city itself has always embraced the Institute, which is fitting as the two entities essential "grew up" together, yet - like the school - this modern Atlanta has never been characterized as a southern city. While many wanted to see the region depend on itself for their necessary progress, the school's mere existence negated all that the traditional South stood for, so it stood at odds with most of the region. So both schools, working towards the same goal of southern preeminence, would view the other as a threat.

This uncertainty manifested itself in the friction between old and new - a region that, primarily, desired to maintain a sense of continuity in its character and did not want to negate the importance of the past in reaching a new identity. This desire for continuity is realized throughout most of the South, outside of the larger cities that have succeeded in becoming

---

[13] Kappa Alpha Order, "The Mission of Kappa Alpha Order," archived from the original on September 28, 2007, accessed October 24, 2022.

influential on the world stage but are not as pervasive as in other parts of the country. This inclination is also obvious in the ordinary southerner seeking to incorporate traditional values with elements of their heritage, desiring to remain "southern," even while being willing to acclimate to a more progressive mindset. A key reason that the conflict exists, however, is because a southern city *does* exist which encompasses all of the modernity that the rest of the country, especially the Northeast, has desired for the region to assume. The history of Atlanta is a key element of this analysis as its environment provides a distinct contrast to how much of the rest of the South lives. Georgia's capital city has quickly become the South's contemporary offering to the global stage, and its transformation since the Civil War is likely what the Redeemers and New South advocates envisioned for the South. Atlanta's contribution to the worlds of finance, healthcare and biomedicine, technology, business, and media and communications has made the city influential both nationally and internationally. It was a pivotal location during the Civil Rights movement and went through the growing pains of reimagining itself into the leading-edge city that it is today. It also went through the struggle of deciding how much of its traditional southern culture could exist in this new era. While remnants of its southern glory can still be found, they have often been renovated into living museums or areas protected as historic landmarks - often to the point of being exaggerated and solely meant for tourists. Other areas of the South may still be currently in the struggle between the past and present, but Atlanta has arguably completed the trial and has entered the present-day successfully, and their connection with Georgia Tech reinforces the university's role in the region.

The historiography surrounding this transformation focuses both on individuals,

businesses, and education. Henry Grady is considered one of the principle architects of the New South and invigorated progressive thought about the South's future. E. Culpepper Clark focuses on his contributions, both good and bad, in *The Birth of a New South: Sherman, Grady, and the Making of Atlanta*. Charles Garofalo and Harold Davis also provide detailed information about Grady's importance in Atlanta's initial introduction to industrialization, showing how his involvement set Atlanta on the path to modernization. The relocation of businesses to Atlanta also provided a boon to its economy. Companies such as Coca-Cola, Delta, UPS, and the Home Depot have bolstered the city's global presence and provided the economic stability of which Grady dreamed. Currently claiming the 10th largest economy in the United States and 20th largest in the world,[14] Atlanta's financial structure is based on a diverse portfolio of industries, demonstrating how it has become attractive to all businesses. In *Old South/New South*, Gavin Wright studies the economy of the Old South, including Atlanta, and considers why it took so long for a thriving order to be established. Other historians examine specific industries that came to Atlanta and how the city was affected by them.[15] Over a span of just a few decades, Atlanta went from a city unable to find its identity, mired in the past, to becoming a center for international business. Improved educational opportunities were also important to Atlanta's rebirth, and while several universities call the city home, Georgia Tech provided the foundation for this goal of higher learning. Just as the University of Georgia symbolizes a people at a

---

[14] "Atlanta: Economy- Major Industries and Commercial Activity," City-data.com, accessed July 16, 2022.

[15] See Harvey K. Newman's "Atlanta's Hospitality Businesses in the New South Era, 1880-1900;" Howard Preston's "The Automobile Business in Atlanta, 1909-1920: A Symbol of 'New South' Prosperity;" Harold Martin's *Atlanta and Environs: A Chronicle of its People and Events, 1940s-1970s*; Drew Whitelegg's "From Smiles to Miles: Delta Air Line Flight Attendants and Southern Hospitality;" and F.N. Boney's "First Atlanta and Then the World: A Century of Coca-Cola."

crossroads of history and future, the importance of Georgia Tech to the growth of Atlanta during the 20th century cannot be understated, and its impact has often been studied over the years. Former Georgia Tech president M.L. Brittain provides a good overview of the school's founding in his book *The Story of Georgia Tech*, and Robert McMath, in *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985*, delves into how the focus of the school directly related to the growth of the city. In *The Technological University Reimagined: Georgia Institute of Technology,* Wayne G. Clough approaches the subject as to how the university was first a unique experiment as a technological university, but then was also uncommon because it was one of the first of its kind in the South. While the South as a whole has changed drastically since the Reconstruction era, Atlanta remains an anomaly of southern cities as it is one of the few areas that embraced the call to modernize. Because of this, its historiography is unique in the study of the South as it encompasses all that the New South was meant to be, and the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry reflects the struggle that the progress of the state of Georgia's capital city with the rest of the region.

The New South was created through economic, political, and social reconstructions; however, one cultural aspect that could not be overlooked was the increasing popularity of college football and the rivalries it produced. This focus may not seem as relevant as many of the other considerations examined in the South's transformation; however, it is a theme that has come to epitomize many of the facets which make the region distinct. While many aspects of the South's growth seemed negative and troublesome, the evolution of this popular pastime grew to the point that it could almost be described as a religion and demonstrates how important traditions, family, and valor still are to the region. Families hold season tickets for decades, die

hard fans avoid getting married on Saturdays in the Fall, and the tradition of tailgating is almost as important as the game itself. The intensity of these rivals lasts generations, as many competitions could even be likened to a campaign with a warrior athlete going to battle with a hated foe. Some of these rivalries, however, are often indicators of the changes that have been going on around them, and one such rivalry is between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech. Two out-of-conference schools, UGA and Georgia Tech's intense rivalry on the football field lasted for over a century. It has been hard fought, with impressive victories on both sides. Like a war, the successfulness of the campaigns have vacillated between the two schools for decades, with neither truly able to proclaim victory during the most contentious period, even though the turn of the twenty-first century has begun to indicate a change in momentum. The historiography concerning these two schools has not changed much; one is seen as a stronghold of southern traditions and values while the other is seen as progressive and groundbreaking. The heated and colorful feud even has its own official title: Clean, Old-Fashioned Hate. Extremely different in all aspects of the setting, traditions, course offerings, and student culture, these two universities each clearly identify with a southern identity at odds with the other during the twentieth century.

The University of Georgia is a classic southern school, one that was formed in 1785 and is one of the oldest universities in the country. It exudes southern charm, and there are not many schools - even southern ones - which could surpass UGA in its faithfulness to traditions and the past. Long a favorite of southerners, the University of Georgia has slowly become more modern in many ways, but that has not detracted from the reputation is has strived to maintain. While many historians have focused on the university's struggles with integration and racism, there are

just as many publications on its culture. In "'The Rising Hope of Our Land': University of Georgia Students Over Two Centuries," retired UGA professor and historian F.N. Boney paints a picture of the university's students and how they have changed over the years, appreciating the changes that were taking place but also still adhering to the traditions which have always characterized the school. Acknowledging that the school has become a modern mega university, Boney points to the students as the true driving force as to how the school has both remained the same but has also moved into the twenty first century.[16] E. Merton Coulter discusses an 1871 speech given by alum Benjamin H. Hill who acknowledged the past of the university, but also encouraged it to move into the future. This challenge resulted in a myriad of reactions, a clear example of the conflict between old and new that would exist at the college for the next century,[17] and local historian Cynthia Jennings examines the complexity of the university's artifacts in demonstrating how important the past is to the school.[18] In interviewing nine students as to how they view the key artifacts characterizing UGA's southern identity, Jennings also was able to show how these pieces have changed in importance as social and political events have affected the campus. The University of Georgia's past plays an important role even today in the culture of the student body and how its traditions are preserved. Even its football team has elements of its past, steeped in the values and culture of now departed age. While the school has changed drastically since the mid-twentieth century, it is not ashamed to hold onto elements of a

---

[16] F.N. Boney, "'The Rising Hope of Our Land': University of Georgia Students Over Two Centuries," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 74, no. 1 (1990): 117.

[17] Coulter, E. Merton, "The New South: Benjamin H. Hill's Speech Before the Alumni of the University of Georgia, 1871," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (1973): 189.

[18] Cynthia L. Jennings, "Pride and Prejudice: A Narrative Study on the Complexity of the Artifacts that Represent the University of Georgia," Order No. 28774882, University of Georgia, 2021.

bygone era.

Georgia Tech, on the other hand, was founded in affiliation with the plan for a New South. It was not rooted in the past but was designed for the future. Because of this intended purpose, the history surrounding this university is typically positive and seen as a valuable addition to the war-torn South. It has been viewed as an entrepreneur, a reengineering of higher education, and the beginning of a new southern creed.[19] In *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985* historian Robert McMath leads a discussion as to its development from a small trade school to the international university that it is today, showing how its evolution mirrors what was happening in Atlanta, and former Georgia Tech president Wayne Clough demonstrates how the Georgia Tech revolutionized the technological university in *The Technological University Reimagined: Georgia Institute of Technology, 1994-2008*. In most histories of Atlanta, and the New South in general, Georgia Tech is given significant credit in contributing to the growth of the region, partly because its foundation was not set in the antebellum south and was, thus, more modern initially, but also because of the type of university that it is. Technology was a northern ideal, not a southern one, and Georgia Tech's engineering focus allowed it to be desired by northern and international students in addition to introducing the subject to the South. While it did immediately contribute to the objectives of the New South, it was not, however, a representation of what the South was in traditions and culture. However, while other aspects of modernity have been accepted gradually, the recognition by southerners of Georgia Tech as a

---

[19] See David Perry, Scott Levitan, Andre Bertrand, Carl Patton, Dawn Packnett, and Lawrence Kelley's "The University as 'Entrepreneur': Georgia Institute of Technology; Ryan McDonald's "Reengineering Global Higher Education: American Polytechnics, Transnationalization, and Cultural Configuration;" and James Brittain and Robert McMath's "Engineers and the New South Creed: The Formation and Early Development of Georgia Tech."

southern university has still not taken place and probably never will be (the foundation of its rivalry with Georgia). It is a northern school founded in the South and a fundamental challenge to the southern way of life.

Two very different schools, two very different cultures, and the conflict between them as football rivals began within a decade of Georgia Tech being established. Like many college football rivalries, sports historians have enjoyed analyzing the hostility, explaining why it started and how it has played out over the decades. Author Bill Cromartie, in his book *Clean Old-Fashioned Hate: Georgia Vs. Georgia Tech*, begins with the first game and tells the story of the controversies, heroism, and championships for the next hundred years. The title of his book was even adopted on the social media hate pages and in the description of the rivalry. Sports historian John Chandler Griffin gives a play by play description of the annual brawl in *Georgia vs. Georgia Tech: Gridiron Grudge since 1893*, and multiple sports articles, biographies, and analyses have been written about the hostility between these two universities. What has not been examined, however, is how this rivalry has mirrored what was occurring in the South during the 1900s - how the old was in conflict with the new, and traditions of the past were being forced to change under the mantle of progress. While Georgia Tech appeared to be prepared for the future from the beginning, it still faced animosity from Georgia, representing much of the traditional south, and it was because of the resentment of Tech's symbolic change that the rivalry was born.

In examining this topic, there is clearly a cultural component that must be explored. Understanding the traditions and values of the Old South and then the different shifts that occurred over the next century assists in the appreciation of a culture that has changed drastically from a primarily agrarian society to one that is now influential on the international stage. Yet, at

the same time, an example of southern modernity does exist in the rise of Atlanta's prominence. Initially, a broad overview of the New South phenomenon will be examined in order to understand the changes that the South experienced during the twentieth century. Identifying the initial goals, the failures, and then the ultimate success of the region will lead into a look at how southerners are reconciling the way things were with how they need to be. This argument clearly progresses through different stages which will be delineated in chapters leading to the final analysis. It is first important to examine what is meant by the evolution of the "Old" to the "New," and this aspect is critical to the argument as the South's shift, as a whole, from the past to the future is clearly represented by the University of Georgia while the growth of Atlanta, individually, is mirrored by the establishment of Georgia Tech. This chapter will also include a detailed look at Atlanta, the international gem of the region that is entirely unique from the rest of the region. Atlanta is a contrast of cultures - one that advanced technologically while others tried to hold onto elements of its past. It is now considered one of the most influential American cities, yet its evolution to this point consisted of multiple cultural clashes which had to be overcome, and Georgia Tech experienced all that the city experienced. Focusing on the different political and racial factors which influenced the need for a New South will also reveal the cultural changes that needed to take place in order for the region transition successfully. The idea of compromise will be introduced based on the idea of continuity in the South's development. How does Atlanta differ from the rest of the South in the latter's attempt to remain unique and distinct while still being progressive? Determining if one approach or the other is most successful will be determined by the analysis of the college rivalry.

The next two chapters will focus on the universities specifically and will identify how the individual universities have functioned in the South during the twentieth century. Both Georgia and Georgia Tech will be examined as to its history, traditions, and student culture, with a special emphasis on how the school represents a certain aspect of southern identity. This analysis will then allow, in a later chapter, the juxtaposition of the two universities in how their rivalry represented the southern conflicts of the twentieth century. Each one is symbolic of a different reaction to modernization - one, the resistance that had to be overcome in order to for southerners to feel comfortable in a more progressive world; the other, the growth of a metropolitan powerhouse that can interact with the international community. For each university, its history, role in the South, representation of its corresponding community, and the steps in took to contribute to the idea of a New South will be examined in order to determine how each is a representation of one aspect of the South's current status. The University of Georgia remains a quintessential example of a traditional southern college, yet it has also been forced into making changes that could have changed the environment of the school altogether. However, the pace at which the university encountered these challenges allowed for a sense of continuity which was important to southerners in maintaining their sense of distinction and uniqueness. Yes, they conceded characteristics of the Old South which other parts of the country considered archaic, but they were also able to assimilate the necessary changes into the traditions they celebrated because of its reluctance and slow acquiescence. While this may be a negative in many people's eyes, it cannot be denied that UGA represents the South as a whole, and some areas - even today - are still learning to make these changes. Georgia Tech, on the other hand, represents all of the hopes and dreams of the early New South advocates - its urban location, its admission of

international and minority students earlier than most other southern universities, and its focus on technology, science, and math - all courses of study which were not consistent with the traditional Old South. Primary sources such as reports, interviews, sport statistics, and photographs will be instrumental in determining the history and rivalry of the universities. Archival material from both the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech will provide valuable insight into how they viewed themselves. Secondary sources such as books and scholarly journal articles will provide valuable information regarding the Old vs. New South in addition to information about UGA and Georgia Tech.

Following a look at the individual schools, the rivalry between the two can more accurately be seen in how they represent such conflicting ideals. The rivalry that existed between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech is an accurate depiction of the conflict which existed in the region for over a century. Even though the goals for the South were stated early by both northern Republicans and New South advocates, the transition was full of struggles, progress ebbing and flowing as the decades advanced. This fluctuation was mirrored in the rivalry between the two schools, both desiring to be the dominant university in the state of Georgia, for years not realizing that they were both able to reflect and contribute to important facets to the South's development. Beginning with where Georgia Tech was to be located, then progressing into debates over school funding, academic recognition, and potential students, the two universities have been at odds since the late nineteenth century. The fact that it transferred to being played out on the football field only deepens the southernness of this rivalry. From the beginning of the athletic rivalry, the events that surrounded the game of football reflected both the animosity between the two schools and the background behind it. The political decisions

which initially caused a sense of distrust between the universities immediately represents the conflict that is taking place on the field; the game record fluctuates depending on which school appears to be gaining traction in representing the South; and the social events surrounding the game reflect how either school views its reputation and role. The importance of college rivalries, specifically in the South, has many cultural implications which define this part of the country as unique. Football, filled with traditions and fierce competition, depicts a southerner's response to change as he is forced to relinquish certain assets of his heritage but also attempting to adhere to a sense of continuity - which will hopefully be manifested in a blend of the two.

The hostility of the universities, the fluctuation in advantage, and the results of one becoming dominant over the other all reflect important aspects of the American South, and the specific rivalry between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech will reflect how football can be symbolic of these attitudes and trials. They interacted, struggled, triumphed, and clashed for over a century, each achieving a state of preeminence which would oscillate, similar to what was occurring in their environment, and each decade bringing them closer to a resolution. By the twenty-first century, the rivalry had diminished except in the case of the diehard fans, and this waning seems to indicate that there has finally been a resolution in the culture clash of old vs. new. Because these two schools appear to represent the two identities of the South as a whole, it will be important to consider whether Atlanta, exemplified by Georgia Tech, truly represents the character of the South of the twenty-first century. While Atlanta is obviously on the same level as other cosmopolitan cities, does it reflect how the majority of the South lives and believes? If so, then the importance of Georgia Tech is clear and the need for it to prevail in this rivalry is critical. However, if there truly is a dual identity in the South, one of those who live in urban

areas and then those who still reside in smaller towns and rural areas, then perhaps Georgia reigns as the premier southern university - able to blend old and new is a successful manner. Or, perhaps it is not imperative that either university "win;" perhaps they can co-exist within their different domains, each answering the needs of a still ever-changing South.

Chapter 1

The Old South

In order to fully understand the clash between different cultural elements of the South, it is important to start at the beginning of this transformation process - a return to where the antebellum South was suddenly required to turn its back on everything that had made it unique and remake itself in ways that the rest of the country would approve. Recognizing that this was not the simple process that many early reformers hoped it would be, and certainly continuing into the late twentieth century, the South's development was always fraught with the tension between old and new. Following the Civil War, the South began a century long process of transforming itself into a modern, participatory faction of the country, one that was more in tune with the progress of other areas of the nation and would allow the region to be more competitive on the world stage. This transformation would go through various stages, ultimately achieving its most considerable step towards success during the three decades following World War II. Extensive historiography exists concerning the transition of the Old South to the New South, primarily focusing on three different eras: Reconstruction, the Progressive Era, and then the time period between 1945-1975. While the first two time periods demonstrated clear goals, objectives, and conflicts, the generation which would ultimately succeed in reconciling the South with the rest of the country - however that is defined - would be during a time of great political, social, and racial upheaval. It could be argued that it was during these three decades that the South was ultimately forced to make the changes that had first been identified immediately following the Civil War,

forcing them into a compliance that would allow them to finally gain international influence and status. However, when looking at this achievement, it is interesting to note that this realization can actually only completely be attributed to Atlanta, Georgia. It is in this city - the city which was forced to resurrect itself after being destroyed - where the goals of the early New South advocates were finally realized. C. Vann Woodward described the difficulty of this rebirth by confining the experience to the region: "For the South had undergone an experience that it could share with no other part of America - though it is shared by nearly all the peoples of Europe and Asia - the experience of military defeat, occupation, and reconstruction."[20] While many assumed that the transition would be an instinctive reaction to the decline of southern ideals, an obvious result of the war's outcome, a sense of isolation would shape the area for the next century - inflicting a glaring animosity between old and new which would shape the region, manifesting itself in many ways including a fierce collegiate rivalry.

Representing the Old South, the University of Georgia would initially embrace many of the South's former glory. The Georgia Institute of Technology, located in Atlanta, would be the innovative South, the one that the rest of the country both expected and demanded. Symbolic of the reconstruction which was going to be required for the South to modernize, the rebirth of Atlanta, and the establishment of Tech, is the prime example of the South turning its back on the traditions and values of the past to establish new ones more in line with how the rest of the country wanted them to behave. However, this does not mean that it naturally applied to the rest of the South; in fact, it didn't - even in many places today. So in analyzing the objectives of the

---

[20] C. Vann Woodward, "The Irony of Southern History," *The Journal of Southern History* 19, no. 1 (1953): 5.

New South and its difficulty in achieving these intentions, and how they were ultimately successful in reaching these goals at least in Atlanta, one must consider the ebb and flow of the decades - ones where concessions and compromise would eventually lead to a modernization of the South, albeit primarily in one isolated city. This consideration of Atlanta as different from the rest of the South is important because it signifies a conflict - a conflict in how southerners wanted their region to be viewed, how they planned to reach these goals, and how they perceived themselves. And while this conflict would be considered and analyzed by the rest of the country, it was extremely personal - personal because it was a region that was fighting to maintain its identity, its uniqueness, in a country that wanted them to become status quo; personal because it involved conflicting philosophies that each endeavored to use to dominate the eventual character of the region; personal because it pit family members against each other; and personal because it would encompass all aspects of southern politics and culture, including college football. It is important to follow the history of the South's movement towards modernization because, only then, can its internal conflict and eventual success be seen.

Its defeat following the Civil War caused many southerners to advocate for radical changes in the political, economic, and racial elements of the antebellum South. The need for these reversals was clear - the South's way of life was seemingly defeated and should be forced to change, viewed by the north as a region with outdated customs and values. And not only outdated, but conflicting with the ability of the South to move into the 20th century with the rest of the nation. The victorious North saw it as their mission to transform the former Confederate states into a region where progress would be in alignment with the goals of the North, not taking

into account that this region might not be open to these changes and would view their defeat differently. While the intentions of many of these campaigners, even those who were from the South, might have been well intentioned, their understanding of the region they were attempting to change was lacking. Traditions and beliefs were strong and deeply rooted in all elements of a southerner's life, not separated into compartmentalized spheres as many were in the North. In fact, the extent of these cultural values was greatly underestimated by the northerners, and their presence was actually supported by high profile southerners. In a personal account from Vermont carpetbagger Marshall Harvey Twitchell, he recounts:

> My duty was to inform both black and white of their changed relations from master and slave to employer and employee, giving them the additional information that it was the order of the government that old master and old slave should remain where they had been [and] work as usual in the harvesting of the crop, at which time I would fix the pay of the ex-slave in case he and his former master did not agree about the amount. I expected all to obey and should not hesitate to enforce obedience from both employer and employee.[21]

However, he quickly realized that "this act had made me very unpopular with the white people, who rightly looked upon it as a distinctly Northern idea."[22] Recent historiography suggests that a sense of continuity was able to persist as the renewal of the southern leadership was not as extensive as early historians suggested. In his article "Redeemers Reconsidered: Change and Continuity in the Democratic South, 1870-1900," James Tice Moore proposes that even though there were some new leaders found in high ranking roles, "these potentially innovative groups

---

[21] Marshall Harvey Twitchell, *Carpetbagger from Vermont: The Autobiography of Marshall Harvey Twitchell*, ed. Ted Tunnell (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1989), 162.

[22] Ibid.

proved either unable or unwilling to alter the entrenched patterns of southern government."[23] It is also clear that they initially had trouble successfully implementing the changes that were viewed as critical to the South's ability to move on from an antiquated past, whether intentionally or through ineffectual leadership. Because of this, progress would be slow for the next seventy years until national circumstances would require changes to be made.

There were still those who tried, though - most notably *Atlanta Constitution* editor Henry W. Grady. Grady believed that not only was change required, but that it was also the only way that the South would be able to realize any sense of national prominence and redemption. With many assuming that the industrial North assumed control of the Reconstruction process, Grady's intention was to initiate this change with southern leaders so that, in presenting his idea of the New South to restructure southern government so that it aligned more with the North, the removal of those who would attempt to maintain the status quo of the pre-Civil War southern government would be possible. There was also the expectation of reforming the economic focus from agrarian to industrial, thus achieving a stronger influence both nationally and internationally. These goals were lofty and well-intentioned, requiring a unity from all involved parties, yet their reality would not be achieved until a century later - proving how deeply rooted the cultural beliefs were engrained in the South, and the difficulty that would exist in reaching the compromises that were needed in order for southerns to be both willing to accept these changes but still be content that elements of their regional distinctions would be evident. These understandings would gain traction and then recede again as southerners would fight for their

---

[23] James Tice Moore, "Redeemers Reconsidered: Change and Continuity in the Democratic South, 1870–1900," *Journal of Southern History* 44, no. 3 (August 1978): 377.

unique character in an ever changing world, but eventually accepting that modernization would be essential in contributing to a progressive, industrial world. However, this conflict would define the century and the South's progression to a reconciled identity.

The concept of what southern progress would entail was ambiguous from the start. Would the focus be on simply making the South capable of contributing to the nation, or would it look to reach a level of unexpected excellence? Would progress be described in political, financial, or cultural terms? Or would progress simply imply being able to move past their racist, rebellious background? Regardless of the eventual answer to these questions, there was an underlying attitude that had to be overcome first - an attitude that was diametrically opposed to any sort of New South. Many in the South began to believe that they had been sorely mistreated and misunderstood after the Civil War, and this assumption was first introduced during Reconstruction as the "Lost Cause." This belief that the South was actually justified in its actions before and during the Civil War is a historical myth which attempted to revise the traditional historiography of the era to justify the South's defense of states' rights and agrarian society, as opposed to northern industrialism which would have changed the culture of the region entirely. This Lost Cause narrative is just one of the many indicators of the conflict that was taking place in the South as it was being forced to find a new identity. Initial advocates of this position included Confederate General Jubal Early and President of the Confederacy Jefferson Davis. As early as the 1870s, these two men attempted to rewrite the history of the Civil War and its causes. A seemingly simple quote attributed to Early demonstrates how a southerner might have justified the Confederate loss: "The Army of Northern Virginia was never defeated. It merely wore itself

out whipping the enemy."[24] He believed that the Lost Cause was a cultural phenomenon which would be advanced through literature and other types of writing. Jefferson Davis, in his two volume exculpation of the South's actions, believed that it was the North who acted unfairly, claiming "whatever of bloodshed, of devastation, or shock to republican government has resulted from the war"[25] and that the slaves actually benefited from the slavery imposed on them, which the North had worked to convince them of otherwise:

> Their strong local and personal attachment secured faithful service ... never was there happier dependence of labor and capital on each other. The tempter came, like the serpent of Eden, and decoyed them with the magic word of 'freedom' ... He put arms in their hands, and trained their humble but emotional natures to deeds of violence and bloodshed, and sent them out to devastate their benefactors.[26]

Yale historian David Blight explained these beliefs as "Confederate memories [which] no longer dwelled as much on mourning or explaining defeat; they offered a set of conservative traditions by which the entire country could gird itself against racial, political, and industrial disorder,"[27] and this can be seen through the South's continued resistance against political, social, and racial changes which manifested themselves into the 1960s.

The Lost Cause ideology even revealed itself in early debates surrounding the idea of the New South. Some of the New South proponents believed in concepts of the Lost Cause as their focus was on industry and not social and cultural change An early rationale for Henry Grady's

---

[24] Jubal Early, "Civil War Quotes," americancivilwarstory.com, accessed February 14, 2023.

[25] Jefferson Davis, quoted in Gaines M. Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865–1913* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 232.

[26] Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government: Volume 2* (August 2020), 163, archived from the original on June 2, 2021, accessed August 3, 2022.

[27] David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2001), 266.

sole focus on the economy as the goal of the New South, his rejection of racial equality in establishing this idea could be explained by the Lost Cause as slavery was not determined to be evil but benevolent, and he states, when speaking to his northern audience, that the South had no regret in its actions: "The South has nothing for which to apologize. She believes that the late struggle between the States was war and not rebellion; revolution and not conspiracy, and that her convictions were as honest as yours . . . The South has nothing to take back."[28] However, there were also those who rejected Grady's New South idealism as they wanted no relationship with the North. So while a conflict did exist between those who defended the Lost Cause of southern superiority completely and those who advocated for a New South's relationship with the North, in reality, the latter would often absorb this "romantic, idealized legend of the Old South into their New South vision"[29] as it would provide a broader base of acceptance for their goals.

The most forceful proponent of the Lost Cause mythology, however, was Thomas A. Dixon whose works attacked African Americans and their increasing involvement in American society. Believing in white supremacy, Dixon propagated the Lost Cause's focus on white prejudice as merely a self-preservation technique. While his works were more race directed than the Lost Cause literature overall, his defense of the Old South's way of life helped further the growth of the belief which still exists today. Describing themselves as honorable and morally upright, the Lost Cause adherents identified a clear contrast between the South and all other parts

---

[28] Henry Grady, "New South Speech," presented to the New England Society, New York City, December 21, 1886. In the *Atlanta Constitution*, December 22, 1886, https://www.ajc.com, accessed September 18, 2022.

[29] Numan V. Bartley, "In Search of the New South: Southern Politics after Reconstruction," *Reviews in American History* 10, no. 4 (1982), 154.

of the country. It sought to retain its uniqueness as believers in this concept were able to validate their perception of the antebellum period. There is also a focus on the South's military strength as heroic and tenacious, a concept which is suggested to play out on the football field during the twentieth century - a return to the idea of a valiant soldier enduring a violent, physical struggle. This theory will be discussed in depth in the discussion of the rivalry between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech, but Blight suggested this idea in that "[a]nd by the sheer virtue of losing heroically the Confederate soldier provided a model of masculine devotion and courage in an age of gender anxieties and ruthless material striving."[30] Regardless of the fact that this myth is discredited by most historians as almost delusional, there are many southerns who still adhere to this idea, an attempt to resist certain changes during the past century but also as a way to confirm the continued desire for a uniquely southern culture. It is an attempt to keep the South shielded from the rest of the country - rare and distinct in its cultures, traditions, and beliefs.

So regardless of which interpretation reformers would take, the term "New South" is what would encompass all aspects of these visions. While many attribute the idea of the New South to Grady, the first to introduce the concept of the New South in his 1871 "Speech Before the Alumni of the University of Georgia" was southern politician Benjamin Hill who encouraged the adoption of new ideas in determining the South's future: "The pressing question, therefore, with every people is, not what they have been, but whether and what they shall determine to be; not what their fathers were, but whether and what their children shall be."[31] Hill understood that

---

[30] Blight, "Race and Reunion," 266.

[31] Benjamin H. Hill, "Speech Before the Alumni of the University of Georgia," *Senator Benjamin H. Hill of Georgia: His Life, Speeches and Writings*, compiled by Benjamin Harvey Hill (Atlanta: T. H. P. Bloodworth, 1893): 335-336.

fundamental changes would need to be made, and he was one of the first who would challenge the region to rise above what they had always been. Unlike Grady, however, he was not focused solely on economic recovery; his vision was more comprehensive of all elements of southern life. In his speech at the University of Georgia, Hill called for three changes which he believed were critical in order for the South to move beyond the consequences of their secession: use better agricultural methods and other natural resources which were unique to the South and, thus, could be profitable to the rest of the country; the importance of education, for both blacks and whites, so that there would be educated workers in new industries; and then forego its previous way of thinking and be willing to adopt new ideas which would be more in line with the nation and the world. While all valid, even indisputable, arguments, each of them would fundamentally challenge an essential belief of the South - its historic economic structure, the segregation of blacks and whites, and then being willing to conform with areas that they believed were diametrically opposed to who they were.[32] Because of this, the conflict between the old and new would commence. When considering the economic conditions of the South, Hill did not solely advocate a transition to industrialization in order to meet these needs. While he did acknowledge that this would be an effective endeavor for the South, he also focused on the natural resources that already existed in the South, believing that they would contribute greatly to the national economy in their own way. He recalls why the colonists initially settled in the area and argues that these resources would help the region contribute to national success: “The areas of [the

---

[32] Ibid., 335.

South] were most extended . . . soils were naturally the most fertile . . . [t]heir climate was the most genial . . . [t]heir productions were the most varied and deemed of greatest commercial value."[33] He admonished his audience to remember the assets of their land and use them to move forward economically. In regards to education, Hill advocated that schooling be provided for all southerners, black and white, as that was the only way that the society could intellectually renounce the appearance of simplicity in how they were viewed:

> In the first place it must be conceded that the most striking manifestations of progress in modern civilization are found in the extensions of educational facilities to the masses of the people; in the elevation and advancement of strictly industrial pursuits; in the establishment of scientific, physical, mechanical, and all polytechnic schools, and in the discoveries made and results wrought by educated and enlightened industries.[34]

While the Georgia Institute of Technology, as one example of a New South university, would be founded fourteen years later, Hill called for the state of Georgia to support its first university - the University of Georgia - in providing excellence in education, believing that "[w]ith a university properly supported, education would flow down to the masses as it trained students to be geologists, mineralogists, chemists, miners, manufacturers, mechanics, and engineers - but also to continue education for the other professions as it had been doing."[35] Hill posited that the state university should take it upon itself to lead the South into a new era, even if it would require changes to the traditional structure of its curriculum and campus life. However, while UGA would pay lip service to assuming this mantle, their willingness to actually fully accept this new

---

[33] Ibid., 336.

[34] Ibid., 337.

[35] E. Merton Coulter, "The New South: Benjamin H. Hill's Speech Before the Alumni of the University of Georgia, 1871," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (1973): 180.

focus would take almost a century to be realized. Even though it was not evident at the time, the differences in how these two universities would react to the modernization of the South would play out as a reflection of the conflict that would inundate the region for the next century, playing out both politically and culturally - old vs new, traditional vs progressive - even into the realm of college sports. Hill's third suggestion was an even more controversial and unpopular one in an area that still believed strongly in a labor structure of white supremacy. He asserted that slavery was the region's curse and believed that it would keep the South from moving forward:

> In fine, it is no extravagance of thought nor straining of language to affirm that for two generations Southern progress, Southern development, and Southern power have been in bondage to the negro; and Southern failure, Southern dependence, and Southern sorrow are the heavy penalties we suffer for that bondage.[36]

Many in his audience would denounce these final comments, preventing them from heeding Hill's other exhortations - ones that might have been accepted if the third was not so reprehensible to them. Although he had been a staunch Confederate, he was viewed as a hypocrite to the southern cause, and his more acceptable thoughts were ignored because of these comments regarding slavery. While the need for a different type of higher education would be a consistent theme from those advocating for the New South, the focus on natural resources and the condemnation of slavery differed from Henry Grady's visions for a New South and caused enough consternation that Hill's address would draw hostile responses as many were not receptive to these ideas yet. One critic, writing in the *Augusta Weekly Chronicle and Sentinel* following the speech, decried Hill's address as one that "seemed to demonstrate that in all the leading matters of dispute between the North and the South, the North was right. The soundness

---

[36] Hill, "Speech Before the Alumni," 337.

of abolition principles, and the superiority of Yankee civilization, were his main topics of discourse."[37] Others criticized him for attacking the attributes of southern civilization of those to whom he was speaking. Hill did not back down on his assertions, however, and suggested that his only offense had been in pointing out the South's weaknesses and suggesting how it could improve:

> To see the work begin and progress in my day…is my greatest earthly desire. To aid in that work is my highest ambition, and to be remembered as one who had the courage to tell the unpleasant truths to a long deluded and now impoverished people, that they might wake up and grow great, is the only earthly glory I crave when I have been interred and sleep with the fathers.[38]

While the New South was not realized during Hill's lifetime, he did inspire a group of men, including Henry Grady, who would continue the work that Hill had started - albeit it on a more focused level - even if it would cause consternation and conflict between those who called themselves southerners.

The term "New South" is one of the most equivocal terms of the past century. Everyone who has used this phrase has his own interpretation of what it means, and the differences in meanings can be radical, especially when speaker, location, and time period are considered. In explaining the origin of the phrase, historian and educator Robert Cotterill explains how it seemed an appropriate term because the South seemed to be "altering the patterns of its economic life, turning its back on its own history, and entering upon new roads to economic salvation."[39] However, over the years, it has broadened to encompass more than just economic

---

[37] *Augusta Weekly Chronicle & Sentinel*, August 30 1871.

[38] Benjamin H. Hill, *Atlanta Constitution,* August 9, 1871.

[39] Robert S. Cotterill, "The Old South to the New." *The Journal of Southern History* 15, no. 1 (1949): 3.

changes but to also include all aspects of how southern life should have progressed after the Civil War. Paul Gaston's assessment of the "New South creed" encompasses multiple possible definitions - propaganda, a genuine creed, a program of action, or movement.[40] Yet, initially, when Henry Grady first proposed his version of a "New South" as an aim for the reconstruction process, he essentially meant the transition from a primarily agrarian society to one that would be able to match the industrial primacy of the North. Using his newspaper to promote his ideas, Grady encouraged friendship between the South and the North, supported Democrats who would support the growth of business in the South, and ultimately saw Atlanta as the city in which all of his goals could come to fruition; in fact, Atlanta would become his special focus in reaching these goals. In his "New South" address, given in 1886 in New York, Grady indicated that southerners, "having been converted to the Yankee way, were rejecting the ideal of leisure, replacing politics with business as their chief endeavor, and sharing the region's mounting prosperity generously with black people."[41] This idealistic vision of the South, though, did not take into account that the people may not yet be willing to "convert to the Yankee way," and his excitement for the possibilities of southern greatness overshadowed a true understanding of the people who would be required in achieving this goal.

Grady believed sharing in a northern mindset was necessary in order to provide economic security to a region that had been devastated by war and that it would begin the modernization process that would be critical to establishing the South as a place of influence and progress. The

---

[40] Paul Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (Montgomery: New South Books, 2011), 8.

[41] Henry W. Grady's "New South Speech," presented to the New England Society, New York City, December 21, 1886, in the *Atlanta Constitution*, December 22, 1886.

goal was to partner with northern capitalists in order to introduce stability into the economy, which would then allow for a total rebirth of the Old South and realize other objectives which were set forth after the Civil War, such as racial harmony and sectional reconciliation. Grady also depicted a South that was willing to give up its rebellious past in order to move towards the future, and he believed that there "[n]ever was nobler duty confided to human hands than the uplifting and upbuilding of the prostrate and bleeding South."[42] His poetic descriptions of the South's new purpose and destiny stirred his northern audience to believe that the South was willing to make these changes and join with them in progress and modernity. He maintained that the South, like the North, decried injustice against the Negro; that the South, like the North, had chosen to have industrialization take root in order to move forward; and that the South, like the North, would establish a strong economy in order to contribute to the Union's prosperity. Many of these sentiments seemed to agree with what Hill had proposed; the only difference - Grady proposed them to a northern audience who was ostensibly in agreement with these ideas, thus solidifying Grady's role in the New South as his appeared to be more widely accepted. In speaking to an agreeable northern audience, not a southern one, Grady's promising this New York audience actions with which the South did not collectively agree did not guarantee its success. It was his vision, not a course of action which had already been determined. He was attempting to initiate a course which he hoped would be followed once the South realized the benefits which would be the result. While most consider Grady's initial vision to only focus on the industrialization of the South, some broadened this vision to include a stronger educational

---

[42] Ibid.

system, which would be recognized in the establishment of Georgia Tech, that would facilitate providing a technological foundation for the success that was desired by these New South proponents; a focus on racial factors which also needed to be addressed as the integration of the freedmen would - hopefully - be instrumental in contributing to the success of a New South; and an attempt to end the sectionalism which sometimes led to a southern's sense of superiority. This broadening of the vision, so similar to Hill's, is what would ultimately assume the title of the New South, and until these courses of action would be accomplished, the South would continue to be characterized as "old."

So while future campaigners would include these goals in their visions, Grady and other New South advocates were not necessarily calling for increased education, desegregation, or an end to sectionalism; instead, their target was solely economic rejuvenation. Sam Jones, a friend of Grady's and a popular evangelist of the era, supported this focus, stating, "I long to see the day come in the South when we shall manufacture the products of the South…Then we will prosper and only then,"[43] and during a speech at Atlanta's Cotton States International Exposition, he shared his hope that, while the South retained its distinction, it could still cooperate with the North, stating that the exposition was "but a meeting ground on southern soil where all states can gather and feel that whatever may have been the condition of the past, we're now one people, and simply live with each other in our efforts to rise and to promote progress."[44] While Jones may not have been the first to advocate for both a sense of continuity yet distinction in their

---

[43] Sam Jones, *Atlanta Journal,* April 3, 1893.

[44] Ibid., November 30, 1895.

progressiveness, the suggestion was made and would be adopted by many southerners for the next century and a half. Jones saw the success of the New South to lie in the creation of a true middle class, focused on such values as honesty, sobriety, thrift, and industry. So this initial focus on economic reform was critical to the region moving forward, and its advocates saw it as the starting point for the South's full integration into the Union even though it would eventually assume the entire interpretation of renewal.

Those who advocated for this shift viewed industrialization as the means to regional prosperity; however, it was singular in its focus, with its primary goal to bring economic revitalization, often ignoring other problems as the end objective was of utmost importance. While this insularity of thought would be answered educationally by Georgia Tech, because these promoters limited the breadth of their crusade, it could be implied that they were not the compelling modernizers that history would have us believe. In fact, this myth has often been said to have a negative impression as it would require the South to forego elements of their society that made them unique in their traditions and beliefs, cultural factors which were too much engrained in their lives to simply abandon just because they had been defeated in war. In the minds of those advocating for a New South, it was not imperative that they initially focus on anything other than the economy (and the technological education that would propel the economy forward), thus not attempting to change the fundamental structure of the cultural and political South. They believed that if they were able to enhance their economic condition, especially in regards to northern dominance in this area, then their national standing would improve. To many of them, it could almost be described as a reclaiming of their economy from

the carpetbaggers and northern investors who flocked to the South after the Civil War in an attempt to take advantage of the devastated South. Historian Wayne Mixon argued that while this idea did inspire the need for change, it also "countenanced complacency toward social ills, resignation to the abuse of the natural environment, and the rise of a mass culture that diminished the personalism in human relations long cherished in the southern folk culture."[45] In the push for this immediate transition to industrialization, racial and sectional objectives were disregarded, and white supremacy remained a mainstay of the New South as these leaders still viewed the power of whites over blacks necessary in order to achieve their ambitions. So while Grady acknowledged Benjamin Hill at the beginning of his New South Speech, saying, "There was a South of slavery and secession-that South is dead. There is a South of union and freedom- that South, thank God, is living,"[46] this nod to the idea of racial equality was more to inspire agreement with his northern audience than to declare that the South now hoped for racial reconciliation. In 1887, Henry Grady stated "the supremacy of the white race of the South must be maintained forever, and the domination of the negro race resisted at all points and at all hazards, because the white race is the superior race... [This declaration] shall run forever with the blood that feeds Anglo-Saxon hearts."[47] He encouraged the white southerners to stay unified so that progress would not be hindered by those who were uneducated or whose votes were "purchasable," and he believed that race relations in the South were ordained by God and should

---

[45] Wayne Mixon, "New South Myth," in *The New Encyclopedia of Southern Culture: Volume 4: Myth, Manners, and Memory*, ed. Charles Reagan Wilson (University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 135.

[46] Grady, "New South Speech."

[47] Henry Grady, Texas State Fair, reprinted in Gunnar Myrdal and Sissela Bok, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944), 1354.

not be altered. For Grady, the purpose of the New South was to conform to northern standards, even to the point of surpassing the victorious North, while retaining a sense of southern culture and distinction, the definition of continuity. Thus, the enduring belief in white superiority did not counter the suggestions that he was making, suggesting a sense of continuity that would last, and thus being in conflict, with the South's modernization and progress.

Initially, it seemed that the South would grow to keep pace with the North, which was now experiencing a Second Industrial Revolution. Even though their production rates were not as developed as those in the north, three important industries existed in the South: iron, tobacco, and cotton. In Birmingham, Alabama, iron and steel manufacturing, along with railroads, were used to encourage commerce and provide benefits to other parts of the economically floundering South; in North Carolina, the importance of tobacco was emphasized with the invention of a cigarette rolling machine by James Duke. Probably the most important move towards industrialization was the creation of textile mills in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. Realizing the wasted expense of transporting their staple crop of cotton to be manufactured in the northern textile mills, southern capitalists began to invest heavily in the construction of similar mills - modeled after their northern counterparts - so that more of the profit could remain in the South. However, according to Kris Mitchener and Ian McLean's findings in "U.S. Regional Growth and Convergence, 1880-1980," "[t]hroughout this period productivity, capital investment, rates of new technology adoption remained low, and a diversified industrial economy that could serve as an engine of growth for the region did not emerge. As a result, income per capita in the South lagged behind the rest of the country before

1940."[48] With a sense of irony, the northern capitalists who had pledged to help the region move towards a more stable economy realized that southerners could be paid almost half of what they paid their workers up north.[49] In fact, even northern business began to move south; between 1920-1930, 40% of Massachusetts textile mills closed, relocating in southern cities. Part of this was due to the fact that, in 1922, northern textile workers were paid 41 cents compared with Alabama's 21 cents; also, by the 1960s, the southern textile industry had assumed control of the market, with a 24-1 margin over northern mills.[50] While this northern participation in southern markets would eventually be a positive result, initially it undercut the regions ability to be economically stable. As a result, while businesses continued to move to the region, the painfully underpaid workers resulted in the South not receiving the economic boost that it desired. There was progress made in various areas of the South, but it was obvious by the turn of the twentieth century that the initial goals of the New South would not be reached as easily as desired. Progress had been made in moving the South's agrarian economy to one that was more industrial in a nature; however, these ventures were not controlled by southerners as the New South apostles had envisioned nor, but by entrepreneurs from the North - initially applauding and and supporting the South's mission to become economically independent - who saw the opportunities in the post Civil War region. With much of the industrialization initiated by these northern

---

[48] Kris Mitchener and Ian W. McLean, "U.S. Regional Growth and Convergence, 1880–1980," Journal of Economic History 59, no. 4 (1999): 1022.

