CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Fourth Annual Education Conference
on
Problems of Segregation and Desegregation
of Public Schools

May 3, 1962, Morning Session
May 3, 1962, Afternoon Session
May 4, 1962, Morning Session
May 4, 1962, Afternoon Session

WASHINGTON, D.C.

CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Fourth Annual Education Conference
on
Problems of Segregation and Desegregation
of Public Schools

May 3, 1962, Morning Session
May 3, 1962, Afternoon Session
May 4, 1962, Morning Session
May 4, 1962, Afternoon Session

WASHINGTON, D.C.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

JOHN A. HANNAH, *Chairman*
ROBERT G. STOREY, *Vice Chairman*
ERWIN N. GRISWOLD
THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.
ROBERT S. RANKIN
SPOTTSWOOD W. ROBINSON III

STAFF DIRECTOR, *Berl I. Bernhard*

CONTENTS

Sessions:	Page
May 3, 1962, morning session	1
May 3, 1962, afternoon session	47
May 4, 1962, morning session	113
May 4, 1962, afternoon session	157
Call to order; greetings and introduction of Commissioners and Staff Director; opening statement by Chairman John A. Hannah	1
Address by Hon. Sterling M. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education, "The Interest of the United States Office of Education in Desegregation of Public Schools"	4
Message from the President of the United States	8
Greetings by Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States	9
Introduction of special guests, staff members present, and explanation of procedure by Staff Director, Berl I. Bernhard	11
Address by Dr. John H. Fischer, dean, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, "Educational Problems of Segregation and Desegregation of Public Schools"	13
Comments from the Northern Viewpoint, by Dr. Houston R. Jackson, assistant superintendent, Staff Services, Baltimore Public Schools, Baltimore, Md	21
Comments from the Southern Viewpoint, by Dr. J. B. White, dean, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla	26
Questions and general discussion	32
Panel, "Factors To Be Considered in Planning Desegregation"	65
Statement of Dr. Ewald B. Nyquist, Deputy Commissioner of Education for the State of New York, Albany, N.Y	65
Statement of Dr. Horace Mann Bond, chairman, Department of Education, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga	73
Statement of Dr. Richard M. Peters, member, Chapel Hill Board of Education, Chapel Hill, N.C	80
Statement of Dr. Oscar M. Chute, superintendent, Evanston Public Schools, Evanston, Ill	87
Questions and general discussion	89
Panel, "Preparation for Desegregation"	136
Statement of Dr. Dan Dodson, director, Center of Human Relations and Community Studies, New York University, New York, N.Y	137
Statement of Mr. Sam R. Bloom, member, Dallas Citizens Council, Dallas, Tex	141
Statement of Dr. John W. Letson, superintendent, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Ga	148
Statement of Dr. Benjamin E. Carmichael, superintendent, Chattanooga City Schools, Chattanooga, Tenn	157
Questions and general discussion	164
Summary of Principal Unsolved Problems, by Chairman John A. Hannah	191

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Mrs. Margaret Anderson
Teacher
Clinton High School
Clinton, Tenn.

Mr. Myron L. Ashmore
Superintendent
Board of Public Instruction
Broward County
Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Dr. A. D. Beittel
President
Tougaloo Southern Christian College
Tougaloo, Miss.

Mr. Selmer H. Berg
Superintendent
Oakland Public Schools
Oakland, Calif.

Mr. A. H. Blakenship
Superintendent of Schools
City of Gary
Gary, Ind.

Mr. Albert P. Blaustein
Commission Contract Research
Attorney
Camden, N.J.

Mr. Sam R. Bloom
Member
Dallas Citizens Council
Dallas, Tex.

Dr. Horace Mann Bond
Chairman
Department of Education
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. A. Burrell
Professor of Education
New York State University at Buffalo
Buffalo, N.Y.

Mr. Ernest Campbell
Superintendent
Seattle Public Schools
Seattle, Wash.

Dr. Benjamin E. Carmichael
Superintendent
Chattanooga City Schools
Chattanooga, Tenn.

Mrs. Erma Chapman
Member
School Committee on Human
Relations
District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

Dr. LeRoy M. Christophe
Principal
Howard High School
Wilmington, Del.

Dr. Oscar M. Chute
Superintendent
Evanston Public Schools
Evanston, Ill.

Mr. Wylie H. Davis
Commission Contract Research
Attorney
Urbana, Ill.

Mr. Richard Day
Commission Contract Research
Attorney
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Mr. Aaron Dines
Legal Counsel
Morristown Board of Education
Morristown, N.J.

Dr. Norman Drachler
Assistant Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Mich.

Dr. Samuel E. Duncan
President
Livingstone College
Salisbury, N.C.

Dr. John H. Fischer
Dean
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, N.Y.

Mr. G. W. Foster, Jr.
Consultant
Commission on Civil Rights
Madison, Wis.

Mr. W. P. Galbreath
Chairman
Memphis Board of Education
Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. Frederick T. Gillis
Superintendent
Boston Public Schools
Boston, Mass.

Dr. Jean D. Grambs
Associate Professor of Education
University of Maryland
College Park, Md.

Dr. William H. Gray
Education Specialist
State Department of Public Instruction
Harrisburg, Pa.

Dr. W. P. Griffin
Superintendent
Asheville Public Schools
Asheville, N.C.

Dr. William H. Hale
President
Langston University
Langston, Okla.

Dr. Robert Havighurst
Professor of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Thomas H. Henderson
President
Virginia Union University
Richmond, Va.

Dr. Robert Hopper
Dean
Department of Education
University of Alabama
University, Ala.

Mr. James Hurt, Jr.
Member
Board of Education
St. Louis Public Schools
St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. Evan W. Ingram
Associate Superintendent
Pittsburgh Public Schools
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Dr. Houston R. Jackson
Assistant Superintendent, Staff Services
Baltimore Public Schools
Baltimore, Md.

Dr. Theron Johnson
Director
Intercultural Relations
New York State Department of Education
Albany, N.Y.

Mr. John Kaplan
Commission Contract Research Attorney
White Plains, N.Y.

Mr. Lawrence W. Knowles
Commission Contract Research Attorney
Louisville, Ky.

Judge Mary C. Kohler
Member
President's Committee on Youth Employment
New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Elizabeth D. Koontz
Secretary
Classroom Teachers
National Education Association
Salisbury, N.C.

Dr. John W. Letson
Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. Harold I. Lief
Member
Louisiana State Advisory Committee
New Orleans, La.

Dr. Barbara Mason
Principal
Roosevelt School
New Rochelle, N.Y.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays
President
Morehouse College
Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Robert C. Miles
Principal
Hartford Public Schools
Hartford, Conn.

Dr. Carroll Miller
Chairman
Department of Education
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Dr. George R. Miller, Jr.
State Superintendent of Schools,
Delaware
Dover, Del.

Dr. W. C. McClurkin
Director
Division of Surveys and Services
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. Vernon McDaniel
Executive Secretary
Teachers State Association of Texas
Austin, Tex.

Hon. Sterling M. McMurrin
U.S. Commissioner of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Richard J. Nelson
Member
Illinois State Board of Higher
Education
Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Roy Nichols
Member
Berkeley Board of Education
Berkeley, Calif.

Dr. Jeanne L. Noble
Assistant Professor of Education
New York University
New York, N.Y.

Dr. Ewald B. Nyquist
Deputy State Commissioner of
Education, New York
Albany, N.Y.

Mr. William Henry Oliver
Superintendent
City Public Schools
Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Richard M. Peters
Member
Chapel Hill Board of Education
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Dr. A. Craig Phillips
Superintendent
Winston-Salem Public Schools
Winston-Salem, N.C.

Dr. J. Rupert Picott
President
Virginia State Teachers Association
Richmond, Va.

Mr. Richard Plaut
National Scholarship Service and
Fund for Negro Students
New York, N.Y.

Mr. Woodford R. Porter
Chairman
Louisville Board of Education
Louisville, Ky.

Mr. Richard Renfield
Project Secretary
Educational Policies Commission
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Mr. James W. Rice
Director
Pupil Welfare and Attendance
Department
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Fla.

Mr. Wilson C. Riles
Consultant
California State Department of
Education
Sacramento, Calif.

Dr. Carl L. Robinson
Acting Superintendent
Highland Park Public Schools
Highland Park, Mich.

Dr. Remus G. Robinson
Member
Detroit Board of Education
Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Merryle S. Rukeyser
President
New Rochelle Board of Education
New Rochelle, N.Y.

Dr. Daniel Schreiber
Director
School Dropouts Project
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Herbert Schueler
Director
Teacher Education
Hunter College
New York, N.Y.

Mr. Oscar E. Shabat
Department of Education
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Theodore H. Shepard
President
Orleans Parish School Board
New Orleans, La.

Miss Esma Shield
Supervisor
Elementary Education
Fairfax County Schools
Fairfax, Va.

Mr. A. Maceo Smith
Zone Intergroup Relations Advisor
Federal Housing Administration
Dallas, Tex.

Mr. Charles U. Smith
Head
Department of Sociology
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
Tallahassee, Fla.

Dr. Rual Stephens
Deputy Superintendent
Atlanta Public Schools
Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. George E. Theobald
Assistant Superintendent
Cleveland Public Schools
Cleveland, Ohio

Dr. Charles H. Thompson
Dean
Graduate School
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Daniel Thompson
Chairman
Social Science Division
Dillard University
New Orleans, La.

Mr. Everett Tucker, Jr.
President
Little Rock Board of Education
Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. Loren Vaughn, Jr.
Superintendent
Phoenix School District No. 1
Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Harold S. Vincent
Superintendent
Milwaukee Public Schools
Milwaukee, Wis.

Dr. J. B. White
Dean
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Fla.

Mr. Frederick H. Williams
Director
Human Relations
New York Public Schools
New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Mary M. Wilson
Member and Secretary
State Board of Education, New Mexico
Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Mr. Eugene G. Wyatt
Commission Contract Research Attorney
Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. David Zimmerman
Deputy State Superintendent of Schools, Maryland
Baltimore, Md.

NOTE.—An index, referring to page of the transcript on which a question or comment by the Commissioners, participants, and staff are found, begins at page 199.

CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Fourth Annual Education Conference
on
Problems of Segregation and Desegregation
of Public Schools

WASHINGTON, D.C.

May 3, 1962, Morning Session

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION, MAY 3, 1962

The Commission met in the Main Conference Room, Department of State Building, Washington, D.C., at 9:10 a.m., Thursday, May 3, 1962, Dr. John A. Hannah, Chairman of the Commission, presiding.

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, because we have a full schedule for each of these four sessions—this morning, this afternoon, tomorrow morning, and tomorrow afternoon—it is necessary for us to begin at this time, and to conclude the session on time, if we are going to meet our schedule.

It is a pleasure, of course, to welcome you here. There is a little confusion about getting our participants registered and in their seats, but that will work out.

This is the fourth annual education conference conducted by this Commission. The first was held in Nashville, the second in Gatlinburg, the third in Williamsburg, and this fourth one is in Washington.

I should like to present the members of the Commission on Civil Rights. To my immediate right is Dean Storey—Robert Storey—former president of the American Bar Association and for a long time dean of the Law School of Southern Methodist University. On his right is Father Theodore Hesburgh, the president of the University of Notre Dame. Dr. Robert Rankin, head of the Political Science Department of Duke University. Dean Erwin N. Griswold is dean of the Law School of Harvard University. Dean Spottswood Robinson, dean of the Law School at Howard University. On my left is Mr. Bernhard, who will be introduced formally later. He is the Staff Director of the Civil Rights Commission. Mrs. Elizabeth Cole, the member of the staff in charge of this conference. We will hear more from her later.

In opening the Commission's fourth annual education conference, it seems appropriate to state the objectives of the conference and its role in the Commission's continuing study of equal protection of the laws in public education.

First, a word about the Commission itself. The Commission was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as an independent fact-

finding agency for a term of 2 years. The Congress specifically directed it to investigate sworn complaints of the denial of the right to vote by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin. Additionally, it directed the Commission to study and collect information concerning denials of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution and to appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government concerning equal protection. Its fourth and final duty was to report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress.

Congress has extended the life of the Commission twice, both times for 2-year terms, without changing its duties in any way. By the terms of the last extension, a final report of the Commission's activities is due in September 1963.

From the beginning, public education has been a major field of Commission study. If its recommendations to the President and the Congress are to be constructive, the Commission must be aware of the educational and administrative problems arising from racial segregation in and desegregation of public schools. Also, it needs to know about programs and practices that are being tried out in various places throughout the country to meet these difficulties.

These educational conferences have served a broad, factfinding purpose. All of the educational leaders here today have been directly involved with problems of segregation and desegregation in their own school systems, or are persons who, in their professional studies and activities, have been concerned with one or more aspects of such problems. The Commission's primary purpose in holding this conference is to ask you to share your personal, specialized knowledge and experience with us.

I am told that many of you, in accepting the Commission's invitation, expressed the hope that you would learn here the answers to some of your own problems. We share your hope. That would be a happy byproduct of the conference, although necessarily a secondary consideration.

The Commission's position on the dual question of the realization of constitutional rights in this area, and improvement of public education in the national interest, is important to you as educators. In its first report to the President and the Congress in September 1959, the Commission stated that the vindication of the constitutional right to be admitted to public schools without regard to race must be achieved without impairing the educational standards of our schools. Indeed, that equal educational opportunity for all must be attained without impeding the continuing process of improving the quality of the programs offered.

This is still the Commission's view. We applaud the statement of the three-judge Federal court that "This is not the moment in history for a State to experiment with ignorance." It *is* the time to experiment with ways to produce scholastic excellence in our schools and to try to raise the educational sights of American youth of all races, creeds, and national origins. Some of you can, and we hope will, tell us about experiments to this end.

This conference departs from the pattern of previous conferences where, for the most part, school administrators from Southern States where racial segregation existed in 1954 by compulsion or permission of State law, told of their personal experience in desegregating their school systems. The court decisions in the *New Rochelle* case, and developments in other northern communities since those decisions, have awakened interest in what has been called "segregation, northern style." This conference has been expanded, therefore, to include representation from local school districts and State departments of education in Northern and Western as well as Southern States, particularly from cities and States with a large minority-group population.

The number of participants here today precludes hearing detailed statements by each of you. We hope, however, that all of you will have an opportunity to give us the benefit of your views and pertinent experience during the general discussion periods which will follow the panel presentations.

