"FOR YOUR PROTECTION": A PROTECTIVE LEXICON, 1908–2025

VERSION 1.0 · 2026-06-11 · ALEX PEMBERTON
COMPANION TO "VENEERS OF HISTORY IN GREEN HILLS EAST", *NASHVILLE SCENE*

> FINDING
>
> From Nichols's 1908 Kansas City to the 1927 Green Hills ad ranking 'RESTRICTIONS — For Your Protection' above price, to the Banner's scare-quoted 1947 league, to the MHZC's 2025 'protective covenants': one word presents a restriction as a benefit — because the covenant binds every neighbor.

SUPPORTS IN THE ARTICLE

- *developers assured buyers that deed restrictions were protective rather than restrictive*
- *1927 'RESTRICTIONS—For Your Protection' to 1947 'Protect' to 2025 'protective covenants'*

ABSTRACT

One word, "protective," ran across more than a century of American real estate and did the same work each time: it sold a restriction on an owner's land as a benefit to him. A covenant runs with the land and binds every neighbor, and "protection" is the name for what it bars those neighbors from doing. The word split by audience — present where covenants were sold and later commemorated, absent where they were catalogued or adjudicated. The academic and judicial registers — survey scholarship, the Supreme Court's covenant cases, the Fisk study — stayed consistently with "restrictive." The marketing word of the 1920s is the preservation word of the 2020s, applied to the same instruments, with the racial clause now absent.

SOURCES

Primary documents

- J.C. Nichols Company outdoor advertising, Country Club District, Kansas City, c. 1908 ("1,000 Acres Restricted for Those Who Want Protection"), reproduced via the State Historical Society of Missouri / *The Pendergast Years* (Kansas City Public Library). The national template for restriction-as-amenity.
- *Nashville Tennessean*, April 6, 1927, p. 3, Green Hills display advertisement ("NEVER AGAIN … RESTRICTIONS — For Your Protection"), placed by all four of Calhoun's authorized realtors. ProQuest doc. 1898671154.
- *Nashville Tennessean*, January 23, 1927, p. 9, Benz Realty Co. classified ("in a restricted location, where you have protection from inferior and poorly built homes"). ProQuest doc. 1898671700.

- Davidson County Deed Book 770, pp. 40–42 (Green Hills Plat 1 covenants, 1927). The recorded instrument: numbered restrictions, no "protective" adjective, racial bar as Covenant 4.
- Davidson County Deed Book 1163, pp. 372–374 (J.P. Ellis Glencliff Subdivision, recorded June 25, 1941) — the earliest Davidson County recorded covenant instrument known to use "Protective Covenants" as its operating noun, beneath a section still headed "RESTRICTIONS."
- *Nashville Banner*, July 2, 1947, p. 6, "Property Owners Form League To 'Protect' Area." Newspapers.com image 603047929.
- *Nashville Banner*, July 17, 1947, p. 6, "Segregation Hit, at Fisk Race Institute" (Charles Hamilton Houston on "those who favor restrictive covenants as *protectors* of residential segregation"). Newspapers.com image 603048165.
- Federal Housing Administration, *Underwriting Manual* (1938 ed.), paragraph 934, pairing "deed restrictions" with "protection from adverse influences." HUDuser portal.
- Metro Historic Zoning Commission, *NCZO Turn-of-the-Century Part II* design-guideline narrative (Richland-West End / Belle Meade Links), "protective covenants."

FINDINGS

ONE WORD DID THE SAME LEGAL WORK AND SPLIT BY AUDIENCE

A clause barring sale to "persons of African blood or descent" operates the same way whether the covenant that carries it is called "restrictive" or "protective." The difference is rhetorical, and it tracked the audience. "Protective" appeared where the covenants were sold: developer advertising, federal underwriting policy, and, later, preservation narrative. "Restrictive" appeared where they were catalogued, adjudicated, or attacked. Helen Monchow's 1928 survey for the Institute for Research in Land Economics, the period's foundational academic treatment, used "deed restriction" 125 times, "restrictive covenant" 19 times, and "protective covenant" not at all. The Supreme Court's covenant cases used "racial restrictive covenants," and the Fisk study that became the national rebuttal used "restrictive covenant" throughout, treating "protection" as the apologists' word.[1] No corpus-linguistic study has measured "protective covenant" against "restrictive covenant" across the period; the Monchow count is the closest approximation, and it covers a single text. The home buyer got "protection"; the judge and the scholar got "restriction."