[49] "Nonpopulation Schedules for Georgia, 1850-1880," T1137, National Archives, https://www.archives.gov/research/census/nonpopulation#state, accessed October 1, 2022.

[50] Harold Meyerson, "How the American South Drives the Low Wage Economy," *The American Prospect* (July 6, 2015), accessed January 22, 2023.

capitalists, the poorer southerners, including African-Americans, did not benefit from this growth; it was primarily the factory and land owners who were regulating the advancement of this New South, most often at the expense of the workers. And southern planters, as a whole, found the movement from slave labor to free labor capitalism difficult and traumatic. The vision of Henry Grady and other southern advocates stalled as the region moved into the twentieth century, and the conflict between north and south was in no way dwindling and would establish itself even more resolutely moving forward.

A second attempt at rejuvenation came with the Progressive movement in the early twentieth century, a trend which fought back against the industrialization taking place nationwide. A discussion of Progressivism typically focuses most often on what was taking place in northern states as their level of industrialization far surpassed what was going on in the rest of the country, and in this case, the North responded more effectively to the circumstances of the era. So while many reforms were similar across the country, southern progressivism did not receive as much attention because its cities had not yet achieved the industrial status that northern cities had, causing it to assume a unique posture in that its issues focused on a region that was still seen as a national outlier, a region of the country that was sorely behind the others in terms of economic success and progressive achievements, a region which most Americans still viewed as the Old South. While Progressives in other parts of the country focused on prohibition, working conditions, child labor, women's suffrage, and race relations, the South was still attempting to emerge from an antiquated way of life. The South would address these issues - especially moral ones such as prohibition and prison reform - but many of the others were either

not seen as problematic or viewed as hardly applying to the region at all. Suffrage, in particular, was slow in coming as the role of a women in the South was viewed differently than it was in other parts of the country. Anti-suffrage was an indelible part of the Lost Cause mythology as it placed a special emphasis on the woman's role in society, and allowing the vote was seen to be utterly changing the structure of southern society. When it came to the ratification of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment, the vote came down to Tennessee as the 36th state - Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia had already rejected the amendment, and it still only passed with Tennessee's one vote. The importance of suffrage just did not manifest itself in the South as it did in the North.

Likewise, another Progressive emphasis was poor factory working conditions, which was seen, for example, in the cotton mills of Huntsville, Alabama; however, this city contained four factories in comparison to the ten large ones that were functioning in the much smaller environ of Lowell, Massachusetts, causing the relevance of this reform to not experience the immediacy that it did in the North,[51] especially as these mills were one of the positive influences on the southern economy. Additionally, still emerging from an agrarian society where children were expected to work alongside their parents, the adverse plight of child labor was also addressed differently than in the North. Change in this area came more slowly than in the North because of compounding issues, such as education, where the opportunities were not developed as quickly as in the larger northern cities. Furthermore, Jim Crow laws still reigned supreme in the South, so opportunities for African-Americans to receive education were even more limited. Even for

---

[51] Whitney Adrienne Snow, "Cotton Mill City: The Huntsville Textile Industry, 1880-1989," *The Alabama Review* 63, no. 4 (2010): 248.

white children, short school terms and low funding were prevalent and resulted in a region that had multiple educational reforms to execute to gain any of the traction seen in the North.[52] Race relations, very important during the northern Progressive movement and specifically seen in the origins of the Harlem Renaissance, was one of the slowest Progressive ideals to reach the South. Still living in a land of segregation and under the Jim Crow laws, southerners did not yet overwhelmingly feel the need to change the status quo of African-Americans. It makes sense, then, that the South would suffer from the population shift during the Great Migration - even though this did not expedite the need for change.[53] Columnist Quincy Ewing, a white southerner writing for the *Atlantic Monthly*, explained that even when there was "no shadow of excuse for the conviction that the Negro is more lazy, or more ignorant, or more criminal, or more brutal, or more anything else he ought not to be, or less anything else he ought to be, than other men,"[54] the racial problem would still exist as it was - at that time - intrinsic to the fabric of southern life. So while those still advocating for a New South gave lip service to racial equality, the South as a whole was not yet ready to fully embrace this balanced status. According to historian Don Doyle:

> Prophets of the New South joined their program of urban growth and economic development to an agenda for social progress. It was a vision that cast business leaders in the role of benefactors to former slaves and poor whites . . . [yet] the New South's

---

[52] See U.S. Bureau of the Census. Decennial data, 1850 to 1930, Fifteenth Census Reports, Population, vol. II; 1940 to 1950, U.S. Census of Population: 1950, vol. II, part 1; U.S. Census of Population: 1960, PC(1)-ID. Other data, Current Population Reports, series P-20, Nos. 54, 66, 74, 80, 93, 101, 110, 117, 126, 129, 148, 162, 167, 206, and 222; 1970 to 1991, Current Population Survey, survey data files.

[53] See "Colonial and Pre-Federal Statistics (PDF), United States Census Bureau, p. 1168, arched from the original on December 29, 2020, accessed December 24, 2022. Karl E. Taeuber, Taeuber, Alma F., "The Negro Population in the United States", in Davis, John P. (ed.), The American Negro Reference Book, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall (1966), 122.

[54] Quincy Ewing, "The Heart of the Race Problem," *Atlantic Monthly* 103 (March 1909): 390.

> commitment to biracial social progress was [still] compromised by the burden of racial prejudice.[55]

So while Atlanta, unique in its own place in the South, specifically would label itself as a city "too busy to hate" - and, indeed, it was better than the rest of the South - the irony of this identification would be obvious until later in the twentieth century when the South finally focused on racial reforms in its search for modernity.

During this era, whites and blacks had reached an impasse, based on both the political structure of the region and social norms, and a cursory working environment had been established. However, this pattern, like many of the other changes which had not yet materialized in the South's search for rejuvenation, was actually detrimental to southern progress. Prominent historian of the twentieth century South, Dewey Grantham acknowledged that the South's Progressive era differed from the rest of the country but still believed that they were reformers - albeit rather mildly - as they approached these changes from an "economically self-interested, ethically shaped middle-class attitude towards life."[56] In identifying three different areas of reform: social control and state regulation, social justice, and social efficiency, Grantham explains how many of the country's reforms were revealed in the South. In regards to social control and state regulation, the South focused on prohibition and prison reform. With its focus on prison reform, the South recognized how it would be able to work towards economic progress by using the prisoners as part of the labor pool, and its concentration on prohibition was a natural

---

[55] Don H. Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 260.

[56] Dewey Grantham, *Southern Progressivism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983), xxvi.

extension of the religious character of the area. Social justice reforms - such as suffrage - were primarily advocated by white women, yet the culture's conservative mindset did not allow the women to reach past racial equality, thus relegating the gender issue to another time. The antebellum mindset of placing women on a pedestal yet not recognizing them as equal to men still existed in the South was not viewed as a negative position; in fact it would have seemed contradictory to the southern mindset that was critical to the continuity of southern distinction and its social order. Even though they would face a dual challenge being both black and female, African-American women also became involved in social justice reforms, specifically focusing on race issues, and assuming this mantle as their contribution to the Progressive movement, even though they had been fighting for social and political equality for years: "African American women, have been political activists for their entire history on the American continent but long denied the right to vote and hold office, have resorted to nontraditional politics"[57] and have been able to lead successful challenges in these ways. While the South was proclaiming to be working towards racial equality, action was slow because of still commonly held cultural attitudes and, like women's suffrage, would be consigned to a different era. Education was a third focus of social justice reform, and this matter affected more of the South's population than any of the others. According to Grantham:

> Southerners doubled state education expenditures, lengthened school terms, passed compulsory attendance laws, reduced the region's illiteracy, and increased funding for institutions of higher learning. And while southern whites were the primary benefactors of this awakening, northern philanthropists helped fund black schools, though they channeled their largess to institutions that promoted 'practical training,' which they

---

[57] Jewel Prestage, "Quest for African American Political Woman," *American Academy of Political Science* (May 1, 1991): 95.

> claimed would ultimately make the African American 'a home-maker, a farmer, a mechanic, and a good citizen.'[58]

Most southerners knew by this time that education was fundamentally critical to the South's progress, and even though they might have disagreed in which form these reforms should occur, they knew that it was essential to provide more opportunities for all demographics. Interestingly enough, they had introduced a different type of curriculum - more technically based - several decades before in the form of Georgia Tech, yet many had viewed this as contradictory to a more traditional education and had not embraced it as they should - and as would have been beneficial for the region. By the mid-twentieth century, the influence of this university and others like it was finally being realized and its curriculum welcomed into long-established southern universities, suggesting a shift which would help the South move forward. However, it took almost a century for the South to move forward in its educational opportunities, discounting the importance of the New South Georgia Tech while remaining proponents of the Old South.

Finally, a desire for social efficiency had the region focusing on improving business structure and worker competence. Populist goals were included in these reforms, including modern farming practices and railroad regulation although some of these would be contrary to the traditional practices of the agrarian society which the South embraced. However, the effort to include the agrarian economy into the reforms of bigger business structures did acknowledge the importance that this sector of the South still played in society, one which southerners had refused to relinquish because of the crops that it was able to produce - knowing that, in particular, their contribution of cotton was a crucial product to the rest of the nation. Therefore, Progressivism in

---

[58] Ibid., 246.

the South took on a different form than it did in other parts of the country. Instead of attempting to dismantle the elements of the South that the rest of the country determined to be detrimental to the region's success - such as cultural traditions and rural heritage - southern progressives were more focused on creating a congenial social balance that would lead to the economic growth that had been desired by the early New South advocates, promoting a sense of continuity in the region as most of the South's residents were still hesitant to abandon their former way of life. Sadly, this would simply not be enough. Attempting to change only certain desired areas of southern life, the region was not able to move on because too many other factors were holding it back. While the Progressive movement did address some of the same issues with which the North was dealing and superficially touched on some of the deeper southern concerns that needed fuller attention, the South still did not achieve importance or influence nationally. It still viewed itself as in competition with the North, fighting a battle that they were not willing to lose again, clinging to the roots of the Old South.

While the late nineteenth century advocates envisioned the South reaching a significant national status within a couple decades of their initial attempts at improvement, both the post-Reconstruction efforts and then the Progressive era failed to produce the desired outcomes anticipated by these men. While some would erroneously proclaim that the new South had been achieved, it was, for the most part, wishful thinking; there was not much "new" about the South between the end of the Civil War and World War I. One of the most commonly accepted explanations why these goals were not realized immediately is that the South was simply not ready for such all-encompassing changes in transitioning to a more industrial society. The South

was an agrarian society with smaller towns and many rural areas. One of its few larger cities had been burned to the ground during the Civil War, and these required adjustments were not just the building of factories and the importing of more progressive ideals - it was a complete change in how the area operated economically. It was also argued that the standards of the New South proponents were not expansive enough to facilitate real change - they were primarily economically based and did not include many of the other antebellum attitudes that needed to be addressed if true change was to occur. Economic change that does not focus on other cultural characteristics, beliefs, and values has little chance in succeeding because the economy comprises all elements of society, not just the financial. Meanwhile, some contend that failure was inevitable because the South was being forced to make changes that they were not yet ready to make - that the idea of southern distinction was engrained in the region and was not one that was easily dismissed in hopes for progress. For several decades, the conflict between the sense of the Lost Cause, a desire for continuity, and animosity towards the North prevented the South from moving forward. They were trying too much to remain the same. Additionally, these cultural changes were not implemented because those who had traditionally been in power remained in power. National laws did not mandate change, so transformation could not be realized when those in control wanted to continue life as it had been, with only minor concessions made to becoming more progressive overall. In many ways, any anticipated progress was stalled, if initiated at all, and at the start of World War II, the South was still viewed as different - not necessarily a negative to them but still clearly detrimental - and isolated from the rest of the country.

Hopes for a New South declined during the Great Depression as the South - still primarily agrarian - was strongly affected by the troubles of the 1930s. While American historian and author George Tindall identified the interwar period of 1919 to 1939 as the beginning of the New South's emergence onto the national stage, problems that materialized during the Great Depression would suppress any progress that had begun until after the second world war. In acknowledging the poor economic status of the South during this time period, Tindall found that "[t]he South's adverse balance of trade . . . was probably a billion dollars annually. The South actually works for the North . . . Mortgage, insurance, industrial and finance corporations pump the money northward like African ivory out of the Congo."[59] As the country faced problems in wages, the work force, and industries, the South seemed to suffer more than the North did. According to former president of the Southern Historical Association James Cobb, "[T]he South's labor market remained isolated while in the North, employers responded to reduced flows of immigration with a greater investment in mechanization and with labor policies aimed at creating a more stable, highly skilled labor force."[60] While the New Deal's creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) has had a lasting affect on the South, it had not yet provided the economic contribution that it eventually would. So as the country entered World War II, the region was increasingly viewed as an economic failure. The promises of the latter nineteenth century had yet to come to fruition, and it seemed like it was almost impossible for the South to

---

[59] George Tindall, *The Emergence of the New South, 1913-1945* (Baton Rouge: Louisaiana State University Press, 1967), 597.

[60] James C. Cobb, "Review of Making Sense of Southern Economic History by Gavin Wright," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (1987): 61.

emerge from the financial woes that had afflicted them since the Civil War, much to their own chagrin and embarrassment.

It is true that after World War II, the South would begin to modernize - sometimes of its own volition, and other times as a result of an unavoidable mandate. The question is, then, did the Old South die when the twentieth century reached it's midpoint? Would all of the changes that would occur over the next half century effectively erase the Old South from any possibility of lending its characteristics to a new generation? Unless one is considering Atlanta, most would admit that there are still components of the past in the southern United States. While it is true that the South has been able to forge an identity which retains many elements of its past, albeit ones that are not controversial, this was not an easily achieved outcome. The region retained much of its Old South mentality throughout the twentieth century, and the struggle encompassed all areas of southern life and can be seen in political, social, educational, and even athletic conflicts. There are many different speculations - such as an industrial-agrarian conflict or the postbellum South sabotaging themselves - as to why the South has seemingly appeared to drag its feet into modernity, and much of the traditional historiography seemed to focus on the concept that there existed two Souths - an Old and a New. However, this New South, never seemed to manifest itself in the region as a whole; instead, it seemed to only find traction in Atlanta, which - like Georgia Tech - is not truly viewed as southern. In setting up this debate, the ability to contrast a past and a present/future allowed for one to provide a harsh juxtaposition of a location not only split by time but also culture. However, with Wilbur J. Cash's argument identifying a

"unity of cultural values [that] kept economic, social, and political conflict in check,"[61] the suggestion of continuity would explain how the South kept its cultural distinction while making the concessions necessary to meld with the rest of the country, yet it also is a suggestion for why it was so difficult for the South to move into a newer era. When considering this theory, the Civil War is not a critical juncture that separates the old from the new, but an interruption that facilitated formidable change, but not the heart of what the South was and still is - one that still finds value in some of its traditions and beliefs. Cash suggests that while change was certainly slow before World War II, since the 1940s, innovation has consistently taken place; however, it has ebbed and flowed, moving forward and then retreating in response to how much it is affecting the culture.

Regardless, progress is being made as southerners consider how to assimilate modernity into their way of life, not completely rejecting who they are and the traditions which are important to them. So, forced to face modernization, southerners have learned how to use their traditions to cope with modernization while, at the same time, they have been able to use modernization to preserve their traditions - in essence, keeping elements which remind them of the Old South. Cash contends that the industrial-agrarian conflict was actually important to the development of the South, an idea suggesting that the agrarian class did not disappear but simply transformed itself into a class that would continue to lead the South forward. This is supported by Numan V. Bartley's question, "How could an established and prosperous society with its own

---

61 W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), 109.

economic, social, and ideological foundations collapse so quickly?"[62] In response to this, Woodward was forced to concede that enterprising landlords "transformed themselves into members of the new class that was creating a commercial revolution and fostering an industrial revolution."[63] It is only because they have learned how to link the two that the South has been able to realize a sense of peace by the end of the twentieth century, and even C. Vann Woodward concedes that "[i]t is in just this respect that the south remains the most distinction region of the country,"[64] with many elements hearkening to its past. In fact, according to a 2011 Southern Identity Poll, 72% of respondents believe that there are certain elements about the South that make it unique.[65] This idea of continuity has become important in the last few decades as southerners are now credited with developing a way to keep their traditional beliefs and values while accommodating contemporary ideas that will move them forward, and demonstrating that the South was not required to forego its historical and cultural contexts in order to move towards economic modernization.

It was only after the North realized that the South could, in fact, create an effective economic environment that they were willing to fully invest in this region. Cobb continues his argument in maintaining that the South's "transformation was gradual and the primary concerns and goals of planters and industrialists compatible enough to support a central set of policies that

---

62 Bartley, "In Search of the New South," 153.

63 C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1981), 49.

64 Woodward, "The Search for Southern Identity," 331.

65 Christopher A. Cooper and H. Gibbs Knotts, *The Resilience of Southern Identity: Why the South Matters in the Minds of Its People* (Chapel Hill, NC University of North Carolina Press, 2017), 33.

served the interests of both groups without necessarily reflecting the relative strength of either"[66] and that defending tradition actually made the pursuit of progress and industrialization possible. In fact, the idea goes as far as to suggest that there is no Old South or New South - it is just the South, a region that has learned to maintain its unique identity if the face of numerous obstacles. In his article "The Old South to the New," Professor of History at California State University, Chico, Robert Cotterill explains that "in no phase of its economic life was the New South new. It was not a Phoenix rising from the ashes of the Old; not a revival, not even a reincarnation: it was merely a continuation of the Old South…not only in its economic life [but] also the *spirit* of the Old."[67] Assistant Professor of History at Elon Nancy Smith Midgette, who received her Ph.D. from the University of Georgia, concurs with Cotterill, identifying three conclusions based on this concept: first, that the same elite power structure that had existed before the war continued afterwards; second, these leaders were able to garner the support of other southerners through a focus on their own economic and social interests; and third, black southerners were not able to take advantage of new opportunities as the idea of continuity relegated them to a similar position as before."[68] While the idea of continuity and whether or not there truly is a New South can be debated, what is most critical to consider is how many view the South to not have made this huge transformation that was envisioned. Instead, when the fundamental beliefs and values of today's South are considered, it is interesting to note that most of them recall the past and how the South

---

66 James C. Cobb, "Beyond Planters and Industrialists: A New Perspective on the New South," *The Journal of Southern History* 54, no. 1 (1988): 56.

67 Robert S. Cotterill, "The Old South to the New," *The Journal of Southern History* 15, no. 1 (1949): 7.

68 Nancy Smith Midgette, "What Students Need to Know about the New South," *OAH Magazine of History* 4, no. 1 (1989): 55

has usually been defined. If this is true, then what does this mean for the region in terms of identity? While, a century later, the New South may not look exactly like Grady intended, the South has been able to find success because it preserves regional ideas - positions such as lower taxes, conservative government, and affordable labor - that can trace their roots throughout the South's past. Although they are not identical to past values as times have changed and progress has been made, the South's current principles provide a sense of continuity that is leading the South into the future. In examining the South in this way, it is easier to explain the attributes that still keep the region a unique part of the country - one that cannot have its characteristics duplicated in any other area. It *is* the South, and there is none like it.

It is important to consider these ideas of southern uniqueness and continuity in determining the current state of the South's identity. What is now the definition of the New South? Is it still the idea of the South becoming unmistakably northern in its economy, politics, and social values? Or has it been allowed to retain some of its own character, the country finally realizing that a "northern" way of life is not synonymous with an "American" way of life? Are those who are claiming that the South is no longer ordinary from rural southern areas where many still experience a culture that - with admitted changes - still retains a sense of tradition? Or did they grow up in cities where that element of heritage was faint if it existed at all? Are we ultimately able to retire the idea of a New South, recognizing that the Old South still plays an important role for the people who live south of the Mason-Dixon line? In his article "The South as 'Other,' the Southerner as 'Stranger,'" Orville Vernon Burton quoted his friend Walt Whitmire

who had said, "I know there is still a South; I know it every time I go North."[69] If one determines that the South has been able to retain its distinction even when challenged by the rest of the country, then it is imperative to examine the influence that the South is currently having on the rest of the country. Many have begun to argue that the South is aware of its increasing presence nationally, even internationally, and is finding ways to exert this influence. With its focus on conservative, religious, family values - traditional attributes that seem to be changing elsewhere in the nation- some argue that southerners are tenaciously attempting to return the country to its founding roots, refusing to relinquish the principles that the rest of the nation has called "old."

---

69 Conversation with Walter Whitmire (June 2012), in Orville Vernon Burton's "The South as 'Other,' the Southerner as 'Stranger,'" *The Journal of Southern History* 79, no. 1 (2013): 9.

Chapter 2

Atlanta and the New South

The changes that took place in the South during the mid-twentieth century clearly moved the region forward; however, the extent to which these developments permeated the area as a whole is often questioned. Containing only a handful of larger cities which could be considered of national importance, has the South, as a whole, embraced the changes necessary to be redefined as a "New South"? If the definition encompasses the idea of becoming international in nature, where little is left of what previously defined the region, then Atlanta is arguably the only area of the South where this has occurred. Atlanta is a city which could be transplanted to any other part of the country and function as well as it does in Georgia. The presence of international businesses, key national industries, high level education, and a diverse, multicultural population demonstrates that Atlanta has achieved the status set forth over a century ago. However, is this the only city that has? Nashville, Tennessee does not have the international status that Atlanta does, but it could still be viewed as successful - albeit embracing the distinctly southern atmosphere of this country music capital. Other large cities, such as Birmingham, Alabama and Charlotte, North Carolina may play important roles in their states, even nationally, yet their perception as unmistakably southern cities demonstrates that they have not reached the global status that Atlanta has. So while the region's status has improved overall - in perceived contributions and influence - it can be argued that it is only Atlanta that has advanced this image, thereby qualifying itself as the sole New South model. While this is an impressive distinction for

the city, it is more important when considering the conflict between the Old and New South - one lone city in competition with a region; a bastion of progress and innovation, fueled by engineering and technology, inhabiting a place where the past is still remembered fondly.

Viewed as a phoenix that has risen from the ashes, Atlanta has become the banner of what the New South was envisioned to be. A city that had been completely destroyed near the end of the Civil War, Atlanta was well situated to rebuild itself according to the visions of the New South proponents, and this "redemption narrative" was critical to Atlanta's postwar character. It also helped the city establish itself as a contrast to the way life had always been - a clear indication that there would be a struggle for the heart of the South moving forward. In his book *Atlanta: Cradle of the New South*, William Link suggests that the "[b]oosters embraced the phoenix metaphor because it represented a clean break from the past and would communicate an optimistic impression to potential investors from outside."[70] Creating this perception of success - especially in the eyes of northern investors - would be a critical first step in Atlanta's transformation into a progressive city on the precipice of greatness. Although not the largest city in the South at the time, Atlanta was poised for the greatness it would achieve due to its location as a crossroads both in the South and for those traveling from the North and because of the large group of visionaries who would choose this city as the place to achieve their goals. Since its reconstruction, Atlanta has been different from other southern cities - in its purpose, its character, its growth, and its industries. While there was initially a southern culture that developed in the city, as the decades passed, Atlanta reimagined itself as a northern city in the South, the key to

---

[70] William A. Link, *Atlanta: Cradle of the New South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 55.

the South reaching the national and international impact that it desired. In fact, the difference between Atlanta and its sister southern cities was identified early on as it was quickly obvious that "Atlanta invited comparison with northern cities and, in its robust eagerness for progress, came to be seen as a southern exception rather than an indigenous spearhead for a New South."[71] Nowadays, it is challenging to differentiate between suburban Atlanta, suburban Phoenix, and suburban Seattle; Atlanta's Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport consistently leads the world in its status as busiest airport; and the city remains at the top of the list of U.S. cities that attract the most convention visitors.[72] While Atlanta is geographically located in the South, most would agree that it is not southern; in fact, when asked where they live, those who live in the city will more often than not designate their residence as Atlanta, not Georgia, demonstrating that it is the urban, not the rural, with which they identify. However, the rise of Atlanta's importance was not immediate and not guaranteed. It was a slow process that was deliberately undertaken by Henry Grady and other New South proponents, chosen because of its location and potential. While there were several key issues that were not addressed until the mid-twentieth century, an early focus on growing industry, promoting new products and investments, and attracting a new variety of residents to the city would soon result in the birth of a new type of southern city. There was even a push to establish a university that would encompass the technological and engineering goals of the up and coming city - the Georgia Institute of Technology. It was not by accident that these changes took place; Atlanta was unique in that it was not a coastal city or positioned in an area

---

[71] Don H. Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 36.

[72] See "List: America's Most-Visited Cities," Forbes.com; "Cvent Announces Top 50 Meetings Destinations in the United States," Cvent.com; "The Best Cities for Conferences in the U.S.," thetraveleam.com.

rich with with natural sources; "[r]ather, it has developed a unique soul through the dedication, foresight and drive of citizens whose personal welfare has been inseparable from Atlanta's."[73] And as the city grew, so did its separation from the traditional South. Because the city was rebuilt from ashes, a disconnect between the antebellum South and the beginnings of a more progressive city was evident early on. Gone were the links to days gone by, and while there would be an initial element of "southernness" to Atlanta, it was never strong and would fade even more as decades passed. Even today, "[r]omantic nostalgia about protecting historic landmarks and controlling reckless growth [is] the mark of 'old fogy' defiance of progress,"[74] and Atlanta is a prime example of a city that does not concern itself with monuments to the past as it continues to look to the future. The significance of this distinction is important to understanding the conflict that has existed in the South since Reconstruction as the traditional South, most often existing in rural areas and smaller towns, was forced to reconcile itself with an urban identity that would position the region to move successfully into the twenty-first century.

From the beginning of the Reconstruction period, Atlanta was destined to be separate from the rest of the South. General Sherman's siege of Atlanta, forty-two days of constant shelling and imposed starvation, ending with the burning of the city on November 15, 1864, symbolically brought the antebellum South, at least in Atlanta, to an end. In fact, the destruction was so complete that it seemed providence had deemed Atlanta the city that would be reborn to bring a victorious New South into existence. It also lost the personality of an inherited southern

---

[73] *Atlanta Resurgens: The First Hundred of Years of a City's Progress, Promise and Philosophy* (Atlanta: The First National Bank of Atlanta, 1971), 91.

[74] Doyle, *New Men*, 37.

aristocracy that still existed throughout Georgia and other southern states. Many New South defenders viewed this symbolic destruction of the Old South as a blessing in disguise - it was an emancipation of the South itself, not just the slave, to become a better version of itself. Those who came to power after the Civil War were not intent on rebuilding an antebellum city but in answering the North's call for a place that would contribute to the nation as a whole and help bring reconciliation with the Union. Professor of History William Link described it as city that "welcomed differences of opinion, encouraged manufacturing and industry, and believed in intersectional harmony - in fusing together the sections of the country that had once been divided between the Confederacy and the Union."[75] In fact, historian Don Doyle argues that "Atlanta's receptivity to northern influence was part of the image its promoters deliberately encouraged after the war. The perception of Atlanta as a Yankee outpost . . . took on new importance now."[76] In fact, the willingness of the city to reconcile these two areas of the country was detected almost immediately in the election of Rufus B. Bullock as governor of Georgia. A native New Yorker and politically a Republican, Bullock had also served in the Confederate army and called Augusta home, and he clearly represented the compromise which was desired by new southern leaders. From the beginning, Atlanta's enthusiasm to cross cultural lines demonstrated that the New South would take on a different emphasis from antebellum qualities. These leaders believed that the future of the South would be determined by cities - bigger was better, communities could determine their own destinies, and businesses would be instrumental in providing the economic

---

[75] William A. Link, *Atlanta: Cradle of the New South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 59.

[76] Doyle, *New Men*, 37.

foundation for large scale success. New South proponents were sensitive to the fact that they needed northern capital in order to achieve the success they sought, so the normal southern aversion to northern ideals was never a part of the Atlanta mentality. These leaders also realized the unique circumstances of their position and believed that it was going to take teamwork to achieve their goals, not the competitive environment which existed in most cities, and this cooperation would lay the foundation for a successful city.

Three different contributions would strengthen the distinction of the area: the growth of business, the introduction of the automobile, and a focus on higher education that would focus on industrial and engineering theories. Early city leaders determined that a focus on industrialization and business would provided the fastest avenue to success, so policies were immediately put into place that would encourage investors to move into the area and businesses to expand at a swift rate. These leaders also patterned most of the city's development on northern models, which not only flattered the North but also enticed them to invest in this burgeoning economy. This appeal to northern businesses was not new, however. Ever since the city had been built around the railroads, northern capitalists had found their way to Atlanta, allowing for a stronger connection with the North than the other southern cities. Doyle explains that "Atlanta, even before the Civil War, came to be regarded as a northern enclave on foreign soil, and much of the famous 'Atlanta spirit' has ben routinely attributed to this infusion of Yankee enterprise,"[77] and these investors found the energy and spirit of the growing city to be addictive, "totally unlike any other Southern

---

[77] Doyle, *New Men,* 34.

city."[78] Its prewar economy differed from the rest of the South as it was not based on slave labor, so after the Civil War, it was already poised to assume an identity different from the rest of the region. Even while the anticipated growth did not happen as quickly as anticipated, new businesses did begin to establish themselves in the city, many of which would introduce an international presence over the next century. Long gone were the days of the railroad on which the city had been established; instead, new fields of employment would aspire to be nationally significant, growing with the city and redefining its relevance to the South as a whole. A clear turning point in perception occurred with Atlanta's International Cotton Exposition of 1881. During this exposition, Henry Grady and his community presented the 'Atlanta Spirit" in full force, where even a journalist for the *Atlanta Constitution* declared the display as "the militant expression of Atlanta's personality - forceful, aggressive, intelligent, harmonious, with an abundance of that requisite indispensable in man or city - sleeplessness"[79] and that by 1940, Atlanta's per capita income roughly equaled the national average; by 1950, it has surpassed this average, especially in relation to the rest of the South.[80] Atlanta's impressive growth was clearly isolated to the capital city; the rest of Georgia, and the region as a whole, did not see the same level of prosperity. Only recently in 2019 did rural Georgia appear to make any progress in improving their GDP in relation to metro Atlanta - the southern Georgia counties growing at a

---

78 Letter to the Editor, "Atlanta," *Atlanta Constitution*, September 21, 1869.

79 "A Grand Success," *Atlanta Constitution*, March 25, 1881.

80 Numan V. Bartley, "Society and Culture in an Urban Age," *A History of Georgia*, ed. Kenneth Coleman (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1991), 378.

3.8% while metro Atlanta only improved by 1.5%.[81] Additionally, Atlanta was one of the few southern cities where racial equality presented itself sooner than others. Because both races were constantly forced to intermingle - sidewalks, street cars, and other public accommodations - the presence of a more fluid job market, where both blacks and whites were able to compete for employment, was apparent long before it existed in cities like Birmingham and Charleston. In fact, Atlanta and Birmingham have demonstrated a "long standing urban rivalry" and "antithetical visions of southern racial politics," with Andrew Doyle explaining that "they were roughly the same size as late as 1940; however, by 1961 metropolitan Atlanta had grown to nearly twice the size of Birmingham. Racial politics was the key factor in Atlanta's postwar growth and Birmingham's stagnation."[82] An aggressive public relations campaign undertaken by city politicians had already dubbed Atlanta as the "city too busy to hate," and while this might have been a slight exaggeration, its ability to overcome racial barriers sooner than other parts of the South speaks to his progressive mindset and ideals. The importance of business in Atlanta has continued throughout the twentieth century, and three-fourths of all new jobs in the South, since 1981, can be found in Atlanta.[83] Even Georgia Tech, clearly known as an engineering and technology university, is ranked 28th in Best Business Schools and #16 in Part-time MBA for

---

[81] Charles Hayslett, "New County-Level GDP Data Suggests Rural Georgia Has, For a Change, Improved Relative to Metro Atlanta," *Trouble in God's Country* (December 9, 2020), accessed January 23, 2023.

[82] Andrew Doyle, "An Atheist in Alabama is Someone Who Doesn't Believe in Bear Bryant: A Symbol for the Embattled South," *Sport in the Old South*, ed. Patrick Miller (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 260.

[83] "Running Fast and Standing Still: Poverty and Black Economic Growth in Georgia's Sunbelt Boom," *Southern Regional Council*. Atlanta: June 1986.

2023.[84] Atlanta has become a bastion for business investors due to the South's conservative, economic conditions, and the community has responded by strengthening the infrastructure that already existed, including educational opportunities and political regulations.

The introduction of the automobile was probably the most pivotal development in driving Atlanta to a new level of influence, and - once again - was considerably advanced compared to the rest of the South. Because the city was primarily a walking city, even at the turn of the twentieth century, the arrival of the automobile created a downtown that would soon outgrow its city limits and create a metropolis that has one of the largest sprawling suburbs in the country, a factor that differed from other southern cities.[85] In examining the importance of this transition in his book *Automobile Age Atlanta: The Making of a Southern Metropolis 1900-1935*, Howard Preston examines how "[a]utomobile dealers in Atlanta grew from 4 in 1908 to 80 in 1920, and automobile businesses and related business on Peachtree Street grew from 0 in 1909 to 79 in 1920."[86] Because the city was still so new, it was easily able to adapt its streets and communities to accommodate cars, and the industries that this invention provided would bring considerable economic growth to the city. Railroads had been important in the founding of the city because they provided a crossroads for travelers from all areas of the country in facilitating movement to all parts of the South; similarly, the expansion of an interstate network, all concentrating in

---

84 "Georgia Institute of Technology," *U.S. News and World Report*, July 13, 2022.

85 "America's Most Suburbanized Cities," newgeography.com (June 7 , 2017), accessed January 23, 2023.

86 Howard L. Preston, *Automobile Age Atlanta: The Making of a Southern Metropolis 1900-1935* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1979), 35.

Atlanta, provided an even greater opportunity for growth and influence in the city. Preston references the periodical *Progress* in defining how:

> Atlanta would become the Mecca of the good roads movement, the center on which thousands of miles of improved highways and interstate roads [would] converge… [automobiles would bring] a great increase of population and influx of capital, which [would] give new life to trade and industry, with work and wages for the masses and benefits for all classes and conditions of men.[87]

Automobiles allowed the city to move beyond its boundaries, encouraging growth in all neighborhoods, both white and black. They allowed what had been, up until 1900, a sluggish growth to change the framework, finances, and physical character of the city, proving that Atlanta was finally earning the New South significance with which had been labeled a century before.

The role of higher education also played an important role in how the city worked to reconcile more progressive ideals with traditional ones that were still attempting to exert influence, and the role of Georgia Tech would become the best example of this effort, especially in relation to other southern universities. Northern models were influencing both white and black colleges in Atlanta, and these schools would provide a foundation for forward-thinking education in the city much earlier than throughout the rest of the South. In fact, black schools in particular would sustain a relationship with northern educational philosophies well into the twentieth century as their ideology tended to promote a commitment to black progress well above what the New South advocated. Spelman College and Morehouse College, two of the most notable historically black colleges, are located in Atlanta and were established shortly after the Civil War.

---

[87] Ibid., 27.

While Tuskegee University was also founded during this time, the growth of the two Atlanta colleges reflected the city's willingness to promote progressive education, especially as Spelman College was initially a women's college and is the oldest of its kind in the United States. The New South creed called for improvements in the traditional southern model of higher education as the work force needed to become more specialized in industrial and engineering fields in order to move progress economically. The antebellum South's colleges tended to highlight a more liberal arts education, focusing on careers such as law, education, and politics. In his 1922 study of early American universities, Maurice Caullery explained how antebellum universities, "imbued with an unyielding traditional classicism . . . did not show any eagerness to favor the development of the applied sciences."[88] Edward Eddy, in his look at the impact of land-grant colleges on education, concurred with Caullery, believing that southern universities "treated science in somewhat the same manner as they treated literature-to be studied but not used."[89]

So while many believed that engineering education was not beneficial to a growing South, the new attention on industrialism precipitated the need for a university geared towards these careers - a science and engineering school that would allow the region to compete with the North. Professor and author Harold Davis explains Grady and his colleagues' opinion as thinking:

> little of classical education built upon ancient languages and liberal studies. That course of study produced politicians, lawyers, and speechmakers and did not lead naturally into business. They were enthusiastic for two kinds of schools: industrial ones

---

[88] Maurice Caullery, *Universities and Scientific Life in the United States*, trans. James Haughton Woods and Emmet Russell (Cambridge, Mass., 1922), 116.

[89] Edward Danforth Eddy, *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land-Grant Idea in American Education* (New York, 1957), 10-11.

> and technical institutes. [In fact for] a time, the *Constitution* favored industrial schools in all Georgia locales which could use them.[90]

The answer was a technical school, based in Atlanta, that would facilitate these career focuses. The Georgia Institute of Technology, opening in 1888 under the name Georgia School of Technology, provided an education that was new to the South, particularly as the purpose of the university was solely focused on what we now call a STEM education. Georgia Tech's program developed rapidly, and it was soon the leading technical school in the South. Davis clarifies that "[i]ts graduates were engaged in manufacturing with remarkable success. Many cities of Georgia had made advances, including those considered the principal rivals of Atlanta; but Atlanta was the leading manufacturer and had shown the most rapid growth."[91] However, this movement away from a liberal arts education was one more way that a critical rift between the traditional South and Atlanta's New South would become obvious. The universities that were more traditionally southern, especially, in this case, the University of Georgia, initially resisted the establishment of this school as a threat to the classic southern education. Even though some of the state universities indicated a willingness to add engineering courses, this offering was merely paid lip service to this new curriculum in an attempts to keep a school such as Georgia Tech from being established. It was clear that such a school would have no southern roots or long established traditions and would have no ties to the antebellum South which was still meaningful to the region. As would quickly become obvious, Georgia Tech would be a unique school in the

---

[90] Harold E. Davis, *Henry Grady's New South: Atlanta, A Brave and Beautiful City* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1990), 188.

[91] Ibid., 190.

southern region of the country - one that would contrast sharply with and initiate conflict with universities in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Mississippi. This university would stand alone in the South, and even today, it is not considered southern. While the university was critical in fulfilling the aims of the New South, its interaction with other southern institutions of higher education highlighted the conflict that was taking place between old and new, traditional and progressive. This competition would play out specifically in its relationship, or lack thereof, with the University of Georgia.

The movement towards a New South continued with the advent of World War II which provided a catalyst that would change the future of the South. Finally, the South finally began to emerge as a leader on the national and international stages, and much of this was due to the fact that a more industrial approach to labor was finally embraced - even in the realm of education as the growth of engineering curriculum at universities like Georgia Tech were finally accepted by traditional southerners as necessary to moving forward. The University of Georgia, which had maintained its status as the state's university and had often found itself in conflict in all areas with its Atlanta rival, even conceded that a curriculum change was necessary in moving forward, even though the university would not establish its own engineering college until 2012. Mobilization for the war galvanized the economies of many parts of the country, and the South was one of the regions which was able to take advantage of the newly required war productions in order to institute the technological and industrial changes that had, so far, lagged behind the rest of the country, particularly the North. During the war, the South's expansion would break records and, according to the U.S. War Production Board of 1945, "Capital expenditures in the

South, which made up roughly one-tenth of the national total in the prewar period, nearly doubled during the war. In total, the South accounted for 23.1 percent of wartime plant construction and 17.6 of expansions."[92] Sandra Stencel, in researching the idea of southern continuity and change, determined that "[t]he South, with its climate for year-round training and the political clout of its senior members in Congress, landed scores of military bases. They provided good-paying jobs for thousands of Southerners and pumped vast sums into the local economies."[93] The southern industries of steel and ship building were critical to the war movement, which finally allowed for a growth in the southern economy. It was engineering and technology, then, that finally allowed the South to move forward, which was ironic since this it what the New South advocates had promised from the beginning. Even more interesting is the fact that many of those military efforts would be funneled through Georgia Tech - the university that the traditional South had so desperately tried to isolate. Those who promoted a sense of southern continuity were forced to assimilate this new - very necessary - element of identification into its philosophy and to determine how it could help the South construct a new character.

After the war, however, is when the South finally realized a sustained period of growth, resulting in the region, specifically Atlanta, finally achieving the economic status of which the New South advocates had dreamed. According to "The Blue Book of Southern Progress" in *Industrial Development and Manufacturers Record*, "Between 1939 and 1958 the value of

---

92 United States War Production Board, *War Manufacturing Facilities Authorized through December 1944 by State and County* (Washington D.C. 1945).

93 Sandra Stencel, "The South: Continuity and Change," in *Editorial Research Reports 1980*, vol. I (Washington, DC: CQ Press, 1980), 167.

manufacturing output in the southern states rose from $9.8 billion to $65 billion, faster than in the rest of the country. In the same period, the number of workers in manufacturing increased from 1.3 million to 3.5 million. New industries set off new growth of commercial enterprises; retail trade rose from $9.2 billion in 1939 to $54.5 billion in 1958, also faster than elsewhere."[94] The conclusion of the war introduced a period of prosperity that would last for three decades as the region finally established itself on the world stage. With its anti-union sentiments, low wages and tax rates, and overall conservative values, businesses began moving to the South to take advantage of the pro-business stance of the area which would greatly help the growth of Atlanta - by 1954 alone, there were over 800 new industries in the city and almost 1200 national businesses had offices located within the city limits.[95] These economic incentives would allow the larger cities of the area, most importantly Atlanta, to begin to change the economic outlook of the South and finally hint at the region becoming a contributing part of the country.

Transformation is the word that best describes the development of the New South, especially Atlanta. It has found its role on the world stage and has embraced it wholeheartedly. It does not pretend to liken itself to the traditional cultural South; instead it has found its own importance in rebuilding a region that was so rejected by the rest of the country; this, however, set up a conflict within the South - one that some say has been resolved in a unique way, while others argue that a compromise has still not been reached. While the early history of Atlanta was based on railroads and transportation, the city has found its role as a regional capital, a national

---

94 "The Blue Book of Southern Progress," Industrial Development and Manufacturers Record (May 1959), 27, 30.

95 Andy Ambrose, "Atlanta," *New Georgia Encyclopedia*, accessed on September 8, 2022.

authority, and of international importance. Because of this, though, it stands at odds with the rest of the South. It is unique in a region which, in many ways, still finds its identity in at least remembering bygone days. It is not to say that the rest of the South has not progressed in its own way, but in its pursuit of a more modern status, the South has also chosen to preserve some of its roots. And, it is this attempt that sets up a conflict throughout the twentieth century that may only now be experiencing an abatement in its ferocity. However, it is because of this conflict that we can also better understand other important facets of the development of the region. The struggle is not just between a city and a region; it plays out in its opposing politics, its cultural elements such as music and food, and even on the football field - an arena reminiscent of the battlefield of the past. In understanding this struggle, the South's present status is clearer, but is obviously still a part of southern life.

When one considers all of the ways in which Atlanta differs from other southern cities, it is easy to argue that the South has not truly become the transformed place that some would claim it to be; that one city cannot represent an entire area of the country; that the city is an anomaly and not the norm. From the beginning, Atlanta was different; not just in its chosen relationship with the North, but in all facets of its daily life. An article in *Harper's Monthly* in the 1860s described its uniqueness as "less peculiar and picturesque than any other town in the South. She looks to me more like a Western town, since her newness and enterprise hardly affiliate her with Augusta, Savannah, Mobile, and the rest of the sleepy cotton markets, whose growth, if they

have had any, is imperceptible, and whose pulse beats are only a faint flutter."[96] In fact, according to historian Numan Bartley:

> Urban historians have tended in recent years to study southern urbanization within a regional context and to suggest that southern cities, rather than being the aggressive vanguards of the New South, were economically, culturally, racially, and in a variety of other ways strongly influenced if not substantially shaped by the surrounding countryside.[97]

If this is true, then should the South's progress and influence be negated since they could technically still be viewed as backwards and nonconforming, or should it be given credit for the headway that it has made in becoming more like the rest of the country? This is the question that has haunted the region for a century and a half and has revealed itself in the conflict in all cultural elements. It is the question that contributes to whether or not the South can now be considered "new." And it is the question that ultimately will be considered when examining the University of Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry.