The first speaker on the program this morning is the man in the present administration most immediately concerned with problems of equal protection of the laws in public education, particularly as they may relate to Federal programs and Federal grants-in-aid, Hon. Sterling M. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education. Dr. McMurrin, who took office only a little more than 1 year ago, has already initiated action on some of the Commission's recommendations in its "Higher Education" report and on others made in its biennial report on public schools published in September 1961. The implementation of additional recommendations appropriate for executive action is being studied. This interest of the Office of Education in equal educational opportunities for all American children is most heartening to the Commission.

Dr. McMurrin's subject today is "The Interest of the United States Office of Education in the Desegregation of Schools." The record under his leadership proves that interest to be more than academic. His message, therefore, is of great interest to us all.

It is a privilege to present Hon. Sterling M. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

STATEMENT OF HON. STERLING M. McMURRIN, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Mr. McMURRIN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege for me to appear before the fourth annual conference of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to discuss the interest of the Office of Education in school desegregation. There is no more important topic on the national educational agenda, and certainly none that is more basic to the achievement of justice in our social system.

The U.S. Office of Education has a large interest in the subject of this conference. The Office of Education is directed, in the words of its enabling act, "to promote the cause of education." As the chief education agency of the Federal Government, it is properly concerned with the education of all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin.

The Office of Education has been entrusted with the administration of programs of financial assistance designed to improve the quality of education throughout the Nation. Within the framework set by the Congress for each of these programs, it is the responsibility of the Office to make certain that every American child may benefit from the improved education made possible by these expenditures of public money.

Our interest in the problems of public school segregation and desegregation then is large, and it is divided into two separate, though related, parts; first, that which is embraced by our concern with broad educational issues, and second, that which is more narrowly focused in the administration of specific programs of educational assistance. I would like to comment on each of these separately for they present somewhat different problems.

The Office of Education has, in the nearly 100 years since its founding, collected statistics, conducted and stimulated research, and provided consulting service on a wide range of educational matters. As might be expected over a 100-year period, it has done some things of genuine significance, others of less importance. Until the 1950's the Office was concerned with the problems of the education of Negroes to the extent of collecting and publishing certain educational statistics by race, and of conducting, periodically, specialized studies on Negro education. At about the time of the 1954 Supreme Court decision, both of these activities stopped in response to widespread public opinion that to treat the education of Negroes as a separate matter was in itself discriminatory. Whether that belief and the response to it were justified is no longer of any importance. What is important is that, since 1954, the public schools of the Nation have been undergoing a transition of major proportions.

In the South that transition has been the slow process of eliminating racially separate schools and accommodating Negro and white children in schools together. In the North, the counterpart to this has been the coming to grips with the large influx of people into the great cities, many of them Negroes from deprived economic and cultural backgrounds, with the attendant economic, social, and academic strains thereby placed on the public schools.

It is safe to say that no task relating to education is of greater importance than the successful completion of this transition. On it depend in part the strength of our economy, the quality of our urban life, the image of this country before the rest of the world, and the fulfillment of our national social ideals.

We are no more inclined to close our eyes to this issue than to ignore the many needs of the schools in the areas of teacher quality, curricular improvement, more and better research and development, and a host of others. In short, we consider the educational problems arising from school desegregation and racial strains, both North and South, to be worthy of our most serious attention.

It was against this background that, on March 30 of this year, I advised of our plans to begin in the Office of Education a clearinghouse on the educational problems of school desegregation. Through this clearinghouse we plan to make available to school officials and other interested citizens reliable information on educational practices used successfully by various school systems in confronting their problems. We hope, too, to stimulate significant research on the educational implications of desegregation, and we plan to make available to interested communities professional advice of the highest quality. We believe that in so doing we can help many communities to bring to bear on their problems the experience and wisdom of others who have confronted these same problems before, thereby facilitating the transition which must inevitably be made. Our course in this area is a natural one. It is an extension of the traditional work of the Office of Education to another major problem area in education.

In contrast, the issues involved in determining policy for the administration of congressionally authorized educational assistance programs are more complex.

The purposes of Federal programs aiding education are to broaden educational opportunity and to raise the quality of education for all children. These are urgent tasks, to which the President and this administration have given the highest priority. These purposes are frustrated when Negro children are excluded from benefits. They would be equally frustrated if white children were excluded because their State and local leaders, rightly or wrongly, decided that they were unable to participate in a Federal program for fear it would be used to accomplish desegregation.

I believe that sound public policy will recognize that two processes here are moving side by side. They are largely separate, but they are related and they reinforce one another. There is the process of school desegregation whose pace has been, and will continue to be, largely determined by decisions of the judiciary. There is also the process of improving educational quality and extending educational opportunity, whose pace is determined in part by legislative and executive policies at the Federal level. While the two are related, it would be a mistake to confuse them. The two processes can and must be concomitant. Winning integrated schools that are inadequate educationally would be a questionable victory; while improving the quality of the schools yet maintaining segregation is still a negation of some of the most profound values of a democratic society.

I am aware that there are other points of view on this matter. This Commission, for example, has recommended that Federal educational funds be withheld, in whole or in part, from schools practicing segregation. Quite apart from the question of whether administrative officials have the authority, in individual programs, to exercise that power, I would in some ways question the wisdom and effectiveness of such an approach. Each educational assistance program is designed to achieve a specific goal. These goals are important to the survival of the Nation and to the economic, social, and intellectual strength of our people. The programs, themselves, benefit citizens of both races.

Withholding needed educational assistance is at best a last resort. I believe that there are more effective ways of making progress—ways that are more direct and do not interfere with the vital task of improving the quality of education. I would cite the recent announcement that the Department of Justice is exploring the possibility of litigation to desegregate the so-called "impacted area" schools. I would cite, also, the bills now pending before the Congress which would directly require compliance with the Supreme Court decision. Both Secretary Ribicoff and I have indicated our agreement in principle with this proposed legislation. These remedies are both more direct and less disruptive of educational progress.

I believe that those who administer Federal programs in education have a serious responsibility. It is to administer their programs in such a way as to insure that all children benefit from them. We in the Office of Education have been keenly aware of this responsibility. We have undertaken a searching and continuing review of all of the programs which we administer and we have found in some of them an opportunity to extend their benefits more broadly than in the past. We believe that these changes will in all cases make these programs more effective instruments for the improvement of education—a test which we are prepared to use in evaluating all of our policies.

I can summarize these changes as follows:

1. The Commissioner of Education is responsible, under a special provision of Public Laws 815 and 874—the programs of aid to federally impacted areas—for determining that suitable free public education is available for the dependents of military or civilian personnel living on a military installation or other Federal property. Beginning in the fall of 1963, the earliest date at which the necessary arrangements can be made, segregated schools will no longer be deemed suitable and appropriate steps will be taken, where necessary, to provide suitable education for these children.

2. The National Defense Education Act authorizes the Commissioner to contract with selected institutions of higher education to conduct institutes for the improvement of high school language teachers and guidance counselors. Starting with the 1962–63 institutes, all participating institutions have agreed, by contract, to conduct the institutes on a nondiscriminatory basis. A full program of institutes has been aranged on that basis, including many at colleges and universities in the Southern States.

3. The recent report of the Civil Rights Commission brought to light evidence on various forms of discrimination practiced in libraries supported by funds from the Library Services Act of 1956. Shortly after the report appeared, we requested further information from the Commission and received copies of the questionnaires which had been sent to library directors. Because the Commission had promised confidentiality to those responding to their questionnaire, we were not able to relate discriminatory practices to individual libraries. The evidence was sufficient, however, to justify our undertaking a study of our own to determine whether the discrimination is of such a nature as to constitute a breach of the terms of the act. I have directed that such a study be undertaken, and preliminary arrangements for the study are now in process.

4. National attention has been directed recently to the pressing need for expanded and improved vocational education opportunities. Recognition of the need for trained technical manpower, the high level of unemployment among youth who leave school early, particularly minority-group youth, and other factors as well, have led to a reassessment of existing vocational education programs. Central to this reevaluation is our concern that minority groups that have in the past been denied training opportunities shall in the future have equal access to vocational education programs. As a part of its annual review of State vocational education programs supported with Federal funds, the Office of Education this year is inquiring for the first time into the availablity of courses of training in predominantly Negro and predominantly white schools, and we are taking steps to insure that

642146—62——2

all children have access to training in any trade offered by a school system.

5. Finally, the Office of Education has for some years provided staff services at the national level for youth groups in the fields of agriculture and homemaking. Specifically, these are the Future Farmers of America and its Negro counterpart in the Southern States, the New Farmers of America, and similarly the Future Homemakers of America and the New Homemakers of America. Steps are now being taken to bring the separate groups together into a single national organization in each field.

The actions that I have here described, Mr. Chairman, are limited. The limits are imposed in some cases by the language or intent of a statute, and in other by many years of administrative practice. Yet each of these actions is a step closer to the goal of equal educational opportunity. Each has been taken within the framework of the legislation passed by the Congress and without damage to the important educational objectives of the programs. Indeed, I am convinced that they will ultimately enhance the effectiveness of these programs. Our experience in the past year has reinforced my conviction that Federal programs in aid of education can, in fact, lead toward genuine equality of educational opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. McMurrin. We appreciate your being with us this morning. We know that you have many other responsibilities, but we hope that you will spend as much time with us as you can.

Mr. MCMURRIN. Thank you, sir.

Chairman HANNAH. I should next like to read a telegram that has just been received from the White House:

Dr. JOHN A. HANNAH,
Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights,
Washington, D.C.

Please extend to participants in the Commission's fourth annual conference on problems of segregation and desegregation of public schools my best wishes for a constructive session.

Compliance with the constitutional mandate for school desegregation has demanded the best efforts of many of the school boards, administrators, teachers, and community leaders represented at your conference. It is a tribute to their competence and dedication that in recent months a number of communities have begun a peaceful and orderly transition to school systems unmarred by racial discrimination.

But, if constitutional rights are to be vindicated and public education strengthened, the efforts of all those concerned—Government officials, educators, community leaders, and parents—must be redoubled. Your assemblage can make an important contribution to the bonds of communication and understanding which make such progress possible. I know of no greater challenge facing America today.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Chairman HANNAH. We had expected the Attorney General of the United States to appear briefly before us at this time. I think we

will just pause for a moment to ascertain if the Attorney General is about to be here. If so, it would be better to hear from him at this time. Then we will ask the members of the panel to proceed.

We will interrupt the proceedings at this point to introduce the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy, we are grateful to you for interrupting your busy schedule to be here with us, and we would be very interested in any comments you would like to make for us.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY (Attorney General of the United States). Thank you very much. I am delighted to be here and have an opportunity for a few moments to meet with you. I think that the effort that you are making, coming together like this and meeting with one another and exchanging views and ideas with the Commission, is most worthwhile.

I first want to thank the Commission, on behalf not only of the Department of Justice and myself but on behalf of the President, for the work that they have done, the effort that they have made, and the contributions that they have made, which have been most important, not only to the work that we have been doing over the period of the last 14 months but, I think, for a number of years. I think it has made a major difference and I want to express the gratitude of this administration, of the President and of all of us who have had any work to do in this field, or any responsibility in this field.

I have just returned from a trip around the world: to Japan, to Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, and then into Europe. Then I stopped off a short time in Pakistan, India, and a number of other countries in the Middle East. There was not one place that I visited—one country or city or community, or press conference that I had, or one meeting with student groups or labor leaders, or intellectuals or whatever it might be—where I was not asked about civil rights. I don't think that there is any question that this is the paramount issue in the minds of all of these people as far as the United States is concerned.

Carlos Romulo, just before he left Washington about 6 weeks ago, came to see me. He has always been a tremendous supporter of the United States, and as we were talking, he said—and I think it is absolutely correct from my own short trip—that unless we move ahead and move ahead in major steps in the field of civil rights, we are not going to be able to assume, and take, and continue the leadership of the free world, because we cannot go around the world to the peoples of other countries and say that we believe in the Declaration of Independence, that we believe in the Constitution of the United States, and yet treat people here, in this country, as inferiors; or assume that one race is superior to another.

This is the major matter that is troubling all the people of the world: what we are going to do in this field. I explained the steps that had been taken and the efforts that were being made by the American people, and by the Government, to try to move ahead in this field, but more is required; more is necessary over the period of the next 10 years. So that is why I think this conference is so important.

I don't think that we should be doing this just to assume the leadership in the rest of the world in the struggles that we are having with communism, but should do it because it is right, do it because this means that we are living up to our ideals.

In that connection, I want to congratulate those communities which have taken steps forward under very difficult circumstances and I think—I cannot name them all—of, for instance, Atlanta, Ga., Memphis, Tenn., Dallas, Tex., some communities in Florida; the efforts that were made in Little Rock this last year; and a number of other communities. More obviously needs to be done in other areas of the country. This is not just focused on the southern part of the United States. Many problems, as we have found, exist in northern communities. Sometimes it is far more subtle than it is in some of our southern communities, but it is often, in our judgment, more sinister.

So I hope that not only will the attention be focused on those southern communities where the segregation is more obvious, and the problems in schools more obvious, but also on some of our northern communities where this problem exists but is not as much in the public attention.

I think that one of our greatest problems still existing is the situation in Prince Edward County, where we still have some 600 young Negro children who have not gone to school for the last 3 years. I would hope that the local authorities—as the local authorities have done in these other communities under difficult circumstances and have moved the situation ahead—that also the local authorities in the State of Virginia, and in that county, would take the initiative and bring some action forward to open the schools to all the children on a desegregated basis in Prince Edward County.

Finally, I want to repeat my thanks to the Commission and to all of you for meeting here today; to assure you that this is a matter that is of great concern to this administration; that it will continue to be a matter of concern as long as the situation exists in the United States as it exists today. We feel that we have made progress over the period of the last year, but we feel that we have a tremendous way to go. We are going to continue to make the effort, and we feel that in this we have the support of the vast majority of the American people.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much for those heartening remarks. We are very grateful to you for coming here this morning. We would appreciate it also if you would express to the President our gratitude for the telegram which was received from him and read just prior to your arrival this morning. The Commission has, at times in recent years, become discouraged, but we are much encouraged by the comments that you have made and the efforts that you and others in the administration are making to help us solve this problem. Thank you very much.

I should next like to introduce Mr. Berl I. Bernhard, Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He will make some introductions, and comment with reference to this conference.

Mr. BERNHARD. First, I would like to introduce the representatives of certain other agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Mr. Burke Marshall, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, had to leave with the Attorney General but he will be back later. James M. Quigley, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. John Field, Executive Director, President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity—who apparently is not here yet. William C. Gausman, who is with the U.S. Information Agency. Carl Francis Miller, who is assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs. Robert M. Rosenzweig, who is here with Dr. McMurrin, and is Assistant to the Commissioner, Office of Education. Pedro Sanjuan, Assistant Chief of Protocol, State Department. Paul Siebeneicher, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I would like at this time to introduce certain members of the staff who have helped to make this conference possible.