THE PHRASE HAD A NATIONAL TEMPLATE AND A THIN LOCAL ANTECEDENT

The national template is Kansas City. J.C. Nichols assembled his thousand-acre Country Club District by about 1908, advertised "1,000 Acres Restricted for Those Who Want Protection," and made restriction-as-amenity the model the national industry copied (see Selling the Restricted Suburb: How Green Hills Was Marketed). The local Nashville antecedent is thinner. Property-owner-association organizing in the 1910s carried "protect the neighborhood" language into

Nashville civic practice a generation before the 1947 league, but the specific associations, their dates, and their protective wording rest on no primary source consulted here; the earliest firmly documented Nashville node remains the 1927 Green Hills marketing.

THE 1927 GREEN HILLS ADVERTISEMENT RANKED RESTRICTION ABOVE PRICE

When Calhoun's four authorized realtors took the Sunday display ad in the *Tennessean* on April 6, 1927, they reduced the subdivision to four selling points: "LOCATION — The Best; **RESTRICTIONS — For Your Protection**; PRICE — Assures Unequaled Value; TERMS — To Suit You." Restriction stood second of the four, in display type, ranked above price. "Restrictions" named the bundle recorded at Book 770: setbacks, a cost floor, a livestock ban, and Covenant 4, the bar on occupancy by "persons of African blood or descent … except in the capacity of servants." "For Your Protection" named what the buyer was told he received. The ad gives the restrictions a purpose and a beneficiary and leaves the recorded deed to carry the rest (the marketing lineage is set out in Selling the Restricted Suburb: How Green Hills Was Marketed). Three months earlier, the same Benz Realty Co. — one of the four signatories — had run a classified promising a home "in a restricted location, where you have protection from inferior and poorly built homes."

THE RECORDED DEEDS KEPT THE WORD "RESTRICTIONS"

The 1927 Green Hills instruments do not call themselves "protective." They open "It is expressly covenanted and agreed by and between the parties hereto that," number the covenants first through fifth, and place the racial bar at Item 4, between architectural restrictions, with no softening adjective (see Racial Covenants and Shelley v. Kraemer). The "protective" framing stayed in the sales copy and, later, in the historical narrative; the operative legal text kept to "Restrictions." The earliest Davidson County recorded covenant instrument known to adopt "Protective Covenants" as its own operating noun is the J.P. Ellis Glencliff Subdivision deed of June 1941 (Book 1163, pp. 372–374), which sets the phrase beneath a section still headed "RESTRICTIONS" and whose Clause 5 bars occupancy by "any race other than the Caucasian race" except domestic servants — the NAREB/FHA template language. That first use is a corpus lower bound from a Davidson County OCR audit, not an exhaustive scan, and an earlier deed carrying the word may yet surface. The softened noun reached local deed practice fourteen years after the same template's marketing language ran in *Tennessean* real-estate copy.

FEDERAL UNDERWRITING POLICY SET THE INSTRUMENT BESIDE ITS RATIONALE

The FHA *Underwriting Manual* of 1938 set the legal instrument beside the reason for it: "Deed restrictions are apt to prove more effective than a zoning ordinance in providing protection from adverse influences," where "adverse influences" was the agency's standard term for non-white prospective neighbors. The federal government took up the developers' rationale and backed it

with mortgage capital. The Glencliff deed's Caucasian-race clause and twenty-five-year auto-renewing term are that federal template recorded in a Nashville deed book. By 1941 the "protective" usage had three channels behind it: developer marketing, NAREB's trade culture, and FHA underwriting policy.