From the end of World War II through the 1970s, the South changed drastically in ways that had only been imagined - and hoped for - during the years immediately following the Civil War. Dewey Grantham views this period as the most critical period in the modernization of the South, where the area "saw the South's labor market more fully integrated into the national economy, the setting in motion of events that would end disenfranchisement and segregation, and the beginning of the end of the region's cultural isolation."[98] It can also be said that after World

---

[96] *Atlanta Resurgens* (Atlanta: The First National Bank of Atlanta, 1971), 80.

[97] Numan V. Bartley, "In Search of the New South: Southern Politics after Reconstruction," *Reviews in American History* 10, no. 4 (1982): 152.

[98] Melton McLaurin, "Review of *The South and Modern America*, by Dewey Grantham," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 79, no. 4 (1995): 990.

War II, "Atlanta was still a commercial capital - more so than ever - but it was also a far more sophisticated city, appealing to the whole man, not only to his desire for economic achievement but also to his love of music or football, his interest in computers or boating, his wish for learning or relaxation."[99] As a whole, the South was finally embracing the factors which would have transformed the region decades before. Whether it was a result of the world wars demonstrating that engineering and technology was the future of the country, the racial components which were finally being dictated on a national level, or that the "old" South was finally embodying elements considered progressive but adapting them into its distinct culture, the South was finally able to claim that they had moved beyond the past for which they had been judged for a century. As this economic transformation occurred, a social upheaval was taking place as well - moving the South further into modernity than it ever had before. Almost viewed as a revolution, the area became highly industrialized with a study showing that in 1940, agriculture was the primary economic function of the region; by 1981, farms made up less than 5% of the financial forecast.[100] Additionally, "[p]er capita income in the Deep South states increased by over 100 percent between 1961 and 1971, compared to a national increase of 83.5 percent."[101] All aspects of the region - politically, economically, and racially - were now in a period of transition and transformation as it seemed like the South was finally able, and willing,

---

[99] *Atlanta Resurgens*, 80.

[100] Gilbert C. Fite, "Farmers Left Behind," in *Cotton Fields No More: Southern Agriculture, 1865-1980*, 1st ed. (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1984), 209.

[101] See *Fortune,* May 1979, 268–289, and *Fortune,* May 15, 1969, 166–184. See also Gurney Breckenfeld, "Business Loves the Sunbelt (and Vice Versa)," *Fortune,* June 1977, 132–146.

to make the changes needed to realize its potential. This only made the New South myth more compelling as prosperity finally seemed to be within the region's grasp.

While the original New South ideals primarily focused on the economic status of the region, political and racial changes were necessary to realize these earliest goals. In many ways the South was finding ways to incorporate political and cultural changes into its own sense of identity, even though politically, the South was leaving behind its traditional identification with the Democrat party and becoming more split along racial lines, resulting from how the two political parties dealt with traditional southern values. Approaching the Civil Rights era, the racial hostility still existed staunchly in the southern way of life, so this split - while seemingly racist in nature - actually was more focused on other conservative, political elements, such as religion. Clearly racism would be the key issue facing the South during the mid-twentieth century, but many had become resigned to this change, especially in Atlanta, so their shift in political parties was a result from other concerns, primarily focusing on matters that many believed to be critical to their southern heritage. White southerners began to reject the more liberal stance of the Democrat party and embrace the Republican party that had constructed a "southern strategy" in response to this political defection; white southerners believed that the Republican party was more in agreement with the traditional, conservative, religious values with which the South still identified. While this political shift reinforced the South's desire for continuity, it was an important move as it reinforced the conservatism, in all areas of life, that would help contribute to the economic boom during the mid-twentieth century. At least politically, the South was able to assimilate an economically beneficial tenet with their traditional

values, a concept that most in the country had denied could occur.

On the other hand, as voting rights improved for African Americans, they began to identify themselves with the Democrats and gave this party a continued presence in an ever changing South. While the clash between these two parties would obviously continue the conflict which had existed for over a century, the friction would soon transition to other social issues than race. However, the rise of the Republican party reinforced the region's emphasis on a conservative mindset, and political scientists Earl Black and Merle Black explain how this conservatism would affect the region as a whole:

> The reigning political philosophy of the new southern middle class is the entrepreneurial version of the individualistic political culture, a blend of conservative and progressive themes. In its emphasis on low rates of taxation, minimal regulation of business, and resolute opposition to unions and redistributive welfare programs for have-nots and have-littles, the current political ideology retains important continuities with the traditionalistic political culture.[102]

Because of this conservative approach, the region became an attractive consideration for businesses looking to expand or relocate. It quickly became evident that "[b]y the 1980s (and indeed much earlier in many places), a new Southern economy prevailed, located in the same geographic space as the old one, but encompassing a very different package of labor, capital, natural resources, and entrepreneurship: not an advanced version of the old economy, but a new economy."[103] While the majority of the economic growth, and thus the increase in influence, was centered in Atlanta with businesses such as Delta, Coca-Cola, CNN, UPS, and Mercedes-Benz

---

[102] Earl Black and Merle Black, *Politics and Society in the South* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1987), 297.

[103] Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War.* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), 241,

establishing operating centers in Georgia's capital city, other southern cities also experienced prosperity with the transplanting of technology companies into areas such as the Research Triangle in North Carolina; BMW, Toyota, and Mercedes moving manufacturing plants from the midwest into the South; and the presence of Walmart, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, and Tesla establishing headquarters in southern cities. The military and NASA moved into the area, namely in Huntsville, Alabama, providing a considerable increase in government funding to the South. In 1951, the South's share of military prime contract awards was only 7.6; by 1980, it received 24.2% of these contracts.[104] Middle class occupations became more commonplace, high-tech city centers brought changes to lifestyles and landscapes, and by the 1980s, the South's economy consistently surpassed the employment growth of the rest of the nation.[105] These expansions were essential to the South taking the steps necessary towards a more financial independence in the country.

Even with racial lines being drawn politically, the improvement of race relations also contributed significantly to the South's ability to demonstrate that changes were taking place. World War II had allowed the African American to participate more fully at home and abroad, and this involvement promised him full access to the benefits of the country in which he lived. This participation also brought attention to his plight as a minority person, and national, even world wide, attention was now focused on how this group was being treated. It was after 1945 that Jim Crow laws were finally addressed, and a methodical attempt was made to diminish the

---

[104] Bruce J. Schulman, *From Cotton Belt to Sunbelt: Federal Policy, Economic Development, and the Transformation of the South, 1938-1980* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 140.

[105] Philip L. Rones, "Analysis of Regional Employment Growth, 1973-1985," *Monthly Labor Review* (July 1986): 8.

discriminatory aspects of southern law and culture. Democratic issues such as voting rights, fair trials, education, and equal job opportunities all played out on the national stage, and the African American was finally able to see progress in the promises made to him almost a century before. While it is true that many southern areas fought the Civil Rights Movement, extending as far as violence and and other types of retribution, the changes in race relations during the three decades following the war demonstrated that the South was willing to move past its antebellum mindset and embrace a more equal society. The transition may have been gradual, but results of a 2010 U.S. Census Bureau poll titled "The Black Population: 2010" demonstrate that a true sense of southern identity now applied to both whites and blacks, finding that African Americans now make up more of southern states' populations than northern ones.[106] Author and historian Orville Burton shares the story of an African American who had recently moved to Atlanta from Maryland and reportedly said that "moving South felt a little bit like coming home."[107] No longer were African Americans avoiding the region which had enslaved them; instead, they were realizing that the South could still be home, especially as important racial changes were taking place. Many could find their history in the former Confederate states, and their return demonstrated the affinity they still felt with the area. This is often viewed as a sign of progress for the South - at least in terms of racial relations - as those whose ancestors who had been enslaved now believed that they could make successful lives in the region, could put down roots wherever they chose to, and could prosper in the business world of Atlanta and other large,

---

106 Sonya Rastogi et al., "The Black Population: 2010.," U.S. Census Bureau (September 1, 2011), 7.

107 Larry Copeland, "For Blacks, a Return to Southern Roots" *USA Today*, July 1, 2011, 1A.

metropolitan cities. These three areas - political, economic, and racial - all saw major developments during the 1970s and the following decades and, because of this, important cultural shifts occurred which have contributed significantly to the South being able to become more influential in all aspects of national growth.

Just as the idea of Lost Cause had propelled southerners to try and maintain a sense of separateness, the identification of a "vanishing south" also motivated the region to reject a generic "Americanization" - whatever that entails - of its region while still modernizing in ways that would differentiate them from the Old South. While social analyst Wilburn Joseph Cash argued that the "South" as it had been known was not disappearing, in fact it could still be recognized as "not quite a nation within a nation, but the next thing to it,"[108] many would like to believe that this unabashedly distinct region is finally conforming. The idea of the vanishing south originated during the region's rapid change in the mid-twentieth century due to the fact that accelerated industrialization, a growth in income and education, and a shift in occupational opportunities began to make the South's economy seem more integrated into a larger American system. Viewed as the country's "economic problem number one" by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the late 1930s, the "problem child of the nation"[109] by John Gunther in 1947, and described as "the black sheep of the American community - a willful delinquent child who has somehow failed to shape up to the national standards"[110] by historian Charles Roland, it is no wonder that the South had an image problem to overcome during the mid twentieth century. So

---

[108] W.J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), viii.

[109] John Gunther, *Inside U.S.A.* (New York: New Press, 1947), p. 658.

[110] Roland, "The Ever-Vanishing South," 3.

as changes occurred over the next three decades, it seemed as if the rest of the country was watching these developments in hopes that the South would finally realize its missteps and choose to overcome them. When this seemed to have occurred, the rest of the country celebrated, finally willing to accept this delinquent child back into the family fold. Yet those who still unabashedly call themselves southerns do not necessarily view their new reputation as a mitigation of values they held dear; instead they actively resisted the label of "vanishing south," instead viewing their new character has modern but exhibiting the attitudes that made them distinct.

So was the issue really resolved as the North assumed? Or was it possible that a compromise had been reached, which was the interpretation the South would claim? When journalist Joseph P. Cumming declared that "the South is over,"[111] an *Epitaph for Dixie* was written by Pulitzer Prize winning editor Harry Ashmore, and Jimmy Carter was elected president, it seemed as if the South had finally shed its regrettable past and been accepted by mainstream America. Some even suggested that the most startling change leading to the idea of a vanishing south was how race relations were viewed. Martin Luther King, Jr. once described Birmingham as "the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States," yet Jimmy Carter proclaimed that the Civil Rights Movement had unified both whites and blacks, and novelist Walker Percy commented that "the South and Southerners … white and black … no longer suffer the unique onus, the peculiar burden of race that came to be part of the very connotation of the

---

[111] Joseph B. Cumming Jr., "Been Down Home So Long It Looks Like Up To Me," *Esquire* (August 1971), 84.

word South."[112] Additionally, a 2001 report demonstrated that both whites and blacks who live in the South are currently more likely to identify themselves as "southern" than even two decades before - a significant change in identity for African Americans who have typically been viewed as unequal and isolated in the area.[113] This identification by both groups as southern has increased since 1971, but for African Americans, it especially demonstrates the change in how they relate to the region. With the South seemingly overcoming its race problem, the rest of the country was finally able to embrace it as a worthy contributor to society. Statistics also seemed to support this idea as the Southern Growth Policies Board reported in 1978 that over six million people had moved to the South,[114] more than twice the amount that had moved to other parts of the country. By 1976, three southern cities - Dallas/Ft. Worth, Houston, and Atlanta - ranked in the top 20 in population in the country,[115] and southern states had sustained a minimum growth rate of 8.4% over an eight year period, well above the national average of 7%;[116] and the numbers, while consistently true for Atlanta, still remain strong, other southern cities are also starting to experience growth. Huntsville, Alabama, for example, has added Blue Origin, Aerojet Rocketdyne, the FBI, Toyota and Mazda, and Amazon to its already exploding economy and has been named by *U.S. News and World Report* as the best place to live in America (2022). Other

---

[112] Walker Percy, "Southern Comfort," *Harper's,* January 1979, 80.

[113] "Southern Focus Polls, South Survey, Spring 2001," The Odum Institute for Research in Social Science (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2001).

[114] "A Profile of the Southern States," in the Southern Growth Policies Board Records #4589, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, December 1978), 4.

[115] "National Summary Report - AHS 1976," U.S. Census Bureau (March 1978).

[116] Ibid.

southern cities are also seeing population explosions, and these are the cities that are supposedly a part of the vanishing south.

So if the South is actually vanishing, why are population statistics rising? Was this an inaccurate label, and people are actually realizing the advantages of living in the region and actively choosing to relocate there? While perhaps incongruous with this analysis, this theory contributes to the role that the University of Georgia has been able to combine elements of both old and new, successfully creating a new identity for the South. Grantham acknowledges that reunification has taken place; however, he also believes that the South remains the "most distinctive region of the nation, in large part because of a cultural heritage that reflects the region's unique past, which includes a 'complex and ambiguous' relationship between blacks and whites and a healthy dose of Protestant fundamentalism."[117] While many hail the South becoming Americanized - if that is truly what has happened - there are many who either view this transition as unfortunate or who simply don't believe that it is true. Tindall, perhaps, said it best when he remarked, "We learn time and time again . . . that to change is not necessarily to disappear. And, we learn from modern psychology, that to change is not necessarily to lose one's identity: to change, sometimes, is to find it."[118] When applied to the South, Tindall's quote proves that the South did not have to become northern, as the nation so desired, in order to be a contributing part of the country. Instead, like is so true with mankind world-wide, it is the

---

[117] Grantham, *Southern Progressivism*, 330.

[118] Tindall, *The Emergence of the New South*, 593.

differences that make a country, and the world, stronger. The South fought for its distinction from the beginning and has proven that it has not vanished.

Is it possible for the region to be considered "new" even when there still exist so many remnants of its past? The problem lies in whether or not a region must give up all of its distinction to be accepted, of whether one area of the country *must* conform to the ideals of another area in order to be correct. Some would contend that, yes, the South must give up all of its traditional values and beliefs in order to truly be viewed as progressive because of its racist, rebellious past - yet this would tend to be the belief of those who are outside of what was the antebellum South. Woodward has argued that the South's key problem is that it historically refused to participate in the nation's traditions of success; it chose to remain set apart, almost reveling in their sins of slavery and secession.[119] Yet at the same time, he admits that "New England, the West, and other regions are occasionally permitted to speak for the nation. But the South is thought to be hedged about with peculiarities that set it apart as unique,"[120] and, because of these idiosyncrasies, not allowed to represent the nation in any way. So why is this assimilation not required of other parts of the country? While clearly inaccurate, some would argue that it's because the United States has lost most of its regional distinction - that with immigration at the turn of the 20th century, relocations for jobs and families, and other methods of integrating areas so that they are like others, specific regions of the United States can no longer be identified by unique characteristics, values, or beliefs. C. Vann Woodward even argues

---

[119] C. Vann Woodward, *The Burden of Southern History* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1960),16-21.

[120] C. Vann Woodward, "The Irony of Southern History," The Journal of Southern History 19, no. 1 (1953), 3.

that "the South is still in the midst of an economic and social revolution that . . has already leveled many of the old monuments of regional distinctiveness and may end eventually by erasing the very consciousness of a distinctive tradition along with the will to sustain it,"[121] and he questions whether or not there will be a time "when the Southerner will begin to ask himself whether there is really any longer very much point in calling himself a Southerner."[122] However, this is simply not true. In values, traditions, small towns, even sports, what occurs in the South cannot be transplanted into other regions in the country. For example, literature that takes place in the South can ONLY take place in the South - just as stories about the Midwest, the West Coast, and New England still share a regional distinction that does not allow them to take place in a different location. Even Woodward admits that it could be through literature that a southern distinctiveness will continue - especially because of the plethora of contribution by southern writers during the early 20th century.[123] Regardless the method or reason, the argument whether or not a region of the country can be significant while remaining distinct is moot; the South is not unique in preserving its uniqueness - all parts of the country have accomplished this - yet it is only the South that is considered "new" as they have navigated this identity crisis.

The issue goes deeper then - why is the South singled out for change? When one determines that the South must be fully like Atlanta to benefit the rest of the nation, then one negates the uniqueness of all parts of the country, and it begs the question as to why the South is the only region that must change and conform in order to be viewed in a positive light. The

---

[121] C. Vann Woodward, "The Search for Southern Identity." *The Virginia Quarterly Review* 34, no. 3 (1958): 322.

[122] Ibid., 321.

[123] Ibid., 337.

Southwest is not required to dismiss its Native American and frontier characteristics; the Northwest is not compelled to diminish its identification with a natural and healthful life; the Midwest still retains its strong work ethic and family values; and certainly the Northeast is not expected to forego its distinction as the birthplace of the country and barometer for all things progressive. No, it is the South, because of its racist and rebellious past, that will always be required to change and conform, especially in consideration of the North. Atlanta is viewed as the standard because it *has* rejected its southern past - any remnant of southern identity is relegated to tourist traps and museums of days gone by. However, is this fair? Is there not an explanation for the South's desire to retain elements of its past? Is there not value in how its people live their lives and strengthen the nation? And, just as importantly, how has this established a substantial struggle between old and new? The South, overall, thinks they *should* be able to continue certain cultural traditions, and perhaps that is why only one city has been able to reach this nationally desired status. Southern historian Charles P. Roland agrees with this opinion in that:

> [i]t is not … in economic, political, or racial affairs . . . that the endurance of the South as a distinctive region is most pronounced. Rather it is in the subtler areas of the mind and spirit, and even of the sense, of the eye, ear, tongue, and palate, that the South continues to affirm its differentiation most effectively.[124]

And maybe it is why the path to a more visible position has been gradual and, often, resisted. It is not that the South is completely unwilling to change; it is understood that there are characteristics which certainly should not continue. However, it is also accurate that elements of its past have defined who southerners are, and it is important that these elements remain a part of

---

[124] Roland, "The Ever-Vanishing South," 8-9.

the culture. This, then, creates a tension between those who desire progress and forward movement, the New South as it may, and those whose loyalty is first to the southern way of life. It also begs the question as to whether a sense of continuity can exist while also moving forward. One of the most important studies of this idea of southern convergence is Dewey W. Grantham's *The South in Modern America: A Region at Odds*. Analyzing the South as a region "at odds" with the rest of the country, Grantham explores the conflict and compromise which the South experienced in order to both merge with the North but also retain its cultural distinction. Many northerners who move South find the southern diet, the dialect, even the pace of life to be too difficult to which to acclimate. They want southerners to lose their drawl and find a sense of urgency in their daily lives, but most southerners do not need feel the need to make these changes in order to "become American." They are passionately patriotic and already view themselves as a part of America. While there has clearly been a sense of conflict between the North and the South, Grantham also shows how it has existed within the South itself, forcing cities and counties to compromise when needed; this conflict and compromise being played out in the region for the past century.

What is critical to understand, then, is that the South is making progress - maybe not at the rate that the rest of the country desires, but progress nonetheless. Faced with policies that would have negated its entire past as unnecessary, even destructive, southerners have often actively resisted the statutes that have been imposed on them - perhaps because they are fundamentally opposed to them, but also because they revolutionize the southern way of life and essentially change who they are. It is this attitude then that moves the South into the twenty-first

century; it is also this compromise that will ultimately resolve the contentious rivalry between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech. Two schools, one placed in the Old South and one in the New, are able to play out both the conflict and the compromise of the past century on the football field - the only question being whether or not one will prevail in assuming the identify of the present day South.

The South as it stands today was clearly not built quickly or easily. While there are eras where progress seemed stagnant, most historiography now identifies shifts taking place that would eventually culminate in the South's position today. However, the contention remains how much the South has lost its regional distinction. Obviously modernization has changed key elements of the South's historical identity due to both desire and necessity. Yet when looking at the region as a whole, it is hard to argue that the South has become completely modernized to the point of absolute conformity with the rest of the country. In determining, then, how the South has progressed to this point, and the role that it has carved out for itself nationally, the conflict and compromise that has existed for over a century must be considered as the determining factors in how the region's identity has emerged. Grady and his fellow New South advocates conceived of a South that was economically contributing to the nation like the North was, and - for decades - it was this image that determined whether or not the region had successfully integrated. However, since the mid-twentieth century, more attention has been given to the idea that the the South has succeeded as Grady and his friends anticipated, yet not in the way that they had envisioned. Instead of rejecting their "southernness," the South has been able to increase in influence yet still retain many of its distinctive features. The region has been forced to face its need for modern

status while still wanting to preserve its history - forcing the South to learn how to balance both.

These ideas of compromise and concession can be seen in multiple ways throughout the South, especially in the past half century. However, one clear example is evident in the classic rivalry between two universities - one that can be considered southern, and the other the New South; one that has roots established a century before the Civil War, and the other established in the midst of Reconstruction and the hopes for a new future; one desiring to retain its place as a southern institution, and one that has never viewed itself that way; and one that mirrors the changing attitudes of the South, and one that has never had a problem identifying itself with the hopes and goals of a changing populace. The University of Georgia and the Georgia Institute of Technology, two very different universities - in their founding, student body, and purpose - both represent the South. Only seventy miles apart in distance, the rivalry of these two schools embody all of the conflict that has existed in the South since the Civil War. Although the struggle most notably exists on the football field - a staple of southern life and culture - the rivalry is present in numerous ways, with students and fans alike claiming dominance whenever possible. Even more important is the fact that one - the University of Georgia - resides in a classic southern town, reminiscent of the Old South in many ways - the epitome of continuity and compromise; and the other - Georgia Tech - is located in Atlanta, the epitome of the New South. A contrast between the old and new can be analyzed in numerous ways, but if one wants to understand a new grasp on the depth of the conflict, an analysis of a good_old college rivalry represents the clash as well as any other process. And, in doing so, a clear representation of how the South has transformed itself into the identity it now presents can be analyzed and understood.

Chapter 3

The University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia - a city off the beaten path, a place that must be your destination if you find yourself there, a community that retains much of its antebellum southern charm, and a town in which you will find the twenty-first oldest university in the United States. Even today, visiting Athens is like a step back in time, not completely consigned to the past, but enough so that one will feel like he has a glimpse of what southern life used to be in terms of charm, hospitality, and tradition. While several southern college towns have also been able to maintain this unique connection to the past, Athens remains a jewel of southern grace and culture, yet at the same time has entered the twenty-first century with a more progressive look than that with which it began the twentieth century. Known as a college town and a prototype of the 1980s indie culture - specifically in music - Athens has consistently been influential in cultural changes and how the South is perceived. It has often found itself in the spotlight regarding civil rights issues and remains on the cutting edge of southern collegiate education. While only seventy miles from the beacon city of the new South, Athens remains a picture of the Old South, and its residents and students are proud to embrace both its ties to the past and its promises for the future. Most closely identified with the University of Georgia, Athens has remained significant in the South's progression to national influence and acceptance, primarily because it has been forced to deal with many of the difficult issues but remain an example of the continuity which so many southerners desire. After the Civil War, the university was initially viewed as one that would

have difficulty adapting to the New South vision that was espoused by so many business leaders and politicians - even rejecting early on a visiting speaker who called on the university to move into the twentieth century as a leader and example. However, over the next century, Georgia was able to reconcile itself to the changes that needed to be made while preserving traditions that still reflected the past with which they were so connected, allowing the university to accept the leadership role that would truly help to define the New South.

While Athens clearly retains most of its influence because of the University of Georgia, it is because of the unique character of this small southern town that so much attention has been focused on it. While Tuscaloosa, Alabama; Oxford, Mississippi; and Little Rock, Arkansas all have universities which have played national significance, the city of Athens has a connotation all its own - a unique impression of the Old South apart from its flagship school. Established in the late eighteenth century as Cedar Shoals and chosen as the site of the state's flagship university because more Georgians lived in the upcountry than in the coastal towns, it was called Athens - after the ancient Greek city of knowledge - in recognition of the new institution of higher learning that would be established there. When one of Georgia's first railroads was built in the area, the city's importance developed even more as it now included a transportation hub for the antebellum south, along with a university that was growing even more influential in the region. Surviving the Civil War more intact than many other southern cities, Athens grew even more rapidly as it approached the turn of the century, becoming a center for transportation, business, and education. Between the end of the Civil War and 1910, the city grew tenfold - from 4,251 inhabitants to 14,913. The city would see extensive growth again during the 1990s when

its population would grow from 45,734 to 100,266 by the turn of the twenty-first century.[125] This late twentieth century growth will prove important when considering how the University of Georgia represents the compromise between the old and new and will provide a southern character which is acceptable to the nation. It will also be reflected in how a deep South rivalry plays out on the football field.

Deeply ingrained antebellum behaviors, however, were not immediately erased from the town's consciousness, and remnants of their past remained well into the twentieth century. In fact, Athens was known to openly reject Grady's New South vision, and the women, especially, worked to ensure that the Confederate memory survived - to the point that a Federal officer stationed in Athens said, "The people of Athens were more disloyal now than they were the day General Lee surrendered."[126] Like many in the South who embraced the Lost Cause theory, the town's citizens transferred their passion for the war to maintaining the virtue of the cause itself, especially those who, in their minds, had died heroically. However, Athens was one of the first southern cities to provide opportunities for an emerging black middle class to appear. Its willingness to work with the Freedmen's Bureau to create education opportunities for freed slaves, unique to the region, indicated a partial softening in their attitude and a readiness to move past previous racist practices and embrace some of the tenets of the New South vision. In 1868, the Knox Institute opened, a freedmen Methodist school in 1879, and Jeruel Academy in 1881, and all of these schools provided primary, intermediate, nursing, and industrial training for

---

[125] "Census of Population and Housing," Census.gov., accessed November 27, 2022.

[126] *Southern Watchman,* May 9, 1866.

African-Americans. Freedmen were also allowed to play a large role in the press with three black newspapers serving the area: the *Athens Blade*, the *Athens Clipper*, and the *Progressive Era*.[127] Since Reconstruction, Athens has experienced the conflict of Old South vs. New South. Unlike Atlanta, whose rebirth was completely dependent on the new, Athens was forced to reconcile itself to what was now expected from the South, and this struggle to find its place lasted for over a century. So even though it has quintessentially remained a college town, the city has continued to play an important role in the South's growth.

While much of its growth has been progressive in nature, Athens - nicknamed the "Classic City" - has also kept its Old South charm; in fact, this antebellum feel that the city exudes affects more of the city's reputation than the other milestones it has reached. The spirit and charm of the University of Georgia also contributes to this perception, so the prestige of this sixth largest city in Georgia remains one of southern timelessness and grace. While many other industries and businesses now call Athens home, it is the presence of the university that has allowed Athens to remain prominent throughout the South; it is the university that has brought the most growth to the city; and it is the university that continues to define the character and culture of the area. UGA's chosen location was initially set away from larger towns as many considered an isolated location more conducive to a positive college experience. However, University of Georgia professor and historian of the Old South E. Merton Coulter explains how "the conveniences of living in a college city must breed a town of some sort, but that same reason held that towns could be molded, developed, and influenced scarcely less than individuals

---

[127] Frances Taliaferro Thomas and Mary Levin Koch, A Portrait of Historic Athens & Clarke County (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2009), 115-117.

who constituted them."[128] Coulter goes on to argue that "[n]o town was ever more completely the creature of an educational institution than was Athens and the character of no town ever more deeply partook of its creator."[129] This initial assessment has continued to be proven true for the University of Georgia and Athens - two entities intertwined and defined by each other. In his book *Annals of Athens, Georgia, 1801-1901*, one of Athens earliest historians Augustus Longstreet Hull describes their symbiotic relationship: "For a quarter of a century at least, the interests of Athens and of the University went hand in hand - they rose or fell together. Indeed one was nothing without the other."[130]

Initially a college for the sons of upper class, southern landowners who had a desire for a life of intellectual ease and lived a life of captivating charm, the University of Georgia has consistently had one of the most beautiful college campus in the country,[131] and, because it is located in Athens, many of its traditions hearken back to the antebellum period. According to Coulter, "Athens's greatest ambition was to appear cultured and intellectual . . . [but not] to become an industrial metropolis; it was a college town where culture and refinement must be bred and developed."[132] After visiting the southern town, James Silk Buckingham of England called the area "picturesque and romantic . . . elegant and highly intellectual" and believed that if Athens could remain this way, "it [could] hardly fail to exercise an alluring influence on the

---

[128] E. Merton Coulter, *College Life in the Old South* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), 264.

[129] Ibid., 264.

[130] Augustus Longstreet Hull, *Annals of Athens, Georgia, 1801-1901,* Banner Job Office, 1906. Reprinted London: Forgotten Books, 2015: 16.

[131] Jennifer Chappell Smith, "The South's Most Beautiful Colleges," *Southern Living*, August 16, 2017.

[132] Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 266, 268.

surrounding country, which in time may rival that of the Athenians of Greece over the people of the Peloponesus."[133] These sentiments have been repeated over the past two centuries as so many universities and their cities have been modernized to the point of losing their initial appeal, yet Athens and the University of Georgia are still the example of southern charm.

The town grew quickly, with 583 whites and 517 negroes in 1828 growing to 1102 whites and 905 negroes by 1838,[134] making it the perfect choice for Georgia's state university. Southern hospitality abounded, demonstrated in one instance when the Athenians refused "to exact room rent from the students who were suddenly thrust upon the bounty of the town in 1831, when one of the University dormitories burned."[135] Even those who were not associated with the university as students or faculty still took advantage of the social and cultural offerings of the school, establishing the university as the focal point of the city and how it would be perceived. The characters of both the city and university remained interchangeable for the first half of the nineteenth century, each defining the other. Although the university was forced to close during the Civil War, Athens remained important to the region as it was a source of supplies for the Confederacy. After the Civil War, the impoverished university reopened, most of its investments lost in the war, so the city called for the state legislature to provide "permanent support of the University"[136] because they believed that "Athens and the University held as a heritage worth

---

[133] James Silk Buckingham, *Slave States of America* II (1842) (Sydney: Wentworth Press, 2019), 94.

[134] *Southern Banner,* March 17, 1838.

[135] Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 273.

[136] *Southern Watchman,* January 24, 1866.

cherishing, the War for Southern Independence and the memory of those who carried it on."[137] Clearly the city did not want to relinquish its past easily; however, with the antebellum period now behind them, Athenians knew that they would have to rediscover their purpose and character. The culture of the university began to change, and a New South was clearly approaching; while the city softened in how it interacted with reminders of its past, these memories were not forgotten and would continue to manifest themselves -continuing to be a part of university life even today. Athens and its university began to choose the elements from its history that still contributed to the character it wished to present, and they began to honor the service, traditions, and values of the bygone days. In fact, some argue that the unavailability of courageous leaders who were willing to sacrifice their own positions and reputations to help Athens and the university move beyond their troubled past hindered Georgia's momentum into the future.[138] The plans, or lack thereof, of these leaders clearly determined the city's modern progression and affected both the standings of the city and the university which was established there. Because of this, it is hard to separate the city from its past, so both Athens and the University of Georgia remain symbols of the Old South even though they have been successful in becoming more nationally influential during the last half century.

Established in 1785, the University of Georgia is the fourth oldest college in the South, the oldest state-chartered university in the nation, and one of the first in the country to be given lands by the Morrill Act of 1862. While the campus itself was not established until 1801, the

---

[137] Coulter, *College Life in the Old South,* 335.

[138] Thomas D. Clark, "Review of *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985*," by Thomas G. Dyer, *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (1985): 88.

university was granted 40,000 acres in 1784 for the purpose of creating a school that would serve the state of Georgia and its citizens. The university's charter alludes to its high purpose for the state: "It should therefore be among the first objects of those who wish well to the national prosperity to encourage and support the principles of religion and morality, and early to place the youth under the forming hand of society, that by instruction they may be moulded to the love of virtue and good order."[139] Initially following the pattern of Yale University, the college focused on offering a classical education to the young men of the state, most who were sons of upper class plantation owners. This model would be followed for almost two centuries until it became evident that some concessions would need to be made in its curriculum in order to enter the twenty-first century at any competitive level; however, the largest colleges at the university are the ones which have existed from the beginning, hinting at a sense of continuity in how it views its role in the state university system.

In determining, then, that the University of Georgia in the epitome of a modern southern school, it is important to consider why it has received this distinction. While it would take UGA decades to be able to claim a stake in the New South identity, by the end of the twentieth century, its program offerings showed that it had accomplished these objectives and now offers a curriculum worthy of progress and modernity. What the university takes pride in, however, is that it has remained southern - that when one steps onto campus, there is still a feel of the antebellum era where chivalry, honor, and devotion to family are an important part of how it wants to depict itself. The architecture of the school has stayed consistently classic with new

---

[139] *Facts About the University of Georgia*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1911.

buildings mirroring the original ones from two centuries ago. The older North Campus, consisting of the oldest buildings on campus and having its district listed in the National Register of Historic Places, reflects the years immediately following the university's founding with the Old College, built in 1806 and enjoying the prestige of being the oldest building in Athens and one of the oldest overall in northeast Georgia, as a centerpiece to the district.[140] In anticipation of the university's growth, the building's front and back design are identical, signifying the school's future growth in both directions. The majority of the buildings were constructed in either Federal, Classic, or Antebellum styles, allowing the university to preserve its historic character.

The North Campus remains the administrative center of the school, as it has been for over two centuries. Comparatively, the South Campus is newer in nature and was built to accommodate the anticipated, burgeoning science and technology programs at the turn of the 20th century. Symbolically, the North and South campuses are connected via Jim Gillis Bridge, indicating the university's desire to harmonize its old and north identities.[141] Many of South Campus's buildings are also built in classical styles; however, the purposes of these buildings clearly reflect the district's focus on scientific and technological advancement. In keeping with the goals of the New South, the true growth of South Campus began with Conner Hall in 1908 and housed the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and also included Dawson Hall where the College of Family and Consumer Sciences is located. These earlier buildings have been thoroughly renovated on the inside in order to offer up-to-date educational conditions,

---

[140] Larry B. Dendy, *Through the Arch: An Illustrated Guide to the University of Georgia Campus* (University of Georgia Press, 2013), 21-23.

[141] Ibid., 22-23.

yet the outside has been preserved in order to protect the antebellum feel of the Old Campus.[142] Construction of science and engineering labs and lecture halls has continued for over a century, and South Campus now represents the university's commitment to STEM programs which are vital to to the future success of any university. Three other areas of development are Central, East, and West Campus which provide the more modern offerings of a university, including residence halls and student centers. It is the North and South campuses, however, that are the heart of the school, protecting the original flavor of the school and its antebellum past yet also looking to the university's future. It is images of these two campuses that are more often than not presented when advertising UGA, and they are the icons the students and alumni envision when identifying with their university - along with their Georgia Bulldogs, but that discussion has a distinct focus. A college campus reflects the spirit, history, and traditions of the school, and the University of Georgia is no different; in fact, even more so than many other schools, UGA finds a sense of identity in this southern pride.

College traditions and rituals are extremely important in providing an unmistakable atmosphere in which current students and alumni can feel recognition and a continued sense of pride. These traditions can be a part of the school's legends, or they can grow out of that unity that defines the student body. Many types of customs at the University of Georgia are the same as they are the same at other universities - unifiers such as fight songs and pre-game rituals; however, most universities also have a unique heritage that reflects the spirt of the school and how it interprets itself to others. Just as the buildings reflect UGA's continued fascination with a

---

[142] Ibid., 23.

romanticized past, several of its traditions also echo the history that many want to remember. Rituals such as the ringing of the Chapel Bell, walking through the campus Arch, fight songs, and the "dawg walk" all signify an intense loyalty to the school and its past. The Chapel Bell and the Arch are located on the North Campus and are closely tied to the university's early days, reflecting both its Protestant background and its initial role as the state university. Other traditions are newer, yet they, too, are woven deep into the fabric of the school's framework. Few universities in the United States revere rituals as old as Georgia's, so the students' and alumni's pride in these rites reflect both a desire to revisit the past of the school while looking to larger role in the future.

The oldest traditions center around the Chapel Bell and the Arch. Both existing before the Civil War, these two locations on campus recall a South before modernization, where daily life was more structured and consistent, when students initially came together to create an atmosphere of unity and distinction. The ringing of the Chapel Bell is the oldest tradition on campus, built in 1832 and initially used to signal different events throughout the students' day. From originally calling them to chapel to announcing the beginning and end of classes, the Chapel Bell provided structure to the students' days and was a reminder of their Protestant orthodoxy roots. Over the years, as the framework of campus life changed, the Bell has taken on more significance for athletics than reminding students where they are supposed to be at a certain time. The Bell was first mentioned as a part of campus life on May 6, 1901 when it became a part of athletic celebrations: "Several boys wanted to ring the chapel bell in celebration of a

baseball victory, but their enthusiasm cooled down before the ringing could be accomplished."[143] Its football significance began in 1906 before a game against arch rivals Georgia Tech. Students were encouraged to cheer their Bulldogs into victory and that "…[a]bsolutely everybody must be at the game backing the team heart and soul, lung and tongue. If this is done, Georgia will surely triumph and the old bell in the chapel belfry will once again proclaim in clarion tones that Georgia reins supreme in the old State."[144] While Georgia unfortunately lost that game against Tech, they were able to repeat the vow after a win against Auburn University on December 5th. After the game, students could be heard chanting, "From the Thanksgiving game we are returning,/And on the campus still is burning, a large bonfire./Sill the chapel bell is ringing,/And the college boys are singing,/"Glory to Old Georgia."[145] Even in 1963, opposing teams were attempting to silence the bell, knowing its traditional importance to the Bulldog faithful. It now rings after Bulldog victories, acting as the gathering place to celebrate a win[146] and is also used to signify solidarity during times of remembrance and national heartbreak, ringing after the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the Sandy Hook shooting. While an over-exuberant student body caused the yoke to break and the bell to fall in 2007, it was returned to its historic post and continues to provide a desired link to the past.

---

[143] "Georgia Traditions," University of Georgia Georgiadogs, archived from the original on January 18, 2013, accessed September 3, 2022.

[144] *The Red and Black* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, November 3, 1906), archived in *Georgia Historic Newspapers,* accessed October 14, 2022.

[145] *The Red and Black* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press,December 5, 1906), archived in *Georgia Historic Newspapers,* accessed October 14, 2022.

[146] "Georgia Traditions," January 18, 2013.

The Arch is the second oldest tradition and has played a significant and symbolic role from its beginning. Former editor-in-chief of *The Red and Black* Daniel Burnett explains its significance this way:

> It's a doorway to history. From the historic Arch on the edge of North Campus, students left the University to become Confederate soldiers. Some came back, wounded; she didn't come back at all. The Arch witnessed the dawn of the automobile. The Great Depression. Two world wars. The new millennium. Under it walked 151 years of living history…is the most defining symbol of the University of Georgia.[147]

A representation of the arch that is on the Georgia state seal, the Arch immediately tied the school to its role as Georgia's leading state university. Initially built to keep cows from wandering onto campus, the Arch found its true importance early in the 1900s when a freshman student, Daniel Huntley Redfearn, vowed to not walk through the Arch until he had graduated. This pledge was soon echoed throughout the student body, and it quickly became superstition that those who violated this promise would not graduate from UGA. Like the Chapel Bell, however, the Arch has also become a gathering place. While the Chapel Bell most often signifies victories and success for the university, the Arch has taken on a more political role; it has often served as a place of political protest, initially with the admission of Hamilton Holmes and Charlayne Hunter in 1961, and then later following the 1970 Kent State University shootings, the Persian Gulf War, and the 9/11 attacks. This dual purpose allows for continued significance for the landmark, creating new remembrances while continuing to uphold the old. Traditions like the Chapel Bell and the Arch - both almost two centuries old - provide a sense of continuity for the school, a pride in where it has been and how these historic rituals can still play into the future.

---

[147] David Burnett, "Graduation Gateway: Students Continue Arch's Century-Old Tradition," *The Red and Black*, November 4, 2009.

While they might not act as a source of continuity for southern distinction, as many universities have traditions of similar importance, they are unique in their own way and reflect the school's past - one which the students embrace as sacred to their experience at the school.

Sorority, fraternities, and freshman traditions have also been an important part of the student culture of the university, and, early on, they often reflected the school's continued enthusiasm with its antebellum past. The Stars and Bars parade, which occurred annually through the early 20th century in Atlanta as a part of the Old South Ball, was sponsored by UGA's Kappa Alpha chapters, along with ones at Mercer University and Emory University Students would wear Confederate uniforms as they marched through the city, recreating a military line from a century before.[148] Southern history also exhibited itself in the social occasions of Greek life, growing more evident during the turbulent Civil Rights decade. A 1957 photo from the University of Georgia's Pandora Yearbook also shows the same fraternity sponsoring social events which replicates scenes of the mid-19th century South, where students would wear Civil War era costumes and the presence of Confederate flags were a prominent feature of the affair.[149] While a tradition that faded away during the 1960s, Freshman red caps were an important part of UGA culture throughout much of the twentieth century, changing in appearance, however, during the era of desegregation. Freshman caps, not unique to Georgia, altered their design during the 1950s, setting them apart from other schools and, once again, demonstrating how closely the university identified with its antebellum roots, even a century later. The 1955 adoption of the

---

[148] *Pandora Yearbook* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1953).

[149] *Pandora Yearbook* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1957).

Confederate rebel cap as the official Freshman cap signified the school's paradoxical reactions to the Civil Rights movement, some arguing that tying the tradition to the past would inspire more enthusiasm from the Freshman to wear them yet others asserting that the university should move beyond this ostensible representation of a racist past. The Confederate Freshman cap presented both a statement on the political and social events of the era, yet also, once again, proved that the memory of the Old South had not disappeared. While the tradition of Freshman caps was abandoned during the 1960s, it was not as a result of a backlash against the style of caps but merely a result of an overall nationwide change in college life and the student body's realization that they must relinquish these more racist representations of their history. These practices of campus student life may not be evident today, but the fact that they existed for a century beyond the Civil War demonstrates how this past has played such an integral part of the university's character and identity and hindered UGA's ability to move fully into the twentieth century.

Newer traditions center more around athletics than they do as a reminder of the past; however, they are just as deeply ingrained in the lives of the students as the others. While a deeper analysis of these will be discussed in later chapters, suffice it to say that these sporting traditions also bear considerable significance to the character of the university. The most relevant of the athletic rituals are the Dawg Walk and the fight songs. Most schools have some sort of "walk" for fans to cheer on their football players before home games, and the University of Georgia is no different. Although not explicitly stated, these walks are evocative of sending soldiers into battle, cheering on those who will fight the campaign with all the pomp and circumstance possible. While some schools may not wish to see the ritual in this way, UGA

would be one where it would embrace this connotation, mirroring a war a century and a half ago that, this time, they may end up winning. Especially when playing a northern school - or even their in-state rival Georgia Tech, which to them was the same thing - the desire for victory intensifying because of the war that they lost, and vindication on the battlefield of sport is the next best thing to redemption. The Redcoat Marching Band, originally called the Dixie Redcoat Marching Band and a product of the UGA Military Department, hailed the team into action. Once on the field itself, the band's performance combines both the school's football team and its culture - focusing on a "corps" style of marching which earned them the Sudler Trophy for their ability to blend a historical contribution with the American way of life - and spending much of their time in the shape of the Arch which is so important to campus life. Just as buglers and drummers once cheered the troops into battle, so does the UGA marching band participate in the Dawg Walk as the players set out to meet their foes. Continuing with the battle theme, UGA's fight songs also reflect a bygone era. "Glory, Glory," the rally song, is set to the tune of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," that, while it was written by a northern abolitionist, is a tune decidedly linked to the Civil War, and the official fight song, "Hail to Georgia," lauds the university which is "down in Dixie." While fight songs and alma maters are always intensely personal to the university faithful, UGA takes pride in its southern past and includes elements in all of its songs. So while the tradition of cheering the football players into the stadium is not unique to Georgia, there is historical and cultural significance in the rituals that surround them at this university - ones that reflect southern pride and identity and a desire to retain a sense of continuity in multiple ways.