On my immediate left, Mrs. Elizabeth Cole, Chief of the Public Education Section of the staff. I will introduce only those who are in the room: two attorneys are here—Mrs. Ruby L. Martin and Mrs. Jane M. Lucas.

Having introduced the members of the staff, I will take a few minutes to ask you to please note that the members of the staff are wearing white identification badges. If you have any questions to ask about procedure or substance of the conference, please locate these staff members with the white cards and ask whatever questions you have.

Very briefly, I would like to mention certain procedures that will be used throughout this conference. It will be as informal as we can make it and at the same time keep the proceedings orderly. After all of the speakers who are listed on the program under a particular subject have spoken, questions and discussion will then be in order.

The Commissioners themselves will open the questioning, followed by Mrs. Cole or by me. Thereafter anyone invited as a conference participant—those wearing the pink badges—may comment or ask a question, after being recognized by the Chairman, Dr. Hannah. To secure recognition, simply raise your hand. After recognition, we would appreciate it if you would identify yourself by name, for the benefit of all, particularly the reporter who has the responsibility of recording these proceedings accurately.

My other announcement has to do with the hours of the sessions, both today and tomorrow. We will recess for lunch at 11:45 a.m. instead of 12 noon as stated on the program, and reconvene at 1:30 p.m. instead of 2 p.m. for the afternoon session. The manager of the cafeteria in the building, where you will be having luncheon if you wish, requests that we get to the cafeteria before 12 noon.

There are present, and have been present, certain photographers and I would like to tell all the participants that if you have any objection to being photographed when you are asking questions or are just speaking here, please so state and your request will be honored. That is all I have to announce.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Mr. Bernhard. Now we will proceed with this morning's program.

I think it would be better if we asked all three participants in this morning's panel to take positions at the head table at this time—Dr. Fischer, Dr. Jackson, and Dr. White. As Mr. Bernhard has indicated, we will proceed with the three statements from our panel and then we will open the questioning of all three of them together, rather than individually.

The first subject for discussion by the conference, "Educational Problems of Segregation in and Desegregation of Public Schools," will be introduced by Dr. John H. Fischer, dean of Teachers College and its president-designate.

He has peculiar qualifications for this role. Dr. Fischer was born and educated in the border state of Maryland, although he received his doctoral degree from the institution he now heads. His professional career, prior to his present post, was within the Baltimore public schools. At the time of the complete desegregation of Baltimore schools in 1954, he was superintendent of public instruction.

Dr. Fischer tells us that Teachers College is deeply concerned with racial segregation in the schools of the North. Thus, his professional experience includes both southern- and northern-style school segregation and qualifies him admirably to speak as a national expert on "Educational Problems of Segregation in and Desegregation of Public Schools."

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. FISCHER, DEAN, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Dr. FISCHER. To say that the problems of race relations in the United States are complex hardly helps to clarify our situation, but unless the complexity of this matter is seen and taken constantly into account, no single step is likely to be very useful.

The problems of American education are no less complex. In a nation as diversified as ours, universal education can never be simple, and it is universal education, with emphasis on both adjective and noun, that we must now achieve. As the issues of race relations permeate almost every aspect of our life, so events in our schools are interlaced with virtually everything we do or hope to do. The difficulties of operating schools which can cope successfully and, as they must, simultaneously with both racial and educational issues are therefore among the most puzzling of all the problems facing the American people.

The other side of the coin, however, is that the benefits that can flow from the solution of these two problems will be of a magnitude comparable to the difficulties themselves.

Virtually all the purposes for which our schools are maintained may be grouped under two major classifications. First, the school is expected to give every student the opportunity and the means to develop to the full whatever individual potentiality he may have. One purpose of the school, to say it more briefly, is to help each student make the most of himself. The second purpose is related to the first but not entirely congruent with it. This is to induct the young person systematically into the culture and society to which he is an heir and in which he should be a partner. The school's success in respect to this purpose must be gaged not only by the competence of its graduates but by the quality of their sense of moral responsibility. By viewing what we do with any child, of any race, against these considerations, one personal, the other social, we should be able to reach reasonably sound conclusions about the effectiveness of our schools and the extent to which their performance approaches the ideals we project in our statements of philosophy.

Limitations of time make it impossible to include in this paper more than passing reference to the fact that the educational problems of desegregation and integration have important political, legal, and social aspects. I shall concentrate upon the more purely educational dimensions of the matter, which is to say its cultural and psychological aspects.

The temptation is always strong to say that the Negro child should be seen merely as any other child, respected as an individual, and provided with an educational program that will best meet his par-

ticular combination of needs. Of course the Negro child, like every other child, is entitled to be treated as an individual. Such treatment is the only sound basis for projecting his or any other child's education, but the easy generalization does not always come to grips with the whole truth. The American-Negro youngster happens to be a member of a large and distinctive group that for a very long time has been the object of special political, legal, and social action. This, I remind you, is not a question of what should be true, or might have been, but an undeniable and inescapable fact. To act as though any child is suddenly separable from his history in indefensible. In terms of educational planning, it is also irresponsible.

Every Negro child is the victim of the history of his race in this country. On the day he enters kindergarten, he carries a burden no white child can ever know, no matter what other handicaps or disabilities he may suffer. We are dealing here with no ordinary question of intercultural understanding, although admittedly cultural difference is a part of the difficulty. Nor are we concerned with only the usual range of psychoeducational problems, for the psychological situation of the Negro child is affected by quite special social considerations. I recognize the hazard in speaking of "the Negro child." It is equally unsatisfactory to speak of "the white child" or "the Puerto Rican child" or "the Spanish-American child" as though any child could be encompassed in a stereotype. Whatever a child's ethnic or racial background, he may be bright or slow, attractive or unpleasant; his parents may be rich or poor, well educated or illiterate, responsible or shiftless. Every racial group distributes itself in some fashion over the whole social and economic scale. But when all the variability is conceded, it cannot be denied that every American-Negro child must expect to encounter certain problems which none of our other children face in quite the same way.

Many of the recent efforts to integrate Negro pupils into the mainstream of American public education have been built on the assumption that the problems are essentially administrative, legal, or political. As a consequence, we have seen drives for what is called "open enrollment" and other schemes to bring about, usually through directive action, a desired combination of races in particular classrooms or schools. Having worked in school administration for some 27 years, I claim some knowledge of at least its limitations. Although, as you might suspect, I hold that administrative procedures and actions can be useful in education, I grow steadily more certain that no major problem of education—by which I mean really effective teaching and learning—has ever been solved solely, or even primarily, by legal or administrative action. To be sure, such action often lays the necessary groundwork and provides the setting in which good teachers may

carry on their work, but the critical point in any educational system is found ultimately in the relation between the teacher and the pupil.

What, then, can be done to produce the sort of pupil-teacher relationship that will contribute most to the tasks we are thinking of today?

For one thing, we must continue to recognize the element of cultural difference. As the Educational Policies Commission pointed out in a recent statement, a principal part of the difficulty of what the Commission calls the "disadvantaged American" is the fact that a substantial minority of Americans have grown up in cultures which are not compatible with much of modern life. This minority consists by no means only of Negroes, nor are all Negroes culturally disadvantaged. But vast numbers of them are, as a direct consequence of legal and social segregation. The situation is not new. The mountain whites and rural Negroes, among others, have lived in cultural isolation for a long time. Now, however, the negative influence of poor economic conditions in their former homes combined with the positive illusory attraction of the city have caused a vast and growing migration. The congregation of tens of thousands of these people in places for which their customary living patterns are ill adapted tragically dramatizes their cultural dislocation.

Many of the Negro children who now come to school are the victims of their parents' lack of knowledge and of schooling. The parents in turn are the victims of a situation over which they have had little or no control themselves. Parents and children alike elicit sympathy and attract charity, but praiseworthy as these responses may be, they form no adequate approach to the education of the disadvantaged urban child. The response of the community and the school must be based also on objective knowledge and mature understanding of the underlying difficulty and an inventive turn of mind among teachers and administrators. Teaching reading, for example, to a first-grade child who has never seen an adult read anything requires an approach quite different from one appropriate to a child in whose home books are as normal as food. Similarly, a child who has never known sustained conversation with his parents must actually learn the skills of continuing discussion before he can learn much else in school.

Nor is it enough to say that the school should accept the child where it finds him and raise him as high and as fast as it can toward an adequate level of cultural attainment. To be sure, this is one of the school's functions; no teacher ever succeeds unless he first establishes rapport and communication with the pupil at the pupil's level. But the school's procedures and its success will necessarily differ between the child whose home background daily complements what the school does, and the one who is caught, so to speak in a cultural downdraft the moment he steps outside the school. In dealing with a population

which is racially and culturally integrated, the school must begin by encouraging teachers to understand the special factors in the backgrounds of all their children, to take these differences imaginatively into account, and to build curricula and teaching techniques that reflect not only idealism but realism as well.

In addition to the cultural aspect, intellectual considerations are involved in meeting the problems of racial integration. A good school is responsibly concerned with all of the aspects of a child's development, but the central purpose that must run through all sound education is the development of intellectual strength. Unless the school is able to help every child to use his mind effectively, none of the other purposes of education can be satisfactorily achieved. We customarily cite physical health as a fundamental goal of education, but unless the child learns to apply his own intelligence to the problem of remaining healthy, he is not likely to do much either for his own well-being or for the public health of his community. The young person who does not become critically thoughtful about moral values, who behaves well only when someone is watching him or forcing him to conform, cannot be trusted to manage his own morality. But the school's success in pursuing this central purpose of education is subject, like so many of its other efforts, to what happens to the pupil outside the school.

In respect to the development of intellectual competence, many Negro children face special problems that should be better understood than they often are. Obviously many Americans of Negro ancestry have attained distinction in fields requiring intellectual eminence and millions of others daily apply their minds with excellent results in more humble ways. Yet the fact remains that during years of oppression, first under slavery and later under more subtle forms of discrimination, the opportunities for large numbers of Negroes to apply their own rational powers with initiative and freedom to important problems have been far more limited than the opportunities available to other racial groups. Many Negro children, therefore, carry the disabling scars of the culture in which they were nurtured, a culture which encouraged the use of muscles and not only discouraged but often penalized those who sought to use their minds creatively. The school must take all of this into account and build programs and provide opportunities which not only reflect these facts but move aggressively to compensate for them.

Every educational problem has its emotional side, and the special problems of educating Negro children in desegrated schools have theirs. Not being a psychologist, I do not intend to examine this complex question at any length. But there can be little doubt that the education of many Negro children is adversely affected by emotional considerations. The fact that it is often difficult to distinguish

among the cultural, the intellectual, and the emotional aspects of education is one reason why teaching any child is so complex.

One of the most serious of the details is the problem of motivation. The Horatio Alger story is a well-established part of our folklore, but few Americans would argue that the typical Alger hero would have made it had his skin been of a darker shade. The sense of frustration which any minority child may experience is heightened in the case of the Negro child, who discovers all too early that his minority has both a special history in the United States and quite unique problems. As a consequence, his attitude toward himself and toward his racial group complicates the effort to help him secure an adequate education. In some cases, he may rationalize his failures by attributing them to limitations which do not, in fact, exist for him. In others, he may develop an understandable aggressiveness which will neither compensate for external difficulties nor correct his own shortcomings. The wise and well-informed teacher is aware of these emotional complications and undertakes to deal with them in positive ways.

In the face of these facts, and in the light of our democratic values, what guidelines for policy and practice in the conduct of American public schools are implied?

In the first place, it is essential to emphasize on every possible occasion and in everything we do in schools that the rights of students, the assessment of their needs, and the release of their potentialities must be approached on an individual basis. What I have said about the identification of students as members of groups is important only insofar as it helps the teacher to understand a particular student. My point, you may remember, is that the individual cannot be understood unless he is seen against the history from which he has come and in terms of the situation in which he currently lives. But his education is peculiarly his own. The opportunities afforded any child may not properly be limited because he happens to be a member of one or another racial group. In this connection again, we face the hazard of stereotyped treatment, a hazard which at all costs must be avoided.

This implication for policy and practice cuts more than one way, however, for just as certainly as no person should be subjected to discriminatory treatment which depresses him because of his race, so it follows that none should be given preferential treatment simply because his complexion or his ancestry is different from another's. A practical application of this principle may arise if a school organizes classes according to the academic ability of students. If, after the most reliable estimates of ability the school can make, it should develop that one classroom contains pupils largely of one racial group while a second classroom is composed mostly of another, the school should not be criticized for the result. If, on the other hand, the school authorities

have used an ostensibly educational device simply to justify some predetermined racial arrangement, the action is totally indefensible. It should be attacked not only as a violation of the constitutional rights of children but as a flagrant instance of professional malpractice.

A second guideline for the development of policy and practice centers about the concept of equality of opportunity. "Equality of opportunity," as we customarily use the phrase, means much more than a schoolroom desk for every child. It connotes, rather, a condition in which every American may rightfully expect to find himself in fair competition with every other American. This condition is achieved and maintained by the operation of a host of agencies and forces, some political, some social, others economic or cultural. The public school has never been the only agency concerneded with producing equality of opportunity, but its role is fundamental to the total effort.

In the cases of some Americans, and in that of the Negro American most dramatically, our traditional system has failed for a long time and in countless ways to provide that equality of opportunity that should be the condition of all our people. Recent improvements have helped correct the imbalance, but much more correction is required. Especially is this true of children whose parents and grandparents were deliberately, systematically, and by law denied what is now clearly recognized as fully equal treatment.

Is it not a reasonable contention—and a just one—that to compensate for past injustice, we should offer these children educational services beyond the level of what might be called standard equality? Could it be that to achieve total equality of opportunity in America we may have to modify currently accepted ideas about equality of opportunity in education itself? Is it conceivable that some of our children are entitled to more and better educational opportunities than most of the others? In fact, of course, the question has already been answered. Thousands of mentally and physically handicapped children, regardless of race, regularly receive teaching service, physical facilities, and supporting services more extensive and more costly than those furnished children who are considered physically or mentally normal. In the cases of many Negro children—and the generalization would apply also to certain other minority groups—we may need to substitute for our traditional concept of equal educational opportunity a new concept of compensatory opportunity.

Such compensatory opportunity might take the form of lower student-teacher ratios in certain schools, or additional guidance services, or better physical facilities. The idea might mean more scholarships for higher education, or, in some cases, custodial and boarding care for children whose welfare required their removal from a crippling environment.