IN 1947 THE *BANNER* SET THE WORD IN SCARE QUOTES

On the evening of July 1, 1947, four hundred residents of the Granny White, Belmont, and Green Hills sections formed a civic league in the auditorium of David Lipscomb College, with a standing committee "to keep abreast with zoning regulations." The *Banner* reported it the next afternoon under the headline "Property Owners Form League To 'Protect' Area" — "Protect" in the paper's own scare quotes (see The 1947 Property Owners' Protective League). The *Banner* was Nashville's conservative afternoon daily and no critic of residential exclusion; that its editors flagged "protect" indicates they read the term as the league's framing and would not adopt it in the paper's own voice. The league formed eight days after the Supreme Court agreed to hear *Shelley v. Kraemer* and ten months before the decision, while the Green Hills Plat 1 racial covenant still had twelve years to run, and its zoning committee marks the point at which the same white property-owner network began assembling the successor instrument before the old one fell. Fifteen days later, on the same page 6 of the same paper, the *Banner* reported NAACP counsel Charles Hamilton Houston at Fisk naming "those who favor restrictive covenants as *protectors* of residential segregation." The defenders' word and Houston's diagnosis of it ran in the same newspaper section within a fortnight.

THE SUBSTITUTION HAS A NAME IN THE SCHOLARSHIP

Karen Benjamin's 2025 study is the closest published statement of the swap as a deliberate strategy: "advertisements assured buyers that deed restrictions were *protective* rather than *restrictive*. During the 1920s, advocates of zoning would embrace similar language."[2] For Benjamin the word is the softening term, used wherever the selling called for a gentler one, and it reaches well beyond race. The literature will not bear the stricter claim that "protective" attached preferentially to racial covenants over non-racial ones; the defensible version is Benjamin's, that "protective" softened the whole exclusionary bundle and did its heaviest work over race because race was the bundle's most charged element. The same argument runs through earlier documentary work on six decades of suburban restriction, where the limits on a lot were sold as a guard against unwanted change,[3] and through an account of how the vocabulary of property — values, character, protection — became the carrier of race once explicit racial language grew legally vulnerable.[4] The Southern judicial pedigree runs back to Richmond, which enacted a racial-zoning ordinance in 1911: the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals upheld it in *Hopkins v. City of Richmond* on the rationale that the ordinance was meant "to protect each race from harm from

the other," two years before *Buchanan v. Warley* moved racial exclusion from public ordinance into private covenant.[5]

IN 2025 THE PRESERVATION NARRATIVE CARRIES THE MARKETING WORD, THE RACIAL CONTENT GONE

The Metro Historic Zoning Commission's *Turn-of-the-Century Part II* design-guideline narrative describes turn-of-the-century Richland-West End deeds as "protective covenants" that precluded "stores, factories, saloons or asylums" and set cost floors and livestock bans, while the same document calls the comparable Belle Meade Links deeds "restrictive covenants." It applies the two terms to different instruments by editorial choice. The originating Richland-West End instruments reachable through the Davidson County chain of title call themselves "Restrictions"; four of the five carry numbered clauses barring sale or occupancy by persons "of African blood or descent." The narrative lists the use, cost, and livestock clauses of those same numbered sets and stops short of the racial ones (the pattern is the subject of Whitewashing the History: The Short History Critique). The marketing word arrives in the preservation document doing the same softening, without the part that became unsayable after *Shelley* in 1948. What the recorded 1927 deed set down as Item 4, the 2025 narrative does not name at all.

THE REFRAMING IS IDENTICAL AT EVERY NODE

Across the nodes — Nichols's billboard, the Green Hills display ad, the Glencliff deed header, the federal manual, the league the *Banner* scare-quoted, the MHZC narrative — the operation does not change. A restriction on the owner's own land is presented to him as a benefit, because the covenant that binds him binds everyone around him, and "protection" names what his neighbors are barred from doing.[6] The word asks the buyer to read a limit on his own property as a guarantee about his neighbors', which is what a covenant running with the land delivers. It sold the covenants in the 1920s, justified their defense in the 1940s, and frames their preservation in the 2020s. The audience for the 1920s sales pitch and the audience for the 2020s overlay narrative is largely one — established-neighborhood homeowners protecting stability and value — and the word persists in part because the audience persists. None of this establishes that the commission's drafters reached for "protective covenants" with the 1927 advertisement or the 1947 league in conscious view; the record shows that the word and its softening function are the same across the span. It outlasted the covenants, the lawsuits, and the law that struck them down, and it still does the same work, now with the racial clause removed.