The University of Georgia also epitomizes a southern school in the attitudes and character that it exudes. A southerner - more than just defined as a person who lives in the southern part of a region, specifically in the United States yet certainly true to this discussion- connotes the ideas of honor, charm, good manners, and a devotion to family. While this was especially true two centuries ago, in many ways it is just as true today, even though the stereotype seems a bit outdated for the more modern areas of the region. It is interesting, then, how schools such as the University of Georgia still seem to espouse this chivalrous way of life. Clearly with all of the changes over the past 150 years, it would seem strange to still consider this a part of the university's culture; however, it is. The charm of Athens, a distinctly southern city, also contributes to the idea that - when visiting the historic downtown or stepping onto campus - one can still feel a sense of the past. Yes, the university is modern and progressive, with all of the attitudes and opinions that are associated with a mainstream, state university. There are political protests and demonstrations; UGA is even known for its contributions to alternative music and, at times, a more bohemian lifestyle. All of these present-day views, however, do not change the fact that the school is still willing to acknowledge parts of its past, even though some of this history is slowly being eroded under political pressure.

As southern studies become more popular, with historians being less likely to simply negate the region's past without truly understanding it, the university offers lectures on southern identity and how the definition of southern culture has changed over the years. Because it is so closely identified with the southern experience, it would be relevant for UGA to provide opportunities to dissect its past and that of the region as a whole. In 2018, the UGA English

Department sponsored a lecture, as part of the Ballew Lecture Series, that analyzed the song "Dixie" in relation to southern identity. In offering this lecture, associate professor of English at the university Dr. Cody Marrs explained why he believes these opportunities are important: "I think it's good for UGA to have events where we get to think about the history of southern culture, and the complicated nature of southern identity."[150] The term 'complicated' is key to understanding the role of the South - and the university - in today's modern society. Arguably one of the most complex regions of the country because of its past, historians are now examining the multi-faceted nature of the region, especially in relation to its continued desire for a distance and unique character. While the importance of southern historiography continues to grow, it is especially relevant to places that have experienced this way of life first hand, that have had their identity shaped by the southern one. The University of Georgia has been immersed in southern culture since it was founded, so it is imperative for the school to consider how these characteristics have shaped, and still do, the experience of the school.

From the beginning, the University of Georgia has been uniquely southern. From its location to its students to its traditions, the school has never relinquished its southern charm. However, the university has been forced to change in numerous ways over the past two centuries, regardless of how much it has attempted to remain the same, and three significant eras, in particular, challenged the school's desire for continuity and tradition. During these events, the university has been compelled to reevaluate its position on many of its established practices and determine how to modernize without abandoning their ties to the past. The stages of

---

[150] Hunter Riggall, "Southern Culture, History is Explored Through Analysis of the Southern Fold Song Dixie," *The Red and Black*, April 19, 2018.

Reconstruction, the women's movement, and the Civil Rights movement all challenged its traditional "southernness" and forced them to rethink the practices that had been a part of the university since its inception - with the intent of moving forward in a more progressive manner. These three political and social challenges directly tested fundamental attitudes to which both the students, faculty, and community had adhered for decades, and while the university eventually conformed to the more progressive ways of thinking, it was not without hesitation and, sometimes, resistance. It forced the school's administration to reconsider rules that had been put into place at its founding, the faculty to change how it discussed issues in the classroom, and the students to find a different purpose in their protests. Dyer recognizes that "[m]any of the problems and the opportunities facing the university during the first two decades of the new century can be traced to the attempt to become more modern, more complex, more diversified"[151] because these transitions reshaped the character and traditions of this southern institution. An initial inaction caused Georgia to fall behind the national norms, causing conflict with institutes such as Georgia Tech in securing state funding. Dyer goes on to explain that even the university's programs, which should have easily evolved during this time period along with the rest of the nation, grappled with modernizing because, paradoxically, they "operated under and increasingly archaic form of governance, with the University of Georgia defending its legally correct but unworkable positions that the other state colleges remain appendages accountable to the university."[152] While all three of the eras affected the nation as a whole, the

---

[151] Dyer, *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985,* 173

[152] Ibid., 173.

tests that they presented to this traditional, patriarchal society surpassed other regions, and the University of Georgia epitomized this community during every generation. The issues compelled the school to not just being willing to have a progressive mindset, but to change its fundamental values and beliefs, components which had provided structure, meaning, and purpose to its culture for over a century. However, through these challenges, the University was able to emerge stronger and more influential than before, showing that its willingness to move into the twenty-first century did not detract from its past - it merely allowed for reconsideration and development.

Reconstruction, an immediate challenge following the Civil War for the South and, thus, the University of Georgia, threatened the financial position of the school as it had already suffered from economic loss as a result of the war. During the war, it made sense - with the college closed - for the college to join the war cause and be used to house soldiers. While beneficial to the Confederacy, these actions, and the loss of revenue as a result of the war, caused Georgia to open its doors again while struggling financially, in part because it lost the momentum in growth that it had before the Civil War. Yet the university was not as affected as many other southern colleges, especially those in Sherman's path to the sea, and its ability to resume standard operating procedures was not as difficult as might have been expected. Chancellor Andrew A. Lipscomb, leading the university from 1860-74, made the observation to the Board of Trustees that "[a]mid the ravages of the time, we have sustained no material losses in the property upon the campus. . . The buildings were in as good a state of preservation as could be expected . . . both of the two dormitories were still advantageously rented . . . and the

scientific apparatus was in good condition."[153] Due to the city remaining essentially untouched by the war in terms of battle or destruction, the university was soon able to regain its energy and begin its return to dominance as the state's university.

However, this restoration was more than in just terms of students and curriculum; it was also loathe to completely forego its antebellum heritage. In welcoming Confederate veterans as students in order to help them rebuild their lives, even the city's newspaper the *Southern Watchman* observed that "the sight of so many of these mutilated heroes . . . has called up many sad and bitter memories, not unmingled though, thanks to God and their valor! with proud remembrance of a lost but not dishonored cause."[154] This would not be the only time in the years immediately following the Civil War that the University of Georgia would identify themselves with the Lost Cause. They often expressed sympathy for the South's traditional ideals and heroes. In looking at their actions following the war, Dyer comments:

> The institution also demonstrated in tangible ways that it revered antebellum values and esteemed the South's wartime leaders. In filling the new chair in civil engineering, the institution first offered the post to Custis Lee, son of Robert E. Lee, and when he declined the Board of Trustees selected M.L. Smith, who had been a Confederate general. When the trustees established a chair in political science and history in 1868, the first offer the position to the former vice-president of the Confederacy, Alexander Stephens, who declined because of ill health.[155]

This resulted in a campus that was receptive to pro-antebellum sentiments, and political tensions were running high. While physical resistance never occurred on the campus, the university would

---

[153] Andrew A. Lipscomb, Trustee Minutes, August 2, 1879, 137-40.

[154] Robert P. Brooks, *The University of Georgia Under Sixteen Administrations, 1785-1955* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1956), 76-77.

[155] Dyer, *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985*, 113.

suffer from controversial statements made by those who would use the university as a platform. Perhaps the most inflammatory of these speeches came in the form of Albert Cox's 1867 commencement speech when he denounced the Radical government as "founded on principles utterly subversive of order, security, and property" and invoked the image of the glorious Lost Cause:

> The mangled arm of your Jackson, the bleeding form of your Johnston are mute petitioners. On! Right and reason are your arms, 'beams of the almighty.' On to the glorious work! Fling out in bold defiance of the unconquered banner of your principles! Collect and revivify the ashes of your dead sentiments, if not of your departed heroes![156]

The speech ended in praise and the playing of "Dixie," yet the administration knew that the event would cause serious problems - and they were correct. The state government ordered a withdrawal of $8,000 year income from the Georgia State Senate, threatening the school's existence.[157] It took an apology from the Board of Trustees in expressing "sincere regret that any thing should have occurred during the literary exercises of the Commencement to suggest the idea of even an unintentional departure from the established usage of the University."[158] University officials would also implore the students to refrain from making political statements; however, this proved to be difficult as many cherished an allegiance to the Southern Confederacy, honored Confederate leaders, and proudly displayed the Stars and Bars at their social events. Only after several years had passed, and the Civil War began to be more distant from the daily lives of the current UGA students, did they appear to move on from reacting to

---

[156] Albert H. Cox, "The Vital Principle of Nations" (1867) in Thomas Dyer, *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985*, 114.

[157] Derrell Roberts. "Joseph E. Brown and the University of Georgia." *The Georgia Review* 19, no. 2 (1965): 240.

[158] Trustee Minutes, July 11, 1884, 504.

Reconstruction politics and moving towards the next movement of progress and change. However, the University of Georgia had confirmed itself as the model of the southern university. The character of the school, even postbellum, had been established, and the university would continue to be identified with the Old South even as they moved towards modernization.

The onset of the second feminist movement in the early twentieth century brought a unique set of challenges to the University of Georgia. Historically, the South was a patriarchal society, slow to change towards a more progressive attitude which would view all citizens as equal under the law, including women. Southern men viewed their attitude towards women as protective and honorable, a respect for the opposite sex that reflected their chivalry and reputations as gentlemen. Initially, southern women accepted this attitude, enjoying the gallantry of their men and how they were treated as delicate and special. Yet this mindset differed greatly from the rest of the country, and southern women would soon join those in the North and West in wanting more equal rights with men. According to University of Georgia Professor of History F.N. Boney, even when they were allowed admission to some of the "traditional" women's programs "coeds tended to clump in . . . majors such as home economics and education, and for a long time they deferred to male leadership and accepted a complex set of rules and regulations that both defined and restricted them as southern ladies."[159] In fact, university administrators - seemingly disconnected from the nation and their own southern women - accepted the distinction between an educational setting for men and women: "We know the State owes as high a duty to the girls as to the boys, and indeed, we might say, a higher duty, but the State does not owe

---

159 F. N. Boney, "'The Rising Hope of Our Land': University of Georgia Students Over Two Centuries," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 74, no. 1 (1990): 120.

exactly the same duty to both."[160] This mentality, however, was not able to match the modernization of the rest of the country, and it was inevitable that the university, and the South, would be forced to change how it viewed a woman's role in society.

One might think that, as chivalrous as the young men claimed to be, they would show a welcoming attitude when it became clear that women would be admitted; however, this was not the case. Instead, they continued to believe that the university setting was designed with young men in mind and to allow women would change the entire structure of their education and campus life - to the point of destroying all of the university's glory. In her article discussing the admission of women to the college, American public school teacher and author Sara Bertha Townsend explains, "And so they clung to the old regime with every means at their command and fought the innovation every inch of the way."[161] Even the Dean of Science stated in 1918 that "[w]hen women walk into my classroom, I will walk out. I will never teach women." His attitude was changed only a few months later when he awarded - to a female student - a 100% for the first time on a chemistry exam.[162] As Georgia had an established teaching college since 1893, and, as more and more pressure was placed on the school to admit women, the university conceded female admission to the graduate school in 1903, and junior college transfers were allowed to integrate into regular courses if they were majoring in Home Economics.[163] To them it

---

160 Carrol Dadisman, "Women in Our University*,"* in *Dear Old UGA, From the Red and Black: Student Life at the University of Georgia, 1893-2013* (Athens, GA: Red and Black Publishing Company, 2013), 99.

161 Sara Bertha Townsend, "The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1959): 156.

162 Quoted in Townsend, "The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia," 164.

163 Dendy, *Through the Arch: An Illustrated Guide to the University of Georgia Campus,* 2.

seemed a fair compromise as the undergraduate program's curriculum and social offerings were still geared towards young men. Chancellor Walter B. Hill, progressive in many of his opinions yet believing that a university's actual campus life would be unsuitable for coeds, still advocated strongly for women to be admitted to the university, even inviting Laura Smith, who was attending the State Normal School, to attend UGA, making her the first woman to appear on a university commencement program. However, pressure continued to grow, and the university was forced to succumb to the nation's demands of educational equality for women. Suffragist Rebecca Latimer argued emphatically for the university to provide coeducation; her husband even proposed legislation to this effect, but it was repeatedly rejected.[164] The university justified their refusal by recognizing that they were not the only ones to deny admission to women. In fact, before World War I, no Georgia university allowed women to enroll as full time students. However, this mindset was destined to fail, and the university was forced to begin the integration process.

As women continued to both enroll, attend, and excel in course offerings, those in the administration began to be less opposed to women assuming a fuller role on campus. An important change occurred when sororities and other social groups were created for the coeds; soon, the presence of women was seen as a necessary and important contribution to the university's culture. No longer were they being viewed as of a lesser standing; instead, they were slowly allowed more and more privileges and inclusion, creating a campus that was truly gender integrated. However, these developments were not sufficient to many feminists, and they would

---

[164] Numan V. Bartley, The Creation of Modern Georgia (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1983), 121.

often compare their struggle to the racial issues which would soon confront the university. Suffragist S.B.C. Morgan presented their case to the University of Georgia Trustees in a 1912 letter: “Remember, Gentleman . . . negro men and women in the State are being given the opportunity for higher education which, so far, the white women of Georgia have pleaded for in vain.”[165] The crusade for gender equality ended with the influence of Andrew M. Soule, who became President of the Georgia State College of Agriculture in 1907, and the start of World War I; by the 1920s, most university programs had female students enrolled in them. Soule, perhaps emboldened by the fact that the College of Agriculture was not directly under the auspice of the university, willingly acted alone to achieve what so many had failed at before - offering full student status to women. In arguing his case before the Board of Trustees in 1918, Soule declared:

> The admission of women to the College of Agriculture is but another form of conservation. There has been a distinct need for the higher education of women along broader technical lines, and so the teaching facilities and laboratories which have been formerly devoted to the higher education of men will now serve women as well. No other institution in the State is in position to take up this work at so small expense to the state as is the College of Agriculture.[166]

Even though Soule’s request was granted, it was still not easy for women to integrate; male students remained hostile. Townsend shares how Dr. Linville Hendren, professor and dean at the university, pointed out how a group of young men met in the University Chapel, hoping to

---

[165] S.B.C. Morgan, Letter to the Trustees, March 25, 1912, reprinted in Townsend, “The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia,” 161.

[166] Andrew Soule, Address to the Board of Trustees, February 18, 1918, reprinted in Townsend, “The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia,” 166.

determine a way that co-education could be prohibited. Phi Kappa and Demosthenian Library Societies attempted to debate the issue, but no one was willing to argue in the affirmative.[167]

In February of 1919, though, when the university newspaper *The Red and Black* received yet still another letter from a student decrying the presence of women at the school, it stated the next week that the issue would no longer be discussed as the argument was no longer relevant, including an editorial in favor of the movement by Dean of the School of Education Dr. T.J. Woofter. This editorial, one of the strongest from a university professor, ended this way:

> Women are entitled to all opportunities in fullest possible measure. Woman's nature is to ennoble and refine, so let us abundantly prepare for her coming, then go out after her and bring her into our University life, not waiting for her longer to beg for justice.[168]

No longer could the movement be ignored, and the university finally acquiesced to the women who desired enrollment at the school. Thomas Walter Reed, registrar at the university from 1909-1945 - the pivotal years in this transition - admitted that, once women were admitted, overall school conduct was better, girls paid better attention in class, and their presence seemed to be an overall positive influence on boys' behavior.[169] While these changes were slow to materialize, the resistance against them was not violent or disparaging; no, it was merely a reaction of a southern mindset and way of life - one that was discriminatory without really realizing it as their intentions, to them, were noble and gracious. However, as the times were changing and the University of Georgia finally joined this progressive attitude, women became

---

[167] Townsend, "The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia," 168-169.

[168] Dr. T.J. Woofter, *Red and Black*, February 1919, Editorial section.

[169] Carrol Dadisman, *Dear Old UGA, From the Red and Black: Student Life at the University of Georgia, 1893-2013* (Athens, GA: Red and Black Publishing Company, 2013).

valuable assets to the school, and the young men were not averse to their presence on campus. By the time of the United States' entry into World War II, the number of coeds was such that the women grew to outnumber the men, and the trend continues today as there are approximately 22,890 female students and 16,257 male students at the university.[170] While it may be true that southern male students may have originally resisted allowing women to enroll at the university, once they had become a part of the campus culture, their contributions and accomplishments have proven to be as significant and impressive as the men's, and a significant hurdle was overcome in moving the university into a more modern mindset.

Of the three crises, responding correctly to the Civil Rights movement was clearly the most difficult shift for the university and the South as a whole. While the feminist movement proved a challenge to the southern gentleman of the University of Georgia, the concept of desegregation fundamentally changed a southern mindset that had not altered since the colony of Georgia had been established. Because most of the country had changed their mentality about the equality of African Americans even before allowing women equal opportunities, the South's racist background ironically caused them to view white women as equal sooner than African-American men. The university, in line with the accepted attitude of racial segregation of the south, really saw no need to address the issue before they were forced to through national mandate. However, "the civil rights movement turned theoretical questions about race relations into practical ones about day-to-day life, and the intangible comforts of traditional beliefs could

---

[170] "UGA Male/Female Diversity," *College Factual* (2022), accessed December 2, 2022.

dissolve in the face of that challenge."[171] While small concerns were raised sporadically after the Civil War, the issue did not demand attention until *Brown v Board of Education* instigated a chain of events that would ultimately change education in the South forever.

The earliest brushes with desegregation were primarily responses to individuals who seemed to support the integration of black students at the university, well before the tumultuous events of the 1950 and 1960s. One of the most famous, known as the Cocking affair, resulted from Georgia Governor Eugene Talmadge's firing of the University of Georgia's Dean of Education, Walter Cocking, as he believed that Cocking was in favor of racial integration. This 1941 incident predated the Civil Rights era by two decades, yet clearly demonstrated southern opposition to educational integration, even at the highest levels of the university system. However, even then, these types of actions were beginning to be denounced by national bodies. In response, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools quickly stripped the University of Georgia of its accreditation, denouncing the interference of a political figure in an educational environment. It took the Georgia state legislature's passage of a constitutional amendment granting the Board of Regents independence from outside influences - and Talmadge's loss in the subsequent election - for the university to have its accreditation reinstated. Even W.E.B. DuBois commented on the matter, acclaiming Dean Cocking of being "in accordance with the best and wisest thought of the nation and of intelligent persons both North

---

[171] Jason Sokol, "A Documented Account of How White Students Reacted to the Racial Integration of the University of Georgia," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 52 (2006): 63.

and South."[172] However, as the challenges to the status quo of segregation became more frequent and politicized, it was clear that the university would soon be forced to tackle the issue, ultimately resulting in a change that they seemingly failed to anticipate.

In 1950, Horace Ward was the first black student who attempted to gain admission to UGA, and this would begin the NCAAP's involvement in desegregating the university. How the school dealt with his application demonstrated how far away they were from permitting this and how deeply entrenched they still were in their past beliefs. He was initially offered state funds to choose a different school, preferably one out of state, but he rejected this proposal, requesting to be considered on the merits of his application just as any white student would be. Hoping that multiple delays would compel Ward to give up his crusade, UGA was forced to send him a rejection letter only days before the term began, resulting in a new set of challenges by Ward. The school established new rules while Ward demanded he be assessed under the old ones. Only when Ward was drafted was the issue resolved, although not with any definitive answer, as his education was no longer an option. University President Harmon White Caldwell responded to the issue by insisting that "white southerners should be allowed to solve the region's racial problems without interference from federal courts or civil rights groups" and that the NCAAP's attempt to introduce new textbooks and penetrate schools was "just another instance of unwarranted meddling by the NAACP. If that organization would let us alone, we could work out

---

[172] W. E. B. (William Edward Burghardt) Du Bois, 1868-1963. The Talmadge-Cocking affair, ca. 1941. W. E. B. Du Bois Papers (MS 312). Special Collections and University Archives. University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries. Accessed December 4, 2022.

our racial problems in the South much more easily and satisfactorily."[173] These early responses to the process of desegregation indicated the long road ahead for the university and the South. Neither was ready to forego the beliefs that had ultimately led to this culture war, instead hoping that they would be left to their own devices to solve the issue.

When racial integration finally occurred with the admittance of Hamilton E. Holmes and Charlayne Hunter on January 6, 1961, student opinion was mixed. Certainly, many of the students who came from conservative, traditional southern families were hostile towards the process of racial integration. These attitudes were echoed in an essay assignment given by, surprisingly, calculus instructor Thomas Brahana, which asked the students to explain their opinions on what was taking place on campus. The students - all but one were southern, most were Georgians, and all viewed to be more intelligent than the average student based on the class - are thought to be qualified representatives of the university's student body. The results of this assignment showed that southern racism was still very much present and indicated the problems that might occur when integration was attempted. According to the essays, when "students mentioned those victimized by force, most were referring to themselves rather than to Holmes and Hunter;" they also maintained their stance that the "logic of white dissent and segregationist resistance was expressed . . . in terms of not only state rights, but also Americanism and God's will."[174] While these were the most prevalent arguments made by the students, there was also an appeal to *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* and simple tradition. Most importantly, the essays revealed that

---

[173] Harmon White Caldwell, "Letter to Herman Talmadge, (June 17, 1952), Box 56, Chancellor's Records, University of Georgia Library, accessed July 30, 2022.

[174] Robert Cohen, "'Two, Four, Six, Eight, We Don't Want to Integrate': White Student Attitudes Toward the University of Georgia's Desegregation," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (1996): 624.

these attitudes were not influenced by educational institutions; instead, they learned at home, from their friends, and in their communities, reflecting the idea that the Old South mentality was still very much present in the region, including the University of Georgia. These were lessons that did not necessarily indicate an unwillingness to change their opinions; instead it was a reflection of southern culture and what they had been taught. One student wrote, "This belief [of black inferiority] was inherited from me by my ancestors who gave their lives that the Southern way of life would live."[175] Another student explained how "I do not desire to associate with persons of low moral character . . . Southern Negroes have a lower moral standard in general than I care to associate with."[176] The racism represented by these students was indicative of UGA's student body as a whole; however, how these students were willing to respond to the integration had shifted over the years - and was probably contrary to how their parents would have reacted.

Many "old school" southerners still desired Jim Crow Laws to play out in all areas of society, but this younger generation - and, thus, the students at the university - pragmatically approached the issue differently; they looked at it from the viewpoint of being UGA students, representing the school and focusing more on their education than fighting racial desegregation. In fact, most of them did not hate Holmes and Hunter as individuals; more so, they resented the controversy that their presence on the Georgia campus caused to the southern way of life, they were frustrated with how the university was being portrayed - as backwards and racist when they

---

[175] TT, "Math 254 Essays," UGA Archives, accessed September 13. 2022.

[176] Ibid., Essay Two.

viewed themselves as traditional and moral - and they simply wanted to resolve the issue and be able to move on with their college education. Tommy Burnside, IFC President, encouraged his fellow fraternity brothers to act properly as "[i]t would be unfortunate if we as students participated in conduct which would reflect discredit on us and on the University."[177] Lowell Kirby, campus leader of Independent Men, and David Fletcher, past president of the Freshman, Sophomore, and Junior classes, responded similarly with Kirby mimicking Burnside's statement, saying "I urge all students to refrain from doing any act which would reflect on the good name and reputation of the student body and University," and Fletcher beseeching the students to "remain rational and unemotional, and just not allow themselves to be drawn into violent demonstrations."[178]

It is true that many of the students, who had always been taught that they were superior to African Americans and that segregation was essential, did not desire the integration that they felt was forced upon them; in fact, these students were challenged by *Atlanta Constitution* columnist Ralph McGill to "save the honor of the South and warm the hearts of good people everywhere"[179] by keeping their racist overtures to themselves. He also believed that "[s]tudents at the U. of Georgia have the God-sent opportunity to do a service for the South which we all love. To erase the picture of the 'ugly Southerner' so starkly and disturbingly shown the nation and the world at Little Rock and New Orleans. The ugly Southerner is not the true

---

[177] "Campus Leaders Ask Students to Follow Non-Violence Course," *The Red and Black*, (January 10, 1961), 2.

[178] Ibid.

[179] Ralph McGill, *Atlanta Constitution,* January 11, 1961, Editorial section.

Southerner."[180] However, when threatened with the university closing due to noncompliance, even these students willingly weighed the options and chose their education and the life of their university over segregation. Senior class president Charlie Christian conceded that "I believe that the University should remain segregated but not if it means closing the school. I think education should come before segregation."[181] So while perhaps not as radical as students on northern campuses, Georgia's college students recognized that these changes must come, and they were unwilling to sacrifice their own studies to support a cause that they knew had no chance of succeeding.

However, while the process was relatively calm, especially compared to the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, the University of Georgia still did not concede their segregated status easily. Holmes and Hunter had initially applied for and were denied admission in 1959, five years after the Brown v Board of Education ruling. This decision, based solely on race, stood until early 1961 when the District Court mandated that the two African American students be admitted. While the university accepted this decision and allowed the teenagers to start classes, there was still some slight resistance. This first day of integration was relatively calm, although a vocal minority did visit Holmes' dorm that night, serenading the new student with "Dixie" and chanting "Two, four, six eight, we don't want to integrate."[182] Overall, however, this was a small sample of the student body, and most students looked at the

---

[180] Ibid.

[181] "Campus Leaders Ask Students to Follow Non-Violence Course," 2.

[182] Tommy Johnson, "Negro Students Prepare for Wednesday Classes," *The Red and Black* (January 1, 1961), 2.

newcomers with "curiosity, cool and dispassionately distanced."[183] In fact, an editorial by Terry Hazelwood in the following day's issue of *The Red and Black* denounced the violence that had occurred the night before:

> Ladies and gentleman of the University, you made history last night. Are you proud of the manner in which you did so? We hope not. We hope you rabble rousers who planned, organized, and carried through that little exhibition last night are not truly representative of this campus. We hope that the real student leaders will realize now, more than ever, the necessity of continuing with renewed zeal and enthusiasm our mutual goal of non-violence.[184]

The Red and Black was filled with similar opinions in the ensuing days, demonstrating that the administration and student body had, overall, become resigned to the change and desired to accomplish it in the best way possible.

However, another instance, more violent in nature this time, occurred five days later, occurred after a tough basketball loss to rival Georgia Tech resulted in high emotions, and a riot developed outside Hunter's window, with students throwing bricks and bottles at her window while shouting racial slurs. The nation as a whole decried this demonstration, and UGA's reputation suffered greatly as the national media denounced the students as "bullies, racists, and ignoramuses."[185] Some contend that the press overestimated the crowd's size - as high as one-third of the student body - in order to deepen the perception that the university, as a whole, was racist, and others insist that this was more just youthful hostility after a humiliating athletic defeat than a purposeful statement of racal animosity. Not that this justifies the actions, but it

---

[183] Dyer, *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985.* 332.

[184] Terry Hazelwood, "Your Responsibility," *The Red and Black*, January 11, 1961. Front Page.

[185] Claude Sitton, "Georgia Students Riot on Campus; Two Negroes Out," *New York Times*, January 12, 1961, Front Page.

might allow the student body to receive some sort of reprieve for the heinousness of their actions. Dean Joseph A.Williams immediately suspended Holmes and Hunter, stating that their personal safety was at stake; this suspension did not last long, however, as a court injunction demanded their return to campus on January 16th. After these initial confrontations, however, no other large-scale problems occurred, and the students moved forward with acceptance of the new students. In fact, Cohen explains that while "a chilling degree of racial animosity and anger endured among UGA students well after the riot, [it is also clear] that the riot and its aftermath had taught students that translating this anger into violence was self-destructive."[186] National scrutiny and public scorn forced the students to decide "whether they wanted to live in a world where riots were the way things were decided. And this was not a trivial question."[187] The students were forced into a decision that many of them were not yet prepared to make culturally but were pressured to politically.

Ultimately, these militant segregationists understood that the price was too high for their violent actions and that the costs they would be forced to make were not worth it. This attitude was the beginning of putting their racist past behind them and accepting integration as the new normal. In moving forward, one student who participated in the Math 254 essay assignment argued that this was the only way that the South would be able to realize its full potential:

> My personal belief is that integration is right. There is no possible way to sanely defend segregation . . . I, being a south Georgian have heard the cry, "Do you want your daughter to marry a Nigger?" and "The Supreme Court is trying to kill the white race in the south" and the other usual statements until

---

[186] Cohen, "Two, Four, Six, Eight," 639.

[187] *Fitzgerald Leader Enterprise and Press Fitzgerald*, Ben Hill County, Ga., January 14, 1961.

> it makes me sick. The south has the potential to become the most prosperous region in the United States. Indeed, it should already be so. However, the segregation problem is going to hold us back until we straighten out.[188]

Another student expressed his disbelief at the ingrained racism this way: "It is still hard to understand why integration is being fought against so violently because 9 out of 10 of the Southern people have been practically integrated with the Negro all their lives. What I can't understand is why we don't mind eating with the Negroes in the kitchen but we wouldn't want to eat with them in the dining room."[189] Many of these second and third generation Georgians (with the Civil War as a starting point) were beginning to not understand how the old mindset could still exist. How was it possible to have such mixed feelings about people you were around all of the time? They saw it as simply absurd. Dyer concludes, "In the end, however, the desegregation of the University of Georgia provided the institution with many more opportunities than problems. Now the work to improve the school's academic programs could proceed without the same heavy concern for the maintenance of the segregationist ethos."[190] While the university would continue to celebrate certain facets of its past, the overwhelming dilemma of racial segregation was finally laid to rest, and the University of Georgia would be able to determine how a sense of the past could still provide continuity as it moved forward.

Even though there would be more minor skirmishes and protests, the university, overall, has avoided other violent displays of racism, and their attempts to move beyond their racist past augurs well for the university's acceptance of racial integration, in spite of the fact that during

---

[188] DC, "Math 254 Essays," UGA Archives, accessed September 13, 2022.

[189] JA II, "Math 254 Essays," UGA Archives, accessed September 13, 2022.

[190] Dyer, *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985,* 334

the first 50 years of desegregation African-American enrollment had still not reached 10%. In fact, between 1995 and 2002, it appeared that the university was actually backtracking on racial integration as the enrollment of African-Americans dropped from 6.9% to 5.9%.[191] In 2020, the percentage had reached 7.5%, a positive sign, but this number was still surpassed by Asians and the same as Hispanics.[192] Unfortunately, these numbers seem to indicate a continued reluctance by the university to accept more black students, with reasons that seem to be unclear, but the administration insists that they are working hard to improve its reputation as a welcoming place for college-bound African-Americans. Attempts to reach out to predominantly black high schools and to establish an office of institutional diversity[193] are signs that the university is taking this slow progression seriously and pursuing a reversal of this trend. On the 40th anniversary of Holmes and Hunter's integration, the university renamed one of its oldest and most prominent buildings as the Holmes-Hunter Academic Building and continues to indicate its willingness to put its racist past behind it and create a new identity for itself that would demonstrate that it desired to be a modern university, influential both nationally and internationally. And while the university has not made the remarkable progress that many would like to see, the fact remains that effort is being made with the hope that Georgia can be the standard for progressive southern universities.

---

191 "Digest of Education Statistics 2002," National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, June 2003.

192 Tyler Norman, "Georgia Daze Strives to Increase Black Student Applicants," *Grady News Source*, March 22, 2021.

193 "The Pitiable Performance of the University of Georgia in Enrolling Black Students," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 45 (Autumn 2004): 38-39.

Today, the University of Georgia is identified as one of the "Public Ivies,"[194] a public university exhibiting the same prestige and respect of an Ivy League school. In 2022, it was ranked tenth overall out of public universities, second out of 1612 universities for its student life, third out of 142 for having the best agricultural sciences, and 85% of its students were living on campus.[195] It is positioned as one of the top three producers of Rhodes scholars[196] and continues to maintain the highest level of educational involvement. UGA is also classified as a "highly selective" school based on its process for both undergraduate and graduate admissions,[197] along with its high emphasis on ACT scores.[198] While the university draws students from all over the world, the state of Georgia's postsecondary school systems that are in closest proximity to Athens are most likely to send their students to the school.[199] Its graduates include members of the United States Senate, House of Representatives, Supreme Court, Presidential Cabinet, ambassadors, state governors. Pulitzer Prize and Peabody Award winners, a United States Poet Laureate, winners of Emmys and Grammys, and even Super Bowl champions. On the athletic side, the university's varsity programs have recorded 46 national championships, 173 conference championships, 264 individual national championships, and 56 Olympic medals. The school is

---

[194] "What Are the Public Ivies," Prep Expert, September 20, 2018, accessed July 11, 2022.

[195] "University of Georgia," niche.com, November 27, 2022.

[196] "Number of Winners by Institution: U.S. Rhodes Scholars 1904-2019," Office of the American Secretary of The Rhodes Trust. 2019.

[197] "Carnegie Classifications - Institution Profile," Carnegieclassifications.iu.edu, archived from the original on August 11, 2018, accessed August 12, 2022.

[198] "Predictive Modeling Data in the ACT Electronic Student Record," ACT, Inc. (March 18, 2019), accessed November 27, 2022.

[199] James Curtis Eck, "Statewide Variation in Postsecondary Enrollment Patterns: An Analysis of Community and Local Schooling Contexts," (PhD diss., University of Georgia, 1997), 42.

still considered a uniquely southern school, but it has also been able to move past its early reputation as a university unable to embrace the progressive ideals needed to become a contributing factor to the New South and a well-respected school internationally. While the university has clearly experienced challenges over its two and a half century existence, it has emerged stronger than ever and remains a leading force in both the South and the nation as a whole.

As with much of the South, the University of Georgia's history shows a deep-rooted connection to its past while also exhibiting a willingness to move towards a more progressive role in the state, country, and world. Chancellor David C. Burrow, who was one of the earliest advocates for modernization, was able to contribute to a sense of continuity by "combining the best of the Victorian-era college president with a forward-looking educational philosophy."[200] While changes have occurred, the university remains a southern school, one steeped in southern tradition and tied to a past that is unique to a region. When visiting the University of Georgia, President Howard Taft remarked, "There is gathered about this institution a wealth of memory that in itself, with the ideals formed here, is every to maintain, as it has always maintained, the civilization of the imperial state of Georgia."[201] Like many in the South, they have often struggled to preserve its connection to its past, honoring the history that is so ingrained in its tradition and spirit, especially where racism is concerned. Students have struggled to voice their opinions on integration in public because they were so contrary to the southern narrative: "[t]he

---

200 "Proceedings of Special Committee Appointed from Its Members by the Board of Trustees University of Georgia in Accordance with the Resolution Contained in this Report," University of Georgia Library, 1923.

201 "The Visit of William Howard Taft to the University of Georgia," *Bulletin of the University of Georgia*, IX, 5A, Serial No. 97 (January 1909).

combination of racism, ideological solidarity, regional tradition, and peer pressure"[202] have stunted the South's growth in many ways and has caused difficulties when trying to find its new identity.

Many southerners have been hesitant to relinquish parts of their past because, in their eyes, it means turning their back on everything that is unique about them. However, this sentiment has been challenged on multiple fronts. In advising the legislature, Atlantan W.F. Thomas declared, "Stop dreaming of a decadent past,"[203] one where those who looked backward were pitted against those who saw a civilized future. UGA alumnus W.C. Henson contended, "Most Georgians are living in the nineteenth century and trying to bring back the days before 1860."[204] These struggles, clearly represented by the University of Georgia's move towards modernization, demonstrate the challenges that the region has faced and has publicly denounced in its attempt to blend old with new. Because of the social changes that have occurred over the past century and a half, however, they have been forced to reconsider many of their convictions, accepting these developments even when they are not of the majority opinion, leading to a character that most southerners can now embrace fully and proudly. One letter, received in 1961 by UGA President O.C. Aderhold, praised the university for putting education and the defense of the law over personal beliefs and interests, proclaiming that the UGA administrators were "the

---

[202] Robert Cohen, "'Two, Four, Six, Eight," 635.

[203] Jason Sokol, *There Goes My Everything: White Southerners in the Age of Civil Rights, 1945-1975* (United Kingdom: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2008). 159.

[204] Ibid., 159.

true spiritual descendants of Robert E. Lee, and the soul of the south!"[205] The administration and student body, for a long time, struggled with how to maintain the school's distinctly southern identity, not wanting to completely be consumed by a northern culture that would discard the characteristics that make the school singular. Because of this reluctance to change, the university was not considered a mega university, nationally and internationally influential, until the latter half of the twentieth century, yet now it is- a southern school moving into the future while not completely forgetting the uniqueness of its past.

---

[205] Jason Sokol. "A Documented Account of How White Students Reacted to the Racial Integration of the University of Georgia," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 52 (2006), 66.

Chapter 4

The Georgia Institute of Technology

Seventy miles away from Athens lays one of the University of Georgia's fiercest rivals - in education, athletics, and in the hearts of the state's most ardent fans. Established in 1885, the Georgia Institute of Technology could not possibly differ from the state's first university more. Its history, purpose, and role in the South's educational system are unique, not only to the type of education it offers but also in how it has contributed to the growth and modernization of the South overall. Created, in part, as a response to the proposed ideals of the New South advocates, Georgia Tech introduced a new type of curriculum to the region - one that was based on technology and engineering. Although the university exists in the South, it is not a southern school, instead providing an education that mirrors the most respected universities in the Northeast. In examining Georgia Tech's relevance in how the South is perceived, there are several factors to consider, including its importance in introducing technology to the region, how it shares minimal correlations with other southern universities, and how it was also forced to respond to social and political changes throughout the twentieth century which differed from how most other southern universities did. More often identified with prominent engineering universities such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Carnegie-Mellon University, and the California Institute of Technology, Georgia Tech provides a unique educational opportunity in the South, one that is important in its development since the Civil War, how it contributed to the changing identity of the South, and the role that the region will play moving forward.

After the Civil War, a spirit of progressivism infected the business leaders of the South. Realizing that fundamental changes were needed in order for the South to move beyond the antebellum reputation that prevailed, these leaders realized that, at least in technology and industrialization, a new educational and market system needed to be implemented in order to compete with the industrial North. At this point, the North had several technology and engineering colleges, including M.I.T., West Point, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Norwich University, and the importance of this type of education was accepted as fundamental to the industrial changes taking the place near the turn of the century and how the country would move forward in the future. Initially, the state of Georgia attempted to meet this engineering need within the context of its already existing universities. With the passage of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act in 1862, the University of Georgia received all of the money and established the Georgia State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. However, this small concession to technological education was not sufficient to meet the state's needs in moving forward after the Civil War. An engineering college was essential, and no such university existed in the South. Henry Grady, who actually graduated from UGA yet still envisioned something new, and other New South apostles determined that an engineering school must be established if there was to be any hope of achieving an equal status with the successful North. The University of Georgia did offer one civil engineering class, and offered to add more, but the New South vision was for a completely new institution - one that focused solely on science and engineering, one that would contribute to the development of new businesses, and one that could also offer a practical

approach to the curriculum in order to establish an industrial presence in response to the North's growing economy.

The creation of Georgia Tech caused significant tension in Georgia's university system. Proposed sites included Atlanta (the urban location), Athens (incorporated with the University of Georgia), Macon (the city southern industrialist John Fletcher Hanson preferred), Milledgeville (still bitter about losing the capital), and Penfield (that had lost Mercer University to Macon), with Macon being the preferred choice of the men in charge of the proposal. Submitting a bid that included $50,000 from the city, a donation of $20,000 collected from Samuel Inman and other private citizens, $2,500 in guaranteed annual support, and the dedication of four acres from Richard Peters, ultimately, Atlanta was chosen.[206] Considered the city which would be able to transform itself into the New South vision, Atlanta was designated to become the phoenix it claimed to be, a city rising from the ashes of Sherman's carnage. Of the many southern cities affected by the war, Atlanta was the one best poised to assume the mantle of the New South as it had not developed into a true antebellum city, such as Charleston or Savannah, before the war. In an 1886 *Atlanta Constitution* article, it was reported that "the Atlanta Manufacturers Association claimed that much of the city's progress was due to its great variety of industries and that it was less vulnerable to economic recession because it was not a 'cotton town' nor an 'iron town.'"[207] The New South apostles' vision "to emphasize Atlanta's distinctiveness as an energetic, modern industrial city with little in common with the sleepy, premodern rural South, and as a city that

---

[206] Robert Wallace, *Dress Her in White and Gold: A Biography of Georgia Tech* (Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Tech Foundation, 1969), 11.

[207] "Atlanta and Her Industries," *Atlanta Constitution*, November 21, 1886.

was far too busy making money to dwell too much on racial hatreds that paralyzed the rest of the region"[208] matched their foresight for a university to accomplish these plans. So as plans for the new university were considered, Atlanta seemed the logical and appropriate choice for its location.

By 1890, Atlanta was Georgia's largest city with a population of 65,533, had a population growth rate of 75.2%, and was the leading manufacturing city in the South. This institute of technology was meant to help modernize the South, and the proponents of these new ideals had already established that Atlanta would be the city designed for this purpose. So Atlanta was chosen to house the Georgia School of Technology (as it was originally known) - much to the chagrin of the other four cities, but especially Athens. It is not unreasonable to find the roots of the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry in this very first decision concerning the school. The University of Georgia considered itself the principal university in the state and resented the fact that they were not chosen to house this new college.[209] From the beginning, they sensed that Atlanta's new university would be instrumental in changing the South's perception and position in the nation, understanding that what Tech would offer was unlike any southern school previously had. Naturally, UGA believed that adding a full engineering component to its curriculum would be mutually beneficial for itself and for the new students who would enroll. These engineering students would be a part of a well-established university which received a significant amount of

---

[208] Margaret Pugh O'Mara, "Selling the New South: Georgia Tech and Atlanta," in *Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley,* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), 185.

[209] P. H. Mell, Jr. (1895), "Chapter XIX: Efforts Towards Completing the Technological School as a Department of the University of Georgia," *Life of Patrick Hues Mell* (Baptist Book Concern), archived from the original on April 7, 2005, accessed December 30, 2022.

the available state funding; the university, in turn, would only strengthen its position in the state. University of Georgia Chancellor Patrick Mell actively fought against Tech's placement in Atlanta as he believed that it would threaten state funds to his own university and would cause a major setback for Georgia's own progress.[210] However, as history shows, this argument did not prevail, and there was soon a university which would challenge UGA for both state funding and prominence.

From the beginning, Atlanta and Georgia Tech have characterized each other and grown analogously through the twentieth century. Once chosen, Atlanta fully embraced the establishment of Georgia Tech and began the process of building the new campus. Georgia Governor Henry D. McDaniel signed the bill which would create a fund the new university, and Atlanta developer Richard Peters donated the land which would contain the first two campus buildings - Tech Tower (now the administrative headquarters) and a building which contained a shop and boiler and engine room. As the initial purpose of the school was to provide classroom education and hands-on training, these two buildings provided a place for both. The two buildings were the same size, indicating how neither aspect of the university was more important than the other and demonstrating the school's, and the city's, commitment to a full engineering and industrial education - mirroring the Worcester County Free Institute of Industrial Science (now Worcester Polytechnic Institute) on which the southern university was based, described as "the embodiment of the best conception of industrial education."[211] The site was initially located

---

[210] Lee C. Dunn, *Cracking the Solid South: The Life of John Fletcher Hanson, Father of Georgia Tech* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press), 2016: 10.

[211] "The Free Institute," *Worcester* (MA) *Daily Spy*, August 9, 1883. 4, accessed September 20, 2022.

on the northern edge of the city, bound by North Avenue on the south and Cherry Avenue on the west, but now encompasses an area from North Avenue to 10th Street, and even moving beyond the traditional border of the Downtown Connector, having become one of the dominant features of the capital city's Midtown. This location also provided one of Georgia Tech's only ties to the Old South and the Civil War - a historical marker indicating that the land occupied by these two buildings provided defense in protecting Atlanta during the war's Atlanta Campaign.[212] Additionally, the city's surrender in 1864 actually took place on what is now the southwestern boundary of Georgia Tech's campus. What is interesting, however, is that both of these details are rarely mentioned when telling the history of the school, and even the majority of those who have attended the school do not know this trivia. So many elements of the school's founding are rooted in changing fundamental elements of the region, yet this link to the antebellum era allows argument that Georgia Tech is undoubtedly tied to the South and how it would recover from its unfavorable reputation. So while some could argue that these factors provide evidence of a connection to the South as a whole, it would seem that a more accurate rendering of this evidence demonstrates that building Georgia Tech on the ruins and surrender of Atlanta only furthers the argument that Tech is the future and that the past is to also be surrendered to the New South ideals.