I doubt that anyone is in a position now to say precisely what the concept of compensatory educational opportunity would mean in every case, but my purpose here is not so much to answer the question as to raise it for discussion. The concept of compensatory opportunity should certainly not be restricted to any one group and, as I have suggested, it has already been applied to other types of disability. But, to the degree that a child's race or cultural background handicap him, and especially where they are attributable, at least in part, to earlier governmental action, they should be taken into acount in adjusting his educational program.

A third guide to educational policy and practice seems relevant to this discussion. If we are to keep the focus of our educational effort on the welfare of the individual child, we shall do well to avoid what is sometimes called social engineering. The very term is inconsistent with the purposes and values of democracy. Even the most desirable end does not justify manipulating people to create a structure pleasing to some master planner. To put it precisely, I am disturbed about the growing pressure to locate schools, draw district lines, and organize curricula in order to achieve a predetermined racial pattern of enrollment. By no means am I opposing the desirability of having in the same school children of different racial backgrounds. Quite the contrary. But decisions about school organization based entirely or primarily on racial criteria seem to me to violate the principle of nondiscrimination.

All school districting arrangements should provide a maximum of free choice for all children, subject only to commonsense protection against unnecessary overcrowding. Indeed, if I had my way, I should have no school attendance districts at all. In a well-conducted school system every school should be so good that those who live near it would never think of going elsewhere except for some extraordinary reason. In the case of secondary schools, or others where specialized curricula might be a factor, the importance of the neighborhood location would, of course, be somewhat less significant. But here again the greatest possible freedom of choice should be allowed all pupils, so long as they are qualified for the programs involved.

The concept of freedom of choice should be interpreted, however, only to allow positive choice and never to permit any group to restrict the opportunities of another. The basic principle is that all public schools of a community belong to all the people of the community, that none is the exclusive preserve of a single racial group. The most offensive aspect of the engineered approach is the assumption that any group can be improved if members of another race are introduced into it. If all the races of mankind are equally to be valued and respected, a group composed of 30 members of race A cannot be improved merely

by substituting a few members of race B. If, on the other hand, the group is to be improved with regard, let us say, to mathematical performance, the introduction of a couple of mathematical wizards will obviously raise the average. A musical group short of tenors can surely be improved by recruiting three good tenors, but the point of origin of their grandfathers or the color of their hair are scarecly relevant criteria. We cannot have it both ways: we cannot say that race per se makes no difference and then argue that important decisions should be based on this inconsequential factor.

To summarize then, briefly, what I have tried to say about the educational problems of desegregating schools:

1. The focus of sound teaching is always on the individual, for education is an intensely personal matter, having its principal effect always within the person.

2. If we are to achieve good education, we must respect the individuality of each student, relating his instruction to his background, his needs, his possibilities.

3. To achieve equality of opportunity within the whole of our culture, it may be necessary to offer those who are handicapped by their history or their current situation not merely equal, but compensatory educational opportunity.

4. In organizing education many considerations are important, many characteristics are relevant, but racial differences in themselves are not. In the administration of schools, therefore, the manipulation of pupils on purely racial grounds is irrelevant and improper.

Thank you, sir.

Chairman HANNAH: Thank you very much, Dr. Fischer. You have raised some very interesting points and I am sure the members of the Commission and other of our participants will want to question you about them further after we have completed the presentation of this panel discussion.

I should now like to introduce the second speaker, Dr. Houston R. Jackson, who is assistant superintendent of Baltimore public schools. He has been asked to comment on this subject from a northern viewpoint.

Dr. Jackson has attended many universities, including Howard, Morgan State, Cornell, Temple, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Pennsylvania. On the other hand, his entire professional career has been spent in Maryland. He is presently the highest ranking Negro administrator in the Baltimore public school system.

Dr. Jackson was selected to speak on this subject not only because of his own unique qualifications but also because he comes from Baltimore. For some years prior to the desegregation of all public schools in Baltimore, the number of activities within the school system itself in which whites and Negroes participated jointly was increas-

ing. And since 1954, Baltimore, like other large border cities, has taken on many characteristics common to northern cities.

One major problem that emerges when a school system is totally desegregated is the employment and assignment of Negro teachers. Dr. Jackson will direct himself to this aspect of the educational problems of segregation and desegregation.

STATEMENT OF DR. HOUSTON R. JACKSON, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, STAFF SERVICES, BALTIMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Dr. JACKSON: I have been asked to comment briefly regarding "The Employment and Assignment of Negro Teachers in Baltimore, Md., since September 1954."

I. CRITERIA FOR THE ASSIGNMENT OF TEACHERS IN BALTIMORE, MD.

On June 10, 1954, upon recommendation of Dr. Fischer, Superintendent, the Board of School Commissioners unanimously approved the following policy directive which was subsequently issued to all staff members:

> In the assignment, promotion, and transfer of staff members, the present policy of respecting relative merit shall be scrupulously observed. As in the past, it shall be the purpose of the department of education to assign each employee to that position in which he is likely to render his best service to the school and to the community. No person shall be denied any opportunity because of his race.

The following statements were extracted from a recent report of the secondary and elementary divisions to the board of school commissioners:

> In recommending a teacher for a given assignment, the secondary division takes into consideration the qualities and aptitudes of the candidate and the requirements of the assignment. The candidate's subject matter background is a significant factor in determining the educational level of the teaching assignment.
>
> In subject areas where eligibility lists exist, the selection of a person for appointment must be made from among the first five names on the appropriate eligibility list. The candidate may refuse the assignment, or request a different assignment. In either case his desires are respected and, if possible, an adjustment is made for him, but not to the detriment of other candidates on the list. Requests for transfers are relatively few in number and are handled on an individual basis.

In the elementary division, because of inadequate teacher supply, eligibility lists are exhausted and, as a consequence, teachers who are qualified are assigned on the basis of the following criteria:

1. The teacher's preference for community and grade level.
2. The suitability of the teacher's preparation and experience for the position available.
3. The effect of the assignment upon the balance of the teacher resources within the school.

> Example:
>
> A balance of qualified and unqualified teachers within the school;
> A balance of experienced and inexperienced teachers within the school;
> A balance of teacher talents within the school.

There are times, however, when the urgency of need for a teacher is so great that one or more of these considerations must be put aside so that children will have an adequate teacher.

Each applicant is urged to visit the school and to confer with the principal before accepting or rejecting the assignment. Where this is done, principals often are able to make evident to teachers the characteristics and opportunities of the teaching assignment.

When prospective teachers are unwilling to undertake the assignment given, they are listed for later assignment if and when the type of position they request becomes available.

II. NUMBER OF NEGRO TEACHERS EMPLOYED SINCE 1954, AND NUMBER ASSIGNED TO FORMERLY ALL-WHITE SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLS ERECTED SINCE 1954 AND OPENED ON A DESEGREGATED BASIS

A recent report from our Bureau of Research shows that there were 3,157 white teachers employed in the Baltimore public schools in the fall of 1954, and 3,693 in the fall of 1961; an increase of 536 white teachers empoyed over a 7-year period. On the other hand, there were 1,794 Negro teachers employed in the fall of 1954, and 2,802 in the fall of 1961; an increase of 1,008 teachers employed over the same period. Thus, there were almost twice as many Negro teachers (newly) employed in Baltimore during this same period as there were white.

In September 1954, all of our schools were desegregated, and from the beginning Negro teachers have been assigned in schools where there were no Negro pupils and in desegregated schools. The number has increased from 2 Negro teachers who were assigned in a formerly all-white school in the fall of 1954 to 1,242 Negro teachers who have been assigned to schools of both races in the fall of 1961. Thus, about 44 percent of the Negro teachers in the Baltimore public schools are employed in schools enrolling both races.

III. REACTION TO THE ASSIGNMENT OF NEGRO TEACHERS IN FORMERLY ALL-WHITE SCHOOLS AND IN SCHOOLS OPENED SINCE 1954 ON A DESEGREGATED BASIS

The first two Negro teachers to accept assignments in a formerly all-white school were transferred from an all-Negro junior high school in the fall of 1954 to an all-white junior high school. They were carefully chosen for their scholarship, personality, training, and experience. They were well-qualified teachers of mathematics and had earned their master's degrees. They had a free choice to accept or decline the assignments. Both felt that the new assignments would be a challenge to them. They made good and soon became popular

with the faculty and student body. Their success was highlighted by the principal of the school in private talks and public gatherings. This paved the way for easy and speedy assignment of other Negro teachers in the secondary division thereafter.

While the assignment of Negro teachers in formerly all-white elementary schools occurred about a year later, once the practice began it proceeded with speed and without great difficulty; mainly, I believe, because of the great demand for teachers in the elementary division. Teacher supply for the last several years has been so limited that every person who has made the elementary eligibility list has been offered a position well in advance of the opening of the school.

IV. THE PROBLEMS CONCERNING TEACHER ASSIGNMENT

The elementary division lists the following reasons for the refusal of some teachers to accept assignments offered them:

1. The school is too far from home.
2. The school is not easily accessible by public transportation.
3. Salary in another system is higher.
4. The location of the school is in a neighborhood which is not acceptable to the teacher.
5. Too many children have personal problems which evidence themselves in such undesirable behavior that the teacher fears his work may become an unpleasant chore, rather than a satisfying experience.
6. In some classrooms, the pupil capacity for learning is quite limited, and the teacher feels he will be thwarted in his efforts to see progress.

The transfer of elementary teachers has also presented a problem. About 50, out of a total of 3,427 elementary teachers, apply each year for transfers.

The reasons most frequently given for the change are—

1. The desire to be closer home.
2. The wish to work with children and parents who represent a segment of society different from one now being served by the teacher.
3. The hope that a change may bring richer and broader teaching experience.

Every effort is made to grant teachers' requests for transfer. When a specific request cannot be filled, alternate possibilities are suggested.

While the same policy applies to all teachers, Negro as well as white, the problem of assignment and transfer of Negro teachers is less acute, mainly for two reasons:

1. The values the Negro teachers see in desegregated faculties, and, consequently, the desire to integrate; and

642146—62——3

2. The larger number of Negro teachers available for assignment and transfer.

White teachers in Baltimore still refuse to accept assignments in all-Negro schools and request transfers out of desegregated schools when Negro pupils approach 50 percent, or more, of the pupil population in a given school.

The elementary division is not unmindful of some of the problems involved in adhering to this policy of assignment and transfer of teachers, as indicated in the report to the board of school commissioners. The following are indicated as issues that arise:

1. There are seldom sufficient vacancies in the higher socioeconomic areas to accommodate these requests.

2. Over the years, following such a policy would result in an accumulation of experienced teachers in the suburban schools.

The midcity schools would lack needed experienced personnel and the suburban schools would have only limited opportunities for young people with new ideas.

3. The securing of replacements in the less-privileged areas for the teachers transferred becomes more difficult each year.

New teachers often refuse to accept the assignments because of hazards to their welfare, or because they feel inadequate as beginners to tackle the problems in these schools.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I would like to summarize and conclude as follows:

Desegregation of the public schools in Baltimore has been an advantage to Negro teachers in many ways:

First, it has opened job opportunities for many more Negro teachers, since there was a shortage of qualified teachers particularly in the elementary division.

Second, since 1954, some Negro teachers who fail the professional examinations have received assignments on a temporary basis because of the shortage of qualified teachers in the elementary division. That was not so for the Negro teachers before 1954 because at that time there was no shortage of qualified Negro teachers. Negro teachers in Baltimore have always been required to take the same examination for placement on the eligibility lists as white teachers. If they did not pass, before 1954 they did not get appointed, because for the Negro schools there was always a large number of Negro teachers on the eligibility list. Furthermore, many of those who did not pass the examinations before 1954 did not get appointed unless they ranked fairly high on the list. Thus, up to 1954 there were no Negro teachers assigned on a temporary basis, except in some of the kindergartens.

Third, for the most part, Negro teachers have made good in their assignments in desegregated schools, and there has been no general reaction to them from the community nor from the schools themselves. On the contrary, in most cases they have been accepted and welcomed.

Fourth, the freedom of choice of assignments and transfer policy have operated equally well for the Negro teachers, because I have been told by authority that many of them also wish to move from schools where children are underprivileged and facilities are obsolete to newer schools and communities which place high value on education.

Fifth, I have every reason to believe that integration of school faculties has had the same beneficial effects on the Negro teacher as integration in the classrooms has had on Negro pupils; for many of them, it has lifted their sights and morale, and stimulated them to further self-improvement.

Finally, while I concurred in the criteria for the assignment and free transfer policy of teachers at the beginning of desegregation in 1954, I am both surprised and disappointed that but one white teacher has accepted an assignment in a school that was all-Negro before 1954, and at the speed of requests for transfers of many white teachers from the desegregated schools as the number of Negro pupils increased in those schools. This has resulted in the request for assignment and transfer of many qualified, experienced Negro teachers from the still all-Negro schools to fill some of the vacancies. To me this is tragic, because the practice is depriving many Negro pupils who remain in all-Negro schools in the central core of the city of the services of qualified, experienced teachers, and these are the pupils, I think, who need good teachers the most.

However, neither the assignment and transfer policy nor the attitude of teachers can bear all the blame; much of it must be attributed to the housing and social patterns of living in the community.

There are, therefore, many problems yet to be resolved before there can be true and lasting desegregation of the Baltimore public schools.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Jackson. You have raised some very interesting questions that I am sure we will want to pursue further in the question period.

We have learned, through experience in previous conferences, that we get better attention if we try to break up these long sessions about in the middle; but also, sometimes, we run the risk of having delays getting people back in their seats so that we may proceed.

We are going to start this morning on the assumption that we can follow directions. We are going to take a 5-minute break at this time, before we call on Dr. White, and if we are back in our seats promptly

we will follow this procedure for the rest of the conference. [Laughter.] If we are not we will have to dispense with it.

(Short recess.)

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, you did very well and if we can follow that procedure we will break in the middle of the session this afternoon, tomorrow morning, and tomorrow afternoon.

It seemed appropriate to the Commission that a southern educator have an opportunity to give the southern viewpoint on the subject under discussion. Dr. J. B. White, dean of the College of Education of the University of Florida, has agreed to do so.

Dr. White is a South Carolinian by birth and received his education at southern colleges and universities—Wofford College, Duke University, and George Peabody College for Teachers.

His professional career likewise has been in the South, with a few interesting exceptions when he surveyed public education in Idaho and served as technical adviser on academic affairs in Bangkok. The list of his publications is long and bespeaks broad experience.

Dr. White has had an active interest in the problems of desegregation for some time. He served as chairman of the Phi Delta Kappa Commission which, in 1959, published a valuable guidebook for educators entitled *Action Patterns in School Desegregation.* Later, he joined with some 30 other southern educators in issuing a statement on the consequences of the closing of public schools. This statement, published as a pamphlet, is entitled, "Can We Afford To Close Our Public Schools?"