NOTES

1. Herman H. Long and Charles S. Johnson, *People vs. Property: Race Restrictive Covenants in Housing* (Nashville: Fisk University Press, 1947). See Racial Covenants and Shelley v. Kraemer. ↩
2. Karen Benjamin, *Good Parents, Better Homes, and Great Schools: Selling Segregation Before the New Deal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2025), 234. ↩

3. Robert M. Fogelson, *Bourgeois Nightmares: Suburbia, 1870–1930* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), tracing six decades of subdivision restriction sold to buyers as a guard against unwanted change. ↩
4. David M.P. Freund, *Colored Property: State Policy and White Racial Politics in Suburban America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), on the postwar shift to the language of markets, property, and character as explicit racial appeals grew legally and reputationally costly. ↩
5. The rationale belongs to the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals in *Hopkins v. City of Richmond*, 117 Va. 692 (1915), upholding the racial-zoning ordinance Richmond enacted in 1911; the line of cases is synthesized in Christopher Silver, "The Racial Origins of Zoning in American Cities," in *Urban Planning and the African-American Community: In the Shadows*, ed. June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1997). ↩
6. Richard R. W. Brooks and Carol M. Rose, *Saving the Neighborhood: Racially Restrictive Covenants, Law, and Social Norms* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), on the developers, brokers, and lenders who promoted racial covenants as guarantors of value and stability, recasting exclusion in neutral terms. ↩

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benjamin, Karen. *Good Parents, Better Homes, and Great Schools: Selling Segregation Before the New Deal*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2025.

Brooks, Richard R. W., and Carol M. Rose. *Saving the Neighborhood: Racially Restrictive Covenants, Law, and Social Norms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Buchanan v. Warley, 245 U.S. 60 (1917).

Davidson County Register of Deeds. Deed Book 770, pp. 40–42 (Green Hills Plat 1 covenants, 1927); Deed Book 1163, pp. 372–374 (J.P. Ellis Glencliff Subdivision, 1941).

Federal Housing Administration. *Underwriting Manual*. Washington, D.C.: FHA, 1938.

Fogelson, Robert M. *Bourgeois Nightmares: Suburbia, 1870–1930*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Freund, David M.P. *Colored Property: State Policy and White Racial Politics in Suburban America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Hopkins v. City of Richmond, 117 Va. 692, 86 S.E. 139 (1915).

Long, Herman H., and Charles S. Johnson. *People vs. Property: Race Restrictive Covenants in Housing*. Nashville: Fisk University Press, 1947.

Monchow, Helen C. *The Use of Deed Restrictions in Subdivision Development*. Chicago: Institute for Research in Land Economics, 1928.

Nashville Banner. "Property Owners Form League To 'Protect' Area." July 2, 1947, p. 6. Newspapers.com image 603047929.

Nashville Banner. "Segregation Hit, at Fisk Race Institute." July 17, 1947, p. 6. Newspapers.com image 603048165.

Nashville Tennessean. Benz Realty Co. classified advertisement, "A Home for the Discriminating." January 23, 1927, p. 9. ProQuest doc. 1898671700.

Nashville Tennessean. Green Hills display advertisement, "Never Again … Restrictions — For Your Protection." April 6, 1927, p. 3. ProQuest doc. 1898671154.

Silver, Christopher. "The Racial Origins of Zoning in American Cities." In *Urban Planning and the African-American Community: In the Shadows*, edited by June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1997.

Stevens, Sara. "J.C. Nichols and the Country Club District: Suburban Aesthetics and Property Values." *The Pendergast Years*. Kansas City Public Library. Accessed May 29, 2026.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Pemberton, Alex. ""For Your Protection": A Protective Lexicon, 1908–2025." Research Brief I1, *Veneers of History in Green Hills East*. alexaustinpemberton.com/journalism/veneers-of-history/#protective-lexicon-through-line. Accessed [date].