Georgia Tech would initially struggle to establish its own presence because this type of education had never been offered in the South before. However, proponents of the school believed that Tech "had the opportunity . . . to make themselves the apostles of the new and

---

212 "Georgia Institute of Technology Historical Marker". Historic Markers Across Georgia. Archived from the original on December 24, 2013. Retrieved December 22, 2013.

coming education, by which must stand and fall."[213] Instead of merely being viewed as a northern school in a southern state - which it unquestionably is - it was also most definitely providing an answer to the pressing problem of creating an industrial foundation in an agrarian society. As the rebuilding of the city had just begun when the location of the university was established, the importance placed on this aspect of Atlanta's New South image could not be understated - clearly the city's visionaries viewed the planting of Georgia Tech to be critical to the success and transformation of the region, and by the twenty-first century, the story of Atlanta and Georgia Tech's shared growth shows the importance of scientific activity in state and local economic development. Robert Thurston, the leading architect of the mechanical engineering curriculum that was being adopted in most of the engineering education centers in the late 1860s, argued that engineering laboratories would be instrumental in providing the fundamental knowledge needed in industry and engineering, would be of "incalculable benefit to mankind," and would bridge the "cultural gap separating scientists and businessmen"[214] playing the exact role that the New South apostles envisioned.

Even though Georgia Tech was established during the era of Reconstruction, so not as affected by it as previously established southern universities, its founding was still influenced by the time period. However, it was not in the same way that the universities of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina were. These antebellum schools were faced with racial and political changes that would follow them into the next century. Georgia Tech, on the other hand,

---

213 Edward Atkinson to Samuel Inman (September 18, 1886), reprinted in *Atlanta Constitution* (October 1, 1886).

214 Robert H. Thurston, "On the Necessity of a Mechanical Laboratory: Its Province and Its Methods," *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 100 (1875): 1412.

embraced the political changes that were taking place; their problems centered around the traditional southerners who were fighting these changes. Tech president M.L. Brittain explained how:

> [t]he new school, victorious after months and years of legislative struggles, faced a people still uncertain and divided as to the wisdom of its establishment. A part of this attitude was the result of ignorance. Georgians understood the old-line classical college, even though they did not always approve or sustain it. To them the engineer meant only the man in charge of the locomotive, and the technological graduate was a person of mystery . . .[o]ur people in the South new little of real engineering science of the 'brain in the hand.[215]

These challenges, in and of themselves, indicate the level of divergence that Tech experienced from other southern universities. They were on one side of the Reconstruction issues, while the rest of the South was on the other.

Not only did traditional southerners not see the need for this type of university, there was also a latent prejudice against science and technological education. In fact, to even suggest this type of education was "to invite recrimination, for many influential southerners interpreted such notions, as a rejection of the socioeconomic system of the antebellum South, a system that northerns had convinced themselves was both economically and morally superior to the wage labor system that prevailed in the North."[216] Before the suggestion of an actual university was introduced, at a time when it was merely the argument of needing scientific training, Senator Benjamin H. Hill was one of the first to publicly endorse this need although he advocated for the school to be located at the University of Georgia. He explained the process as a revolution: "We

---

[215] Brittain, *The Story of Georgia Tech*, 12.

[216] William R. Taylor *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), 212.

must (his emphasis) have an educator labor. We must have multiple industries. We must have schools of agriculture, of commerce, of manufacturing, of mining, of technology, and, in short, of all polytechnics, and we must have them as sources of power, and respectability, and in all our own sons must be qualified to take the lead and point the way."[217] When former Confederate officers Major John Fletcher Hanson and Nathaniel Edwin Harris proposed the original idea of a technical school in the state of Georgia, they were focused on the need for the South to move away from their primarily agrarian society and embrace an industrial economy as could be found in the North. They believed that by "altering the patterns of manufacturing, commerce, finance, and agricultural production, the white South could strike from its shoulders the chains of mercantilistic subservience to North."[218] While Harris is remembered as playing a continuous role in the founding of the university, Hanson is virtually unknown today, yet he is the one who proposed the most radical changes to the economic and educational structure of the Old South. He desired students of any gender or economic level to "quit crowding the law and study chemistry, this newest and most promising science, especially practical chemistry as it applies to the invention in cheapening methods in dyeing, in production of oil combinations."[219] In fact, many consider Hanson as a true New South apostle while Grady was still Old South, just with a modern mask. Hanson was the one who "challenged traditional Southern attitudes and policies while creating jobs, expanding the industrial economy, advancing educational opportunities, and

---

[217] Benjamin H. Hill, *Senator Benjamin B. Hill of Georgia: His Life, Speeches, and Writings* (Atlanta: H.C. Hudgens & Company, 1891), 343.

[218] Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking,* 98-99.

[219] "A Word to Young Men and Boys," *Columbus (GA) Daily Enquirer-Sun*, January 13, 1883, 2.

promoting a new attitude toward some of the most pressing social issues facing Southerners at the time."[220] Hanson was the one who came into conflict with the others, the traditional South on one side with him on the other; he acknowledged this fact when speaking at a banquet in 1903: "It has fallen to my lot to advocate policies that were not in favor with the people of this state,"[221] his position being explained even further in an article by Harry Stillwell Edwards with the *Macon Telegraph* in 1910: Hanson believed that "skilled labor was always the last to emigrate . . . it was useless to look to England or New England for the people demanded by the improvement in machinery for cotton goods."[222] In moving forward with developing Georgia Tech, it was Nathaniel Harris who was authorized to lead a committee to study how the education of northern technical and engineering schools could be adapted to the South; when they returned, their findings were submitted as House Bill 732 to the Georgia General Assembly on July 24, 1883. John Hanson was the bill's best advocate, even speaking in front of the Georgia legislature on August 1, 1883, and he trusted that those who had favored this new university previous would continue to do so.

While it seemed like leading businessmen and politicians had been supportive of the idea of a technical school, the actual proposal faced significant opposition and was ultimately defeated. It seemed that, when faced with yet another concession to the Yankee North, the resistance intensified, and the arguments ranged from concern over agricultural interests, opposition to technical education, economic apprehension at draining the already limited Georgia

---

220 Dunn, *Cracking the Solid South: The Life of John Fletcher Hanson, Father of Georgia Tech,* 2.

221 "Eloquent Talks at Big Banquet," A*tlanta Constitution,* February 18, 1903.1.

222 Harry Stillwell Edwards, "John F. Hanson - The Man." *Macon (GA) Telegraph* 18 December 1910. 6.

treasury, and the state's 1877 constitution preventing excessive spending in reaction to "carpetbaggers and Negro leaders."[223] Hanson acknowledged that these were the primary reasons in defeating the bill, believing that it was clearly because of a "misunderstanding of the concept of technical education, preached against factory labor [thought to be solely a northern ideal], and opposition from agricultural interests."[224] Those in favor of the university quickly realized that, while the idea of becoming a more economically sound region seemed attractive, the animosity felt towards anything northern would have to be overcome in order for the university to become a reality. By using a more explicit rhetoric, Georgia Tech president Lyman Hall attempted to appeal to this antagonism in order to secure support for the university: "When the first brick is layed in the textile department of the Georgia School of Technology the South declares war against New England; a war not of secession but of aggression, a war against slavery, and we are the slaves who shall be free."[225] This reminder of the South's embarrassment at the hands of the North inflamed those who had experienced the shame of the war's outcome, and a transition to acceptance would begin to take place.

A second attempt was made in February, 1884; only this time, Harris had garnered the support of important politicians Joseph M. Terrell and R.B. Russell, the State Agricultural Society, and the University of Georgia (that would be sorely disappointed later to not be chosen to actually house the new technical school since it had already added a civil engineering in

---

[223] Wallace, *Dress Her in White and Gold: A Biography of Georgia Tech,* 6.

[224] Ibid., 7.

[225] Lyman Hall to Clark Howell (March 7, 1898), Lyman Hall Correspondence (UA309), Archives, Library and Information Center, Georgia Institute of Technology. Accessed September 5, 2022.

1866). By 1885, the bill had passed the House and was sent to the Senate, which would make two amendments to the bill before passing it. This amended bill was then rejected by the House. It was only after Harris intervened once again did the bill finally pass. It was signed into law on October 13, 1885 by Governor Henry D. McDaniel. Even this, however, did not keep there from being dissent over the establishment of a school, and severals efforts to repeal the law had to be quashed by Speaker of the House W.A. Little. What started as an obvious step towards economic rejuvenation and independence quickly became an element of contention between old and new, the past and the future. This conflict continued into the 1920s as the competition for state funds persisted between the relatively new engineering university, a representation of what could be, and the traditional southern universities. Enrollment quickly outgrew the campus, yet multiple requests for state help were either minimized or not granted at all. Tech president Kenneth G. Matheson, holding the position from 1906-1922, explained that the difficulty of convincing the state of Georgia that financially assisting Tech was an investment in the future was virtually fruitless during his tenure:

> It was our hope and belief that by developing an efficient technological school, the legislators would amply support it. In spite of many handicaps and discouragements, we gave to the state what competent critics declare to be the second engineering college of the nation–the first [MIT], by the way, having recently spent $28,000,000 in its development. Notwithstanding ... [soaring] enrollment, donated equipment totaling many thousands of dollars in value, $1,500,000 in subscriptions from friends and other evidences of growth, the legislatures of the past two summers have appropriated only half of the amount actually needed for the operation of the school.[226]

When successive president Marion L. Brittain took over from Matheson, he was more successful in arguing for the development of the university, saying, “there are more students in Georgia

---

[226] McMath, Jr., et al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 133.

Tech than in any other two colleges in Georgia, and we have the smallest appropriation of them all."[227] One of the key factors that he used to finally convince the rest of the state that Tech would be beneficial to the state's future was by receiving grants to establish the Daniel Guggenheim School of Aerospace Engineering. At this point, no other aerospace programs were provided in the South, so the importance of funding this curriculum was soon realized. Today, Tech boasts the second largest faculty in the country in the field.[228] Yet even through the 1940s, Tech was still struggling to garner the same funding for their students as other state universities did. Tech president Blake R. Van Leer, the first engineer to lead the school, explained his goal of seeing the university as no longer "a small regional school mired in the shop culture and known primarily for its football team."[229] In looking at the problems that Tech faced, he quickly identified the schools lack of funding and announced that the crisis resulted from the state of Georgia still not being able to acknowledge the importance of the programs offered at Tech:

> It is exceedingly difficult to understand . . . why the State of Georgia would spend more per student per year upon a girl at Milledgeville ($330.00 per year), a lawyer at Athens ($197.00 per year), a Negro at Fort Valley ($307.00 per year) than it does upon an engineering student in Atlanta ($112.00 per year), especially when the cost of engineering education is known to be higher.[230]

While the importance of funding the university was finally realized mid-century, much of the Reconstruction era and the subsequent half century was spent in trying to convince the traditional

---

[227] Ibid., 165.

[228] Kimberly Link-Wills, "The Sky's the Limit: Guggenheim Award Established School of Aeronautics". *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine*, Vol. 80, no. 2 (Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Tech Alumni Association, 2003), 30–32.

[229] McMath, Jr., et al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 172.

[230] O'Mara, "Selling the New South: Georgia Tech and Atlanta," 202.

South that the New South was not only feasible, but necessary. In fact, "[o]f 2,257 scientists starred in the first seven editions of *American Men of Science* (1906-1943), only 220 of them, or 9.7 percent, were southern born."[231] This antagonism against science was still felt even in 1964 when Clement Eaton called the South "essentially unscientific."[232]

The economic instability of the 1970s affected all higher education, and Georgia Tech was not immune to this downturn. However, by this point, the South had become cognizant of the importance of the university to its economic development and modernization and understood that the lack of funds would undo many of the gains that the region had made since World War II; they also understood that Georgia Tech's presence was critical in maintaining the South's relevance. Nationally, however, the government was unable to step in and help the floundering universities, but where the federal government failed, state programs did not. In 1982, while standing in a ball room named for Henry W. Grady, Governor George Busbee addressed a meeting of potential technology developers and said:

> As we plan ways to escape the current economic contraction, I'm convinced that our state needs to concentrate on building a base of high technology employment. The state cannot accomplish all that is needed because it does not have the resources nor does it have all the expertise that is needed. Instead, I want to propose that the public sector in Georgia forge an alliance with business to focus our best resources on finding and implementing solutions to our economic growth problems.[233]

---

[231] Stephen Sargent Visher, "Scientists Starred 1903-1943 in "American Men of Science," *Nature,* 162, no. 595 (October 16, 1948), 274.

[232] Clement Eaton, *The Mind of the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1964), 156.

[233] "Remarks of Governor George Busbee, Advanced Technology Strategy Conference, Peachtree Plaza Hotel, Henry Grady Room" (October 5, 1982), in CAR (ATDC).

New projects, important to the technological advances worldwide, were introduced, many of them specifically focused on Tech's capabilities, and "Georgia Tech would find itself very much involved in …these approaches to economic recovery and reform; crash programs in energy and industrial research and development, and state-level 'industrial policy.'"[234] In fact, the story of Atlanta and Georgia Tech demonstrates how this connection worked to "southernize" science, to prove that the South was just as adept at producing quality engineers and research as the North. So while the conflict between the two sides, traditional and progressive, was evident from the beginning, the importance of an engineering and technological university was irrefutable by the second half of the twentieth century. There had to be a full backing from the state in order for the school to move forward, and slowly it was realized that Tech's impact on Atlanta and the South as a whole indicated a change in attitude towards industrial and economic matters. From the beginning, Georgia Tech was solely identified with a new South, one that would attempt to assimilate with the values and practices considered "northern" by devout southerners. From the beginning, there would be a divide between Tech and other southern universities, the idea that Tech was "not like them" in curriculum, traditions, or purpose. And from the beginning, a latent resentment would exist between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech - two universities with seemingly paradoxical identities, at odds with each other and their places in the South - a conflict that would find itself playing out over the next century.

Reflective of its role as a progressive university, Georgia Tech would greet political and cultural changes in different ways than state universities. Even though they did not have the

---

[234] McMath, *Engineering the New South*, 438.

antebellum past to overcome, Tech struggled with the inclusion of coeds on the basis that most men did not consider women competent in an engineering field . The focus of its curriculum was not as conducive to female enrollment as some of the state universities since they did not initially have a teaching college or other liberal arts degrees. During the first half of the twentieth century, most women were not interested in engineering or other STEM education, and those who were interested were still not admitted as the extremely small number was thought to be disruptive to the other - male - students. By the beginning of the twentieth century, women were beginning to gain admission to northern engineering programs - such as Purdue, the University of Minnesota, and Iowa State University - and other schools were beginning to feel the pressure to allow the same access to their academic programs. So even though Georgia Tech admitted its first female student in 1917, before the state required female acceptance until 1920, their concession was admitting Anna Teitelbaum Wise to the evening program in Commerce. In 1919, Wise was the first woman to graduate with a degree from Tech; she was also immediately hired as a faculty member - both of these milestones matching what was happening at the University of Georgia. However, while UGA was able to continue this trend more easily because of the type of education it offered, it would appear that Tech struggled more with this cultural change due to the preconceived notion of women in an engineering field.

The next major milestone for women at Georgia Tech was in 1927 when Dorothy M. Crosland was promoted from Assistant Librarian to Librarian, but the university would have no more success in the capacity of coed admission until 1952 when Tech President Blake Van Leer led the Board of Regents to allow women to be enrolled undergraduate programs, however

limited. While World War II opened many new opportunities for women in general, there was still a stigma surrounding female engineers, and the university believed that Tech's reputation and curriculum rigor would be diminished with their admission. In fact, a survey conducted in 1947 showed that 64% of Tech students were against conceding to this cultural shift.[235] However this resistance came to an end when the first two undergraduate women, Elizabeth Herndon and Diane Michel, were admitted in 1952 - albeit only to programs that were not available at other universities; four years later, Diane Michel and Shirley Clements Mewborn would be the first female graduates of a complete undergrad program. After this inevitable breakthrough, Tech embraced the inclusion of women, and milestones were reached more easily. Sally Lam Woo was the first female Asian graduate in 1966; the first black women, Adesola Kujoure Nurudeen, Tawana Miller, Grace Hammonds, and Clemmie Whatley, were admitted in 1970; women's athletics began in 1974; and, in 1984, Lisa Volmar was the first woman allowed to drive the Ramblin' Wreck, finally allowing women to be integrated into beloved school traditions. As of the 2021-2022 academic year, female enrollment had reached 40%, one of the largest ratios at a national engineering university. It could be argued that the university would have been more willing to allow coeds sooner except for the fact that engineering, like many other careers during this time, were simply not seen as suitable for women - that it was not necessarily a desire to remain conventional; instead it was more indicative of the times and conventional social norms, not only in the South but nationwide. However, this argument does not excuse the fact that they were unwilling to make the progressive decision regarding female enrollment. So while Tech

---

[235] Amy Bix, "When Coeds Came to Georgia Tech," School of History and Sociology's Spring 2020 Speakers Series, Social Justice: Power, Inequity, and Change (March 2, 2020), accessed on October 5, 2022.

was progressive in so many ways, the reaction to the women's movement was stunted due to the administration and students discrediting the idea of women in engineering.

When faced with the issue of racial integration, however, Georgia Tech once again demonstrated that it was a university that was designed for change, one that was willing to embrace a difficult issue and look to the future in solving the problem. The reality of their location in the South made their decisions to desegregate even more meaningful as they were willing to stand for racial equality earlier than most of the other southern universities. The university, its administration, faculty, students, and board of regents would be commended by the *St. Paul Recorder* in 1961 "for a reasonable sensible approach and solution to a tough situation. Tech came through with honors."[236] Perhaps the most well-known controversy surrounding Georgia Tech and racial integration involved the 1956 Sugar Bowl. Invited to play in the Sugar Bowl after a successful 1955 season, Tech was faced with the decision of whether or not to accept the invitation and play the University of Pittsburgh, a northern team who allowed African-American players on its roster. During this season there had only been one black player on Pittsburgh's team, Bobby Grier, and if Georgia Tech had traveled out of the South to play the game, there would never have been a controversy. However, it was still Georgia custom that state universities could not play desegregated contests on southern soil; so while both Tech and the University of Georgia had traveled north during the season to play desegregated teams, the backlash came because the University of Pittsburgh would travel south to play the game in New Orleans. Based on these earlier season games, Tech president Van Leer and legendary coach

---

[236] "Georgia Tech Integration," *St. Paul Recorder* (Nov 17, 1961), 6, Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers, Library of Congress, accessed January 10, 2023.

Bobby Dodd accepted the contract, believing that it would be acceptable as times were changing. However, the recent *Brown v Board of Education* decision had inflamed the racist attitudes of many southerners, and Georgia governor Marvin Griffin responded to the pressure in an extreme manner - requesting that Tech not play the game, no state university systems be allowed to play any desegregated games, and that state funding be removed from all schools who broke this rule. In his public wire to President Van Leer, Griffin presented a plea that he believed would not only be accepted, but lauded:

> It is my request that athletic teams of units of the University System of Georgia not be permitted to engage in contests with other teams where the races are mixed on such teams or where segregation is not required among spectators at such events. The South stands at Armageddon. The battle is joined. We cannot make the slightest concession to the enemy in this dark and lamentable hour of struggle. There is no more difference in compromising integrity of race on the playing field than doing so in the classrooms. One break in the dike and the relentless seas will rush in and destroy us. We are in this fight 100 percent; not 98 percent, nor 75 percent, not 64 percent– but a full 100 percent. An immediate called meeting of the State Board of Regents to act on my request is vitally necessary at this time.[237]

However, Griffin greatly underestimated the emotion surrounding the game. Tech students immediately responded to his statement by immediately organizing a protest and marching on Five Points, the Governor's Mansion, and the Georgia State Capitol, burning Griffin's effigy at each location. While these riots were denounced by the majority of the Board of Regents, President Van Leer refused to back down, saying, "I am 60 years old and I have never broken a contract. I do not intend to start now,"[238] and it was decided that Tech should be allowed to play in the game. In order to further demonstrate their resistance to Griffin's racism, the Georgia Tech

---

[237] "Tempest Over the Sugar Bowl," *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine* 34, no. 4 (1955), 8.

[238] Ibid., 9.

players purposely chose to sit with Grier at the postgame dinner - taking place at the St. Charles Hotel in New Orleans, a hotel that had never hosted a black man for dinner. This controversy was quickly noticed on a national level, and the sentiments of the rest of the country were clearly defending the Tech students, even if the reason was athletically based. The *Arizona Sun* addressed the issue through an editorial on December 9, 1955:

> This paper should probably write an open letter of thanks to Georgia's Governor Marv Griffin for the service he has done the cause of integration by helping the Georgia Tech boys see how stupid segregation is. They might never have seen this phase of segregation if the governor had not used segregation to stop the boys enjoyment of the game of football. The governor touched a nerve this time and soreness of integration is much less painful to the Tech boys than the gain of athletic nonentity . . . Gov. Griffin undoubtedly was slow witted enough to believe his actions would not only be thoroughly approved by the young "southern gentleman" at Georgia Tech, but that he would personally become a great hero . . . [but] Georgia Tech is behind the integrated college whose Negro players will march through the Georgia line like the union army marched through Georgia.[239]

This controversy was one of the first to signal the conflicts that were starting to appear, yet the refusal of Tech's students to accept the forced segregation was also indicative of how the university as a whole would respond to the issue of racial desegregation over the next decade. It demonstrated how the governor was out of touch with how many southerners were beginning to respond to the Civil Rights Movement, and instead of reinforcing a supposedly unalterable southern ideal, he had disgraced the state's reputation instead.

The next time the question of desegregation ensued was in 1960 when a Georgia state law mandated "an immediate cut-off of state funds to any white institution that admitted a black

---

239 "Southern Gentleman Revolt," *Arizona Sun* (December 9, 1955), 4.

student."[240] Once again, Georgia Tech students decided to challenge the state's stark racism by meeting on January 17, 1961, during which time an overwhelming majority of the 2,741 students chose to endorse the integration of qualified applicants.[241] This attitude led to Georgia Tech becoming the first Deep South university to integrate without a court ordered mandate. On September 20, 1963, Ford Greene, Ralph A. Long Jr., and Lawrence Michael Williams became the first three African-Americans to attend the Georgia Institute of Technology, and - in keeping with how the university's students had acted so far - there was little reaction to their admission. Mayor William Hartsfield proudly declared Atlanta "a city too busy to hate" and noted in his farewell address that "[m]any sections of our southland have tried to stop the inexorable clock of time and progress, but without success and at great cost to themselves. Atlanta's mature and friendly approach to the problems of racial change has earned for us the respect of the nation."[242] This sentiment was echoed in the *St. Paul Recorder,* commending the city for:

> [showing] the way twice: first in the public school system, and second at Georgia Tech in the heart of the city. In doing so, it has demonstrated that desegregation can be accomplished in the Deep South, given the will to accomplish it, without ugly upheaval. Conversely, it has demonstrated the the unhappy experience of Little Rock and New Orleans was not inevitable and could have been prevented.[243]

---

[240] "University of Georgia Integration," Civil Rights Digital Library, University of Georgia Library, accessed October 5, 2022.

[241] Pat Edwards, *"*Being New to Tech Was Not Always Easy*," The Technique* (September 10, 1999), accessed October 5, 2022.

[242] "William B. Hartsfield, 80, Dies; Atlanta's Mayor for 23 Years," *The New York Times* (February 24, 1971), accessed October 13, 2022.

[243] "Georgia Tech Integration," *St. Paul Recorder,* Nov 17, 1961, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov., accessed January 10, 2023.

During the Civil Rights Movement, Atlanta attempted to distance itself from the rest of the distasteful racism of the South; even a *Newsweek* article explained the uniqueness of Atlanta's attitude: "Atlanta was never part of the plantation South. It was never a population of planters - Atlantans were different people: railroad construction workers, carpenters, storekeepers, hard-bitten mountain people come down from northeast Georgia, and a trickle of New Englanders."[244] Likewise, so did Georgia Tech accept the change peacefully, and - just as immediate changes followed the enrollment of women - progress was quickly made in how blacks were treated by the university. John Gill became the first black editor *The Technique* in 1965, and William Peace joined the Department of Social Sciences in 1968 as the Tech's first black professor. By 2001, Georgia Tech accounted for over 40% of black engineering students nationwide; while some argue that this is how it should be as half of the nation's black population resides in the South, it is still an admirable figure as the next closest university - MIT - is less than half of Georgia Tech's number. Additionally, Georgia Tech employs the highest percentage - 3.4% - of black faculty.[245] Befitting the role that Georgia Tech played in Atlanta's modernization, it makes sense that the university's students would not feel threatened by this change, again embracing a future that would only move them forward,

This connection between the city and the school continued throughout the subsequent decades. As Tech expanded its research capacity, it became even more immersed in the economic growth of the city. The school's contributions to the military during the two world wars began to

---

[244] O'Mara, "Selling the New South," 199.

[245] "Among the Highest-Ranked Engineering Schools, Georgia Tech Leads in Racial Diversity," *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 33 (Autumn, 2001), 73.

allow Tech to be viewed as a national institute of influence, and this continued through the second half of the twentieth century as the school's - and Atlanta's - growth exploded during the Cold War. By the 1950s, Tech had established itself as having some of the strongest programs in engineering and science, yet it still had not reached the status of MIT, Stanford University, or the University of Pennsylvania. Atlanta, comparably, was still establishing itself on a national and international stage - growing in prosperity and population, yet still not as influential as New York City, Philadelphia, or Boston. Because of the Cold War, however, the resources which Georgia Tech could provide not only brought extensive attention to the university, but also - as a result - to Atlanta. The city became more attractive to the science and high tech communities. This era, unable to be foretold by the New South prophets, once again, however, fulfilled their vision. In her article "Selling the New South: Georgia Tech and Atlanta," historian and professor Margaret Pugh O'Mara describes how "Atlanta's and Georgia Tech's story … is a prime example of the way in which scientific activity became a key element of state and local economic development campaigns, and how urban and regional development strategies of the era were structured to attract scientific employers and scientific professionals."[246] Beginning as an answer to the northern industrial and engineering progress at the turn of the century, by the end of it, Georgia Tech and Atlanta had far surpassed the New South's vision.

How, then, exactly is Georgia Tech important to a southern industrial age? What is it about the school that provides an answer to the need for an industrial economy? While initially it only offered a mechanical engineering degree, it soon added added chemical, electrical, and civil

---

[246] O'Mara,"Selling the New South," 183

engineering by the beginning of the twentieth century. Tech's initial omission of classical studies and weakening of a liberal arts curriculum were intentional in order to not threaten the University of Georgia, but instead to provide a different type of education which would appeal to a different demographic. Journalist Nathaniel Harris described the desired relationship between UGA and Tech as "[t]he head is in Athens; the Hands are here. We have here thought versus work; practice against theory; the shop against the study; the hammer against the book; the blouse against the cutaway."[247] Like Worcester, it initially offered both classroom and practical classes, which contrasted MIT who "stressed higher mathematics, theoretical science, and original research."[248] This choice to blend an education with a trade school was influenced by Thurston who believed that a mechanical engineer "should be educated as a designer of construction, not a constructor"[249] and that "there were two classes of people and that they needed to be educated differently. One class was best suited for intellectual pursuits, while the other was endowed with construction faculties."[250] However, Georgia Tech soon realized that the university should focus more on classroom education and research, and in 1896, the controversy culminated in the trustees decided that a shift was needed away from a shop school and the university should be changed "to a purely educational institution as far as possible."[251] In 1948,

---

[247] Nathaniel E. Harris, *Atlanta Constitution,* October 6, 1888, https://www.ajc.com, accessed September 18, 2022.

[248] Robert C. McMath Jr. et all, *Engineering in the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 9.

[249] Thurston, "Instruction in Mechanical Engineering," 6904-5.

[250] James E. Brittain and Robert C. McMath, "Engineers and the New South Creed: The Formation and Early Development of Georgia Tech," *Technology and Culture* 18, no. 2 (1977): 177.

[251] Trustees of GST, Minutes, April 29, 1892.

the school officially changed its name to the Georgia Institute of Technology in order to indicate its move away from the trade school element of its program to one focused primarily on teaching and inquiry. Ironically, it was this original identification with the trade school that allowed the University of Georgia to disparagingly label the university 'North Avenue Trade School' at the height of their rivalry - a name which is still uttered in an attempt to insult the school but is embraced by the engineers who attend.

It is not difficult to identify the differences between Tech and other southern colleges, and its distinct curriculum and purpose set it apart from the beginning. With the North flourishing as a result of the Industrial Revolution - new inventions, investments, and businesses - it was imperative that the South restructure its current economic structure to embrace these northern elements which were providing so much prosperity to the region. However, the South did not have the means to be at all competitive at the end of the Civil War. Perhaps the most industrial commodities present were the railroad and the cotton gin, and even these were focused on cotton production. A new university was needed - one unlike the others, one that could be viewed as an experiment in southern acceptance of northern values, and while the concept may have been new to southerners, the university grew steadily over the next half century. It had even developed enough after the first two decades to secure a visit from then President Theodore Roosevelt, who stood on the steps of Tech Tower and hailed the advancement of technological education:

> America can be the first nation only by the kind of training and effort which is developed and is symbolized in institutions of this kind ... Every triumph of engineering skill credited to an American is credited to America. It is incumbent upon you to do well, not

> only for your individual sakes, but for the sake of that collective American citizenship which dominates the American nation.[252]

Tech garnered the attention of other presidents, also, as President-elect William Taft visited the campus on January 16, 1909, followed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on November 29, 1935. The university benefited from several consecutive university presidents who were instrumental in building the university in regards to student enrollment, campus growth, and curriculum offerings. Isaac S. Hopkins, Georgia Tech's first president, explained the importance of the school when he explained that industrial education was "one of those great revolutions of thoughts and public sentiment, the results of which are not for a day or a generation for all time."[253] He also explained how this type of training would break down the barriers between the educated upper classes and those who belonged to the working class - that it would become a defense against "communism and revolution."[254] After the university was established, the support of powerful businessmen and politicians allowed Tech the opportunity to grow and develop in a way that would benefit the South. Tech was depicted as the state's secret weapon as it sought industrial success. Once some of the naysayers saw the positive changes in how the South was viewed - and how it changed the southern economy for the better - there was less resistance for the project, and Georgia Tech soon came to rival the engineering universities of the North and placed the South on a clear path towards prominence.

---

[252] Sean Selman. "Presidential Tour of Campus Not the First for the Institute", (March 27, 2002), A Presidential Visit to Georgia Tech. Georgia Institute of Technology. Archived from the original on September 4, 2006. Retrieved December 30, 2006. Accessed October 6, 2022.

[253] Isaac Stiles Hopkins, "Industrial Education," in *Sources and Reprints.* Atlanta: Emory University Publications, 1952), 2.

[254] Isaac Styles Hopkins, "Industrial Education: An Alumni Address, Emory College, 1883. *Emory University Publications*, ed. Goodrick Cook, ser. 7, no. 1 (Atlanta, 1952), v-ix.

In relation to Georgia Tech's purpose and curriculum, not much has changed over the past century and a half; they still focus on what is most important to modernization. Still primarily science and technology based, the university now offers six colleges, encompassing approximately 31 different departments. Viewed as one of the premier engineering and research schools in the country, Georgia Tech has consistently been ranked at the top of U.S. News and World Report's list of best engineering schools[255] and has expanded its satellite campuses to Savannah, Georgia; Shenzhen, China; Metz, France; and Singapore. Its motto is "Progress and Service," indicating the university's commitment to the ideals on which it was founded. Proving that it is committed to helping the South achieve both national and international prominence, Georgia Tech is one of the most racially diverse universities in the South with white students only constituting approximately 45% of the student population; Asian students comprise 23%, and the remainder of the student body is primarily Black/African-American and international students.[256] While the majority of students enrolled are Georgia residents, Tech has also helped to establish the American Talent Initiative, working with over 120 public and private institutions

> to increase the number of low-income, first-generation and Pell-eligible undergraduates nationwide. For more than ten years, the Tech Promise program, offered to dependent Georgia residents whose families have an annual income of less than $33,300 and who are seeking their first undergraduate degree, has increased access to Georgia Tech's programs for low-income students from across the state. Serving 171 students in 2019-20, this program is designed to bridge a gap in the financial aid support system, picking up where other financial aid options leave off.[257]

---

255 Andreas Kaplan, *High Tech: Georgia Tech, in Higher Education at the Crossroads of Disruption: the University of the 21st Century* (London: Emerald Publishing House, 2021), 156.

256 "Georgia Tech Demographics & Diversity Report," College Factual, accessed October 2, 2022.

257 "Georgia Institute of Technology: Complete College Georgia Plan," 2020 Status Report, accessed October 29, 2020. 2.

Interestingly enough, the students who apply for admission to Georgia Tech rarely also apply to the University of Georgia - once again indicating completely different purposes and roles for the two schools in the wake of the New South's agenda. Depending on the report, Georgia Tech is consistently ranked in the top of 5 of most influential engineering universities and is currently the largest one in the United States.[258] It was key in helping Atlanta host the 1996 Summer Olympics - an important achievement in reaching international prominence. While Tech's campus was the center of much of the Olympic activity, even hosting the athletes and coaches, it's primary contribution was in showing how Atlanta was modern enough to host this international event. In an article examining Tech's Olympic Legacy, Tech alum Melissa Fralick contends that "without Georgia Tech, the city's improbable victory likely wouldn't have happened. A coalition of Tech faculty and students created a dazzling virtual tour for Atlanta's Olympic bid that wowed the International Olympic Committee and helped secure the city's selection as the site of the 1996 Summer Olympics."[259] One of the most important milestones for the university in relation to other engineering schools across the country was the arrival of personal computers. In 1997, students were required to own computers, and in 1999, Tech was the first university in the South to provide internet to its sororities and fraternities. Additionally, as "[t]he influx of R&D funding enlarged Tech's research mission, [it] heightened its regional and national reputation,"[260] precipitating both the university and Atlanta's influence. Many

---

[258] "The 10 Best Colleges for Engineering Universities," *Money* (June 7, 2022), accessed October 2, 2022.

[259] Melissa Fralick, "Our Olympic Legacy: A Look at How the Centennial Games Changed Georgia Tech 20 Years Ago," Georgia Tech Alumni Association (Summer 2016).

[260] O'Mara, "Selling the New South: Georgia Tech and Atlanta," 202.

considered that Tech would be the secret weapon that would propel Atlanta, and the South, into the technological future. In her article "Selling the New South," O'Mara quoted a local reporter speaking on the subject in 1962: 'the research done at Tech can often mean the difference between an industry's gaining knowledge for an important breakthrough, or its continuing in the old - often marginal or submarginal - rut.'"[261] The presence and growth of Georgia Tech since its founding in 1885 reflects the South's commitment to progress and modernization. The success of the university over the past century and a half mirrors the different milestones that have taken place in the South, especially in Atlanta. It is safe to say that without Georgia Tech the modernization of the region would have been severely stunted as there would have been no institution providing the training necessary for the South to move beyond a primarily agrarian society. The establishment of Tech provided credibility to the promises made by the New South advocates; it also allowed for these promises to be fulfilled sooner rather than later. A response to a critical need, Georgia Tech is the epitome of the New South, an integral contribution to the South's twentieth century progress.

When considering the reputation of Georgia Tech and its southern location, it is not difficult to determine that Tech does not fit the mold of a southern university, especially the ones that existed during the antebellum period and immediately following the Civil War. The course of study that the school emphasizes, the traditions and customs that have developed since 1885, and what they have determined to be their purpose are all diametrically contrary to other southern institutions. Institutions such as the universities of Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina,

---

[261] Ibid., 211.

Tennessee, and Mississippi were all established before the Civil War, and they took pride in modeling the antebellum era, while universities such as Auburn and Mississippi State - although founded shortly after the war - also incorporated southern traditions and customs into the student life experience. Only Georgia Tech stood alone at the turn of the century, in no way even trying to emulate the sentimental attitudes of the other schools. Certainly Tech has its own traditions and customs which have become deeply rooted in its student culture, yet the history behind them and their significance in the students' daily lives are not as critical to their educational experience as at the older southern universities. Instead, what they see as their role in the South and what they have chosen to emphasize on a day to day basis have differed from its conception. Antebellum universities tend to offer a plethora of degree programs, including engineering in their curriculum but not setting it on a higher pedestal than degrees such as law, business, and education. According to *Atlanta Constitution* editors in 1882, the "South had 'more lawyers than cases and more physicians than patients;" they also conveyed that "the idea that manual labor [was] vulgar and the trades are not respectable."[262] Georgia Tech's fundamental focus is technology and engineering, and Marion L. Brittain, longest serving Tech president, explained its early success as a cosmopolitan character as it has been "the policy of the authorities … to avoid inbreeding and provincialism by taking care to secure a large number of the new instructors from the North and the West."[263] While new to Georgia Tech, these imported instructors - often from

---

[262] "Practical Education," *Atlanta Constitution* (December 1882), www.ajc.com, accessed October 22, 2022.

[263] Brittain, *The Story of Georgia Tech,* vii.

Harvard, Yale, and the University of Chicago - were established professors in their fields, adding strength to the fledgling university.

It is true that Tech has added some liberal arts programs to their curriculum, but students still primarily attend the university for its engineering programs. According to multiple college survey websites,[264] Georgia Tech's degrees in engineering, technology, and science are in the top 10 of most in demand and highest paying degrees after graduation. While mechanical and chemical engineering degrees rank highest, electrical, aerospace, computer, biomedical, and systems engineering are consistently in the top 25 fastest growing fields worldwide. When considering how the world is changing, clearly the most important changes are in STEM related areas as the technology in these enterprises changes daily, and Georgia Tech consistently provides the highest level of education in these areas. In 2019, Tech reached 16,159 undergraduate students, a record high for the university; what is more significant is that 80% of these students were enrolled in STEM programs;[265] compare this to MIT's 50% student enrollment in engineering programs.[266] Further proving Tech's commitment to STEM is the overall number of STEM degrees acquired during the 2010s decade - 2,157 STEM degrees were earned in 2011-2012, and by 2019-2020 3,335 STEM degrees were earned - a 55% increase over the decade.[267] The university also rates high for graduating underrepresented minorities in

---

[264] See the following website statistics: *Princeton Review, Business Insider, Investopedia, Kiplinger, and Forbes.*

[265] "Complete College Georgia 2020 Status Report: Georgia Institute of Technology," Complete College (October 29, 2020), 4.

[266] "Facts and Figures," MIT School of Engineering (2022), accessed November 22, 2022.

[267] Complete College Georgia 2020 Status Report: Georgia Institute of Technology, 4, accessed October 3, 2022.

mathematics, engineering, and computer science and graduating more women in engineering than any other U.S. university.[268] The United States military has also greatly benefited from the efforts of the university and its students. During World War I, Tech opened its campus to army technicians, supply officers, and cadet aviators; this resulted in the creation of a Reserve Officer Training Corp, the first in the South. Unlike the University of Georgia, which lost most of their able-bodied men to the military, Georgia Tech did not suffer as much during the war as their programs of study contributed to the war cause through an automotive school for officers and a rehabilitation program for disabled soldiers.[269] Even as early as 1934, Georgia Tech responded to growing military and industrial needs by creating the Engineering Experiment Station, now known as the Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI). Their mission statement reflects Georgia Tech's overall stated purpose, saying that their objective is to "develop advanced technology solutions and large-scale system prototypes to address the most difficult problems in national security, economic development, and the overall human condition."[270] The Georgia Tech Research Institute is now one of the most respected research labs in the world, with over 2,800 employees worldwide maintaining eight laboratories worldwide. As of FY2021, GTRI had received more than $780 million in research awards that provide solutions in both government and industry fields. However, the greatest honor that Tech has received is the Guggenheim Award which provided $300,000 to establish one of the nation's first aeronautical schools in 1930. Notable alum include former President Jimmy Carter, Kary Mullis (Nobel Prize winner in

---

[268] Ibid., 4.

[269] McMath, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885–1985,* 125.

[270] "Georgia Tech Research Institute," gatech.edu, accessed October 3, 2022.

Chemistry), G. Wayne Clough (one of the most successful Georgia Tech presidents), Bobby Jones (founder of the Masters Tournament), and 14 astronauts. The success of GTRI and Georgia Tech's undergraduate and graduate programs has changed how the South is perceived in terms of modernization. It embraced the mantle of progressivism for which Grady and other New South leaders advocated, and, from the beginning, found its purpose in responding to the critical science and technological needs of each time period.

While the purpose of the school is clearly focused on STEM training and research, it is still a university with a student body who desire a true college experience. Traditions and customs are meaningful to students of all universities, and Georgia Tech is no different, having several traditions which are deeply embedded in student life. Some even argue that these traditions are even more important to a student body who survive on little sleep and copious amounts of caffeine due to the rigor of its curriculum. In fact, one of their traditions even revolves around their perceived brainy reputation - the Tyler Brown Pi Run. One of the longest continuous races in Atlanta, the 3.14 run occurs annually in March and wanders through the campus on a specially created trail that equals the required length. Solely a Georgia Tech tradition, this race proves how the student body embraces the difficulty of their studies and even welcomes the running community to join them in this acknowledgement of their programs. Another significant tradition is an authentic steam whistle which used to blow hourly for five minutes, reflecting a tie to its industrial past and identification. Tech also has Greek life, which is unexpectedly similar in both the number of fraternities/sororities and active student participation as the University of Georgia; the school also has fight songs and chants, akin to other universities

with athletic programs. The two most important legends - stealing the T and the enrollment of George P. Burdell - are central to college folklore, and when Tech alum fondly reminisce over their college days, these two traditions always come to mind. While the number of traditions is much smaller at Tech, they are still an important part of student life.

Perhaps the most important of Georgia Tech's customs is the stealing of the Tech 'T.' Atop the oldest building on campus, Tech Tower, the word Tech appears on each side, proclaiming the school to the thousands of drivers who pass by on the I-75/85 connector that spans downtown Atlanta. Every academic year without fail, a group of students will orchestrate a plan to steal the "T;" very rarely do these engineers succeed though. The tradition began in 1969 when the "Magnificent Seven" successfully removed the five-foot-tall letter, beginning a tradition that would have various success and generate intense school spirit when accomplished. For a couple of decades, the administration - while not publicly condoning the activity - still realized the importance of the tradition to the students. President of Georgia Tech from 1987 to 1994, John Patrick Crecine hailed the tradition: "I think stealing the 'T' off the Tech Tower is among the all time greatest rituals."[271] However, this perception has changed recently- at least publicly and legally - as the university does not want to face litigation in case of disaster. Starting with the successful removal in 1999, the consequence for undertaking the mission is expulsion, and the student(s) will also face legal repercussions. The most recent theft was in 2014, and alum and students alike came together in solidarity to protest the suspension of the perpetrator, regarding

---

[271] Arvind Narayan, "Why the T Thief Shouldn't Be Suspended," *Technique* (March 20, 2014).

the action as tradition and not a crime. Even with the threat of such consequences, the crusade continues, with those who have succeeded becoming legends in Tech lore.

Others argue that the most important tradition involves a fictitious student named George P. Burdell, a legend that is introduced to Tech at every freshman class orientation and was created by William Edward "Ed" Smith in 1927 after he received two acceptance letters to the institution. Instead of discarding one of them, he took the opportunity to enroll Burdell at Tech, even signing him up for all of the same classes he was taking. After figuring out how to "help" Burdell pass these classes, Smith continued the farce until Burdell received a BS in Ceramic Engineering in 1930. As of the turn of the 21st century, Burdell has completed every undergraduate degree at the university, even receiving graduate degrees in some of them. He has joined fraternities, lettered in varsity sports, served in wars, participated in a theatre production, named as an alternate to the Democrat National Convention in 2000, and even married another fictitious character named Ramona Cartwright. In fact, their 50th wedding anniversary was celebrated by the radio broadcast "Prairie Home Companion" on September 23, 2006.[272] When the registration process went digital in 1969, many thought the tradition would cease. However, considering that this is a school full of engineering and computer geniuses, the process was hacked, and Burdell has continued to take courses at the university. Burdell is paged at football games and even at Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport. Arguably the greatest acknowledgment of the student, however, is when President Barack Obama spoke at the university and expressed his disappointment when Burdell, who was supposed to introduce the

---

[272] "A Prairie Home Companion for September 23, 2006", American Public Media (September 23, 2007), retrieved 2007-03-02, accessed October 4, 2022.

president, did not show up.[273] Burdell is clearly a beloved member and one of the most prestigious graduates of the Georgia Institute of Technology, and - as students find the opportunity - new shenanigans will definitely ensue.