We are happy to have such a distinguished southern educator comment on the educational problems arising from segregation and desegregation from the point of view of the South.

STATEMENT OF DR. J. B. WHITE, DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Dr. WHITE. As I understand my assignment, it is to attempt to represent the southern point of view; not to defend it but to explain it. Many of the southerners here may disagree with my interpretation. Identical facts are often interpreted differently, depending upon one's values.

In an attempt to get a picture of the situation in the South, I shall deal first with the overall situation and then more specifically with education.

The South today is experiencing a social revolution, which for many is serious, shaking the foundations on which its society has developed for more than 300 years. Most of you are familiar with this phenomenon and I shall not attempt to recite well-known facts. Suffice it to mention that this change had started long before the

Supreme Court decision of 1954. In fact, the Court decision forced a setback in many biracial movements that were developing with increased momentum at that time.

Now, 8 years after the Supreme Court decision, progress still has not caught up with that achieved prior to 1954 in many aspects of our work between the two races. True, we have moved ahead slowly but surely in desegregating schools. In many situations this has come about because of the force of the Court decision rather than because of any real effort on the part of the two races to solve their problems. In some communities beginnings had been made in biracial planning, but too often this cooperation has ceased to exist and the two races find themselves in camps, each one wondering what the next move of the other will be.

To illustrate, in Florida, where the racial tension has never been as serious as in some of the Southern States, an elementary council was organized in 1951 to promote and study elementary education. This biracial group was organized under the leadership of the State department of education. However, after 1954, the State superintendent of public instruction, an elected official, ordered the council to separate according to race. Only now does the tension seem relaxed sufficiently to suggest that the council begin to function once more as a biracial group.

I am not saying that more would have been accomplished if the Supreme Court decision had not been made in 1954. The Court decision was right and necessary. What I am saying is that this decision created among many a feeling of resentment and hostility. It takes a long time to overcome this feeling of enmity that developed and has been promoted continuously by various groups.

During the past 8 years, extremists on both sides of the racial question have been the most vocal, while a vast majority have remained somewhere in the middle of the road, unheard, but nevertheless concerned. Unfortunately, many have violated one of our cherished American traditions by insisting that all people must believe one way and by persecuting or imposing sanctions on those who feel differently. Fear of social and economic reprisals has silenced many moderates who would seek a cooperative attack in solving the racial problems. Intolerance can be applied with equal accuracy to the opposing groups. Those of us who profess to be liberals often find ourselves intolerant of people who are conservative in their points of view. In like manner, the conservative completely misunderstands the motives of the liberal.

Now for the situation in 1962. Eight years after the Supreme Court stated that schools must desegregate with all deliberate speed, what kind of progress have we made toward meeting this require-

ment? In 1958, at the conclusion of the first 4 years, 777 districts out of 2,889 biracial districts in the 17 Southern States had desegregated or had started a program of desegregation. This represents approximately 27 percent of the districts, principally from the border States. Four years later, in 1962, the number of desegregated districts had increased to 824, an increase of only 47 districts, or 2 percent. This is real progress, for the 47 districts are primarily in the Deep South. These are important breakthroughs in areas where many groups, including many State legislatures, had declared that there would be no—absolutely no—school to break over. These 47 districts come from States such as Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Virginia. Now, only three States—Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina—have no desegregated schools. In December 1961 Southern School News reported 233,509 Negro children attending biracial schools. This represents 7.3 percent of the Negro enrollment in the Southern States.

Apparently the South is beginning to accept little by little that most schools will eventually be required to desegregate. One evidence of this is the fact that few State legislatures passed laws during this year in an effort to maintain segregated schools. This probably has been influenced in part by the court decisions which have ruled that the pupil assignment law was not a satisfactory plan by which to desegregate. Many Southern States have been depending upon this law to meet the legal requirements of desegregation. Evidence indicates that in the next 4 years more rapid progress will be made in the number of districts that permit some Negro children to attend previously all-white schools.

Most school boards recognize that they will eventually have to desegregate, but they choose to wait until forced by a court order. This places the responsibility on the courts and not on the school boards. However, in States where a number of schools have already faced the court orders, some school boards are taking the initiative. This is a hopeful sign. I am sure that many school boards throughout the South will not move until required to do so specifically by a court ruling.

Assuming that most schools will eventually desegregate their student bodies, what are some of the factors that have to be considered? What are some of the problems that will develop as a result of this action? And how can they be met?

Many articles have been written and many studies have been made concerning this problem. There is a wealth of material to which school authorities can turn for suggestions and comments by those who have gone through this experience.

Probably one of the most practical and comprehensive studies was that made under the auspices of Phi Delta Kappa by its Commission on Educational Policies and Programs in Relation to Desegregation. This commission employed Dr. Herbert Wey, who was assisted by Mr. John Corey, to make a study of the problems which had been experienced by systems that had desegregated or were in the process of desegregating their schools. This study is reported in *Action Patterns in School Desegregation*, issued by Phi Delta Kappa in 1958. If you are interested in getting a copy of it, and have not seen it, you can get one by writing to Phi Delta Kappa.

The study secured data from 70 school systems, 215 teachers, and 87 principals throughout the South. Many of you have read this publication, but for the benefit of those who have not had a chance to see it, I shall mention a few highlights which are included in its findings.

Advanced preparation involving the community, school faculties, and students is highly essential if desegregation is to move without many problems and serious opposition. It is also necessary for the school officials to determine when the community is ready, what kind of desegregation will be best accepted and what grades should be desegregated first.

There were many approaches in developing a readiness program. Probably the compresensive approach which involves numerous organizations in the community and many individuals in discussion groups and lectures is the most effective. This approach also places great importance on the preparation of teachers, principals, and students to accept and face the problems occurring in a desegregated school. There can be no one best plan. In this report 20 school systems used the "all-at-once" plan, desegregating all grades at once, while others started at the bottom and worked up grade by grade. Others started at the top and worked down. Some districts began the first year at each level—elementary, junior high, and senior high—while others favored the pupil assignment plan. It was pointed out that the pupil assignment plan was the most common in the Deep South.

Any plan must be carefully developed and carried out without wavering. In carrying out a plan of desegregation, one needs courage, firmness against militant groups, and the cooperation of many people, especially teachers, pupils, and parents. Most plans find it desirable and important to provide some flexibility in dealing with parents so that the privilege of transfer is not completely denied. Law enforcement officials often play a key role and should be involved in the planning. The attitude of the law enforcement officials is very important. One superintendent recommended that desegrega-

tion be postponed until firm action on the part of the police is assured.

Each school must develop its own technique for desegregation. What has worked well in one community might fail completely in another. Students are the easiest group to adjust to this new experience. The following statement of a school superintendent is typical of the experience of many. He said: "Develop a good plan. Be sure your police take quick and firm action. And once you start, don't back up or give in on any phase of the plan. One retraction opens the way for many additional complaints and often means failure."

The report stresses the importance of the proper use of the news media. Cooperation of the reporters is essential. Many schools find that it is wise to keep newsmen and photographers away from the school during the first days of desegregation. However, all say that news reporters must be kept informed regarding all steps of the planning.

Dealing with the instructional program in a desegregated school is one topic which has been given little publicity. Part 4 of this study reports many experiences of school people in facing the instructional problems resulting from desegregation. The wide range of achievement of students in the same classroom is a major concern. The study reveals that desegregation creates no new instructional problems, but merely intensifies those already known. However, when school officials and teachers face these problems realistically, the results often improve the educational program.

The study also deals with personnel problems, discipline, student acceptance by the teacher, truancy, health, guidance, and counseling. One aspect of this problem—discipline—has received considerable publicity. The study states that—

> Discipline problems formerly unnoticed by parents and children in segregated schools suddenly blossom into difficult situations in desegregated schools because of the race issue. Awareness of this fact and prompt action prevent disturbances that decrease efficiency of the total educational effort.

The study continues by pointing out that patience, understanding, tolerance, faith, tact, firmness, sportsmanship, flexibility, awareness, and a keen sense of humor are important characteristics for teachers, counselors, and principals in mixed schools.

The final chapters deal with problems relating to student activities, such as social affairs, athletics, music, clubs, and the like. There is little integration in social activities in desegregated schools. School dances and parties present problems of a serious nature. The athletic and music groups work out their problems with greater ease.

The study concludes with the following statement:

> It is the feeling of teachers, principals, and superintendents who participated in this study that desegregation is giving the Negro child new opportunities, a

greater desire; that it is increasing his own self-respect as well as giving him a better understanding of and respect for the white race. At the same time, the white student is losing his fear of the Negro and is beginning to practice the democratic principles he has learned about in school. Students are making more rapid progress toward race acceptance. . . . When the students now in school become parents, many of the problems that seemed insurmountable will decrease in importance.

There have been many studies sampling the attitude of people toward integration. They tend to find people in the South are more conservative and people in the North are more liberal. However, we are aware that each section of the country has its mixture of conservatives and liberals. A study made by Henry G. Stetler, State supervisor for Connecticut's Commission on Civil Rights, on *Attitude of Whites and Negroes Toward Racial Integration in Connecticut*, found that only one-fifth of the whites compared with three-fifths of the Negroes wanted "complete integration." Whites differed among themselves with respect to integration in specific areas. For example, 70 percent of the whites favored integration in public schools and employment, but only 28 percent favored integration in private housing. More than 90 percent of the Negroes favored integration in such areas. Both whites and Negroes tended to underestimate each other in the extent to which they favored extension of racial integration.

The fate of previously all-Negro colleges is of concern in some areas in the South. For instance, Bluefield State College in West Virginia is asking questions about its future role. Should it continue as a State 4-year college or be changed to a junior college with a vocational emphasis? In like manner, the only predominantly Negro State college in Kentucky has requested that a study be made to determine its future.

The role of the Negro teacher will continue to be a problem. While some effort in a number of States has been made to integrate the Negro teacher into white faculties, there is considerable evidence that many Negro teachers, principals, and supervisors will eventually be unemployed.

I conclude this paper on the note on which I began. The social revolution through which the South is moving is for many a traumatic experience. Social change comes slowly and painfully. In this case it is aggravated in many communities by the inability of the two groups to sit down and talk through their problems, by the unwillingness on the part of many southern leaders, particularly political leaders, to admit that the decision of the Supreme Court has become the law of the land and must be respected and enforced. It has been aggravated still further by the impatience on the part of others at the slow progress that is being made, by an unwillingness to recognize what is involved in changing 300-year-old customs and traditions.

True, the compliance with the requirements to desegregate schools has only been a token in many communities, admitting only a few Negroes to the formerly all-white schools. However, these tokens are significant. Once such a step has been taken successfully, further desegregation is facilitated. This can be illustrated by what happened in Atlanta. In September 1961 the 11th and 12th grades of four white high schools admitted nine Negro students. This was done without incident or difficulty in spite of the strong position that had been taken by many political leaders in the State of Georgia. Dr. Rufus E. Clement, the city school board's only Negro member, said his willingness to accept some of the more conservative aspects of the Atlanta desegregation plan had gotton him in trouble with some of the Negroes in the community. He said, however, that he considered it more important that we begin to accept the Court's decision than to show our disagreement with the pupil placement plan.

Obviously, there must be some pressure from the courts and from public opinion to insist that progress be made. Too strong pressure or too great insistence on speed can retard progress rather than promote it. Solutions to many of our racial problems, of which school desegregation is only one, must depend to a large extent upon the leadership that can emerge within the two groups. This leadership will most likely come from those who are not associated with either of the groups on the extremes. Only a reasonably favorable climate between the two races makes it possible for this leadership to function effectively. The proper amount of pressure stimulates action, while too great a pressure produces a climate which makes it difficult for local leadership to function. When to apply and when to ease the pressure demands extreme wisdom and keen insight. One of the most difficult problems in the South has been the unwillingness of many of its leaders—political and educational—to approach the problems of desegregation realistically and to seek cooperatively with all groups concerned ways and means of solving these problems. Until this is done, progress will continue to be slow. An openminded experimental approach, devoid of emotionalism in studying the human dimensions of this problem, is needed so that decisions may be made on the basis of sound, common, knowledgeable judgment.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. White.

Now we have about 40 minutes, or a little less, for discussion. You all recognize that the primary usefulness of this conference is in the record which is kept of everything that is said, which will eventually be published.

This morning we spent about an hour of our time on preliminaries and preliminary statements. This afternoon we will begin at about 1:30 and continue to 5 o'clock, so that you will have an hour and a

half longer for discussion and presentations than this morning—which will mean that you will have more time for participation than you have this morning.

We will follow this procedure: we will first invite the members of the Commission to ask questions of our panel. Then we will turn to the participants at the tables. Mrs. Cole and Mr. Bernhard will have some questions that, if they have not been asked by the Commissioners, they will want to get into the record.

Since our time this morning is shortened for the reason Mr. Bernhard mentioned—that if we are going to use the cafeteria we must be there before 12 noon—I will appreciate it if you will dispense with the speeches and ask the questions of our panel participants. [Laughter.] This afternoon, when we have more time, and again tomorrow, there will be a better opportunity for the comments that all the participants, I hope, will want to make.

We have a public address system, which I am sure is unexcelled in this country. If you will raise your hand the monitor sitting in the booth will turn on your loudspeaker. When the red light comes on, that is it, and we remind you, of course, that everything that is said, including whispers, will go out over the whole of the system [laughter] until the light goes out.

If, when we have had the Commissioners, you will raise your hand and be recognized we would like you then to state your name and address for the record.

Commissioners, do you have some questions that you would like to ask of any of our panelists, Dr. Fischer, Dr. Jackson, or Dr. White? Dean Storey.

Vice Chairman STOREY. I would like to ask Dr. Fischer one or two.

I was intrigued by this item under your second or third guideline, of compensatory opportunity. I think I understand the background—it is because of history and past injustice and so on—but my question is this.

You say at the bottom of page 11 and at the top of page 12:

> In the cases of many Negro children—and the generalization would apply also to certain other minority groups—we may need to substitute for our traditional concept of equal educational opportunity a new concept of compensatory opportunity.

My question is this: outside of the minority groups—and the emphasis is on the Negro, as we understand—aren't there certain other underprivileged groups? I think of the lower classes, from an economic standpoint, in the white majority who, because of economic handicaps and so on, live in the slum areas. Would you extend this compensatory educational opportunity to those people, or confine it to the minorities?