Georgia Tech traditions also surround athletics, as most larger universities do. While "campus athletics and student activities were nonexistent in early years, [it only took] two decades to establish sports, clubs, publications, and fraternities"[274] - all critical to creating a student culture that would contribute to a full university experience. The administration initially fought the formation of these social aspects of the college, believing that they would undermine the academics for which the university was established. However, student culture cannot be denied, and these campus offerings - especially athletics - quickly took hold at the university. The oldest rivalry for Tech is focused on the University of Georgia, and - just like the state university chants at their rival - enthusiastically proclaims "To Hell With Georgia" or "Give 'Em Hell, Tech" whenever possible. While the importance of the rivalry with Georgia, which will be discussed further in chapter 5, is significant to the area's development, there are plenty of other practices inundating athletic traditions. The "Ramblin' Wreck" is the oldest of Tech's two mascots and was introduced in 1930. This Ford Model A Sports Coupe, known around the world as the symbol of Georgia Tech, has led the football team on to the field since 1961. A select student organization, the Ramblin' Wreck Club, is committed to preserving the tradition and continuing its importance to student culture. The most visible mascot at athletic events is Buzz,

---

273 "#POTUSatGT: Seven Memorable Moments from President Obama's Speech". Retrieved 2015-03-11.

274 McMath, Jr., et al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 29.

the official Georgia Tech mascot. This large, plush, costumed yellow jacket is also a part of team introductions, entering football games to the sound of swarming yellow jackets. His influence in creating school spirit is significant and is shown by backflips at the 50 yard line, crowd surfing, and rushing the goal posts. He also helps lead the different fight songs and chants during the games, including the official school songs "Ramblin' Wreck from Georgia Tech" and "Up With the White and Gold." While the number of athletic traditions may not be as numerous at Tech as they are at other southern universities, and are often focused towards only one school, they are still integral to a sense of tradition in student life.

The student culture of an urban university differs greatly from one in a distinctly college town; the opportunities available to students in a larger city clearly affects them in comparison to a smaller college town where the entire community is centered around the happenings of the university. This is particularly true of Georgia Tech as it is situated in the heart of downtown Atlanta. While Atlanta may not have initially been the megalopolis that it is now, the university was able to grow and evolve with the city itself, contributing it its identity and assuming some of its character for itself. What the city needed in regards to industry and engineering, Tech would do its best to provide; Tech graduates would, in turn, seek employment in Atlanta, helping the city reach its full potential. The university and the city worked together to achieve the New South dream, and this connection has greatly impacted the student experience. Unlike most of the larger southern universities that are located in smaller cities where all eyes are turned towards the institution for their experiences with arts and athletics, Georgia Tech students had at their fingertips a plethora of opportunities off campus in which to participate. College towns offer a

singularly focused team for each sport; Tech students had both college and professional teams from which to choose. Most universities have a museum, theatre, and concert hall; Atlanta boasts numerous offerings of each. Tech students also have easy access to air travel and railways, freedom to travel beyond the borders of their university effortlessly. So while Georgia Tech does provide all of the cultural offerings of a typical university, they also encourage student life off campus into the city of Atlanta, beyond its walls and limits. The university itself has expanded past its original campus perimeter, crossing Atlanta's downtown connector to establish Technology Square, a revitalized area offering a multidisciplinary technology research center, graduate offices, classrooms, restaurants and outside businesses. Georgia Tech has continued to infiltrate the city, continued to contribute to its growth, and continued to provide their students the most comprehensive student life possible. Tech has not isolated itself within its walls but has maintained its historical role in creating a city of influence and importance.

When its relationship with Atlanta's history and identity is considered, it is evident that the Georgia Institute of Technology deserves its perception as a forward-thinking, modern university, willing to accept the challenge of making the South "new" and of international influence. Except for perhaps how they were hesitant to accept women as students, Georgia Tech has led the South in every facet of political and cultural change. Its campus rising from the ashes of Sherman's march, its student body one of the most diverse in the region, and its curriculum always cutting edge and innovative, Georgia Tech has been successful in answering the charge of the turn-of-the-century North to lead the South into national relevance and international importance. From its origins as the first engineering and technology school to its current status as

a world leader in all forms of engineering and other STEM programs, Georgia Tech - in no way - embodies the Old South. It is New and, in being such, contributes to the South's past, present, and future.

Chapter 5

College Football in the South

As the South worked its way through the twentieth century, finding its place in a postbellum era where many of its traditions and values were questioned, challenged, and rejected, the clash between old and new played out in various ways. Attempting to find a new identity, one that was acceptable to a progressive nation yet also one that stayed true to the essence of the region, the South's struggle was seen in business markets, population growth, and even educational opportunities. It could even be seen in athletic competitions, specifically on the football field. One of the strongest athletic rivalries of the 1900s was the annual contest between the University of Georgia and the Georgia Institute of Technology. Coined "Clean, Old-Fashioned Hate" by author Bill Cromartie in his book by the same name, this rivalry has currently spanned 129 years, with only a few short pauses in the action. And while the most obvious expression of this hatred is revealed on the field, the two schools have been at odds since the establishment of Georgia Tech in 1885. From state funding to student recruitment to curriculum offerings, UGA and Georgia Tech could not be more different, and their interactions have clearly highlighted the disparity between the Old South and the New. Their rivalry is symbolic of the struggle that the South has faced in modernizing and growing in influence, in desiring continuity yet knowing that some fundamental changes had to occur. Georgia, the state's flagship university and deeply ensconced in the traditions of old, was challenged immediately after the Civil War by the founding of Georgia Tech, the emblem of a new identity which

possessed none of the characteristics which had always described the South. These two universities struggled against each other for state prominence and influence, both seeking to represent the South moving forward. Would the University of Georgia be able to successfully transform itself into a university that would be viewed as authentically southern yet also cutting edge as the twenty-first century approached; would it be Georgia Tech that prevailed, creating a completely new focus for the economy and commerce of the region? Or would the two universities learn to co-exist in an equitable manner, both recognizing the importance of each other's strengths and working together to assure the nation and the world that the South deserved to be viewed in a new light - while still, once a year, fighting out old grievances for bragging rights? The South had no choice but to transition, and this progression can be documented in the UGA-Georgia Tech rivalry.

Before delving into the obsession that is college football in the South, it is important to note that the rivalry between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech has not just played out on the field; in fact, the animosity in the annual football game is simply the manifestation of the conflict that has long existed between the two. The founding of a state engineering and technology school threatened the state university from the beginning. While there were other universities in the state - Emory, Mercer, and Augusta- the University of Georgia was clearly the premier university, the choice for upperclass young men, and the one qualifying for the greatest amount of state aid. However, after the Civil War, the need for a college that would fulfill the New South vision would threaten the importance of UGA in the state's future, or at least this was their perception. When Grady presented his vision in New York, UGA immediately offered to

house these new programs, believing that they would be able to effectively provide the necessary curriculum to fulfill this ideal but also realizing that, in order to retain its dominant status, it needed to be the university that was chosen. As the largest university in the state, the University of Georgia assumed that it would continue to represent the state of Georgia in all of the transitions that were being required of the South; clearly a "new" South would not include a university that was modeled after the hated North's educational structure. However, as the school only offered classes in civil engineering taught by one faculty member, the committee researching the concept of a new university did not feel that the university would dedicate the necessary funding and attention needed to make this type of education effective and comprehensive. It had never been the purpose of the school to instruct engineers, and most southern families during this time would not feel the need to send their sons to a university that did so. Engineering colleges were, in the southern mind, a northern response to the industrialization of its cities, not necessary in an agrarian South. Clearly, though, UGA understood that these programs would lead the South into a new era and did not want to be left out. Already struggling at the end of the 19th century, the University realized that losing this role could possibly make them irrelevant, or at least minimize their significance to the region's future. However, the intention was to move forward, and this was with a new type of university - one that reflected the new and the North, two ideas diametrically opposed to what UGA stood for. Georgia Tech was created in order to move the South into the future; it was almost as if the University of Georgia was discounted in this purpose. The New South apostles were not looking to Georgia in any way to contribute to their vision; the university appeared to be forgotten in

achieving this new goal. So from the beginning, UGA would hold a grudge against Georgia Tech even though it was not the institute's fault that it had been created separately.

The fundamental differences between the purposes and curriculum of the schools also contribute to the hostility between the two. The two schools have never had the same purpose, causing them to pursue distinct types of students, construct different types of academic buildings, find importance in dissimilar campus activities, and graduate students into completely different occupational fields. The two curriculums are also at odds in every way. While a century later the two universities have added token examples of the others' stronger programs, the academic agendas differ to the point that that it is not, and has not been, possible to collaborate with each other; the differences also contributed to stereotypes on which each student body capitalize in mocking their rival. It also did not help that, in order to establish Georgia Tech, there would be immediate competition for state funds. The University of Georgia was suffering after the Civil War and needed this money to recover the vitality they had begun to experience beforehand. On the other hand, Tech would need the financing, and the attention, of the state to be adequately established; otherwise, a lack of growth could allow for the institute to be abandoned if it did not demonstrate its significance quickly. Essentially every aspect of the two schools differed. It seemed inevitable that these two state universities would become rivals, vying for the coveted position of educationally leading the South into a new age.

In order to understand, then, how this rivalry can to be viewed from the vantage point of a most beloved southern tradition, it is important to understand how college football evolved in the South. Perhaps Pat Dye - a player at the University of Georgia, an assistant coach at

Alabama, and the head coach at Auburn University from 1981-1991 - stressed this obsession best: "The folks up north and in other places around the country play football, and they enjoy it…That's fine. But down here we don't play college football. We live it. And we live it every day."[275] Historian Charles Rowland shares this opinion when he explains how college football in the South amounts to "levels of meaning, intensity, and violence entirely foreign to other regions."[276] Rowland also quotes historian Richard Scott who takes the idea even further, bestowing upon the sport an almost mythical connotation:

> [Football} life manifests itself in a unique and profound dimension on game days when Old Miss fans tailgate at the Grove…or when the 'Vol Navy' drifts down the Tennessee River to storm the beaches at Neyland Stadium…It drifts on the winds through the parking lots of Tiger Stadium on the Louisiana State University camps as the fans eat pots of gumbo…It takes on mythical proportions as the foot of Bear Bryant's statue…It soars with the eagle circling the crowd at Auburn's Jordan-Hare Stadium…It barks between the hedges at Georgia. It rings like a cowbell at Mississippi State. It calls the Hogs at Arkansas and crows like a fighting Gamecock at South Carolina. It clings to a healthy measure of hope and history at Kentucky and Vanderbilt.[277]

Superstitious belief is also allotted to the sport as Erk Russell, UGA defensive coordinator from 1964-1980, explained his reasoning behind the university's national championship season after picking up a random dime on the ground:

> I picked it up, put it in my left shoes…I was wearing saddle Oxfords, which I did all the time anyway, and we beat Clemson that day. Maybe it was the second or third game of the season. I taped the dime in my shoe so I wouldn't lose it, and made sure that I wore it

---

[275] Richard Scott, *SEC Football: 75 Years of Price and Passion* (Minneapolis, MN: Voyageur Press, 2008), 8.

[276] Charles P. Roland, *The Improbable Era: The South Since World War II* (Lexington, Ky: University of Kentucky Press, 1976): 181.

[277] Ibid., 8.

> throughout the season. We were 12-0 and won the national championship, and I'm sure the dime did it.[278]

The atmosphere surrounding college football in the South has even affected those in the North, with UGA All-Star Frank Sinkwich, born in Croatia and raised north of the Mason-Dixon line, explained how "I'm from Ohio . . . but if I'd known when I was two what it was like down South, I would have crawled [there] on hands and knees."[279] So even before considering the way the sport that has become an obsession, it is clear that this game would connect with southerners, especially following the Civil War. According to Northeastern Illinois University Professor Emeritus Patrick B. Miller in his discussion on college sports in the New South, "the development of college sport in the white South followed a difference pace and pattern than it did elsewhere."[280] It would be both a means of symbolic revenge but also, subconsciously, a plea for acceptance and reintegration into the nation's framework.

When it did begin to become an integral part of university life, it was because the region focused on the sport's construction of a masculine character and establishment of regional pride, an essential part of the postbellum South. For both the athletes and the spectators, these contests would echo the importance of southern virtue, dignity, and manhood. Not surprisingly, the South has not yet surrendered these values, and southern coaches have continued to implement the standards of southern identity and traditional manhood. Legendary University of Alabama coach Paul "Bear" Bryant, often viewed as the epitome of a southern football coach, explained:

---

[278] Ibid., 171.

[279] Ibid., 64.

[280] Patrick B. Miller, "The Manly, the Moral, and the Proficient: College Sport, *in the New South. The Sporting World of the Modern South*, edited by Patrick B. Miller (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 17-51.

> I've laid it on the line to a lot of boys. I've grabbed 'em, kicked 'em, and embarrassed them in front of the squad. I've got down in the dirt with them, and if they didn't give as well as they took I'd tell them they were insults to their upbringing, and I've cleaned out their lockers for them and piled their clothes out in the hall, thinking I'd make them prove what they had in their veins, blood or spit, one way or the other, and praying that they would come through.[281]

Ultimately, it was southern honor which would elevate the sport in the South as young men, fascinated with the formal aspects of warfare and military traditional overall, would embrace the conflict and competition of a new type of battle. A sport that depends on military structure and terminology, football would serve as a proxy for the war they had just lost - a chance for them to revisit the battlefield which would this time, hopefully, end in a different result. The coach as General on the sidelines, providing strategies and shifting the action as needed; the Captain as leader during the game, willing his teammates to play hard and secure a victory; the university, some achieving empire-like status when its program is successful; the use of the sport as a recruitment tool for schools, promising young men the opportunities of heroism and recognition; the terminology used during the game - formation, blitz, neutral zone, trench warfare, bullets, bombs, no man's land, and flanking - originating with the military - all elements of the game with which the South would identify being only recently removed from their valiant struggle. According to John Franklin Crowell, president of Trinity University from 1887-1894, the sport taught "virility, self-control, and caring courage of American youth."[282] Football is arguably the

---

[281] Paul W. Bryant and John Underwood, *Bear: The Hard Life and Good Times of Alabama's Coach Bryant* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974), 10.

[282] John Franklin Crowell quoted in Jim Sumner, "North Carolina Inter-Collegiate Football Association," *The North Carolina Historical Review* 65, no. 3 (July 1988), 267.

sport which is most like a military encounter, and even though it would spread first throughout the North, the hold that it would soon have over the South would be unmistakable.

Interestingly enough, there was also an element of the New South in this burgeoning game. Originating in the North, it could not possibly be only a manifestation of southern tradition; it clearly would also have northern elements in its make-up. Industrial elements such as the precision of time management and the clock, an emphasis on logistics and planning, the mirroring of a factory hierarchy, and rules emphasizing rational operation are all elements encompassed in the game itself.[283] It could be suggested, then, that these characteristics would be attractive to those who were advocating for a New South and would provide even more motivation for embracing the game. The mechanical nature of these elements would provide a contrast to the romantic notions of the South and would be one more catalyst for using football symbolically, especially in the University of Georgia/Georgia Tech competitions as it would pit old against new unlike other southern rivalries. Additionally, it must be remembered that the game was brought to the South *from* the North - by those who had experienced it and wanted it to take hold in the South. As the decades passed, it would reflect these northern distinctions more clearly, such as the importing of northern coaches and representing the progress of the New South over the next century. Historian Patrick Miller explains how this tie to the New South is not necessarily divergent from the Old South ideas, especially when it pertains to the identity of continuity. Most southerners realized that it was impossible to move forward without adjusting in some way, and this mindset would be important to the eventual outcome of the UGA/Georgia

---

[283] Miller, *The Manly, the Moral, and the Proficient*, 21.

Tech rivalry; however, it was also a necessity to retain parts of its past, and Miller argues that this would be possible with football: it was essential to find the sport which would contribute "to the future of American higher education, and marking what for their era were forceful, if coded, racial distinctions, the academic promoters of athletics contributed substantially to the establishment of one of the pillars of New Southern identity and culture."[284] Proponents of this new southern ideal eagerly embraced the sport, understanding that it had the potential to connect with southerners and encourage their acceptance of northern ideals.

In examining the game in this way, one could even go as far as considering football according to separate groups of the time period. First, New South proponents would view its importance in terms of adopting a northern cultural component that would ultimately lead to progress and modernization. In terms of southern supporters, however, they believed that the game could be used to celebrate sectional pride and to honor these athletic heroes just as they would Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and J.E.B. Stuart. So while it did not originate in the South, the region would soon embrace the new sport and impose upon it figurative implications, while still cultivating northern qualities. These qualities would be just that, though - characteristics of the game, not the identity of it, keeping its manifestation in the South distinctly southern. Sadly, however, it would also incorporate other elements of a southern character, and it gave elites of this community the ability to "project onto other sports - especially those

---

[284] Ibid., 29.

conceived in terms of certain 'rules' - a similar means of training for social leadership and racial control."[285] This idea of racial control would manifest itself during the Civil Rights era as:

> the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech inhabit[ing] an athletic world totally separated from African-American colleges. In an age of rigid segregation, neither university ever considered playing against a southern black team" because "even more than social status was at stake. Since the culture of college football emphasized manliness and physical prowess, interracial competition would also open up the possibility of white defeat, an intolerable threat to white masculinity and the social order.[286]

Georgia Tech would be willing to play integrated games sooner than other schools in the South yet was still affected by the atmosphere encompassing the region during this time period and mirrored the attitudes of the place in which it was located. While it would obviously change during the 1950s and 1960s, this initial perception of the game as a statement on southern politics and cultural reflected many elements of the antebellum era that would need to shift during the twentieth century. According to Lane Demas in his book *Integrating the Gridiron: Black Civil Rights and American College Football*, southerners "infused the game with cultural values and used it to reinforce identity in the twentieth century … and that football in the American South embodied transcendent values,"[287] many of which needed to be changed during the turbulent midcentury. These aspects play into the rivalry between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech as even the development of the game demonstrates a clash between North and South.

---

[285] Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007): 165.

[286] Charles H. Martin, "Racial Change and 'Big-Time' College Football in Georgia: The Age of Segregation, 1892-1957." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (1996), 537.

[287] Lane Demas, *Integrating the Gridiron: Black Civil Rights and American College Football* (Rutgers: Rutgers University Press, 2011), 75.

First played in 1869 and originally a favorite sport in the North, football is now the most played sport at the high school and college levels, and the South is particularly obsessed with college football.[288] In fact, according to Patrick Miller, "[s]everal of the most important events on the [southern] collegiate calendar were inspired by athletic competition, while some of the most popular activities on campus were created to support the teams and stimulate school spirit."[289] A study that examined the rankings of college football teams in former Confederate states, the percentage of teams ranked in the top ten consistently stayed above 30% and those ranked in the top twenty stayed above 40%.[290] This popularity can be traced to how the sport developed in the South - immediately following the Civil War, a region that still celebrated chivalry and honor, an area that was also humiliated by its recent defeat in what they viewed as a justified conflict. When this early affinity to the sport is considered, it is clear that southerners tended to approach the game with more violence and aggression than the northern schools did, a heightened sense of motivation than was found in the rest of the country.

So as the sport spread, southerners designated its own interpretation to the game's culture - one that reflected the recent events in its own history and allowed them the opportunity to act out the values and traditions that were important to them - in essence, keeping them alive. As will be demonstrated in the analysis of the University of Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry, much of the importance placed on college football was not necessarily only focused on redeeming the

---

288 High School Athletics Participation Survey, The National Federation of State High School Associations (2021-2022).

289 Miller, *The Manly, the Moral, and the Proficient,* 34.

290 "Past Rankings: AP, UPI, USA Today, Harris," http://www.collegefootballpoll.com/polls_1936_present.html, accessed on November 1, 2022.

antebellum era and an agrarian society - although there was a sense of that in the contests as the sport reinforces the elevation of "rugged physical pursuits;" it was also a fight against "such developments reflect[ing] an ideology bound to the process of urbanization and industrialization…broad-based discussions about the meanings of manliness and morality, as well as modernity."[291] This interpretation focuses on a sense of pride in fighting for one's community and the prestige that comes with a glorious victory - all elements of the antebellum period which the South felt slipping away. The concept of southern chivalry even manifested itself in a contrast between the masculine and feminine as invitations were offered to the ladies of Athens and Lucy Cobb School to come hail the men to the game. As the years passed, these coeds would become cheerleaders for their heroes, assuming the same role as true soldiers' mothers, wives, and girlfriends, providing the support and adoration that these brave champions deserved. Just like the conquering hero, these players craved the accolades of their fans, and this characteristic of Saturday football in the South still plays an important role in the ritual.

These elements became so engrained in the South's perception of the game that they are still critical to the events surrounding the Saturday meetings. Distinct emblems, such as fight songs, banners, chants, mascots, and colors, exist and are integral to the competition. Hand-to hand combat as the offensive line moves forward, the willingness to risk for a possible reward, bravery, and teamwork all mirror the components of war.[292] There's a hero, involved in a violent battle, fighting for pride and victory. There is a send-off of the players to the game, fans hailing

---

[291] Miller, *The Manly, the Moral, and the Proficient,* 19.

[292] Ibid., 24.

their warriors as if headed to battle; there is a hierarchy of positions, mimicking the roles of the general to the foot soldiers; there are rules involved in the contest, guaranteeing that both teams engage in a, hopefully, fair contest; and there is a band providing the call to fight, keeping the heroes engaged and upbeat, mirroring the buglers who would accompany the soldiers to the field. While northern football also had these elements, they were not viewed in the same way as southerners viewed them, integral to the character and identity of the region they call home. Still, Miller explains that "the 'embrace of muscle' by southern college students not only appeared to 'fit' the dominant culture of the old South [but] their games also sustained analogies to an emerging *new* southern mentality, following patterns originally deriving from the Northeast,"[293] indicating that the Old South would be forced to compromise with the North in some way although there would be years in which they would struggle with each other both on and off the field - again, an element which manifests itself in the development of the UGA/Georgia Tech rivalry where one side will ultimately prevail because it was able to successfully reach this compromise without sacrificing its soul. While this interpretation may now be "gone with the wind," especially with how the demographics of the South have changed over the past century, these traditions are still glorified, even if it be unwittingly, every Saturday during the fall, and the "victor" of the UGA/Georgia Tech rivalry would be an indicator of where the South now stands culturally and politically.

No matter the war, no matter the era, soldiers are sent to war with pomp and fanfare - the people celebrating those who serve and and hailing the victory that will soon be won. The

---

[293] Ibid., 21

identity of the foe is often irrelevant; it is the heroism, the chivalry, and the courage that are celebrated. There is no thought of defeat - these are champions who will not be routed, who are fighting for the glory of those they have left behind. While this ritual has been important to many civilizations, it became necessary to the South after the Civil War. Perhaps one of the reasons that college football grew so quickly, and to the extent that it has, is because of this pageantry that was reminiscent of how the war had started and how the prestige of the university must be protected just as they felt the South should have been. At the beginning of the war, southerners firmly believed that their cause was just and their quick victory assured. Dressed in rebel blue, these men promised their families that they would be home within the month, believing that God was on their side and would provide them the advantage. As history shows, these beliefs did not come to fruition, and the South suffered a total, humiliating defeat. The shame that they suffered was personal, and they were hungry for anything that would allow them to regain the grandeur of the antebellum South. As the game of football migrated southward, those who had been defeated began to view the sport as an opportunity to symbolically reclaim a position of prominence in the country against which they had so recently fought. Here was a new battle which could be fought, and here was a new chance to achieve a token victory over their perceived aggressors.

The growth of the sport also coincided with the advent of the Lost South mentality - a chance for the South to defend its belief that their cause was a valid one - that they were the ones wronged in the war and treated unfairly afterwards According to Andrew Doyle in his article "Turning the Tide: College Football and Southern Progressivism," "[t]he bellicose assertions of sectional pride and the ceaseless allusions to the glories of the southern past that were an integral

part of the dramaturgy of southern college football dovetailed nicely with the Lost Cause and the myth of the Old South,"[294] and so the idea of continuity began to take hold in the South, a tool wherein modernity could be explored yet the past still remain at the forefront. So the pomp and circumstance which had originally sent their brave boys into battle was now focused on their fearless college players who were looking to restore the reputation of the South. Victories over the northern teams, although quite rare in the early years of southern college football, were moments to be heralded, proclaimed across the region as if a mighty battle had been won. These football players were the new military heroes, advancing onto the battlefield. The fact that the clash resembles a battlefield - two opposing teams lining up facing each other, protecting the goal that represents their respective cultures - also hearkens to the gallant hero, forced to fight a violent battle to prove his worth and manhood. The chivalrous ideal of the antebellum South viewed a ruthless contest as indicative of true manhood, as the standard for honor and esteem. Likewise, the encounter on the football field makes heroes out of the young men playing, exalting those who succeed and ignoring those who offer no contribution. Names will be long remembered by the faithful fans, numbers retired as future players are prematurely deemed unworthy to share the celebrity of the player, and statues erected for those who bring extraordinary glory to the school. Stadiums are named after successful coaches (symbolically conquering generals), and records are kept so that a true victory may be named at the end of the season. The South has committed itself whole-heartedly to characterizing the game of football as

---

294 Andrew Doyle, "Turning the Tide: College Football and Southern Progressivism," *Southern Cultures* 3, no. 3 (1997): 120.

the symbolic "do-over" of the Civil War, and while this original concept may not be as obvious as it originally was, the rituals that take place each Saturday still evoke a sense of the Old South.

In interpreting the game of football as a symbolic reenactment of the war, southern fans have, then, assigned elements of warfare to the games themselves. It is as if, almost unconsciously, college rituals have been born out of an athletic contest that could, in no way, remain just a game. In and of themselves, sports breed competition and rivalry - the demand for valiant warriors, a fair fight, and a clear victor. Southerners' impose noble attributes to their players, ones that hearkened back to the Middle Ages and the presumed glories of the Crusades. The need for their players to be physically strong and psychologically confident echoes both Crusaders and the Confederate hero. These games are not just a Saturday pastime but a search for glory. Similar to the Lost Cause myth following the Civil War - a belief that many revere almost as strongly as their belief in God - college football has become akin to a religion, one that seeks the same sacred significance as the Crusades themselves. In fact, when Trinity College, now Duke University, played Wake Forest in 1889, this emphasis on the religious, was remembered 30 years later by R.L. Durham: ""To be beaten by a rival sect, Christians though we both are, was more humiliating than to bite the dust before the pagan hordes of the constitutionally unchurched University! Queer that we church people love each other so."[295] In "equating 'lost-cause' imagery with team mascots and schools, like the waving of Confederate flags or the use of 'rebel yell' cheers, the game offered yet another testament to the permanence of the antebellum

---

[295] R.L. Durham, "The Beginning of Football at Trinity," quoted in Jim L. Sumner, "The North Carolina Inter-Collegiate Foot-Ball Association: The Beginnings of College Football in North Carolina," *The North Carolina Historical Review* 65, no. 3 (1988): 148.

South in twentieth-century southern culture."[296] So as the players marched towards the stadium, different traditions began to emerge, similar to how soldiers are sent to war. Fans who were attending the game, and even those who weren't, line both sides of the walkway, cheering as the team walks by, urging them to both fight and to win - and, if it was a northern school, to humiliate them. The coach leads the players - the commander bringing his men to the playing field. Shakers are waved, banners are unfurled, and chanting ensues - a demonstration that promises unconditional support of whatever will happen on the field. The players, in turn, respond to this ceremony, fist bumping fans while also listening to their own hype playlist in an attempt to focus on the upcoming contest. They realize the faith that is placed on them, and they are determined to deliver - each of them envisioning the glory he will receive if he is a hero in the game. At this point, the future is theirs, and they are on the cusp of victory.

Just as the fans cheer their team to the game, a university band accompanies the players to the field. Music has always been extremely important on the battlefield, and a college football game is no different. Historically, battlefield bands were used to signify daily wartime activities, move the troops into battle, reinforce morale and resolve, and even entertain and comfort soldiers in the evenings. Wartime bands have produced music that has become a part of military lore and cultural identity. Much of this music is even incorporated into university fight songs and chants. During the Civil War, Confederate General Robert E. Lee, understanding the importance of music to his soldiers, reportedly declared, "I don't believe we can have an army without

---

[296] Demas, *Integrating the Gridiron: Black Civil Rights and American College Football,* 76.

music."[297] Likewise, university bands not only provide a structure in which the fans can participate in the game, they are a force in their own right - essential to the game experience yet competitive themselves. University bands use traditional battle songs while creating their own unique fight songs and chants for their school and team. These fight songs become traditions in and of themselves, memorized by all freshman at orientation and sung in all applicable circumstances. They provide the entertainment at half time, much like army bands encouraging the soldiers at night, and leading the fans in cheering for their team. At the same time, university bands are also competitive against other school bands. Their realized importance has created a culture that celebrates their contributions to their teams, with competitions centering around formations, movements, and song. School bands are equally important to both northern and southern universities, signifying its effect on the resolve of both players and fans. The band is a wartime essential, the harbinger of school spirit and involvement. Without the band, the football experience would be greatly altered and the morale of the game sorely lacking.

So as the South approached the twentieth century, and the sting of humiliation was still noticeably present, there were many who would adopt the game of football as a way to act out their aggression, fight for victory, and create heroes that would allow the South a position of strength and recognition nationally. Because the sport originated in the North, it was against these schools that newly formed southern teams were forced to play, the revisiting of North vs. South existed from the beginning. And to the chagrin of southern schools, they were still routinely beaten by these northern schools - a continuance of the war that they were still fighting

---

[297] Robert E. Lee, quoted in "Music of the 1860's," American Battlefield Trust, accessed January 15, 2023, https://www.battlefields.org/learn/articles/music-1860s.

in their minds. While victories against neighboring schools were a source of pride for the universities, the occasional win against a northern school was grounds for celebration. Not until 1925 when the University of Alabama - finishing the season with a perfect record and a Southern Championship - was invited to play the University of Washington in the Rose Bowl did southern football became a force to be reckoned with nationally. Hailed as "the football game that changed the South," this game has been considered the most significant game for southern football. The first southern team to be invited to play in the Rose Bowl, Alabama came from behind to beat Washington 20-19 - proving that the South was capable of fielding teams that could compete with the West, Midwest, and East. Routinely suffering from "northern invasions" before this time - occurrences which only reinforced the biting humiliation of the previous monumental defeat - "the deluge of sectionalist passion that greet[ed] Alabama's triumphant Rose Bowl performance reflected the perennial desire of southerners to exact vengeance for the humiliations they had suffered at the hands of the Yankees."[298] Southern fans were finally able to believe that they could defend their honor and overcome the backwards stereotype that had haunted them for half a century. From this date on, southern football only grew in strength and dominance, quickly becoming a source of pride for southerners and the teams they supported. Larger, more modern stadiums began to be constructed, and football now became a public relations tool - one that was used to show the rest of the nation that the South was progressive and respectable. A *Gadsden Times-Journal* reporter defended this new mentality in believing that

---

[298] Doyle, "An Atheist in Alabama is Someone Who Doesn't Believe in Bear Bryant," 109.

a "town that can give the right kind of support to athletics can do anything."[299] Georgia Tech would join Alabama as one of the two schools who initially brought acclaim to the region. Tech would be invited to play in the Rose Bowl in 1928 after ending the season with a perfect 9-0 season and would beat the University of California, winning the national championship. In fact, Tech's first four bowl appearances - Rose Bowl (1929), Orange Bowl (1940), Cotton Bowl (1943), and Sugar Bowl (1944) - would be the first time that a school had played in all four of the major bowl games. This early success would play into their rivalry with Georgia as, years later, Richard Scott would acknowledge that "[a]lthough Georgia Tech [was] no longer a member of the SEC, there's no doubt that the Yellow Jackets had a considerable impact on the early ascent of the conference as a national force,"[300] starting with John Heisman's 220-0 victory in 1916 over Cumberland University. This success opened the door to SEC dominance, and by the 1983 season, the conference would become the first in college football to place seven different teams in a singular bowl season: Alabama, Auburn, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Old Miss, and Tennessee. While the region's teams, especially those in the Southeastern Conference (SEC), have developed intense rivalries with others in their conference, the original animosity towards northern universities, or those who they feel represent these types of ideologies, still exists.

The SEC asserts itself as the strongest conference in college football, and, since the 1980s, this statement has repeatedly proven to be true, so the South takes great pride in victories against teams north of the Mason-Dixon line or west of the Mississippi River. So while most

---

299 Editorial in *Gadsden Times-Journal*, reprinted in *Tuscaloosa News* (January 4, 1926), 4.

300 Scott, *SEC Football: 75 Years of Price and Passion,* 26.

intense rivalries in the South are against other conference schools, there is one rivalry that mirrors the original ones and that is extremely indicative of the conflict the South has struggled with since the end of the Civil War. Yet this one is unique as it is between two universities both located in the South, the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech - the only rivalry that mirrors the one between North and South but takes place in a southern state, heightening the tension as it symbolically represents which identity will ultimately prevail. The animosity between the two universities evokes memories of the war - the conflict between the North and the South. Georgia Tech was established in the image of northern industrialism and has never identified as a southern school. The University of Georgia, on the other hand, has existed during all of the South's historical periods, has struggled with all of the same issues as the region has, and has been forced to find itself in a new era. In all aspects of their relationship, these two schools have represented two different areas of the country - regions that have been in conflict with each other culturally, politically, and economically since the beginning. With the University of Georgia representing the Old South - or at least a South that needs to find its way in a new century - and the Georgia Institute of Technology representing the New, the century and a half rivalry of these two schools has represented the deep struggle in the South to come to terms with a new identity. While Georgia Tech's identity has been clear from the beginning, UGA's has been in limbo - much like the South in which it has existed. The intense, consistently hostile rivalry between these two universities has reflected the animus involved in the South finding an identity that can carry it into the twenty-first century. On the football field, then, is where the conflict will play out - where the traditional will tussle with the innovative, and the familiar will be challenged by

the unknown. Already at odds because of what they each represented and how they had been forced to interact with each other from the beginning, UGA and Georgia Tech's struggle for dominance can clearly be viewed through an athletic lens, through a sport that was growing and developing alongside the rivalry. This was a personal struggle for the two schools - one that pitted family members and neighbors against each other. Like many college football rivalries, the true success of a season was determined by who won the annual match-up, regardless of what other feats had been achieved. Absolute victory came the second the scoreboard showed 0:00 on the clock, and the next 364 days would be either of time for sweet exultation or calculating revenge. The football game itself reflected the issues that were taking place off the field - the tensions, the challenges, the struggles. The field was simply the symbolic battlefield of all that was occurring socially, politically, and culturally in the twentieth century South.

Chapter 6

Rivalry

Most rivalries cannot claim to have existed from the very first game, yet the hatred that already existed between these two universities simply transferred to the football field, and the next 100 years of on-field competition would mirror the conflict between the universities and their place in the South. Reflecting the dislike and distrust that the two schools had upon the establishment of Georgia Tech, the athletic antipathy was intense from the beginning. In fact, football was the perfect public relations tool to play out their animosity in a popular arena.

Already at odds with each other economically and academically, the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech began their football rivalry on November 4, 1893 at the UGA's Herty Field. Originally intended by the University as a warm-up game for an upcoming contest against Vanderbilt University, this initial match up of the Universities and the Techs, as they were then called, immediately established an atmosphere of hostility, distrust, and bitterness. Tech's surprising 28-6 win in what was supposed to be a scrimmage resulted in UGA calling foul over the presence of non-student players and Tech's trainer acting as umpire. Most upsetting was the presence of Captain Leonard Wood, a professional trainer-coach, who decimated UGA's defense. University fans did not react well to Wood, and as he "ran touchdowns and Tech's score mounted, the crowd grew rowdy, and finally the game over, the hosts chased the visitors to the train."[301] This initial matchup set the tone for the rivalry, neither side trusting the other during the

---

[301] McMath et al., *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 141.

early years of football where fewer rules and guidelines had been put into place. By the time he assumed the head coaching position, Tech coach John Heisman of Heisman Trophy fame, knew the significance of the game, telling his players that "[b]etter to have died as a small boy than to fumble the football"[302] during the annual match-up. An illegal recruiting charge against Tech, which was later exonerated, deepened the distrust between the two teams, and by 1910, the relationship was so strained that the athletic rivalry was almost cut off completely. However, these games had become such an integral part of the two universities' student culture that a compromise in the early 1910s was reached that would attempt to quell the post-game fracas, barring all placards and pictures that were intended to create resentment; obviously, this understanding did not last long.

The game in 1913 saw an intense reaction to the University of Georgia's 14-0 win over Tech; this time even the cheerleaders were involved. The two yell leaders, Dick Russell from UGA and Fax Montague from Tech, would end the evening barely able to talk from shouting so loudly during the game, even enticing their respective fans to raid downtown Atlanta. In the following day's *Atlanta Georgian*, the record of the story told how "[it] has nothing to with the football game. It is the result of an almost hopeless effort to tell intelligibly something of what happened after the game, when an unintelligible army of college men took charge of Atlanta's streets."[303] Ironically, this brawl would end when coeds from both schools entered the scene: "They were bewitching maidens, and each had the whistle of her favorite fraternity on her lips.

---

302 John Heisman, quoted in *Stadium Stories: Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets* (Guilford, Connecticut: Glob Pequot Press, 2006): 2.

303 "After Game, Students Raid City," *Atlanta Georgian* (November 17, 1913).

Mr. Tech and Mr. Georgia were both well-behaved gallants in the presence of the girls."[304] Two years later, reporter in *The Birmingham Age Herald* reported on the 1915 game as a "fight to scoreless muddy tie on muddy field" with UGA outplaying Tech but the "fierceness mark[ing a] struggle" that was inherent to the players when they met on the field.[305] The rivalry grew even more hostile when the two universities would accuse the other of illegally inducing students to attend their schools for the sole purpose of playing athletics. The trouble started when Georgia attacked Tech for unfairly securing Joe Guyon, a second team All-American at Carlisle Indian Industrial school and the brother of the school's assistant coach, arguing that Guyon was an ineligible player. Tech Director of Athletics William Randle replied, "There is no cause for this row, but now that Georgia has started it, they will be forced to stop it. All of Georgia's allegations are untrue [and stem from the fact that] Georgia is sore [that] they failed to get Guyon, They wanted him and wanted him bad, but he came to Tech in preference, and then they started to howl."[306] These types of insults would continue throughout the rivalry as both universities attempted to establish dominance, and another instance would occur only three years later but, this time, would have more serious repercussions. When play was suspended in 1919, the record would stand at 9-8-2 in the University of Georgia's favor, both teams evenly matched in their play.

---

[304] Ibid.

[305] "Georgia and Tech Fight to Scoreless Tie on Muddy Field," *The Birmingham Age Herald* (November 14, 1915).

[306] Fred Bodeker, "South Interested in Guyon Case; Tech is Subject to Fire," *The Birmingham Age-Herald* (October 5, 1916).

The contributions of the two schools to the war effort differed drastically, with UGA sending many of their young men to war while Tech was used by the military in many different capacities, including the establishment of an aeronautic program which help train some of the first United States pilots in World War I. Because Tech was able to continue the bulk of its educational programs, primarily because of the requested military training, the school actually experienced a rise in student enrollment, including a good number who could play football. Obviously this change in fortune would irritate the school in Athens, knowing that Tech would be able to grow their program during a time that theirs was being placed on hold. This led to a University of Georgia student calling Tech "yellow" and Tech demanding the young man to be expelled as Tech had already done earlier with a quarrelsome student who had insulted UGA.[307] This remark heightened tensions, but the ultimate insult - which would lead to the pause in the rivalry - came immediately following the war. Interestingly enough, the event that would lead to this interruption would be UGA's attack on Tech's honor and integrity, a justifiable action to the gentrified South and one that clearly reflected what they still viewed as important in their culture. Some would suggest that this attack would come at a time when Tech was beginning to exert its significance to the South - where they were being viewed as critical to national, i.e. military, concerns and industrial progress - and that this could have helped to produce panic at the University Georgia as they were unable to assert any sort of dominance during the war. In 1919, during a four-game series in baseball, UGA's annual Senior Parade featured a replica World War I tank with a banner declaring "1917 Georgia in France 1918" while a following car proclaimed

---

[307] Robert C. McMath, et. al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985).

"Tech in 'Lanta 1917-1918," suggesting that one school was patriotic while the other stayed home to play football,[308] completely negating the role that Tech had played in assisting the military. Following this insult to Tech's honor, all athletic competition stopped and would not resume until 1924, and this hiatus would only intensify the deep-seated hate.

Eventually the stalemate ended, with UGA's Dr. Steadman Vincent Sanford and Tech's athletic director John B. Crenshaw, working behind the scenes to reach an agreement that would allow the return to athletic competition. The two men agreed that the students, teams, and universities would maintain "the high principles of good sportsmanship" and would "abstain from any acts which may cause friction or ill feeling between the teams or members of the institutions." They also agreed that if any side violated this agreement that the miscreant would would be punished in order to halt "the cause of friction and resentment."[309] Upon reaching the agreement, the *Atlanta Constitution* published the following statement, allowing for the two universities to once again meet on the gridiron: "The University of Georgia and Georgia School of Technology have agreed, with the approval of the chancellor of the University and the president of Georgia School of Technology, of its faculty chairman of athletics and of the president of the two student councils to renew athletic relations."[310] The student and alumni response was overwhelmingly positive as the importance of this rivalry was paramount to all others. The pause in relations resulted from an issue of pride and honor, showing how deeply

---

[308] Patrick Garbin, "The Insult That Stopped Old-Fashioned Hate," *UGA Sports* (August 2, 2020).

[309] 'Agreement between the University of Georgia and the Georgia School of Technology, March 1,1924, folder 3, box 8, Sanford Personal Papers.

[310] J. B. Norris to S. V. Sanford, *Atlanta Constitution* (March 2, 1924), folder 3, box 8, Sanford Personal Papers.

ingrained the conflict between the two schools was, yet it was also this pride and honor which motivated the two schools to resume their rivalry. With the interruption in athletic competition, a meaningful element of the early 20th century South had been affected, and this disruption was even noted "up North," showing how evident the animosity was throughout college football. A reporter in *The Indianapolis Times*, in commenting on the 1927 game, reported that "[t]he outstanding conflict of the southern football season will be played at Grant field here Saturday between the undefeated, untied University of Georgia eleven and the powerful Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets. The game is attracting national attention [following] resumed athletic relations . . . [and] will be in the nation of a rubber affair."[311] Even the North knew that when the rivalry was resumed the region could once again fight for the status that each university, and ideology, would claim as defining the South moving forward.

When the two universities resumed their rivalry in 1925, neither team had experienced a losing record since since their meeting in 1919, and with Tech winning in this resumed encounter, the series would be tied 9-9-2. They appeared equally strong, with Tech actually emerging as the more dominant team in those first few years following the standoff - mirroring the possibility that an engineering and technology school might finally be contributing to a new identity for the South. In fact, southern poet and critic Donald Davidson explained how this juxtaposition could be seen in that the South of the 1920s "disproved the axiom that two bodies cannot occupy the same space:"[312] the two universities appeared to be contributing equally to the

---

311 "Tech, Georgia to Meet Saturday; Dixie Land is Stirred Up," *The Indianapolis Times* (November 29, 1927).

312 Donald Davidson, *The Attack on Liviathan: Regionalism and Nationalism in the United States*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938). 141.

South's relevance even while continuing to demonstrate their hostility to each other on the football field. Doyle, in his analysis "Turning the Tide: College Football and Southern Progressivism," agreed with Davidson: "An emerging urban society built upon the secular gospel of progress and innovation coexisted uneasily with an agrarian society wedded to a more traditional value system."[313] However uncomfortably, this synchronous relationship was still beginning to emerge. Yet the hostility between the two universities existed as the South was clearly at odds with itself, attempting to retain both its traditions yet realizing that progress was necessary in order to remain relevant, and this conflict, "a complex and richly nuanced cultural test that offers insights into the searing internal conflicts that beset the South during this period"[314] was clearly represented in this rivalry. In 1927, the UGA/Georgia Tech football game reached "big time" status for the first time with the University as the heavy favorite and poised to become the national champions. In front of a record attendance of 40,000 at Tech's Grant Field, Tech beat the Bulldogs - as they were now known - 12-0, cementing the rivalry as one of the most intense in college football. However, this equilibrium would soon end as cultural events would shift to UGA's favor.

Moving into the era of the Great Depression and approaching the second world war, a shift in momentum reflected a social climate where it appeared that older southern values were gaining a stronghold. While it had appeared during and immediately after World War I that the contributions of a school like Georgia Tech were fundamental to the growth of the South - even

---

313 Doyle, "Turning the Tide," 101

314 Ibid., 101

to the point of proving itself as the way forward - certain events took place that suggested that advocates of the antebellum way of life still had a firm grasp on the political and cultural developments of the region. From the Great Migration to the reemergence of the Ku Klux Klan, the South, in many ways, appeared to being moving backwards in its search for modernity. The Great Migration - that movement of over six million Black people from the South to northern, western, and midwestern states - suggested that the South was not moving forward in the areas of integration and education for African-Americans that was expected and needed. Compounding that, the growing influence of the Ku Klux Klan indicated that the southern attitude of many towards blacks was more than just neglect and disinterest; it was a conscious decision to cause harm. These cultural problems would result in a weakening of the South's economic status and social standing to the point that, in 1938, President Franklin D. Roosevelt would refer to the region as "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."[315] Additionally, Andrew Doyle explains "one criticism [that] was especially galling to southerners steeped in the traditions of an honor culture: while antebellum northern polemicists saw their southern counterparts as a threat to be feared and despised, contemporary critics dismissed southerners of the 1920s as backward hayseed worthy of contempt and scorn."[316] While it may technically be unfair to align the University of Georgia with this progressive regression, the fact remains that many of the students and faculty still held to more traditional southern ideas - demonstrated through their rebel rat caps and antebellum styled social functions, such as the Stars and Bars Parade and Kappa Alpha events,

---

[315] Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Message to the Conference on Economic Conditions of the South," Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project, accessed December 12, 2022. https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/209037.

[316] Doyle, "Turning the Tide," 110.

and Tech's momentum waned in the early 1930s for six years, with UGA handily beating the Yellow Jackets in four of these meetings.

The interwar period began with Tech gaining military and political significance, and this was reflected in the Yellow Jackets firmly taking the lead in the series by 1928. However, as was typical with this rivalry, dominance didn't last long. By the beginning of World War II, the University of Georgia held a 19-13-5 lead, and the state university seemed fully in control of its destiny, reflecting what was taking place in the region. The annual meeting was still considered the hardest game for both teams each season, yet a sense of resignation began to sit in for Tech fans as UGA grew more and more dominant. In 1940, editor Ralph McGill anticipated the fabled game by stating that "[t]he Georgia Tech people expected nothing. They had one of those lingering hopes, sorrowful hopes…Tech had only three or four good players…They didn't look like a football team which could compete with the Georgias."[317] In many ways, the rivalry had even staled, with *Atlanta Journal* columnist Ed Danfort remarking "[h]ow cordial - and dull - are the relations between Tech and UGA these days. It is hard to imagine that the great educators of the early 1920's thought a game between UGA and Georgia Tech inadvisable because hard feelings, fist-fights, and downright rioting would result."[318] So even though the 1940 season ended with the two teams having played the exact same number of games (385) and having the exact same winning percentage (.596104), the Bulldogs seemed to be emerging as the stronger of the two football teams, especially if one considered that those equal statistics resulted from Tech

---

[317] Ralph McGill, *Atlanta Constitution,* December 10, 1940, 25.

[318] Ed Danfort, *Atlanta Journal*, Dec 1, 1945, Editorial section.

having more wins against northern teams than southern ones. Perhaps the greatest UGA statement came in November 1942 in the game that sports history has dubbed "The Biggest Game of All." For the first time, Georgia and Tech were ranked #1 and #2 respectively; even though Tech was undefeated, they still entered the game as the underdog as the Bulldogs had Heisman winner Frank Sinkwich and future All-American Charlie Trippi on its roster. These two players proved to be the difference as UGA won 34-0, guaranteeing that Tech had still never won at Sanford Stadium. As World War II loomed, it seemed as if the South had not made much progress since the Reconstruction era, still plagued by economic problems and racism - with seemingly little support for becoming a technological power player on the national stage. Interestingly enough, the University of Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry mirrored this condition with Georgia slowly emerging as the stronger team.

As with World War I, however, a momentum shift would occur again during and after World War II, once again demonstrating that Georgia Tech and its engineering and technological strengths were critical to the war effort and to how the country, and the South, was developing as a whole. Many consider the development of the atomic bomb and the ensuing scientific discoveries of the next two decades pivotal to America's growth as a world superpower, especially when considering the advent of the Cold War. Once again, the country was forced to focus on technology as the hope for the future, and this focus was critical as the Soviet Union appeared to be taking the lead in many of these areas. The Cold War provided the impetus necessary for the country to demand that science, engineering, and technology take center stage in schoolhouse curriculums, and the leading school in the South to fulfill this mission was

Georgia Tech. All of a sudden, Tech had found its permanent niche in the South, one that would not be placed on the back burner again. The world had changed, and this institute would be one of the key factors in bringing growth and stability to the region. Tech president Blake R. Van Leer, who served in this role from 1944 until his death in 1956, was determined to capitalize on this need and lead the school into its future. He was intent on the institute providing excellence in engineering education and wanted it to be known that the school was no longer "a small regional school mired in the shop culture and known primarily for its football team."[319] This admission by the head of the school clearly delineated the course Tech wanted to take, but it was also just one more dig at its rival university as UGA's focus on football was beginning to grow. Compounded with this fact was that this era also saw the outbreak of the Civil Rights Movement which would greatly affect the South and how it was viewed nationally - and even more importantly, finally addressing and settling important cultural beliefs to which many still clung. The southern United States had reached a decisive moment in its history and in choosing its identity. Over the next three decades, a monumental shift would occur in the South, finally placing it on the precipice of international influence, and this precipice was even evident in this intense rivalry.

Like the previous two eras of the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry, this games during this time period reflected what was going on culturally and politically. After Tech's difficult loss on the field in 1942, America's entrance into World War II again interfered with higher education, and, once again, the roles that the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech students played would differ according to their educational role - also affecting how normal each school's student life

---

[319] Robert C. McMath, et. al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 300.

would remain. Like before, UGA's young men volunteered to actively serve overseas in the military while many of Georgia Tech's students were needed on the home front. Both universities decided to keep their athletic programs active this time; yet the Bulldogs' football team would become one of civilians, and Tech would merge Navy V-12 students with its players. However, this time, the University was not as negatively affected as they were during the first world war; with Frank Sinkwich and Charley Trippi on the field and led by Coach Wally Butts, the Bulldogs would finish their season 10-1, win the SEC championship, defeat UCLA in the Rose Bowl, and share the national championship according to six different polls. While the level of competition would not be as strong as during the previous decade, the fact that colleges continued to play was encouraged by President Roosevelt. Bill Cromartie's book *Clean Old Fashioned Hate* covers all years of the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry from 1893-1986 and explains how:

> [t]he continuance of college football and major league baseball, despite the acute shortages and travel difficulties, were encouraged and tolerated for civilian and military morale reasons . . . There was also an element of a psychological ploy, as President Franklin Roosevelt wanted the enemy to know that America could fight a war on foreign lands and seas and, at the same time, "play games" at home.[320]

Bill Alexander, Georgia Tech's football coach during these years, also understood the importance of continuing the rivalry with UGA and commended Georgia's Coach Butts on continuing competitive play: "It's hard enough to coach a football team with V-12 students and a few civilians, and it's even hard to coach with just civilians. I want to congratulate Coach Butts for staying in football competition. I think what he has done at Georgia these last two years has

---

[320] Bill Cromartie, *Clean Old-Fashioned Hate* (Nashville, TN: Rutledge Hill Press, 1987), 221.

contributed much to football and to our conference."[321] So while the games continued, the rivalry shifted in momentum due to who stayed behind.

In 1945 and 1946, the Bulldogs suffered two of their worst defeats at the hands of the Techies, 48-0 and 44-0, respectively. The next three years would be split 2-1 in favor of UGA; however, during that time, Tech would acquire head coach Bobby Dodd, one of Tech's most successful coaches, and the university itself would be pivotal in keeping the United States relevant in the early years of the Cold War. In 1949, the Yellow Jackets would initiate an eight game win streak over the Bulldogs, still the longest in the rivalry's history, and - for only the second time - would take the lead in the series. The previous year, Tech had entered the game with the number one defense in the country, yet still losing to UGA. For the next eight years, however, the tide was clearly in Tech's favor, even when it would appear that the University Georgia had the better team. In 1951, Tech was on the national stage again with a record of 11-0-1, winning the Orange Bowl, and sharing the SEC championship with the University of Tennessee; they were even stronger the next year with a perfect 12-0 record, owning the SEC championship, and winning the Sugar Bowl which allowed them to share the national title. One of the most unique aspects of this early 1950s Tech team was that Coach Bobby Dodd was able to play a two platoon system, with no player playing both offense and defense in a single game; this dominance was reflected in the fact that there were no touchdown passes against Tech during this perfect season. In 1954, Tech was victorious for the sixth straight time, and the series was

---

[321] Ibid.

once again tied. It seemed as if the Yellow Jackets were unstoppable, even when they shouldn't have been:

> Georgia had just bullied the Jackets all over the muck of Sanford Stadium, only to drop its sixth straight game to their hated rivals from Atlanta. Georgia got 12 downs, Tech only had three; Georgia gained 327 yards, Tech a measly 73; Georgia had just one turnover, Tech six; Georgia camped in Tech's territory all afternoon, while Tech crossed the midfield strip only once.[322]

The game ended 7-3 with Tech taking advantage of its one solid drive and UGA just unable to capitalize on its movement down the field. The Institute's momentum matched the significance of Tech's role in the South, and the nation, during the early days of the Cold War. The country demanded engineering and technology excellence, and Georgia Tech was the premier school in the South which was able to provide this. The two schools were both beginning to be challenged by cultural changes taking place; however, Tech's defined purpose allowed them to stay focused internationally even with the domestic troubles surrounding them. In their 50th meeting in 1955, the two teams met with Tech having lost just six of their last 60 games. Once again, they would beat the Bulldogs - this time 23-3 - and Tech would regain the lead on the stat sheet. The dominance continued in 1956 with Bobby's Dodd's 100th victory since becoming Tech's head coach 12 years earlier. These would be the "glory years" for Georgia Tech. They would achieve six straight bowl victories (including three in the Sugar Bowl and one each in the Orange, Cotton, and Gator bowls), two SEC championships, eight straight wins over UGA, and an overall record of 59-7-3. The southern emphasis on a spiritual aspect of the game was renewed as a popular slogan was "In Dodd We Trust," and according to a 1969 article in *Sports Illustrated*,

---

322 Cromartie, *Clean Old-Fashioned Hate*, 274.

"There was something almost ethnic about [the Yellow Jackets]. An Atlanta boy who listened on the radio to Tech coming from behind again and again by some quirk of fate or character to beat a favored and heavier opponent was likely to become confirmed in a particular sort of white Southern American dream."[323] Tech appeared to be unstoppable, and while the University of Georgia would rebound for a few years afterwards, Tech would again appear dominant during the early years of the 1960s, a turbulent time in the country, but especially in the South.

While there would be multiple factors impacting the South, the two universities, and college football specifically, the Civil Rights Movement would play a defining role in changing the face of southern life, even college football. and examine how the shifts in racial exclusion/ inclusion exposed the South's relation to these developing national trends. In fact, a popular narrative in the South regarding football and race relations is that it was actually the popularity of the game that would assist the South in reconciling itself with the changes in racial policies in the region. In an article entitled "'We All Came Together on the Football Field:' Unpacking the Blissful Clarity of Popular Southern Sports Story", authors Natalie Adams and James Adams identified the progression of this shift to racial integration:

> [First,] [s]outherners' allegiance to their football team creates a sense of community that transcends race and social class barriers; [second] [o]ur quest to win games and championships has had a healing effect in promoting better race relations; [and third,] [f]ootball brought about integration in a way that laws, policies, and legislative acts could not.[324]

---

[323] "A New Slant on an Old Game in Atlanta," *Sports Illustrated* (September 1, 1969), vault.si.com, accessed February 3, 2023.

[324] Natalie Adams and James Adams, "'We All Came Together on the Football Field:' Unpacking the Blissful Clarity of a Popular Southern Sports Story," *Counterparts* 434 (2014), 337.

The demand for football was now viewed as an arena in which this important cultural confrontation could be addressed, especially as its celebrity "had reached a point where intercollegiate football damaged the fight to preserve [the] region's status quo."[325] While no longer as draining on the national economy as before World War II, the South was still viewed negatively as it was now seen as a civil rights pariah, suggesting that the New South emphasis on economic stability was not enough. Race relations, strenuous since the Civil War, had not improved by mid-century as the South believed 1930s/1940s Jim Crow laws should be forced on northern university football teams so that southern schools would not be required to play against integrated teams. After World War II, however, northern universities refused to kowtow to the South's racism, forcing the South to reconsider its own racial policies. According to historian Charles H. Martin, "[t]he growing presence of black athletes on non-southern teams forced [Georgia and Georgia Tech] to re-evaluate their commitment to full segregation, which now threatened to interfere with their passionate desire to win a national championship."[326] Southern universities began to play integrated teams when traveling north, but its own contests, including bowl games, remained segregated, "clearly reflect[ing] prevailing white racial values in the Deep South. To grant equality on the playing field, even if only for three hours, represented an unacceptably symbolic action because it suggested the possibility of equality in other areas of southern life."[327] The University of Kentucky was the first southern university to integrate its

---

[325] Demas, "We Play Anyone," 74.

[326] Martin, "Racial Change and 'Big-Time' College Football in Georgia: The Age of Segregation, 1892-1957," 534.

[327] Charles H. Martin "Integrating New Year's Day: The Racial Politics of College Bowl Games in the American South," *The Sporting World of the Modern South*, edited by Patrick Miller (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 194.

football team. In 1967, Kentucky sent a letter to the other southern schools, asking whether they would be willing to play an integrated team. The response was telling - Ole Miss would be the first school to play an integrated Kentucky squad; Tulane and Georgia Tech responded immediately that they, too, would be willing to play; UGA and Florida indicated that they would consider it; and Auburn, LSU, and Tennessee did not bother responding at all.[328] The willingness of many of these schools to even consider playing an integrated squad demonstrated how the cultural attitudes were shifting during this time period, even from a decade before.

More importantly, though, was that southern coaches were watching northern universities recruiting southern black players, which strengthened their squads and universities as a whole. This realization that their teams would suffer if they chose not to integrate, and facing the loss of federal funding from the US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, all SEC schools were integrated within five years, including Georgia Tech in 1969 and UGA in 1971. In keeping with the role that Tech had played in moving the South forward, one would expect the school to be more willing to integrate its athletic program earlier than some of the other southern universities. It is true that Tech had been the first southern school to integrate without court mandate and that they integrated their athletics two years before the University of Georgia, but this progressivism was not as evident as other milestones that the university had achieved as other southern universities also saw the need to add African-American players to their rosters as quickly as possible. Georgia Tech had been willing to play against integrated teams since the early 1950s, and two years after Kentucky's groundbreaking decision to integrate, Georgia Tech

---

[328] John Sayles Watterson, *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 333.

fielded its first African-American player, quarterback Eddie McAshan. Not only was McAshan Tech's first integrated player, he was also the first black quarterback in any southeastern university. His first game success in rallying the Yellow Jackets to a 23-20 win over South Carolina cemented his role in Tech football history. During his time at Tech, McAshan's 32 passing touchdowns ranked him fifth in Tech football history, and he holds 17 other school records. However, to many, the higher academic standards which were beginning to be put in place at Tech indicated a covert racism towards African-American athletes, even though others would argue that it caused a bias towards all athletes. Tech coach Bobby Dodd reflected on these academic changes, understanding that a new type of student was enrolling overwhelmingly in the university, and he believed that "rising academic standards and Tech's limited curriculum would make it more difficult to field competitive teams than [it was in] the glory days of 1950s and 1960s."[329] So while Tech had traditionally been a forerunner in adjusting to cultural change, this challenge seemed to be more difficult than ones in the past, primarily based on its educational focus but a challenge nonetheless. The willingness to accept change was there, but its curriculum and purpose seemed to circumvent this previous zeal.

Conversely, the way that the University of Georgia approached the situation surprised many. Neither school fully integrated until 1961, but the university had struggled with the reality of athletic integration since the 1920s when there had been a rumor that New York University would play its black quarterback in a game against the Bulldogs. However, a 1929 article referencing the game indicated that "[t]he Negro will not be officially barred but by a

---

[329] Robert C. McMath, et. al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 402.

gentleman's agreement between N.Y.U. coaches and Georgia's officials he will not be used in the game against Georgia."[330] When Vince Dooley became Georgia's head coach in 1963, he was open to the idea of recruiting black players and would welcome Ken Dious as a walk-on to the football team in the spring of 1966 (three years before Tech), saying "[h]e has the same right to come out for football as any other boy. Dious will be given the same treatment as every other player."[331] While Dious did not choose to play football that fall, the integration of black players to the Bulldogs' athletic teams had begun. Finally in December, 1970, Coach Dooley would sign players who would be able to successfully integrate the varsity football team. Like other changes during the Civil Rights Movement, these players would face racial intimidation; one of these first recruits, Clarence Pope, remembered how it felt to face these threats:

> [w]hen we got there on our first day of arrival, there were guys that were sitting at the front of the steps at McWhorter Hall [the campus athletic dorm], and you had a Grand Dragon who had a sheet over his head sitting in a chair with a shotgun. You had other guys sitting with shotguns and a banderole belt with ammunition in it. From what I hear, this was a welcome that they always did. It was something we didn't like . . . We knew we going into this we would face adversity, but we considered ourselves as teammates. There might have been or two that had certain rejection [of integration], but as far as the entire team, we drew closer and closer through cohesiveness and understanding.[332]

It was also the resolve of Vince Dooley that would help the Bulldogs successfully integrate. Understanding that there would be initial problems between white and black players, Dooley encouraged communication between the teammates, understanding that "when we broke these

---

330 "Rumor That Negro Will Play is False," *The Red and Black* (October 25, 1929), UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions, accessed November 11, 2022, https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1757.

331 Lennie Pallats, "It May Cost Something," Red and Black (April 7 1966)," *UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions*, accessed November 11, 2022, https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1485.

332 Jason But. "Dooley Sought Diverse, Talented Players," *The Red and Black* (February 28, 2007), 9. UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions, accessed November 11, 2022, https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1427.

accusations down for the most part it was a matter of perception and once we got the players communicating…it was a big help to us."[333] Dooley remembered how the coaching staff was forced to acclimate to an integrated team, also:

> As coaches, we discussed the integration on several occasions and tried to prepare to best handle the black players. As you, of course, should be aware, we never coached black players. In fact, the mistake as I look back on it, I at one time tried to be overly sensitive to understanding the black players, and consequently, did more harm than good to our team. However, after that experience we ended up philosophically treating everybody the same. We got better results and respect from both the blacks and whites. So, in actuality, we ended up coaching the way that we had always coached, and that involved setting standards without being coerced whether a player was black or white.[334]

Because of Dooley's leadership during this time period, the integration of UGA football went significantly more smoothly than the university's experience as a whole and emerged from the era stronger than it had been before. In 1975, he "decided not to make race an issue anymore. From that point on we were going to be colorblind - there were no white players and no black players. The only people we coached were football players on the Georgia football team."[335] While the integration of southern football was, in some ways, forced upon the teams, even to those - like Tech - who had already been willing to play against integrated teams, these actions provided a new definition of fulfilling the New South ideal. Only this time, UGA was on par with Tech in reaching this milestone, primarily due to the leadership of the school's most beloved Coach Dooley. For the first time, the University would be recognized as moving the South

---

[333] Robert Epling, "Integration of Black Athletes at the University of Georgia: Vince Dooley Interview," UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions, accessed November 11, 2022, https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1427.

[334] Ibid.

[335] Vince Dooley, *Dooley: My 40 Years at Georgia* (Chicago: Triumph Books, 2005), 128.

forward, not trying to hold onto the past. This did not mean that it was abandoning its southern culture; however, it did demonstrate how the University of Georgia was willing to start making concessions in order to become more influential in the South, and Georgia Tech had experienced a significant setback in its New South role.

It would also be during these years that Georgia Tech would choose to leave the SEC in 1964 , eventually joining the ACC, which would have a profound impact on the rivalry. No longer was it an in-conference rivalry that would affect the SEC standings at the end of the season. It became, essentially, a game that still had serious personal implications, but no longer affected the two universities' national status. In fact, it could be the first indication of the rivalry's decline - a sense that Georgia Tech would not represent the identity of the South; instead it had chosen a different path - one that disassociated itself from the South even in athletic competition.[336] Relishing their role as the MIT of the South, Tech attempted to imitate another northern school in the athletic arena - which, once again, emphasizes how they have never considered themselves southern. When leaving the SEC, Tech believed that they could become the Notre Dame of the South, an independent school that had more freedom in choosing its athletic opponents.[337] Unfortunately, this was a considerable mistake for the Yellow Jackets, one which still affects their athletic standing and reputation in the state as a whole. To the SEC faithful, the school had rejected the SEC and allegiance to them was no longer as attractive. In 1975, Tech would request to rejoin the SEC but were rebuffed, and it is still rumored that UGA

---

[336] Robert C. McMath, et. al, *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 300.

[337] Richard Scott, *SEC Football: 75 Years of Price and Passion* (Minneapolis, MN: Voyageur Press, 2008), 112.

was behind the rejection - an easy innuendo to believe considering the universities' history. Mississippi State and Ole Miss are the two schools blamed for blocking their re-admittance to the conference, but Tech faithfuls will never be convinced that it was not the University of Georgia who secretly campaigned for this rejection. This was a crossroads in the rivalry of the two schools, and it is one that UGA would seemingly win.

Two other developments were occurring during this time period which would also begin to weaken Tech's football program. First, the National Football League established Atlanta's first team, the Falcons, in 1965. This event would result in a downturn for revenue for the Yellow Jackets' games and would also affect the attendance, and thus the fervor, previously enjoyed at the games. According to an article by *SBNation* columnist Jason Kirk, titled "Has Georgia Tech Football Ever Been More Popular Than the Falcons?," this has not been true since the Bobby Dodd era. He argues that Tech leaving the SEC was what spelled doom for the Yellow Jackets, especially as this happened during the same time period as the creation of a professional football team, and that since the 1960s "they've become the team for alumni and alumni only. If you're born in Georgia without specific ties to a team besides UGA, you're a Dawgs fan."[338] When looking at the economic effects of the addition of the Falcons, Georgia Tech economists William Schaffer and W. Carl Biven contrasted the significance of Tech's financial contribution through football before and after the professional team appeared on the scene:

> The Ramblin' Wrecks have made a contribution to Georgia Tech far greater than can be measured on an accounting sheet. Tech's football team and fight song brought early national recognition and led the way for an impoverished school in a poor state in tapping

[338] Jason Kirk, "Has Georgia Tech Football Ever Been More Popular Than the Falcons," SBNation.com (June 9, 2011), accessed February 3, 2023.

> national resources for growth and development. Now, with intense competition for the sports dollar from professional teams and with the dramatic increase in research funding in recent years, the income from football has become small in comparison to Tech's total budget.[339]

This economic assessment was completed in 1978, only a decade past the establishment of the professional team. This immediate fiscal downturn can be viewed in two ways. First, the forming of the Atlanta Falcons truly did divert the attention of Atlantans from Tech to the Falcons - that those who had been supporting Tech, who were not students or alumni, were not as devoted to the Yellow Jackets as they merely were to the idea of a local football team. This would obviously indicate a shift in the school's athletic momentum, perhaps a reflection of other circumstances taking place at the school. A second way to look at this financial effect is that this decrease would have happened irregardless of the pro team's appearance - that the fervor surrounding the team was already waning as the school's focus was beginning to change. Regardless, the establishment of the Falcons would make an impact on a football team that was beginning to struggle.

It was also during this time, especially by the end of the decade, that the institute began to focus more on their status as an engineering school and less on extracurricular activities such as athletics. According to the findings of the "Goals of Engineering Education" study published in *Engineering Education* in 1968, technical universities were experiencing a steady rise in students who were pursing and engineering degree and an even greater percentage of those same students seeking postgraduate work.[340] While this positive growth would benefit Georgia Tech and its

---

339 William A. Schaffer and W. Carl Biven, "The Impact of Georgia Tech: Money, People, Ideas" (1978). Applications. 14.

340 "Goals of Engineering Education Final Report of the Goals Committee," *Engineering Education* 58 (January 1968), 380-381.

national significance, it would also detrimentally affect the in-state rivalry, which would become obvious in the following decades. Although the Institute as a whole would continue to gain strength as an educational facility, its athletic dominance was clearly waning. Interestingly enough, this did not seem to bother Tech overall. Coach Dodd believed that the "rising academic standards and Tech's limited curriculum would make it more difficult to field competitive teams than in the glory days of the 1950s and 1960s"[341] as engineering and science focused students did not tend to care about athletics as much - as say, perhaps, those choosing the curriculum offerings at the University of Georgia. This was, in no way, meant to disparage their rivals but was just acknowledging the different emphasis of the two schools. Meanwhile, UGA - beginning to expand their curriculum and having survived major cultural shifts - was quickly becoming one of only a couple southern universities which would define all of the others. They were quickly understanding the compromise that was necessary in retaining their southern character but also ensuring a modern approach to their education. So by the late 1960s, with the Civil Rights at its peak yet also beginning to be resolved and Tech's shift in focus, the energy would once again shift - this time to a UGA team that would grow increasingly stronger over the next three decades and raise the question of whether or not the rivalry was still significant.

The universities' responses to these cultural changes were reflected, although minimally, on the football field. At this point, the two schools seemed to be growing closer to an equilibrium, but would actually result in what would be a monumental shift in the rivalry - although not evident until over a decade later. Tech began the decade strong - tying and then

---

[341] McMath, Jr., *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885-1985,* 402.

passing the University in the rivalry record for only the second time, even though it would only last for one season and would never be achieved again. By 1964, the Bulldogs would sense a change in momentum and would settle into its new role. Following this season's win, *Atlanta Journal* columnist Furman Bisher explained the shift as "a very special kind of contentment behind which there is a very special kind of meaning that has not yet been fully realized. This defeat of Tech by Georgia marked the final step in the indoctrination of a new era of football in this state."[342] Vince Dooley had assumed the head coaching position and - like previous Bulldog coaches - understood the significance of the Tech game. When asked about his first season and whether or not he viewed it as successful, Dooley responded, "I'd rather not say now…See me after the Tech game. After all, it depends on what we do against Tech."[343] A UGA win in 1964 would tie the series, and, at this point, the rivalry was still very much present. Coach Dooley and Tech Coach Bobby Dodd, two of the greatest coaches for both universities, would only meet on the field three times, and their mutual respect reflected how meaningful the rivalry was. In fact, the 1966 Bulldogs were in the position to beat Tech soundly, yet Dooley remembers, "I knew that once the game was in hand, you didn't run up the score and embarrass a fellow coach. Besides, the tables might be turned one day soon."[344] Proving this equilibrium, the 1966 meeting ranked with the 1927 and 1942 games as one of the three most important games in the heated rivalry. Especially when compared to the 1942 game:

"Both years, Tech went to Athens with a 9-0-0 record; [b]oth years, Georgia was

---

[342] Furman Bisher, "Bulldogs Regain Old-Time Growl to Wreck Tech," *Atlanta Journal* (Nov 30, 1964).

[343] Cromartie, *Clean Old Fashioned Hate*, 331.

[344] Dooley, *Dooley: My 40 Years at Georgia*, 57.

> waiting with one loss; [b]oth years Georgia won handily; [b]oth years, Georgia's win made it two straight over Tech; [b]oth years, Tech and Georgia went bowling; [b]oth years, Georgia won its bowl to finish with one loss; [b]oth years, Tech lost its bowl to finish with two losses."[345]

This would be the final season for Bobby Dodd, the most successful Georgia Tech coach since John Heisman, who was retiring just as Vince Dooley, UGA's strongest coach to date, assumed the reins (although Kirby Smart is beginning to be mentioned in the same breath as the legendary coach). This change in leadership would mark a turning point in the rivalry, yet even as the tide was turning and the Bulldogs grew in dominance, Dooley recognized that the annual Thanksgiving weekend game could result in a win by either team, no matter the strength of one over the other. However, Dooley's Bulldogs would prove to dominate Tech during his tenure. In 1967, "Georgia's bowl-bound Bulldogs found a surprisingly tough foe in crippled Georgia Tech Saturday and what was expected to be a slaughter turned into a vicious head-to-head battle."[346] In 1968, the University of Georgia reached a milestone as it reached 40 points for the first time in the rivalry and achieved a series record of five consecutive wins against the Yellow Jackets with the "state's newspaper heap[ing] lavish praise on this Georgia football team the next day, referring to it as 'great,' and 'powerful' and 'devastating,' and the 'best Georgia team ever' and 'No.1."[347] However, once again, Tech responded the next year, handing Dooley his first shutout at UGA and demonstrating that "[t]he occasion was to settle an annual grievance…Basically, the issue is clear - Tech dislikes Georgia and Georgia dislikes Tech, in a perfectly bloodthirsty

---

[345] Cromartie, *Clean Old Fashioned Hate*, 341.

[346] Furman Bisher, "Georgia Tops Tech in Fight to Finish," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* (Nov 26, 1967).

[347] "Georgia Rips Georgia Tech, 47-8, For Fourth Undefeated Season," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* (December 1, 1968).

manner, of course."[348] The decade ended with UGA leading the series 31-28-5, seemingly still a rivalry to be reckoned with but quickly changing.

The 1970s began with still relatively balanced competition, with the University of Georgia only up by two games, 31-29-5. However, Bulldog momentum would soon assume control of the rivalry, and it would be rare that Tech would again win back-to-back games. This abrupt shift may seem surprising considering the seemingly even competition that had typically existed between the two schools. Somehow, regardless of whether it was the Bulldogs or the Yellow Jackets who would momentarily hold the advantage, the other team would eventually find its footing again and surge back to equalize the record. However, over the course of the next half century, Tech's ability to rebound would be greatly diminished, and it would appear that UGA would assume a dominance that, to this day, still exists. In examining this shift in light of political and cultural issues in the South, this rivalry once again mirrors the events taking place in the region and also indicates how the rivalry would exist moving forward. As the city of Atlanta increased its influence in the business and financial world, it became evident that an unrivaled emphasis on industrialism and engineering that had been so desired by the New South prophets would not manifest itself in the region. Georgia Tech would remain one of the key research institutes in the nation, yet the South, even Atlanta which had so long been designated as the area's technological hope, would find itself focusing on industries that were the strength of UGA's curriculum. Business, finance, healthcare, and even agriculture have become the prominent trades of the South and ones that are supported by degrees from the state's flagship

---

[348] Furman Bisher, "Now Bud Knows What It's Like - So Does Vince," *The Atlanta Journal* (November 30, 1969).

university. The rapid growth of Atlanta and its industries, always before identified with the engineering institute, can be depicted by the shift in the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry and the Bulldogs' accelerated dominance in the contests. The South, and the University of Georgia, was quickly finding its place both nationally and internationally, welcoming a myriad of industries which contribute to a region that was influential in numerous ways, not just the one that the New South proponents saw as the future. Both the region and the school were establishing the compromise that would eventually prove to be the most successful - modernity with a distinct southern flavor.

Neither of the schools had dominant seasons during the decade, but the University of Georgia was still able to hold Tech to only two series wins. In 1976, UGA players, including quarterback Ray Goff (who would go on to coach the Bulldogs from 1989-1995), began to verbalize what many Bulldog fans were feeling - that Georgia Tech was no longer their biggest rival; instead, Auburn and Florida were the teams to beat during the season. However, once again, Coach Dooley recalls that "I'm sure [Goff] was speaking his feelings and probably the feelings of a lot of Georgia fans, but even now it's something you just don't say . . . I started to think we might be in trouble against Tech."[349] The University of Georgia would go on to win the game against the Yellow Jackets, yet Dooley's comments show that even in a period of success, a win against their in-state rival could not be taken for granted. The 1977 game, with both teams entering the game with a 5-5-0 season record, was described as Tech alum and columnist Lewis Grizzard as "like being married to a plain woman. She isn't much to look at, but she's all we

---

[349] Dooley, *Dooley: My 40 Years at Georgia*, 82.

got."[350] The following year, the rivalry's intensity rebounded with one of the most exciting games of the vibrant conflict as Tech was expected to repeat as "[a]t Georgia, things ha[d] never looked worse. Vince Dooley [was] starting with puppies and try[ing] to mold them into Bulldogs…New players, new offense, new tradition at Georgia - losing."[351] Shocking the Jackets, the "Wonderdogs" rebounded from a twenty point deficit to win the game, and this victory would lead to a six year win streak and a dominance that would become clearly lopsided. However, even with an era of Bulldog dominance inevitable, Tech players and fans still found significance in the game. Following the 1978 game, which many considered the greatest in the rivalry to that point, the Bulldogs overcame a 20 point deficit to win by 29-28, and Tech's quarterback Eddie Lee Ivery - who never won a game against UGA and was sidelined that day with an injury - remembered the game this way:

> You're always disappointed when you don't beat your arch rival. That's a game, you throw out all the other games you've played all year long, and when it comes down to that University of Georgia game, you want to win that game. Even if you win every game of the season or lose every game of the season, you want to win that one.[352]

According to Dooley, that game "from a purely spectator standpoint, was one of the greatest games ever played in Sanford Stadium. That game had everything that anybody could hope for: an onside kick, a punt return for a touchdown, a kickoff return for a touchdown, a fourth-down play that turned into a touchdown, and a two-point play that word the game, but had to be run

---

[350] Lewis Grizzard, *Atlanta Constitution* (November 26, 1977), Editorial Section.

[351] Cromartie, *Clean Old Fashioned Hate*, 419.

[352] Adam Van Brimmer, *Stadium Stories: Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets* (Guildford, CT: Globe Pequot, 2006), 124.

twice."[353] The game between the two universities continued to provide a dramatic end to the season, even if it seemed obvious who would prevail. By the time the 1980s arrived, with UGA winning the national championship in 1980 and a new young recruit, Herschel Walker, shattering national records, the university was on its way to establishing itself as one of the premier southern universities and a representation of how the South would be perceived going forward.

At this point, did Tech begin to understand that its role in the South, while itself not necessarily diminished but clearly equaled - even surpassed - by an emerging University of Georgia, was changing - and that this shift was even reflected on the football field? If so, they did not give up the fight easily. Tech's 1981 season was difficult as it had suffered its worst season to date, approaching the UGA game with a 1-9 record while the University mirrored it at 9-1. Tech's team was desperate for a win, frustration evident in every play. UGA players remember the frenzy of the game as excessively hostile and, almost, dangerous. University of Georgia cornerback Dale Williams recalls how "[t]hey were using their mouth more than their shoulder pads the whole game. I couldn't believe some of the things that went on out there there today;" UGA safety Bob Kelly was reminded how "[t]toward the end of the game, you really had to be careful. They took some unnecessary shots when the play was over;" and Bulldog quarterback Buck Belue was just happy when the game was over.[354] The desperation was evident again in 1984 when Tech, facing a seventh straight loss at the hands of the Bulldogs, had its best

---

[353] Dooley, *Dooley: My 40 Years at Georgia,* 101-102.

[354] Cromartie, *Clean Old Fashioned Hate,* 442-443.

chance at beating UGA in years - and they succeeded. The elation was so great for Tech students that:

> [t]he Grant Field goal posts came tumbling down on Saturday, and on Monday, 48 hours later, the Grant Field scoreboard still displayed for one and all to see the game's final result. But the game wasn't played at Grant Field. It was played at Sanford Stadium in Athens. To observe this delirium, one would have thought it was Tech's first football victory over Georgia in seven years, or Tech's first athletic victory over Georgia in *any* sport in almost three years. It was…on both counts.[355]

For Tech, the rivalry was still relevant and necessary - an essential part of their school's history and success. Not that they placed their identity in their wins and losses against their in-state rivalry as they once had, but they were definitely important to athletic morale.

However, with the changes in their academic standards and focuses, it was more difficult to recruit the level of athlete who could compete against the University of Georgia, and this disparity became evident during the last decade of the 20th century. In 1993, with tensions running high as usual between the two teams, Tech's frustrations once again manifested themselves in a bench clearing brawl as UGA ran up the score and Tech's defense responded by throwing punches.While not a proud moment for the Yellow Jackets, this 1993 altercation indicated the significance with which this game was viewed. Again in 1997, the Bulldogs eked out a close game, winning in the final 14 seconds. Larry Munson, renowned University of Georgia football announcer, expressed both the excitement and relief at the Bulldogs last minute win, exclaiming, "Our hearts that were ripped out and bleeding not he ground, we picked it up

---

[355] Ibid., 467.

and stuck it back in. We had no business winning this game."[356] It was becoming clear that a shift had occurred in the rivalry's momentum, and many began to wonder if there would be no return for Tech's competitiveness with UGA. Their decline continued in 2002 when the Yellow Jackets were completely demolished in the annual meeting as the Bulldogs had a 34-0 half-time lead and ended up beating their rivals 51-7. The strength of Georgia's squad, reflecting a solidifying of a new southern identification, was quickly becoming obvious, and even Tech fans could sense a shift from which they would never return. In 2006, the University of Georgia had endured a disappointing season; however, they were still able to beat the ranked Tech team 15-12. While the Bulldogs were experiencing a growing strength in their program and many had given up on the rivalry, the two teams were still passionate about the game, knowing that neither side is guaranteed a win. Even today, the two schools hate each other, and the fans desperately want the annual bragging rights that a win allows. However, by the turn of the century, most SEC universities were investing heavily in their football programs[357] as they had become an integral part of student life and southern culture as a whole, and UGA had clearly bought into this mindset while Tech had not. Moving forward, it increasingly became clear that the University of Georgia was becoming a powerhouse in Division 1 football, and Tech was being left behind.

Until the turn of the twenty-first century, many still considered the rivalry to be significant, a game that was highly anticipated each year as one of the determining factors of

---

[356] My God a Podcast, "It Couldn't Have Happened," YouTube, uploaded November 24, 2006, accessed December 11, 2022. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xGGFjnwcOM4&t=40s.

[357] See Michael Casagrande, "SEC Shares $777 Million with Schools as Revenue Jumps 18%," AL.com (February 10, 2022); Blake Toppmeyer, "How SEC Athletic Departments Ranked in Total Revenue for 2018-19 Fiscal Year," *Savannah Morning News* (July 18, 2020); Kristi Dosh, "Who's Making Money in SEC Football?, Forbes (January 26, 2011).

how successful the season had been. Even as the University of Georgia became a Southeastern Conference powerhouse, they always approach the rivalry game as a possible spoiler of their season - knowing that, no matter how poor Tech's season might have been, the Yellowjackets entered the game with the intent to humiliate their opponent, bringing their best game of the season. Even at the end of the 2022 season, with the Bulldogs on the cusp of back to back national championships, the 5-7 Yellow Jackets held the defending champions to a 10-7 lead at halftime - one of the smallest margins in Georgia's season, demonstrating the intensity with which the teams still face each other. It is this respect between the two schools that allows the hatred to continue even when there seems to be little significance nationally for the outcome. There are still evident signs that neither school has given up the "clean, old-fashioned hate" that has dictated this rivalry, such as Tech's locker room placing replicas of a bulldog in the uirnals, Yellow Jackets' fans questioning the legitimacy of the state university by referring to them as the "University (sic) of Georgia," UGA returning the favor by referring to the Atlanta university as North Avenue Trade School, and Tech players not being allowed to ever wear the color red.[358] It has become a part of the college football experience for the state of Georgia, and they are loathe to admit that the rivalry might not be as intense as it had in the past. While many called for the showdown to be suspended, most fans still interpreted the annual event as a matter of state pride and the validation of "We run this state." In his article "Clean Old-Fashioned Hate, Not So Much Anymore," journalist Richard Proctor acknowledges this changing opinion but insists that "the game remains a feisty affair and must have some point as if you are a Georgia coach and lose too

---

[358] Ian Stancato, "Georgia vs. Georgia Tech: 10 Little-Known Facts About Clean, Old-Fashioned Hate," Bleacher Report (November 25, 2011).

often to Tech, you lose your job . . . [o]r if you are a Tech coach and beat Georgia some and continue to not behave as a little brother should, you anger the Bulldog faithful and fall out of favor with the local media."[359] However, even then, there was a sense of ambivalence slowly beginning to set in - the idea that the values and focal points of the two universities would never be assumed by the other and that the two schools were destined to always represent different characteristics of the South.

Nonetheless, a series that began the 21st century looking as if it could still even out quickly revealed itself to not be even at all, and the athletic rivalry has appeared essentially over. It is also during this time that the University of Georgia's curriculum and culture assumed the characteristics that the South would begin to exhibit at the end of the century and which would become its national and international role moving forward. Even Atlanta seemed to abandon, in part, that it would become a copy of the industrial North; instead, it embraced other industries, many of which were curriculum focal points at the University of Georgia. The South, as a whole, was beginning to find its national role and to solidify an identity that would both emphasize its commitment to modernization while still retaining those traditional elements which southerners were remiss in abandoning. It is important, then, to understand how the conflict on the football field, and the waning of its intensity, reflects the realization that the South had now determined its role and was confident in its chosen identity. With UGA consistently leading the series since the beginning, was it destiny that the university would find its footing in the conflict between old and new and become a face of southern football; or was it with Georgia Tech making the

---

[359] Richard Proctor, "Clean Old-Fashioned Hate, Not So Much Anymore," *The Newnan-Times Herald* (November 24, 2021).

decision to forego excessive spending on their athletic programs - instead confirming their desire to be on the same level as other engineering and research institutes and not concerned with becoming the football powerhouse that the University has recently become - that the rivalry has essentially been declared over. Regardless of the reason, no longer is there a conflict, for the most part, on which team - or southern identity - will prevail.

As of 2022, the rivalry stands in the University of Georgia's favor with a record of 70-41-5. Tech still holds the longest win streak at eight games vs. UGA's seven. They are essentially tied regarding the largest margin of Tech's victory of 48 points to UGA's 47 but Georgia holding the record of most points scored 52 to Tech's 51. While Tech still occasionally enjoys the taste of victory during the annual meeting, athletics is no longer their focus, no longer essential to the perceived success of the university. In fact, the reality of the University's continued growth as a football powerhouse is now generally accepted, especially with its recent back-to-back national championships. According to Proctor, that does not mean that the Georgia/ Georgia Tech should be abandoned, however; instead it is important to admit that the tide has turned in regards to the two universities' strength and that "Tech is to have its role and that role is to not be a threat to UGA, only to provide a spirited game and for many years this has been the case."[360] Just as the conflict between the Old South and New South seems to be lessening, so does one of the oldest rivalries in the South.

---

[360] Ibid.

Conclusion

According to current University of Georgia Head Coach Kirby Smart (2016-Present), the rivalry between the two Georgia universities is still as important as it always has been to those who understand the history, but he also admits that there has been a change in the intensity:

> Our kids don't know the history of this rivalry, what goes into it . . . The physicality of the game. I think educating our players on that so they understand it. Because it means a lot to our players in terms of what they want to achieve, and they've got to win this game in order to achieve those things. So making sure they understand that and teaching the history of that is important . . Because it will mean something to the Georgia Tech players and the Georgia players 20, 30 years from now.[361]

While the athletic rivalry may not be as symbolic of the regional conflict that it was during the twentieth century, the history between the Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Georgia encompasses more than just a contest on a football field; it embodies the conflict and character of the South since the Civil War. Since the establishment of Georgia Tech in 1885, the two universities have been at odds - over offered curriculum, available funding, state status, and even the number of fans each has. Antithetical in every way, both schools have striven to achieve pre-eminent status in the state, hoping to become the university which helps Georgia move into the twenty-first century. One with ties to the antebellum South, the other a promise of what could be - both integral to what the region has become - neither existing alone in this twenty-first century South. The University of Georgia - the area's hope for continuity and distinction while trying to modernize; Georgia Tech - initially seen as the only way for restoration with the rest of

---

361 "Kirby Smart: Georgia-Georgia Tech is Still a Big Rivalry," Georgia Bulldogs Football on Dawgs HQ, YouTube (November 23, 2022).

the Union, but now viewed as one of the many characteristics which made the South what it is. These two schools have battled it out in the classroom, in the State House, and on the football field. And while success in the rivalry has fluctuated over the past century and a half, many are now beginning to believe that the rivalry is waning - or at least the reason for it. While the rivalry may still exist in the hearts and minds of the Tech and UGA faithful, it cannot be denied that there has been a shift in the strength of the two programs, one clearly beginning to dominate the other.