Dr. FISCHER. No; I wouldn't confine it simply to racial minorities; but my point is that the obligation of the government to certain groups is of a different order from its obligation to other groups. The Negro and certain other minority people in our country, for example, the American Indian, have suffered certain disabilities because of governmental action. Therefore, it seems to me logical and just that, by governmental action, we should try now, as far as we can, to compensate in this generation for the errors of preceding generations. I recognize this is difficult, but I think there is here an obligation.

Now, I would not say that this is the end of the usefulness of the notion of compensatory opportunity. Certainly the economically underprivileged child, the culturally deprived child, whatever his racial background and whatever the behavior of the government toward the group of which he is a member may have been in the past, has certain educational needs that should be taken into account.

My point is that the rationale for applying this principle may be different in the case of the child whose disability is clearly attributable, at least in part, to previous governmental action.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Then you would limit it to governmental action, and by that you mean the local, State, and National level?

Dr. FISCHER. No; I wouldn't limit it to that. I am trying to express first my reason for believing that there is a debt here that needs to be settled. Then I would go on to say that this is only one segment of a larger circle, and the circle of need includes children who have many different varieties of need—educational, social, and so on.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Such as the lower economic class and so on—though it might not be caused by governmental action?

Dr. FISCHER. Yes; and as I try to point out in my paper, we have provided what might be called compensatory rather than equal opportunity for children who have been physically handicapped, for example, and on whom regularly, in many parts of this country, we spend many more dollars than we spend on physically normal children who come into the public schools. Even those children who are handicapped by reason of records of delinquency which are attributable to a wide variety of causes are frequently cared for in custodial and residential institutions where the expenditure per child may be raised to $3,000 or $4,000 per year, compared with $300 per year, or even less, expended in public schools in neighboring communities.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Thank you.

Chairman HANNAH. Father Hesburgh.

Commissioner HESBURGH. I would like first to address a question to Dr. Fischer and then one to Dr. Jackson.

Dr. Fischer: we heard from Dr. Jackson that many of the teachers in Baltimore asked to be transferred out of a situation once it had

become rather difficult or, to use another word, challenging—where they had a predominance of Negro children in the school, or where the teaching was more difficult because of the social background of students. I was curious to know whether or not there is something in the courses of teacher education today that would try to raise the motivation of teachers to accept this challenge as one of the very particular challenges of our times, and to recognize that without a little more sacrifice on their part we are never going to overcome the situation; that we must get our best teachers in these schools. Is there anything in the teacher education courses today which would press this point of motivation of the teachers?

Dr. FISCHER. I would say there is something, but far from enough. The question that you highlight here is one of the most grievous needs in teacher education in this country. I have often said that the behavior of the teacher who says, "I don't want to teach in a difficult school" might be likened to a social worker who said, "I don't want to work with people who have family problems," or a psychiatrist who said, "I don't want to deal with people who are emotionally ill because I find it unpleasant."

What we see is teachers declining to work with people who most need to learn and be educated. This is not, however, simply the fault of the teacher. This is not due to sheer selfishness on the part of the teacher. In part, those of us who have something to do with teacher education are, and have for a long time been responsible, because we have not paid as much attention as we should to the special problems of dealing with culturally underprivileged children.

We know a great deal more about how to educate the academically apt and the educationally oriented child than we do the child who needs first to learn the value of learning. You see, we have been dealing for many centuries with those who want to go to school. It is only a few years, relatively, that we have been attempting to educate those who had to be financed, and sometimes forced, to go to school. So what we are dealing with here is a very complex problem on which we, incidentally, in education need a great deal of help from the anthropologists, the sociologists, the psychologists, the political scientists.

We have many more questions than answers here, and until we can provide in teacher education the kind of background work that will enable the teacher to work in the kinds of neighborhood we are talking about with a satisfaction comparable to that enjoyed by a teacher who works with children to whom the school has already been adjusted. Until this happens we are going to continue having difficulty, just as we would have difficulty if we assigned physicians to nothing but incurable diseases. This would make it very difficult, I suspect, to persuade certain physicians to take on certain types of cases.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Thank you. The reason I brought up this question is that I was having some discussions yesterday about Peace Corps projections in various underdeveloped parts of the world. It seemed a little absurd to me that we were asking many people to go to underdeveloped parts of the world on the ground that education will help to clear up their problems, while we had this problem ourselves here.

Dr. FISCHER. There are common problems. We don't know nearly as much as we need to know about education in underdeveloped areas.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Dr. Jackson, you mentioned that the Negro teacher in Baltimore has, in a sense, a better break today because, in the past, a teacher who was not qualified, or who barely passed the qualification test, would normally not get a job, or at least a temporary kind of assignment, whereas now, you say, these teachers are almost all being assigned. I was curious. What is the provenance of these teachers? Where do they come from mostly? Are they predominantly from Negro teacher colleges?

Dr. JACKSON. In the elementary division, most elementary teachers come from the Coppin State Teachers College which is an—I started to say "all-Negro" teachers college, but it is not; there is one white student there [laughter], and it is in the Towson [State Teachers College] area. Baltimore gets more elementary school teachers from Coppin State College than from any one college in the United States, so we depend greatly upon them. Towson State Teachers College is only 12 miles away, but we get very few teachers from Towson at all. In recent years the better [Negro] students are not going to Coppin. They are taking advantage of desegregation [at Towson]. They are going to Towson so the overall quality of the teachers at Coppin is not equal to what it used to be years ago before there was desegregation.

Despite that fact, because of the great need of the elementary division, we have got to take them—even if they barely pass, and even when they don't pass. We have some teachers who have been teaching 5 or 6 years as special substitutes on a temporary basis in the elementary division. We have some 1,100 or 1,200 special substitutes in the elementary division.

Commissioner HESBURGH. The second question I wanted to ask—I am getting you in a circle and want to warn you beforehand—is, do most of these people from Coppin come from practically all-Negro schools, high schools, etc.?

Dr. JACKSON. Yes.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Are most of these barely qualified teachers teaching in practically all all-Negro elementary schools?

Dr. JACKSON. Not any more—because of the great need for teachers and the refusal of white teachers to accept assignments, not only for all-Negro schools but even in the desegregated schools——

Commissioner HESBURGH. They are predominantly Negro?

Dr. JACKSON. Yes. We have to assign some of these Coppin graduates even in the desegregated schools.

Commissioner HESBURGH. What I am getting at is that if the problem is an educational problem, and if the students from the poor schools, where they have had poor teachers, go to an all-Negro college where, again, they have poor students and, possibly, poor teachers and then are reassigned, to go back and teach more students in schools of this sort, the circle goes on and on?

Dr. JACKSON. Yes; that is tragic. We don't get all of our teachers from Coppin. We get several from some of the other colleges throughout the country. For instance, Virginia State College has had an elementary school curriculum for teachers and we get a few elementary teachers from there.

Commissioner HESBURGH. But by and large, the story would be that we do have this circle in existence, whereby students from inferior schools go to inferior colleges and go back to teach at schools which are inferior; and unless we break through this we are not going to really tackle the problem?

Dr. JACKSON. No; and as long as the demand [for teachers] exists as it does, I don't see how we are going to solve this.

Commissioner HESBURGH. I think the point made earlier was that there was a crucial need for better motivation?

Dr. JACKSON. Yes.

Commissioner HESBURGH. If, instead of that, we are sending those barely qualified to teach students that are least prepared to be taught, I think we are really in trouble——

Dr. JACKSON. I agree.

Commissioner RANKIN. With respect to your second point, where you say, "—we must respect the individuality of each student, relating his instruction to his background, his needs, his possibilities," are you there, for a short time, or in effect, bringing about a return to segregated schools, Dr. Fischer?

Dr. FISCHER. No. I don't think we need to segregate children in order to recognize their individual needs. I would oppose the notion.

Commissioner RANKIN. If a certain minority-group have the same needs, the same background, and the same possibilities, wouldn't that bring about the effect that they would be together?

Dr. FISCHER. Not necessarily. They might be together for certain purposes, but they would not necessarily be segregated into a separate school, or even into a separate class for the full time of their education. You often find, in an elementary school, for example, children who have common needs in reading and essentially, for a part of each day, they spend their time together in a remedial reading center, but

this does not mean that they are then together for math, or for social studies, or for music, or for physical education. They are segregated to the extent that they need to be, but they are segregated in terms of educational need, not in terms of race.

Commissioner RANKIN. I understand that, but if a group of the same race have the same needs, wouldn't they more or less be together?

Dr. FISCHER. Yes, they would, but I cannot believe that this would necessarily mean that the group would be purely composed of a single race. You might find a predominant number of one race in a group, but my point was, earlier, that the school should not then be accused of segregating children on racial grounds if it groups them according to academic need because this appears to be the best way to deal with the academic need. If the racial composition of a group happens to fall one way or another, I would ignore the racial composition because it is irrelevant to the solution of the problem.

Commissioner RANKIN. I have one more question, of Dr. Jackson, if I may ask him.

Is desegregation driving the white teacher from the elementary school teaching profession in Baltimore? Are they leaving it? I noticed your statistics.

Dr. JACKSON. They are leaving it.

Commissioner RANKIN. They are leaving the profession?

Dr. JACKSON. I don't know that they are leaving the profession. They are leaving Baltimore. I think they are going out into the counties where they say it is easier to teach, and they can get more money.

Commissioner RANKIN. It is not the result of desegregation. It is easier to teach and they can get more money?

Dr. JACKSON. That is what they say.

Commissioner RANKIN. Do you believe that the stated reason is the real reason?

Dr. JACKSON. No; I don't.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. I would like to make one observation, prompted by something that Dr. Fischer has said, and then ask a question on another matter of Dr. Jackson.

Dr. Fischer suggested, and Father Hesburgh supported him, that there is a great need for social work in some of these matters. Just as we have had psychiatric social workers and family case workers, I wonder if there isn't a need, a great opportunity, for the development of an almost wholly new concept of the educational social worker, and if the schools of education and the schools of social work might work together more than they have, and more effectively than they have? I wonder whether Dr. Fischer would like to say anything about that?

Dr. FISCHER. There is a classification of professional worker called the school social worker. There have been school social workers in American schools for something of the order of 25 or 30 years, I suppose. These people serve as not only consultants to teachers but as liaison workers between schools and all of the other agencies of the community that can provide social case work and psychiatric service.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. I am thinking of something different from that. I am thinking of the teacher who is trained to teach, but to teach, as regards attitude and atmosphere, as one who is an educational social worker.

Dr. FISCHER. There isn't any question, in my mind at least, that teachers do need, in their background and in their range of competence, a good many of the kinds of skills and kinds of knowledge which we have heretofore associated with social work, with psychological counseling, and so on. The danger here, of course, is in converting teachers to social workers or to psychologists—clinical psychologists—and so underemphasizing their importance as teachers per se.

I had something of this sort in mind when, in responding to Father Hesburgh's question earlier, I said that we need a great deal more help from anthropology, from social psychology, and so on, in the education of teachers, because it is not enough for a teacher simply to know his subject and know something of the pedagogy for dealing with that subject; it is important also that he know a great deal about the nature of the learner—looking at the learner in a broad sense—than most teachers know today.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. I am in entire agreement with you. We have many people—many of us know them and have encountered them—who, in a very dedicated way, devote themselves to social work and, as Father Hesburgh has said, many of them are now attacking very tough problems in other parts of the world. I find myself a little puzzled and bothered that in this particular area at home, when a really challenging proposition comes up, we are told that the good teachers duck away from it.

Why doesn't this challenge appeal to the many dedicated people in our community? What is wrong with our training of them to meet this challenge? Why don't we have a flood of people who say, "Look, this is a difficult problem. This is what I would like to do"? Do you have any thoughts about that?

Dr. FISCHER. I would say that the publicity we give to people who go overseas tends to underplay the contributions which many dedicated people are now making and have long been making in the schools of this country. If you take the total number of Americans who now volunteer to go overseas and compare that total with the number who have long volunteered to teach in the most difficult neighborhoods

of the United States, you will find that the present teaching force of this country looks pretty good.

The truth is that this kind of sacrificial service and skillful service does not get the amount of attention that it is entitled to. There are many good teachers in this country working in these difficult schools, but their work is not particularly new in many respects and therefore it does not get quite the attention that it ought to get. I think it is all right that we pay attention to the problem, because there is a lot more left to be solved than we have ever solved so far, but it is not a matter of all or nothing.

Another observation I would make here is that, difficult as some problems are in working in overseas communities, they probably aren't as complex as the problems of working in some of the American urban centers where you have a much more complex social milieu in which to work than you do in many quite simple communities in the developing countries. These two problems are not entirely comparable.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Thank you. Now I would like to ask the question of Dr. Jackson.

Dr. White, in his remarks, said that there is considerable evidence that many Negro teachers, principals, and professors will eventually be unemployed. That would, of course, it seems to me, be a very unfortunate development. I just found myself wondering what your reaction or view was, to that suggestion or prophecy.

Dr. JACKSON. I think that would depend upon the demand for teachers. It certainly hasn't affected Baltimore. I think in my conclusion I made the statement that desegregation has been a great benefit, a great advantage, to the Negro. We can't get enough of it. Even those who are not qualified are getting assignments, so not one Negro teacher has lost a job in Baltimore as a result of desegregation, and we are getting many of those teachers who have lost their jobs in the South, who are coming up [to Baltimore]. Many of them cannot even pass our examinations, but they are being assigned as special substitutes on a temporary basis because we need teachers just that badly in Baltimore City, and as long as we have that demand for teachers I don't see any Negro teacher being adversely affected.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Then you would conclude that there might be considerable shifts in the geographical opportunities for Negro teachers, but not an overall decline in the opportunities available to them?

Dr. JACKSON. I would think that would be correct. I think the Baltimore situation is comparable to what they tell me is taking place in most of the large cities. I don't know of any teachers who have lost their jobs in any of the big cities because of desegregation.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Dr. White, in reference to what you have termed "pressure" from the courts and public opinion to insist that progress be made, you have also made the point that too strong a pressure and too great an insistence on speed can retard rather than promote progress. Is it not a fact, however, that what progress has been made in desegregation has been made as a result of the decision of the Court in regard to school desegregation?

Dr. WHITE. I don't think there is any question that the progress in school desegregation has come about as a result of the Court decision and the pressure that was exerted from that point of view.

I was speaking in a broader context of the overall solution of the differences between the two races in the southern communities, where you depend upon your local leadership to bring about cooperative planning and a real integration of purpose and a oneness in spirit. There must be a fairly satisfactory atmosphere before this can take place, and this has not existed in many communities.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Of course, I can recognize the desirability of that, but I also understood from what you said that not a great deal of that is going on at the present time.