The paradox, however, is that there should have been no reason for there to be conflict between the schools - regardless of the basis of the hostility immediately following the Civil War. They are diametrically opposed in every way- essentially the only similarity being that they both call the state of Georgia home. They should have both been able to establish a distinct presence in the region, understanding that they each contributed unique educational characteristics which could work together to move the South forward. Yet from the beginning, they each determined that the other threatened its very existence - that only one could prevail and define the South in the eyes of the nation and the world. Just as the Confederate South itself was struggling with its place nationally, each of the two universities was contending for its place in the state of Georgia. In retrospect, this contest would mean more than just two colleges (and their football teams) striving for relevance in the post-war South; it would develop into an analysis tool by which one can more deeply examine the South's own identity crisis, particularly through the lens of college football. From the sport's inception and inclusion in southern universities, mirroring the fledgling region's attempts to also introduce something new, to the ebb and flows

of the football game reflecting the challenges the South faced during the 20th century, the Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry assumed a reality that cannot be assigned to any other college rivalry, especially in the South. It was old against new, past versus present, and traditional versus progressive, and it played out clearly in the relationship between the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech.

It cannot be argued that the South of the 21st century is radically different from the one that emerged from the Civil War - defeated, humiliated, and adrift in a nation that was demanding immediate change in order for the region to become a contributing, influential part of the Union. Its post Civil War race relations and policies, dependence on an agrarian economy, and reluctance to implement many of the social reforms valued by the rest of the country caused the South to be viewed as antiquated and out-of-touch. It would take significant national crises for these characteristics to change, finally moving the South forward in a way that the New South proponents had proffered in the decades following the war. While the impetus of Henry Grady and his cohorts was the establishment of an environment - technology, engineering, and science based - that would not only keep pace with the industrial North but even reach a level where competition was possible, the next century would bring more concepts to the New South vision - ones that would fundamentally change the behavior of the South without eliminating its classic charm and spirit which make it unique from the rest of the country.

Many of the ideas would be gender and racially based - challenging some of the South's traditional values and beliefs; however, even economic trials would force a reanalysis of its industries and educational opportunities. While agriculture is still an important part of the

southern economy, the region would shift from a solely agrarian society to one that would be competitive on the international stage - in the engineering world that the New South foresaw, but also in business, financial, and medical fields. The 20th century would see the South slowly embrace social reforms such as women's suffrage, better working conditions, and equal educational opportunities. And most importantly, the promises of racial equality that were espoused during the Reconstruction Era would finally be realized a century later with the Jim Crow laws finally renounced and segregation no longer a factor in day-to-day life. All of these transitions would result in a comprehensively New South - one much different from Grady's vision but one that was also destined to be more successful.

So while these changes would create a region that was radically different from the one the rest of the nation initially reviled, somehow the South has retained a sense of continuity, the characteristics that cannot be duplicated in any other area of the country or - for that matter - the world. When one travels South, there is a clear shift when one crosses the proverbial Mason-Dixon line - a change in the traditions and values which cannot be separated from the region, a sense of grace which permeates the manners and relationships which are still based on family and friends, and the slower pace of life of a community that does not feel the need to rush through their lives. These characteristics may seem stereotypical in nature, yet they are consistently acknowledged by those who travel South and by those who leave and then return. Even more so, in an article by Pauline M. Willis in the journal *Southern Cultures,* she questions those who still disparage the South and argues that the region now encompasses so much more than its past:

> Why don't these people see the beauty of the South now? Its music and literature and other fine arts. Its great sports figures. The fact that races are getting along. People up north always seem to give people of color civil rights but not friendship. There have always been cross-race friendships in the South, even long before the Civil Rights Movement. Southern culture will not disappear; it will evolve to something better.[362]

No longer do even Southerners view themselves in the characteristics of an antebellum era - even if they do still hold to many of the values. Instead, they recognize the sense of continuity which still exists, no longer apologizing for who they are, proud of how they have combined both old and new. So, yes, the South has changed its identity in many ways, but to those who call themselves southerners, the important distinctions are still present and undeniable.

There are numerous ways in which to examine the identity of the changing South, yet one facet of historical analysis that is essential is to consider the conflict that was taking place within the South itself. Throughout the 20th century, there was obviously a struggle between the South and other parts of the country, especially the North, but it is just as important to explore the relationships that were changing within the region itself. So many times, the analysis focuses on the South and outside areas, yet this same struggle is mirrored on a smaller scale at the local level. No one suggests that all southerners were in favor of the changes that were required by them, so a clear struggle between Old South and New South would exist for over a century. While one can certainly explore the conflict between the two in a merely historical context, it can also be studied through the presence of two important southern universities which both existed in Georgia, the heart of the Confederate South. The University of Georgia and the Georgia Institute

---

[362] Pauline M. Willis, "Who Is a Southerner? It's Your Turn to Tell Us," *Southern Cultures* 11, no. 3 (2005): 1-2.

of Technology compellingly represent the Old South and the New, and their intense rivalry would effectively demonstrate the South's own attempt to create for itself a new identity.

Until the late twentieth century, the University of Georgia was a model of the Old South and all that it held dear. From its classical architecture to its uniquely southern customs and traditional curriculum, UGA epitomized the Old South and, in many ways, attempted to keep many of the antebellum characteristics present in the changing South. On the other hand, Georgia Tech embodied the New South and the changes that were needed in order for the region to become influential and modern. Focusing on science and engineering, Georgia Tech was diametrically opposite from its close rival, and the fact that they resided in the same state only intensified their rivalry and its significance to understanding the South's twentieth century struggle. This rivalry may be an unconventional way to examine how the South moved from an antebellum society to one that is ready to be a contributing member of an international community; however, the two schools embody the two identities that were at war with each other, and the beloved cultural tradition of college football provides this cultural struggle.

The Georgia/Georgia Tech rivalry - which was present even before the first athletic competition- would span a century of tremendous southern change, and the hostility between the schools, most clearly shown on the football field, mirrored the animosity between the two schools of thoughts as to which direction the region should take. The back and forth of which team dominated the playing field reflected the turmoil that their fans were experiencing socially and politically. Even the prize for winning the annual football context, the Governor's Cup, reflects the emphasis placed on the schools' importance to the region. Each school would show

strength during different time periods based on what traditions and values were applauded at the time. Initially one of the college football elites, Georgia Tech would begin the century strong, relishing its place as the future of the New South - this position reflected in how it was able to recruit top coaches and players. While succumbing at times to a strong UGA team, more often than not, the series was even as the South attempted to find a place for engineering and technology in its conventional agrarian society. It is interesting to consider, however, how the University of Georgia - overall - has consistently led the rivalry record, indicating that there was continually a strong presence of the past in the South as it moved forward, never fully succumbing to the technological advances that seemed to be its only way forward. Even when Tech experienced its record win streak or celebrated the largest win margin over their rival, Georgia fought back, demonstrating that the old South was not going to be discounted or dismissed, and it would fully resist being relegated to obscurity. As many of the social issues began to be resolved and the University of Georgia learned to reconcile its own traditions with what was expected of the South, there appears to be a permanent shift in the rivalry's momentum. Slowly, Tech - choosing to focus more on academics than athletics - saw its wins dwindling in comparison to UGA, and the state university seemed to find its footing as a powerhouse, both academically and athletically. Although Tech continues to be the more academically challenging university, the University of Georgia is no longer seen as the intellectual inferior of the engineering institute and has established itself as a leader in education. Bulldog fans are also satisfied with the way that the school had conformed itself to a social culture which had been imposed upon them; they believe that the school still retains a sense of

the southern identity which they believed still defined them, even after a century removed from the Civil War. Because it appears that the University of Georgia has found its place, both nationally and internationally, Tech, while still relevant and necessary to the South's new identity, is clearly not going to represent the identifying character of the region. In essence, the University of Georgia has won, and the rivalry would slowly diminish in importance.

Once Bobby Dodd retired and Vince Dooley assumed the head coaching position at UGA, once the South's political and cultural conflicts seemed to abate, and once the University of Georgia finally embraced an acceptance of a new southern identity that was more modern while Tech's reputation - progressive and looking to the scientific and engineering future - remained the same, the rivalry between UGA and Georgia Tech has seemed to wane. Maybe not to the die-hard fans who live in the 70 mile radius of the two universities, but undeniably to the rest of the college football world. Since 1965, over a half century ago, Georgia Tech has won only 14 rivalry games, even though they still hold the record for the longest winning streak, and there appears to be a shift in how the school has approached its athletic programs, especially football. As of 2022, the rivalry stands in the Bulldogs' favor, 70-41-5, and while Georgia Tech still holds an invaluable position of importance in the South and how it contributes to science and technology, it is the University of Georgia that is, once again, the flagship university in the state. This, in no way, detracts from the role that Georgia Tech plays - the institute is still the fundamental engineering school south of the Mason Dixon line, and its worldwide importance is evident by the number of international students who apply each year, the prestige of the Georgia Tech Research Institute, and its contributions to the engineering world. Overall, unless you are a

diehard fan of one of the two schools, the general consensus is that both universities now represent the South well and have found the role that they they are to play in the region's future. However, it is clear that the rivalry, which started as a fight for the identity of the New South, had finally been resolved, and the University of Georgia has succeeded best at defining the region.

The South's struggle did not end with the surrender at Appomattox; in fact, in many ways, this was just the beginning of a long period in which the South worked towards reconciliation with the rest of the country and even itself. One of the most important conflicts was creating an identity which was progressive yet traditional, a sense of continuity with modernization. Initially, the two roles seemed so contrary that it appeared that one would have to win decisively for the issue to be resolved. However, as the 20th century passed, the ability of the Old South - symbolized by the University of Georgia - to both retain its history yet learn to embrace the traits of the New South - represented by Georgia Tech - allowed for a compromise to secure a new identity for the South, and because of this, it could be argued that the Old South won. Yet it was more because the South was willing to recognize and accept the prospects of the future that it was truly successful. The University of Georgia adapted and conformed - it is a different university than it was in 1865. Meanwhile, Georgia Tech has remained the same - it has not needed to compromise, nor has it faced an internal conflict concerning its own future. It is, as many still maintain, not a truly southern school; thus, it would never be able to characterize the South as a whole. It was imperative that the University of Georgia change in order for the school, and the region it represents, to move successfully into the future. Because of its ability to do this,

the university has increased in influence and strength, able to overcome an identity conflict that often appeared like it would shift the opposite way. Likewise, the South is not only considered influential on an international level, but it has also remained distinct - a region that has preserved what it believes makes it unique, a region that has no desire to be like any other. Moving forward, there will still be clashes between old and new, but the future of the region is clear as it now encompasses the industries of business, medicine, finance, and engineering - all areas which make it marketable in all arenas. The rivalry between the two universities, and therefore the two southern identities, may be over, but the conflict between the two was essential in making the region what it is today.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

"A New Slant on an Old Game in Atlanta." *Sports Illustrated,* September 1, 1969,, vault.si.com,. Accessed February 3, 2023.

"A Profile of the Southern States." In the Southern Growth Policies Board Records #4589. Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, December 1978.

"A Word to Young Men and Boys." *Columbus (GA) Daily Enquirer-Sun,* January 13, 1883, https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn84024799. Accessed November 20, 2022.

"After Game, Students Raid City," *Atlanta Georgian,* November 17, 1913, https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn84024799. Accessed November 19, 2022.

Agreement between the University of Georgia and the Georgia School of Technology, March 1,1924, Folder 3, Box 8, Sanford Personal Papers. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Augusta Weekly Chronicle & Sentinel, August 30 1871, https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn82015215. Accessed November 7, 2022.

Barrow, David C. to Dr. [R.H.] Powell. August 25, 1924. Box 26, Barrow Collection. Accessed October 5, 2022.

Bodeker, Fred. "South Interested in Guyon Case; Tech is Subject to Fire." *The Birmingham Age-Herald,* October 5, 1916, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85038485/. Accessed November 1, 2022.

But, Jason. "Dooley Sought Diverse, Talented Players." *The Red and Black,* February 28, 2007. UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions. https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1427. Accessed November 11, 2022.

Caldewell, Harmon White."Letter to Herman Talmadge." Box 56, Chancellor's Records, University of Georgia Library. Accessed October 23, 2022.

"Carnegie Classifications - Institution Profile." Carnegieclassifications.iu.edu. Archived from the original on August 11, 2018. Accessed August 12, 2022.

Davis, Jefferson. *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government: Volume 2* (August 2020). Archived from the original on June 2, 2021. Accessed August 3, 2022.

DC. "Math 254 Essays." UGA Archives, https://www.libs.uga.edu. Accessed September 13, 2022.

Du Bois, W.E.B. "The Talmadge-Cocking Affair" (1941). W.E.B. Du Bois Papers (MS 312). Special Collections and University Archives, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries, http://scua.library.umass.edu. Accessed December 4, 2022.

Enrollment Records (MF020). Archives, Library and Information Center, Georgia Institute of Technology. https://finding-aids.library.gatech.edu/repositories/2/resources/261. Accessed November 28, 2022.

Epling, Robert. "Integration of Black Athletes at the University of Georgia: Vince Dooley Interview." p. 4 *UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions.* https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1427. Accessed November 11, 2022.

Fitzgerald Leader Enterprise and Press Fitzgerald, Ben Hill County, Ga., January 14, 1961, https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn89053306/. Accessed November 3, 2022.

"Georgia and Tech Fight to Scoreless Tie on Muddy Field." *The Birmingham Age Herald,* November 14, 1915, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85038485/. Accessed September 22, 2022.

"Georgia Institute of Technology Historical Marker". Historic Markers Across Georgia. Archived from the original on December 24, 2013. Retrieved December 22, 2022.

"Georgia Traditions." University of Georgia. www.Georgiadogs. Archived from the original on January 18, 2013. Accessed September 3, 2022.

Hill, Walter B. "The Twentieth Century University." In Walter B. Hill Family Papers, Box 34, Folder 5, no date, University of Georgia Library. Accessed July 13, 2022.

JA II. "Math 254 Essays." UGA Archives. https://www.libs.uga.edu. Accessed September 13, 2022.

J. B. Norris to S. V. Sanford. *Atlanta Constitution* (March 2, 1924), folder 3, box 8, Sanford Personal Papers. Accessed July 13, 2022.

Kappa Alpha Order. "The Mission of Kappa Alpha Order." Archived from the original on September 28, 2007. Accessed October 24, 2022.

Lipscomb, Andrew A. Trustee Minutes, UGA Archives, August 2, 1879, https://www.libs.uga.edu.. Accessed September 13, 2022.

Lyman Hall to Clark Howell. Lyman Hall Correspondence (UA309). Archives, Library and Information Center, Georgia Institute of Technology, March 7, 1898, https://www.library.gatech.edu/archives. Accessed September 5, 2022.

Mell, P. H., Jr. " Chapter XIX: Efforts Towards Completing the Technological Schools as a Department of the University of Georgia." *Life of Patrick Hues Mell.* Louisville, KY: Baptist Book Concern, 1895. Archived from the original on April 7, 2005. Accessed December 30, 2022.

"Nonpopulation Schedules for Georgia, 1850-1880." T1137. National Archives. https://www.archives.gov/research/census/nonpopulation#state. Accessed October 1, 2022.

Pallats, Lennie. "It May Cost Something." Red and Black (April 7 1966)." *UGA Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions*, April 7, 1966, https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1485. Accessed November 11, 2022.

Pandora Yearbook. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1953. https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Pandora Yearbook. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1957. https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed July 30, 2022.

"Proceedings of Special Committee Appointed from Its Members by the Board of Trustees University of Georgia in Accordance with the Resolution Contained in this Report." University of Georgia Library, 1923, https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed September 15, 2022.

"Remarks of Governor George Busbee, Advanced Technology Strategy Conference, Peachtree Plaza Hotel, Henry Grady Room." Advanced Technology Development Center File. Georgia Institute of Technology Archives, October 5, 1982, https://www.library.gatech.edu/archives. Accessed August 3, 2022.

The Red and Black. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, November 3, 1906. Archived in *Georgia Historic Newspapers.* Accessed October 14, 2022

The Red and Black. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press,December 5, 1906. Archived in *Georgia Historic Newspapers.* Accessed October 14, 2022.

The Red and Black. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, January 13, 1970. Archived in *Georgia Historic Newspapers.* Accessed October 14, 2022.

Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Message to the Conference on Economic Conditions of the South." Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley. The American Presidency Project, June 25, 1938, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/node/209037. Accessed November 11, 2022.

"Rumor That Negro Will Play is False." *The Red and Black.* Special Collections Library Online Exhibitions, October 25, 1929, https://digilab.libs.uga.edu/scl/items/show/1757. Accessed November 11, 2022.

Selman, Sean. "Presidential Tour of Campus Not the First for the Institute". A Presidential Visit to Georgia Tech. Georgia Institute of Technology Archives, March 2002, https://www.library.gatech.edu/archives. Accessed October 6, 2022.

Sitton, Claude. "Georgia Students Riot on Campus; Two Negroes Out." *New York Times*, January 12, 1961, Front Page. https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/ref/membercenter/nytarchive.html. Accessed November 7, 2022.

Southern Banner, March 17, 1838, https://newspaperarchive.com/athens-southern-banner-mar-17-1838-p-1. Accessed November 7, 2022.

Southern Watchman. May 9, 1866, https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn82014669. Accessed November 7, 2022.

Sullivan, W.H. to Sanford, May 9 and August 16, 1934, Box 3, Steadman V. Sanford Collection, University of Georgia Library. Accessed October 5, 2022.

"Tech, Georgia to Meet Saturday; Dixie Land is Stirred Up." *The Indianapolis Times,* November 29, 1927, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn82015313. Accessed October 3, 2022.

TT, "Math 254 Essays," UGA Archives, https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed September 13. 2022.

University of Georgia Trustees. Minutes, April 29, 1892, https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed July 30, 2022.

"The Visit of William Howard Taft to the University of Georgia," *Bulletin of the University of Georgia*, IX, 5A, Serial No. 97 (January 1909). https://reg.uga.edu/faculty-and-staff/archived-bulletins. Accessed July 30, 2022.

"William B. Hartsfield, 80, Dies; Atlanta's Mayor for 23 Years." *The New York Times,* February 24, 1971, https://www.nytimes.com/1971/02/24/archives/archives.html. Accessed October 13, 2022.

Woofter, T. J. *Red and Black*, February 1919. Editorial. https: gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/gua1179162. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Primary Sources

"A Grand Success." *Atlanta Constitution,* March 25, 1881, https://ajc.newspapers.com. January 31, 2023.

Atkinson, Edward to Samuel Inman. September 28, 1886. Reprinted in *Atlanta Constitution,* October 1, 1886, https://ajc.newspapers.com. Accessed July 30, 2022.

"Atlanta and Her Industries." *Atlanta Constitution*, November 21, 1886, https://ajc.newspapers.com. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Bisher, Furman. "Bulldogs Regain Old-Time Growl to Wreck Tech," *Atlanta Journal,* Nov 30, 1964, https://ajc.newspapers.com. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Bisher, Furman. "Georgia Tops Tech in Fight to Finish." *Atlanta Journal-Constitution,* Nov 26, 1967, https://ajc.newspapers.com. Accessed July 20, 2022.

Bisher, Furman. "Now Bud Knows What It's Like - So Does Vince," *The Atlanta Journal,* Nov 30, 1969, https://ajc.newspapers.com. Accessed July 30, 2022.

"Campus Leaders Ask Students to Follow Non-Violence Course." *The Red and Black,* January 10, 1961.

"Census of Population and Housing." Census.gov. Accessed November 27, 2022.

"Complete College Georgia 2020 Status Report: Georgia Institute of Technology," *Complete College*, October 29, 2020, https://completecollege.org. Accessed July 15, 2022.

Danfort, Ed. *Atlanta Journal*, Dec 1, 1945, Editorial section. https://ajc.newspapers.com. Accessed July 30, 2022.

"Digest of Education Statistics 2002." National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education, June 2003, https://nces.ed.gov. Accessed July 28, 2022.

Editorial in *Gadsden Times-Journal.* Reprinted in *Tuscaloosa News,* January 4, 1926, https://www.tuscaloosanews.com. Accessed July 28, 2022.

Edwards, Harry Stillwell. "John F. Hanson - The Man." *Macon (GA) Telegraph,* December 18, 1910, https://macon.com. Accessed September 3, 2022.

"Eloquent Talks at Big Banquet," *Atlanta Constitution,* February 18, 1903, https://www.ajc.com. Accessed November 3, 2022.

"Facts and Figures." MIT School of Engineering (2022).

"The Free Institute." *Worcester* (MA) *Daily Spy,* August 9, 1883, https://www.loc.gov/item/sn83021205. Accessed September 3, 2022.

"Georgia Institute of Technology." Complete College Georgia Plan: 2020 Status Report. October 29, 2020.

"Georgia Institute of Technology - Main Campus International Student Report." College Factual, college factual.com. Accessed July 9, 2022.

"Georgia Rips Georgia Tech, 47-8, For Fourth Undefeated Season," *Atlanta Journal-Constitution,* December 1, 1968, https://www.ajc.com. Accessed September 4, 2022.

"Georgia Tech Demographics & Diversity Report." College Factual, collegefactual.com. Accessed October 2, 2022.

"Georgia Tech Integration," *St. Paul Recorder,* Nov 17, 1961, https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov. Accessed January 10, 2023.

Grady, Henry. “New South Speech.” Presented to the New England Society, New York City, December 21, 1886. In the *Atlanta Constitution*, December 22, 1886, https://www.ajc.com. Accessed September 18, 2022.

Grady, Henry. Texas State Fair. Reprinted in Gunnar Myrdal and Sissela Bok. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy.*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.

Grizzard, Lewis. *Atlanta Constitution,* November 26, 1977. Editorial Section. www.ajc.com. Accessed November 1, 2022.

Harris, Nathaniel E. *Atlanta Constitution,* October 6, 1888, www.ajc.com. Accessed November 18, 2022.

High School Athletics Participation Survey. The National Federation of State High School Associations (2021-2022). Accessed January 4, 2023.

Hill, Benjamin H. Hill. *Atlanta Constitution,* August 9, 1871. www.ajc.com. September 20, 2022.

Hill, Jr., Benjamin H. *Senator Benjamin B. Hill of Georgia: His Life, Speeches, and Writings.* Atlanta: H.C. Hudgens & Company, 1891.

Hill, Benjamin H. “Speech Before the Alumni of the University of Georgia.” *Senator Benjamin H. Hill of Georgia: His Life, Speeches and Writings*. Compiled by Benjamin Harvey Hill. Atlanta: T. H. P. Bloodworth, 1893.

Hull, Augustus Longstreet. *Annals of Athens, Georgia, 1801-1901*. Banner Job Office, 1906. Reprinted London: Forgotten Books, 2015.

“International.” University of Georgia Undergraduate Admissions. admissions.uga.edu. Accessed July 9, 2022.

Jones, Sam. *Atlanta Journal,* April 3, 1893, www.ajc.com. Accessed September 3, 2022.

Jones, Sam. *Atlanta Journal,* November 30, 1895, www.ajc.com. Accessed September 3, 2022.

Johnson, Tommy. “Negro Students Prepare for Wednesday Classes.” *The Red and Black* (January 1, 1961).

Letter to the Editor. “Atlanta.” *Atlanta Constitution,* September 21, 1869, www.ajc.com. Accessed August 3, 2022.

McGill, Ralph. *Atlanta Constitution,* December 10, 1940, www.ajc.com. Accessed November 3, 2022.

McGill, Ralph. *Atlanta Constitution,* January 11, 1961, Editorial section. Accessed November 3, 2022.

Morgan, S.B.C. Letter to the Trustees. *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 43 (1959).

My God a Podcast. "It Couldn't Have Happened." YouTube. Uploaded November 24, 2006. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xGGFjnwcOM4&t=40s. Accessed December 11, 2022.

"National Summary Report - AHS 1976." U.S. Census Bureau, March 1978, https://www.census.gov. Accessed September 4, 2022.

"Number of Winners by Institution: U.S. Rhodes Scholars 1904-2019." Office of the American Secretary of The Rhodes Trust. 2019.

"*POTUSatGT: Seven Memorial Moments from President Obama's Speech." Georgia Tech News Center, March 10, 2015, https://news.gatech.edu/news/2015/03/10/potusatgt-seven-memorable-moments-president-obamas-speech. Accessed September 18, 2022.

"Practical Education." *Atlanta Constitution,* December 1882, www.ajc.com. Accessed September 18, 2022.

"A Prairie Home Companion for September 23, 2006". American Public Media, September 23, 2007, https://www.prairiehome.org/shows/57121.html. Accessed October 4, 2022.

"Predictive Modeling Data in the ACT Electronic Student Record." ACT, March 18, 2019, act.org. Accessed November 27, 2022.

Rastogi, Sonya, Tallese D. Johnson, Elizabeth M. Hoeffel, and Malcolm P. Drewery, Jr. "The Black Population: 2010." U.S. Census Bureau, September 1, 2011, www.census.gov. Accessed July 5, 2022.

Smart, Kirby. "Georgia-Georgia Tech is Still a Big Rivalry." Georgia Bulldogs Football on Dawgs HQ. YouTube (November 23, 2022).

Soule, Andrew. Address to the Board of Trustees, February 18, 1918. Reprinted in "The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1959): 156–69.

"Southern Focus Polls, South Survey, Spring 2001." The Odum Institute for Research in Social Science. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 2001.

"Southern Gentleman Revolt." S*outhern Watchman* January 24, 1866. Reprinted in *Arizona Sun* (December 9, 1955). Accessed November 12, 2022.

Stiles, Ezra. *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles* (1901). Edited by Franklin B. Dexter. New York: Arkose Press, 2015.

"Tempest Over the Sugar Bowl." *Georgia Tech Alumni Magazine* 34, no. 4 (1955). https://www.gtalumni.org>alumni>magazine-pages. Accessed August 10, 2022.

"The Blue Book of Southern Progress." Industrial Development and Manufacturers Record. May 1959.

"UGA Male/Female Diversity." *College Factual* (2022). Accessed December 2, 2022.

"University of Georgia Integration." Civil Rights Digital Library. University of Georgia Library. https://crdl.usg.edu/. Accessed October 5, 2022.

University of Georgia Trustees. Minutes, July 11, 1884, https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed July 30, 2022.

War Manufacturing Facilities Authorized Through December 1944 by State and County, V.2: New Jersey-Wyoming. United States: n.p., 1945.

Secondary Sources

"The 10 Best Colleges for Engineering Universities," *Money,* June 7, 2022, money.com. Accessed October 2, 2022.

"Atlanta: Economy- Major Industries and Commercial Activity." City-data.com. Accessed July 16, 2022.

Atlanta Resurgens: The First Hundred of Years of a City's Progress, Promise and Philosophy. Atlanta: The First National Bank of Atlanta, 1971.

Bartley, Numan V. "Society and Culture in an Urban Age." *A History of Georgia*. Edited by Kenneth Coleman. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1991.

Bartley, Numan V. *The Creation of Modern Georgia*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1983.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Black, Earl, and Merle Black. *Politics and Society in the South.* Boston: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Bowers, Claude G. *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln*. Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1929.

Breckenfeld, Gurney. "Business Loves the Sunbelt (and Vice Versa)." *Fortune* (June 1977), 132–146.

Brimmer, Adam Van. *Stadium Stories: Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets.* Guildford, CT: Globe Pequot, 2006.

Brittain, M.L. *The Story of Georgia Tech.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press,1948.

Brooks, Robert P. *The University of Georgia Under Sixteen Administrations, 1785-1955.* Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1956.

Bryant, Paul W., and John Underwood. *Bear: The Hard Life and Good Times of Alabama's Coach Bryant.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974.

Buckingham, James Silk. *Slave States of America* II (1842). Sydney: Wentworth Press, 2019.

Bradley, Mark L. *Bluecoats and Tar Heels: Soldiers and Civilians in Reconstruction North Carolina*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2009.

Burnett, David. "Graduation Gateway: Students Continue Arch's Century-Old Tradition." *The Red and Black,* November 4, 2009.

Cash, W. J. *The Mind of the South.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.

Caullery, Maurice. *Universities and Scientific Life in the United States*. Translated by James Haughton Woods and Emmet Russell. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1922.

"Changes to UGA's 'Old South Tradition." Grady Newsource, March 26, 2015, https://gradynewsource.uga.edu/. Accessed January 21, 2023.

Cooper, Christopher A., and H. Gibbs Knotts. *The Resilience of Southern Identity: Why the South Matters in the Minds of Its People.* Chapel Hill, NC University of North Carolina Press, 2017.

Copeland, Larry. "For Blacks, a Return to Southern Roots." *USA Today,* July 1, 2011, usatoday.com. Accessed September 1, 2022.

Coulter, E. Merton. *College Life in the Old South*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

Cox, Albert H. "The Vital Principle of Nations" (1867). In Thomas Dyer, *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985.* Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Cromartie, Bill. *Clean Old-Fashioned Hate.* Nashville, TN: Rutledge Hill Press, 1987.

Cumming Jr., Joseph B. "Been Down Home So Long It Looks Like Up To Me." *Esquire,* August 1971, esquire.com. Accessed August 3, 2022.

Dadisman, Carrol. *Dear Old UGA, From the Red and Black: Student Life at the University of Georgia, 1893-2013*. Athens, GA: Red and Black Publishing Company, 2013.

Dadisman, Carrol. "Women in Our University*."* In *Dear Old UGA, From the Red and Black: Student Life at the University of Georgia, 1893-2013.* Athens, GA: Red and Black Publishing Company, 2013.

Davidson, Donald. *The Attack on Liviathan: Regionalism and Nationalism in the United States*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938.

Davis, Harold E. *Henry Grady's New South: Atlanta, A Brave and Beautiful City.* Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1990.

Demas, Lane. "'We Play Anyone': Deciphering the Racial Politics of Georgia Football and the 1956 Sugar Bowl Controversy." *Integrating the Gridiron: Black Civil Rights and American College Football.* Rutgers: Rutgers University Press, 2011.

Dendy, Larry B. *Through the Arch: An Illustrated Guide to the University of Georgia Campus*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2013.

Dooley, Vince. *Dooley: My 40 Years at Georgia.* Chicago: Triumph Books, 2005.

Doyle, Andrew. "An Atheist in Alabama is Someone Who Doesn't Believe in Bear Bryant: A Symbol for the Embattled South." *Sport in the Old South*. Edited by Patrick Miller. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Dyer, Thomas G. *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985*. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Early, Jubal. "Civil War Quotes." americancivilwarstory.com. Accessed February 14, 2023.

Eaton, Clemen. *The Mind of the Old South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1964.

Eck, James Curtis. "Statewide Variation in Postsecondary Enrollment Patterns: An Analysis of Community and Local Schooling Contexts." PhD diss., University of Georgia, 1997.

Eddy, Edward Danforth. *Colleges for Our Land and Time: The Land-Grant Idea in American Education.* New York: Harpers, 1957.

Edwards, Pat. *"*Being New to Tech Was Not Always Easy.*" The Technique,* September 10, 1999, https://nique.net. Accessed October 5, 2022.

Davis, Jefferson, Quoted in Foster, Gaines M. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Doyle, Don H. *New Men, New Cities, New South.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Dunn, Lee C. *Cracking the Solid South: The Life of John Fletcher Hanson, Father of Georgia Tech*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2016.

Facts About the University of Georgia. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1911.

Fite, Gilbert C. "Farmers Left Behind." In *Cotton Fields No More: Southern Agriculture, 1865-1980*, 1st ed. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1984: 207–25.

Fralick, Melissa. “Our Olympic Legacy: A Look at How the Centennial Games Changed Georgia Tech 20 Years Ago.” Georgia Tech Alumni Association (Summer 2016).

Garbin, Patrick. “The Insult That Stopped Old-Fashioned Hate,” *UGA Sports* (August 2, 2020).

Gaston, Paul. *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking*. Montgomery: New South Books, 2011.

“Georgia Institute of Technology.” *U.S. News and World Report.* July 13, 2022.

“Georgia Tech Research Institute.” gatech.edu. Accessed October 3, 2022.

Grantham, Dewey. *Southern Progressivism.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983.

Gunther, John. *Inside U.S.A.* New York: New Press, 1947.

Heisman, John. Quoted in *Stadium Stories: Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets.* Guilford, Connecticut: Glob Pequot Press, 2006.

Hopkins, Isaac Stiles. “Industrial Education.” In *Sources and Reprints.* Atlanta: Emory University Publications, 1952.

Hopkins, Isaac Stiles. “Industrial Education: An Alumni Address, Emory College, 1883.” Edited by Goodrick Cook. Atlanta: Emory University Publications, 1952.

Jennings, Cynthia L. "Pride and Prejudice: A Narrative Study on the Complexity of the Artifacts that Represent the University of Georgia,” Order No. 28774882. University of Georgia, 2021.

Kaplan, Andreas. *High Tech: Georgia Tech, in Higher Education at the Crossroads of Disruption.* London: Emerald Publishing House, 2021.

Kirk, Jason. “Has Georgia Tech Football Ever Been More Popular Than the Falcons.” SBNation.com (June 9, 2011). Accessed February 3, 2023.

Lee, Robert E. Quoted in “Music of the 1860’s.” American Battlefield Trust. https://www.battlefields.org/learn/articles/music-1860s. Accessed January 15, 2023.

Link, William A. *Atlanta: Cradle of the New South.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Martin, Charles H. “Integrating New Year’s Day: The Racial Politics of College Bowl Games in the American South.” *The Sporting World of the Modern South*. Edited by Patrick Miller. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2002: 175-199.

McMath, Robert C., Ronald H. Bayor, James E. Brittain, Lawrence Foster, August W. Giebelhaus, and Germaine M. Reed. *Engineering the New South: Georgia Tech, 1885–1985*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Miller, Patrick B. “The Manly, the Moral, and the Proficient: College Sport. In the *New South. 17-51 The Sporting World of the Modern South.* Edited by Patrick B. Miller. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002: 17-51.

Mixon, Wayne. “New South Myth.” In *The New Encyclopedia of Southern Culture: Volume 4: Myth, Manners, and Memory.* Edited by Charles Reagan Wilson, 132–35. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Narayan, Arvind.“Why the T Thief Shouldn’t Be Suspended.” *Technique,* March 20, 2014, https://nique.net. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Norman, Tyler. “Georgia Daze Strives to Increase Black Student Applicants.” *Grady News Source,* March 22, 2021, https://gradynewsource.uga.edu. Accessed September 4, 2022.

O’Mara, Margaret Pugh. “Selling the New South: Georgia Tech and Atlanta.” *In Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005. 182–222.

“Past Rankings: AP, UPI, USA Today, Harris.” http://www.collegefootballpoll.com/polls_1936_present.html. Accessed on November 1, 2022.

Percy, Walker. “Southern Comfort.” *Harper’s,* January 1979, https://www.libs.uga.edu/taxonomy/term/29. Accessed July 30, 2022.

Preston, Howard L. *Automobile Age Atlanta: The Making of a Southern Metropolis 1900-1935.* Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1979.

Proctor, Richard. “Clean Old-Fashioned Hate, Not So Much Anymore.” *The Newnan-Times Herald,* November 24, 2021, https://times-herald.com/. Accessed November 1, 2022.

Riggall, Hunter. “Southern Culture, History is Explored Through Analysis of the Southern Fold Song Dixie.” *The Red and Black.* University of Georgia, April 19, 2018. Accessed October 14, 2022.

Roland, Charles P. *The Improbable Era: The South Since World War II.* Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1976.

"Running Fast and Standing Still: Poverty and Black Economic Growth in Georgia's Sunbelt Boom." *Southern Regional Council*. Atlanta: June 1986.

Schulman, Bruce J. *From Cotton Belt to Sunbelt: Federal Policy, Economic Development, and the Transformation of the South, 1938-1980.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Scott, Richard. *SEC Football: 75 Years of Price and Passion.* Minneapolis, MN: Voyageur Press, 2008.

Smith, Jennifer Chappell. "The South's Most Beautiful Colleges." *Southern Living* (August 16, 2017).

Sokol, Jason. *There Goes My Everything: White Southerners in the Age of Civil Rights, 1945-1975*. United Kingdom: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2008.

Stancato, Ian. "Georgia vs. Georgia Tech: 10 Little-Known Facts About Clean, Old-Fashioned Hate." *Bleacher Report,* November 25, 2011, https://bleacherreport.com/articles/956435-Georgia-vs-Georgia-tech-10-little-known-facts-about-clean-old-fashioned-hate. Accessed September 3, 2022.

Taylor, William R. *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Thomas, Frances Taliaferro and Mary Levin Koch. *A Portrait of Historic Athens & Clarke County*. Greece: University of Georgia Press, 2009.

Tindall, George. *The Emergence of the New South, 1913-1945*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967.

Twitchell, Marshall Harvey. *Carpetbagger from Vermont: The Autobiography of Marshall Harvey Twitchell.* Edited by Ted Tunnell. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1989.

"University of Georgia," niche.com, November 27, 2022.

Wallace, Robert. *Dress Her in White and Gold: A Biography of Georgia Tech*. Atlanta, Georgia: Georgia Tech Foundation, 1969,

Watterson, John Sayles. *College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

"What Are the Public Ivies." Prep Expert (September 20, 2018). Accessed July 11, 2022.

Wright, Gavin. *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War.* New York: Basic Books, 1986.

Woodward, C. Vann. *The Burden of Southern History.* Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1960.

Woodward, C. Vann. *Origins of the New South.* Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1981.

Wyatt-Brown Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Journal Articles

Adams, Natalie, and James Adams. "'We All Came Together on the Football Field:' Unpacking the Blissful Clarity of a Popular Southern Sports Story." *Counterparts* 434 (2014).

Ambrose, Andy. "Atlanta." *New Georgia Encyclopedia*. Accessed on September 8, 2022.

Among the Highest-Ranked Engineering Schools, Georgia Tech Leads in Racial Diversity." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 33 (Autumn, 2001).

Bartley, Numan V. "In Search of the New South: Southern Politics after Reconstruction." *Reviews in American History* 10, no. 4 (1982): 150-163.

Bix, Amy. "When Coeds Came to Georgia Tech." *School of History and Sociology's Spring 2020 Speakers Series, Social Justice: Power, Inequity, and Change*. March 2, 2020. Accessed on October 5, 2022.

Boney, F. N. "'The Rising Hope of Our Land': University of Georgia Students Over Two Centuries." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 74, no. 1 (1990): 117–33.

Brittain, James E., and Robert C. McMath. "Engineers and the New South Creed: The Formation and Early Development of Georgia Tech." *Technology and Culture* 18, no. 2 (1977): 175–201.

Burton, Orville Vernon. “The South as ‘Other,’ the Southerner as ‘Stranger.’” *The Journal of Southern History* 79, no. 1 (2013): 7–50.

Clark, Thomas D. “Review of *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History, 1785-1985*. By Thomas G. Dyer. *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (1985): 81–89.

Cobb, James C. “Beyond Planters and Industrialists: A New Perspective on the New South.” *The Journal of Southern History* 54, no. 1 (1988): 45–68.

Cobb, James C. “Review of Making Sense of Southern Economic History, by Gavin Wright.” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 71, no. 1 (1987): 53–74.

Cohen, Robert. “‘Two, Four, Six, Eight, We Don’t Want to Integrate’: White Student Attitudes Toward the University of Georgia’s Desegregation.” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (1996).

“Conversation with Walter Whitmire” (June 2012). In Orville Vernon Burton’s “The South as ‘Other,’ the Southerner as ‘Stranger.’” *The Journal of Southern History* 79, no. 1 (2013).

Cotterill, Robert S. “The Old South to the New.” *The Journal of Southern History* 15, no. 1 (1949): 3–8.

Coulter, E. Merton. “The New South: Benjamin H. Hill’s Speech Before the Alumni of the University of Georgia, 1871.” *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (1973): 179–99.

Crowell, John Franklin. Quoted in Jim Sumner, “North Carolina Inter-Collegiate Football Association,” *The North Carolina Historical Review* 65, no. 3 (July 1988): 263-286.

Doyle, Andrew. "Turning the Tide: College Football and Southern Progressivism." *Southern Cultures* 3, no. 3 (1997): 28-51.

Durham, R.L. “The Beginning of Football at Trinity.” Quoted in Jim L. Sumner, “The North Carolina Inter-Collegiate Foot-Ball Association: The Beginnings of College Football in North Carolina,” *The North Carolina Historical Review* 65, no. 3 (1988): 148.

Ewing, Quincy. “The Heart of the Race Problem.” *Atlantic Monthly* 103 (March 1909): 390-392.

Fairclough, Adam. "Was the Grant of Black Suffrage a Political Error? Reconsidering the Views of John W. Burgess, William A. Dunning, and Eric Foner on Congressional Reconstruction.” *Journal of The Historical Society* (June 2012).

"Goals of Engineering Education Final Report of the Goals Committee." *Engineering Education* 58 (January 1968): 380-381.

Grantham, Dewey W. "Southern Historiography and a History of the South." *American Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1953).

Hackney, Sheldon. "Origins of the New South in Retrospect." *The Journal of Southern History* 38, no. 2 (1972).

Hayslett, Charles. "New County-Level GDP Data Suggests Rural Georgia Has, For a Change, Improved Relative to Metro Atlanta." *Trouble in God's Country* (December 9, 2020). Accessed January 23, 2023.

Konczal, Mike. "How Radical Change Occurs: An Interview with Historian Eric Foner." *The Nation* (February 3, 2015).

Martin, Charles H. "Racial Change and 'Big-Time' College Football in Georgia: The Age of Segregation, 1892-1957." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (1996): 532–62.

McLaurin, Melton. "Review of *The South and Modern America*, by D. Grantham." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 79, no. 4 (1995): 989-991.

Meyerson, Harold. "How the American South Drives the Low Wage Economy." *The American Prospect* (July 6, 2015). Accessed January 22, 2023.

Midgette, Nancy Smith. "What Students Need to Know about the New South." *OAH Magazine of History* 4, no. 1 (1989): 51–55.

Mitchener Kris, and Ian W. McLean. "U.S. Regional Growth and Convergence, 1880–1980." *Journal of Economic History* 59, no. 4 (1999): 1016–42.

Moore, James Tice. "Redeemers Reconsidered: Change and Continuity in the Democratic South, 1870–1900." *Journal of Southern History* 44, no. 3 (August 1978): 357–378.

Mugleston, William F. "The Press and Student Activism at the University of Georgia in the 1920s." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 64, no. 3 (1980): 241–52.

"The Pitiable Performance of the University of Georgia in Enrolling Black Students." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 45 (Autumn 2004): 38-39.

Prestage, Jewel. "Quest for African American Political Woman." *American Academy of Political Science* (May 1, 1991): 88–103.

Ramsdell, Charles W. "The Changing Interpretation of the Civil War." *Journal of Southern History* 3, no. 1 (1937).

Roberts, Derrell. "Joseph E. Brown and the University of Georgia." *The Georgia Review* 19, no. 2 (1965): 239–50.

Roland, Charles P. "The Ever-Vanishing South." *The Journal of Southern History* 48, no. 1 (1982): 3–20.

Rones, Philip L. "Analysis of Regional Employment Growth, 1973-1985." *Monthly Labor Review* (July 1986): 3-14.

Schaffer, William A., and W. Carl Biven. "The Impact of Georgia Tech: Money, People, Ideas." *Applications* (1978).

Snow, Whitney Adrienne. "Cotton Mill City: The Huntsville Textile Industry, 1880-1989," *The Alabama Review* 63, no. 4 (2010): 243-275.

Sokol, Jason. "A Documented Account of How White Students Reacted to the Racial Integration of the University of Georgia." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, no. 52 (2006): 60–68.

Stencel, Sandra. "The South: Continuity and Change." In *Editorial Research Reports 1980*, vol. 1. Washington, DC: CQ Press, 1980: 161-84.

Thurston, Robert H. "On the Necessity of a Mechanical Laboratory: Its Province and Its Methods," *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 100 (1875): 1409-18.

Townsend, Sara Bertha. "The Admission of Women to the University of Georgia." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1959): 156–69.

Visher, Stephen Sargent. "Scientists Starred 1903-1943 in "American Men of Science." *Nature,* 162, no. 595 (October 16, 1948), 274.

Willis, Pauline M. "Who Is a Southerner? It's Your Turn to Tell Us." *Southern Cultures* 11, no. 3 (2005): 1-2.

Woodward, C. Vann Woodward. “The Irony of Southern History.” *The Journal of Southern History* 19, no. 1 (1953): 3–19.

Woodward, C. Vann. “The Search for Southern Identity.” *The Virginia Quarterly Review* 34, no. 3 (1958): 321–38.