Dr. WHITE. That is true. I said that there is probably less going on now than there was prior to 1954. I can cite one instance. I came from South Carolina originally, in 1945. We held a statewide conference on teacher education which was completely integrated—both white and Negro professional people working together for 1 week in this conference. This probably could not happen now in that State.

Commissioner ROBINSON. I believe you also said that at the present time only about 7.3 percent of all the Negro pupils in the Southern States are in any sort of desegregated situation?

Dr. WHITE. Yes, according to the Southern School News report.

Commissioner ROBINSON. You wouldn't consider that, almost 8 years after the Supreme Court's decision, this has been very rapid desegregation of schools?

Dr. WHITE. That is a fact.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Does it not appear that the present requirement is more emphasis on speed, rather than on what you call pressures?

Dr. WHITE. I tried to make it clear that some pressures are needed. The extent to which these pressures should be applied is one that requires insight and wisdom. I would not say that we need more emphasis on speed at the moment. I think we have to recognize that social change takes place very, very slowly and maybe we are too impatient in trying to insist that it become an overnight change.

Chairman HANNAH. Because this is a very important subject we are not going to cut off discussion when we reach the luncheon ad-

journment period; we will continue, if it is agreeable to the panel, for the first portion of this afternoon to exhaust this very important subject.

Mr. CHARLES U. SMITH. I would like to ask Dr. Jackson what proportion of the white teachers in the elementary division are regarded as unqualified?

Dr. JACKSON. At the last report there were about 1,100 unqualified teachers in the elementary schools and, in round numbers, about 3,200 elementary teachers. I have the exact figure here.

Mr. SMITH. The next question is: Were the white teachers leaving the elementary division prior to 1954? Were they leaving Baltimore then?

Dr. JACKSON. Yes; but not in as large numbers as they are now.

Mr. SMITH. But they were leaving?

Dr. JACKSON. That is right.

Dr. DRACHLER. I would appreciate it if Dr. Fischer would elaborate on the use of his phrase "social engineering," only because I am afraid that many educators who do not have the viewpoint that Dr. Fischer expressed are putting everything under the term "social engineering." Now, moving children around like checkers for the purposes of desegregation is neither good education or sound engineering.

Dr. Fischer, in a former address I admired very much a statement that you made that contemporary opinion is merely a sign of progress, and not the attainment of a goal. Now what is the role of a public school system in the achievement of goals in our society?

Dr. FISCHER. It seems to me that almost any important social goal of a society, or cultural goal, or even economic goal, must involve the school system at one point or another; but if I understand the implication of your question, it might be stated this way. Should not the school deliberately organize the classes and schools within a district so as to get a satisfactory combination of children of different races in the same enrollment? Is this really the question you are asking?

Dr. DRACHLER. If it is educationally sound, should it say that it is doing it as good education as well as because it is a democratic goal in our society?

Dr. FISCHER. My position in this matter is that we ought to encourage in every possible way the interrelation of the races that compose this country. I think we ought to encourage also the interrelation of all of the other different groups that compose this country. I would hope that every child would get to know, in school, not only children of other races than his own but also children of other religious backgrounds than his own, children of other cultural backgrounds, children whose parents come from different economic groups,

children whose parents and ancestors originated in different national areas, but I would not undertake to manipulate a public school system to provide a "mix" according to some formula that I decided was good. I don't know what such a formula is. I don't know, for example, whether a mixture of white and Negro children—to simplify the question—is better when it is done on a 50–50 basis, a 60–40 basis, or 90–10 basis. I don't know what a good mix is, and until I knew that, I would not want deliberately to undertake to draw district lines to bring in some mixture.

What I would prefer is to open the door of the school to all of the children who want to go to that school, subject always to the limitations necessary to prevent overcrowding, but subject to no limitations that would bar a child because of his race. I would not undertake to push or pull anybody through that door by administrative action.

Now I am not talking here about the matter of closing enrollments in schools in order to take advantage of having spaces in one school and relieving overcrowding in another. This is obviously a sensible thing to do. At least, it is obvious to me. It may not be to other people. But I would not do this on racial grounds. I would be just as insistent on bussing children of any race as I would on bussing children of a single race if they could use spaces in a building across town. I would not do this for racial reasons. I would do it for educational reasons.

Chairman HANNAH. One more brief question?

Dr. HAVIGHURST. I will make the question brief, but I suspect that Dr. Fischer is going to be answering this question one way or the other this afternoon and should not perhaps be asked to do it this morning.

Really there are two questions. Dr. Fischer has, I think, done very well, and I am glad the Attorney General started this morning by emphasizing the problems of de facto segregation in northern cities. I have made some estimates to the effect that two out of six Negro children are attending segregated schools in northern cities, three out of six in the South; and that leaves about one out of six Negro children who are not attending segregated schools.

It seems to me that, essentially, there are two questions to be answered—two practical questions that lie at the heart of the problem, at least in the northern cities.

The first is whether we can have equality of opportunity with de facto segregated schools. That is the first question: Can we have equality of opportunity with schools that are segregated de facto?

And somewhat related to this is the second question: Can we maximize free choice? I like that phrase of Dr. Fischer's: that we should maximize the free choice of pupils, and also the patterns in

our society, without designing schools that have a certain kind of social composition. I think we cannot, and I somehow have the feeling that Dr. Fischer feels you can give them free choice without paying attention to the importance of social composition of schools.

Chairman HANNAH. Because of the importance of those questions and the length of time it will take to answer them adequately, I am going to give Dr. Fischer the noon hour to think of the answer. [Laughter.]

May I call your attention to the fact that if we are going to get into the cafeteria in this building, we must be there almost immediately.

We are going to convene this afternoon promptly at 1:30. The cafeteria is on this floor.

(Thereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. of the same day.)

CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Fourth Annual Education Conference
on
Problems of Segregation and Desegregation
of Public Schools

WASHINGTON, D.C.

May 3, 1962, Afternoon Session

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 3, 1962

(The conference reconvened at 1:30 p.m., Chairman Hannah presiding.)

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, we do not want to be a difficult taskmaster, but if we're going to accomplish what we would like to accomplish, we're going to have to maintain our time schedules.

We are now reconvened, and I think we will take about 45 minutes to finish asking questions or raising points we would like to raise of the panel before us.

You will recall before we adjourned for lunch, Dr. Havighurst had just asked a rather complicated question of Dr. Fischer, who has now had an hour and a half to arrive at a brief answer. So, Dr. Fischer, we will let you take up with the answer.

Dr. FISCHER. I wonder if Dr. Havighurst would want to raise his question again so I can be sure I am talking specifically to his question rather than to some hazy recollection of it I might have.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Havighurst.

Dr. HAVIGHURST. I would be glad to have Dean Fischer formulate the question, and I think perhaps he should.

I believe that, insofar as this conference might be concerned with problems of segregated schools in the North, there are a couple of major questions that need to be cleared, and I think these questions were raised by Dean Fischer, and I don't think he answered them; and, so, I had in mind that one might ask these questions. I don't know that he will feel that he wants to try to answer them definitively. I don't believe this conference is capable of answering them definitively, but I think we ought to consider them.

The first of these is: Can we have equality of opportunity with de facto segregated schools?

As I read the Supreme Court decision of 1954, the Court said that you could not have equality of opportunity in segregated schools. I don't think at the time they were thinking about de facto segregated schools, but it's pretty hard for me to believe that the evidence on which the Court based its opinion does not also apply to schools which are 95 to 100 percent segregated, no matter where you find them. That's the first question.

The second has to do with the proposition that we should maximize free choice. Now, we all believe that. We also know that not everybody can have a completely free choice about everything. So, I suppose it might be better to use the term "to optimize free choice." There have to be some priorities. Individuals have to say which choices they place higher than others, and I think probably some societies have to do the same thing; but, nevertheless, accepting the notion of trying to increase the amount of free choice of individuals, I wonder whether it's possible to maximize free choice without paying some attention to the social composition of schools.

By social, I mean racial and economic composition of schools. I suppose that most of the Negro parents in Chicago, if they had their way, would not send their children to 100-percent or even a 90-percent Negro school. Now, how are you going to maximize their free choice without having some policies about the social composition of the schools? This is the other basic question, I think, that we're concerned with, if we want to deal with the kind of segregation that we have in the northern cities.

Dr. FISCHER. I think there are several things that can be said in comment on these questions. Some, obviously, are matters of opinion. Others have to do with facts.

I would say that we can have equality of opportunity even though some schools might be composed entirely of one race. It seems to me a great pity that we use the same word to describe several different situations. There's a vast difference, in my thinking, between a school in which members of a single race have assembled more or less by choice or as a matter of convenience and a school to which they have been forced to go and from which others have, with equal force, been excluded.

I think that the Supreme Court decision spoke of and rested upon the evils of schools segregated by the force of law. I read nothing in the Supreme Court decision about what we now have come to call de facto segregation. I would point out that de jure segregation happens also to be de facto segregation, but these are quite different situations, I think, from one in which people are together because they choose to be there.

Another point that occurs to me always in this connection is that it strikes me as offensive to say that a school composed of Negro children is a bad school. I won't accept this. Now, if the school is composed of children who are behavior problems, regardless of their race, then this school is less desirable than one that is composed of children who are well behaved and more pleasant to live with. If the school is a ramshackle physical hole, then it's a bad school to that extent. If the teachers are incompetent, to that extent it's a

bad school. But I don't believe that a school becomes any better because we add to it children of one race or any worse because we add to it children of another race. This is, to me, a basically offensive thought.

Now, on the business of integrating student bodies, I would agree wholeheartedly that integrated student bodies are desirable and that they should be encouraged in every possible way, but I don't think that any child should be brought into any school as an exhibit for the edification of another child. This I also find offensive. It's using people as means rather than treating them as the supreme ends. I think that opportunities for integration ought to be provided through policy action and through administrative action, but I do not think that any governmental agency, any school board, or any school administrator ought to establish racial quotas or ratios. This, I think, is another offensive idea, and in conflict in spirit as well as in letter, I think, with the Supreme Court decision.

It seems to me that what we face here is the question of what the schools are really trying to accomplish, and I keep insisting that this is, the best possible education of all the children who come to those schools, treating these children as worthwhile, valuable, respectable individuals, one by one. I do not believe that we ought to develop a stereotype which holds that a school of one race is a better school than a school of another race.

Now, there are some practical problems here. If in New York City, in Manhattan specifically, we undertook to provide a good mix in all of the schools, I suspect we'd have to import a number of white children because there just wouldn't be enough of them to go around to give what most people would consider an optimum balance in the composition of the schools. How you would engineer that situation to get what most of us would want, although not all of us would be willing to bring it about by administrative action, I don't quite understand. I don't understand how this would happen in some of the neighborhoods of Chicago, although I don't know Chicago as well as I do New York.

I continue to believe that free choice means just what those words imply, and I would hope that the choice would be as free as it could be made for all of our children and that they would be encouraged to make the choices which are most likely to be good for them. This is one of the reasons why I would hope for a good guidance program in every school that would advise children and parents not only as to curricula and possible vocational choices, and so on, but also with respect to the schools of a community that might be more desirable at one time or another in the light of particular educational purposes or needs of a given child.

I come back again to my original statement, which is that I do not like to see administrators or policymakers playing God by manipulating human beings in order to create patterns which seem good to somebody who considers himself wise enough to know what a good pattern is. I would prefer rather to provide the richest possible opportunities in all our schools, and I know this will still take some doing; but, working toward that, I would then want to provide full opportunity for choice, and I would want to help people to make the choices which are most likely to be useful for them, but leave the choice to them.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

The first gentleman.

Dr. PETERS. I should like to get to another point with Dr. Fischer, as a physician and surgeon. You state you can't get physicians who will make their primary job taking care of incurable disease;——

Dr. FISCHER. That wasn't what I said.

Dr. PETERS. Yet there are many who do just this, and I wondered whether you would address yourself to the problem not only of the teacher, but of the facility that is offered to this teacher. We can't get physicians to go to rural areas of the country unless we provide them with clinics and places where they have the tools that they need to work. I wondered how much of this problem of not getting the teacher to go into the area where there were deprived children was that the facilities, and all that goes with teaching, were just as deprived as the subject who was to be taught.

Dr. FISCHER. I would quite agree that we need to improve the physical facilities, the auxiliary services, and so on, that are available in the schools which many teachers choose to reject now, and I think we ought to move as rapidly as we can to do that. I think we ought to improve the working conditions for the individual teachers in those schools in every way we can.

This would have to do with class size. It would have to do with time for teachers to prepare their work. It would have to do with the position of classroom assistants. It would have to do with a good many things. But even when we might provide in these schools the best that we now know, and the maximum level of services that we could now define as desirable, I don't think we will have done what needs doing, all of it, because we still need to know a great deal more than we now do about the most effective ways to work with these children.

I hinted at it this morning when I said that teaching reading to a primary grade child who comes from a home in which he has never seen anybody read anything is a problem of a different sort from teaching reading to a child in whose home reading is as natural as eating. There are many other problems of this kind—the problem

of how you deal with a child, all of whose experiences out of school tend to drive him counter to the thrust which the school attempts to develop. We have here problems of relating the child's basic cultural pattern to the cultural pattern which is more or less standard in American schools. We don't know enough about making that transition, and I'm afraid that teachers haven't been given much help in their professional education in working in that kind of cultural transitional situation.

So, I would hope that, as we upgrade the services and the facilities of these schools, we'll also begin developing much more effective ways of planning the curricula and actually carrying on the instruction of many of the children in these schools.

Dr. PETERS. That will have to be done within those schools, won't it? You won't be able to——

Dr. FISCHER. It will have to be done within the schools, but a great deal of basic research is required before the pedagogy can be developed.

Dr. PETERS. Within those schools you have to make that research?

Dr. FISCHER. Within the United States; within some of our cities, for example.

Chairman HANNAH. Will the gentleman——

Dr. FISCHER. And this is not a matter of race. The problem is just as serious with some of the white groups as it is with any of the Negro groups.

Chairman HANNAH. Will the gentleman who asked the last question identify himself for the record?

Dr. PETERS. Dr. Peters.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

Dr. PICOTT. My name is Rupert Picott and I am from Virginia—Richmond.

My question grows out of my background. It is in two parts. The first is, I am from Virginia and we have a situation there which we call Prince Edward County, where schools are closed entirely to evade the Supreme Court decision. I wondered if Dr. White would care to comment, in light of his statement, as I understood it, about applying certain pressures, and also in view of what some of us in Virginia seem to think is an urgent proposition where you have had schools closed since 1959 to almost 3,000 children.

Dr. WHITE. Well, I feel that the State, and eventually the United States, has its first obligation to children. It is somebody's responsibility to see that every child has an opportunity for a good education, and I certainly don't mean to leave the impression so much that this would not happen.

Dr. PICOTT. May I follow that? I don't want to put him on the spot at all, but I'm interested in who this "somebody" is. We in Virginia have been trying to find that person.

Chairman HANNAH. Would you care to answer that, Dr. White?

Dr. WHITE. Yes; I would like to. Well, I'll say what I think. I feel that education has primarily been the State's responsibility. If the State fails to live up to this responsibility, then I see no alternative except for the Federal Government to step in and assume some responsibility.

Dr. PICOTT. Thank you for that southern viewpoint.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

Dr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I am Roy Nichols from Berkeley, Calif.

I want to ask Dr. Fischer—I'm not sure whether it's one question or several, but I think his observations are so critical that I need to understand precisely what he means. He indicated that he was opposed to what he called social engineering, and if I understand properly what he meant by this, he means any device employed by a superintendent of schools or a board to forceably and physically integrate races within a system. This, as I understand it, is what he refers to as engineering.

I would like to ask a question based on these two observations: The fact that housing, within given cities, up until recently, restricted minority populations by law through the enforcement of covenants which are now outlawed—this basically provided for the American ghetto reinforced by the courts. Even though we no longer have the enforcement of covenants, the fact is the ghetto is a state of being, engineered both by law and by de facto circumstances in the past and in the present.

Add this to the fact that in a normal public school situation in most cities (though the Supreme Court did not specifically refer to de facto segregation in northern schools) for the most part, a child is forced to attend school within district; therefore, he does operate within certain compulsory boundaries that are fixed by the board or by the system, itself, in some fashion.

Now, am I to understand that your position is—and I think this has reference both to the South and North; whether you sense the implications or not, it seems to me that it does, and it has some reference to the Supreme Court decision, itself—do you mean, then, we ought not to unengineer that which has been artificially engineered? Under the circumstances, do educators have any responsibility in this respect whatsoever?

In answering this question, I would like for you to explain to me what you mean when you say "open choice" or "open districting" in the selection of schools. I'm not clear at all on your position in this matter.

Dr. FISCHER. I can give you a precise example of what I mean. It is the city of Baltimore, where any child, regardless of where he lives, is free to attend any school in the entire city, with only this exception:

That there are in the city—I don't have the precise number now, but it would be of a total of some 200 schools—perhaps 25 or 30 which are so badly crowded that children just simply cannot be admitted to them from a wide area. In those cases, though, the children who live nearest to those schools are still at liberty to choose any other school in the city that they wish to attend.

Now, what I am suggesting is quite different from what prevails in most cities, but this is one of the elements that I would include in this operation of free choice. I would, within a given school district, in the sense of an area under a given board, if I had my way, completely abolish attendance districts and give any person who lived within the jurisdiction of that board the opportunity to enroll his child in any school within that total community.

Dr. NICHOLS. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, a followup question: What actually happens in Baltimore?

Dr. FISCHER. Well, I think Dr. Jackson is better qualified to answer that than I am, because he's there now, but I can tell you that one effect of this was that most children continued to attend, as a matter of free choice, the schools nearest to which they live, but those children who wanted to attend elsewhere did, and every year there are some children whose parents ask for transfers some distance from their own neighborhood school to attend a school which they like better.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Jackson, do you want to add to the answer?

Dr. JACKSON. Yes. I would like to verify that. This free choice has permitted over 51,000 Negro pupils to enter desegregated schools. Of the some 93,000 Negro pupils in Baltimore, a little over 51,000—I think about 55 percent of them—are in desegregated schools because of this free choice policy. Now, if our schools were districted, because of the pattern in which the people live in Baltimore, the housing pattern, the ghettos, it's estimated that less than 20,000 Negro pupils would be in desegregated schools. So, if our schools were districted, it would limit the number of Negro pupils who would be free to attend the schools of their choice, and that's desegregated schools.

Now, I want to hasten to add, too, one point here: That one of the reasons why we don't have more than 51,000 out of the 93,000 attending desegregated schools is because it is the general opinion in Baltimore, people who know, that some of the best schools in Baltimore are still all-Negro schools. All the best teachers haven't transferred out of all the Negro schools, and I could name you a few schools where some of the qualified Negro teachers refuse to transfer out. Some of the best schools from the standpoint of facilities in Baltimore are still all-Negro schools. I think in the last 8 years we have built more new buildings in the heart of the city where only Negroes live than we have around the periphery.

And, secondly, the instructional programs in some of those all-Negro schools are considered as good, if not better than in many of the all-white schools in Baltimore.

So, for those reasons, I think the districting policy has certainly helped Negroes, both teachers as well as pupils, in Baltimore City.

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman in the middle row, B.

Mr. DINES. My name is Aaron Dines and I am counsel to the Morristown Board of Education, Morristown, N.J.

I again, with Dr. Fischer's permission, would like to ask him a question and, with your permission, since some reference has been made to the decisions of the Supreme Court, before I ask the question, would like to quote from part of that decision, because I think it bears heavily upon what has been discussed so far in the last few moments.

I believe this is an exact quote from Chief Justice Warren's opinion, and it is a conclusion of the Court, in 347 U.S., page 491: "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal facilities has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

Now, it is significant also to note that in the earlier decision, where the Court did not precisely consider the question of separate but equal facilities, but did consider the attendance at a law school in a Western State, the Court made comment on—and I am quoting now—"those qualities which are incapable of objective measurements, but which make for greatness in the law school."

Of course, that was the *Sweatt* v. *Painter* case.

I would also like to point out that in note 6 of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Brown* case, I think the Court by reference to the situation, I think, in Boston, Mass.—well, put it another way: I don't think that Justice Warren just put that in for no reason at all.

Under these circumstances, I would like to ask Dr. Fischer how he can square a doctrine of free choice in the many thousands of small communities throughout the United States, where I think it is quite evident that such a practice is prevailing with people who just about send their children to the same school they are going to anyway, with my interpretation at least of what the Court had in mind in these decisions.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Fischer, do you want to answer the question?

Dr. FISCHER. Far be it for me to attempt to decide or to say what was in the Chief Justice's mind when he wrote his opinion, but it seems to me important to note that the whole context of the *Brown* case was a context of legal compulsion of segregation. The *Brown* case, so far as I know, did not involve the consideration of voluntarily chosen, uniracial schools. The whole effort behind the *Brown* case was to protect

children and to free them from the requirement of the law that they attend segregated schools.

Now, I could be wrong about those facts, but I don't believe I am.

Chairman HANNAH. Dean Griswold, do you want to comment on this one?

Commission GRISWOLD. Well, I think I would tend to agree with Dr. Fischer. In the quotation read, the reference was to separate but equal, and separate but equal was a legal doctrine based upon a decision of the Supreme Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. It seems to me tolerably clear what the Court was dealing with in the *Brown* case was legally required segregation.

Now, it is perfectly true there is another problem which is closely related, which has been referred to here as de facto segregation.

I find myself with a little feeling that maybe we oughn't to worry too much about de facto segregation until we have beaten the legally required one. Then we can move up on the de facto segregation problem, which has lots of angles and problems in connection with it, in which it may be unwise for us to move too fast until we have gone farther than we have in eliminating legally required segregation.

But specifically with respect to that quotation, my interpretation of it would be that it was referring to legally required segregation, that being the only thing that was involved before the Court and the whole argument before the Court being based on it.

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman at the end of table D.

Mr. NELSON. Richard Nelson, Chicago, Ill.

I hope that Dean Griswold does not mean that we in the North will do nothing about de facto segregation until legal segregation has been eliminated in the South.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Certainly——

Mr. NELSON. I would like to——

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Certainly not. Certainly not. At any point where we have got legal segregation beat—then maybe we should begin to proceed on the next. Then surely we should begin to proceed on the next.

Mr. NELSON. I would like to ask this question, then: Is there subsidy of transportation in Baltimore so that students can attend schools that are a considerable distance from their homes, and if there is no subsidy in Baltimore or perhaps in other communities, is this really freedom of choice?

Dr. FISCHER. The answer is: There is no subsidy for school transportation in Baltimore except in the cases of physically handicapped children and a few others who are moved from one school to another by administrative action in order to take advantage of open space and available classrooms. In those cases the transportation is provided

at public expense, but without regard to race. It happens that some of the children involved are Negro and some are white, but the schools have not been chosen for the purpose of race, for racial reasons.

Now, if you say this eliminates some freedom of choice, well, I guess it does. I'm sure that it also is a fact that freedom of choice for a good many Americans is limited by the fact that it costs more to buy a house in some communities than it does to buy houses in other communities. How far we go in subsidizing choices is another question altogether.

If a community does provide free transportation or transportation at public expense to schools, then it would seem to me that the question of making it possible under some reasonable plan for people to choose schools outside their own neighborhoods ought to be pursued.

This again is something that—if we want it badly enough we ought to be willing to pay for.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Mays.

Dr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give Dr. Fischer a breathing spell and ask Dr. White a question.

In the light of the progress which Dr. White indicates has been made, would he say, on the whole, despite tensions and pressures, human relations in the South have greatly improved since 1954 and since desegregation began? I ask this question because of the continuing pressure in the South and because, having lived in the South most of my life, I feel less tension since 1954 than I felt in the 1940's.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Mays, before Dr. White answers the question, for the record, will you identify yourself a little further.

Dr. MAYS. Yes.

Benjamin E. Mays, Morehouse College, Atlanta.

Dr. WHITE. It's very difficult to answer this in a generalized way because it varies some from community to community or from State to State. I would say human relations probably have been improved in some communities and they are in worse condition in others. You can cite many cases where the human relations situation, cooperative planning between the races, does not exist now that did exist prior to 1954, while in other places, where you have strong leadership, it probably has been improved. So, the answer would be yes and no.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir. The gentleman here.

Mr. KAPLAN. My name is John Kaplan from White Plains, N.Y.

I would like to ask Dr. Fischer how he would apply his doctrine of compensatory opportunity to a racially mixed school. Would he merely pick out the Negroes from similar white children and give them a better education?

Dr. FISCHER. No. I wouldn't pick out the Negroes necessarily, but I would try to identify those children whose educational needs are

such that they seem to require compensatory opportunities and treatment. This might be a Negro child. It might be a white child who has been in a deprived environment for some time. I would not make any of these decisions on racial grounds. I would make the decisions in terms of educational needs.

What I said in the devolopment of this point was that many of our Negro children, to wit, in a certain sense, all of them, are historically the victims of discrimination which was brought to bear by the force of government, and, therefore, if there is any difference in moral entitlement to this kind of opportunity, certainly the Negro child has the better of that; but I would not make any educational decision concerning any child simply in terms of race. I'd look at the child. I'd look at his history. I would look at his needs, and then I would do the best I could for him.

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman in row F.

Mr. RUKEYSER. I am Merryle Rukeyser, New Rochelle.

Chairman HANNAH. New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mr. RUKEYSER. We were the guinea pigs for the Nation in this matter, and I would be very pleased while I am here, but not at this time, to give any information I can which will throw light on the general problem.

At this moment I just wanted to make two brief observations: One was if I don't hear anything else besides Dr. Fischer's presentation, I am very happy I came to this conference, and I think it's a strange distortion of educational philosophy to question the professor as to whether his doctrine fits into what some lawyer thinks that Chief Justice Warren was trying to say. I didn't think Chief Justice Warren was trying to freeze educational philosophy and curriculum and pedagogy for all time.

Now, I would like to say that, Dr. White, based on experience, the southern schools make a serious mistake if they're waiting for the courts to take over and decide educational problems. I think the courts have demonstrated that they have less capacity to do this than professional educators and school boards. I've got great respect for the courts when they stay in their proper precincts. We showed extreme courtesy and respect to the U.S. district judge that heard our case, and I regret to say that it wasn't reciprocal in that he didn't understand the division of powers and didn't understand that a State officer, such as the president of a school board, is also entitled not to be treated contemptuously.

When Baltimore and Washington in 1954 sent teams up to New Rochelle to study how, particularly in the secondary schools, we had the races living in schools happily together, I regret they didn't also have an opportunity to study how we were keeping a high-level teaching

staff at the Lincoln School in a predominantly Negro neighborhood because, as of today, we haven't had the same experience that some of the other cities report, where there has been a flight of good teachers out of the Lincoln School.

I don't purport to have all the answers but I think part of the answer was that we had two very fine principals of the school. They were dedicated educators, and they created a spirit and a dedication among the teaching staff. As of today, the 220 children whose parents elected, despite the court order, to keep them in the Lincoln School have been petitioning the school board: "Please don't take away our neighborhood school because it has been shrunken by judicial decree. Please don't taken away our good principal, Dr. Robetaille. Please don't take away our dedicated teaching staff. Please don't take away our neighborhood school." So, I assume that free choice is a two-way street.

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman at the end of row G over here.

Dr. LIEF. Harold Lief, New Orleans.

By implication at least, Dr. Fischer has said that we must make a clear distinction between race and social class.

I think we have to keep this in mind. If we don't realize that Negro children come from different social classes, different backgrounds, which gives them attitudes and values which differ among themselves, we tend to make errors in two directions. One is that we apply a racial tag which is based on social class.

An error has been made also in another direction. I would like to ask Dr. Fischer to comment on this.

In one recently desegregated school that was studied in New Jersey, we found that teachers were making no record whatsoever of the number of Negro and white children they had in their classes, and when asked outside the class how many they had of each race, they were unable to answer.

This bears on the other point that Dr. Fischer raised, that we must be realistic as well as idealistic. We have to recognize that some of these children will have special educational problems, and I think this attempt to avoid appearing as if one is prejudiced can have dire educational effects.

The second question I would like to ask Dr. Fischer is: What is being done in educational circles to think ahead of the problem of teaching children how to deal with each other, children of different races to deal with each other, in classes? We have spoken a little bit about what we are doing with teachers in the attempt to orient them to the special problems of desegregation. What are we doing about the preparation of children for this?

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Fischer.

Dr. FISCHER. Well, of course, they—let me say first I don't think I referred to social classes in my comments. I did refer to differences in cultural background, and I think there is a subtle, but important, difference here.

The American public school system, for a long time, has been helping children to learn to live with other children of different cultural backgrounds than their own. This has gone on as long as we have had common schools in this country. Now, in recent years—and by that I mean something of the order of the last 25-or-so years—more deliberate attention has been given to what we call intercultural education. We call it by various other names, but in many schools throughout the United States deliberate efforts are made through the social studies program, through high school courses in problems of democracy, and in various other ways, to help children and young people understand the problems of a variegated, diversified society and to learn to live well in that society.

I would be the last to say we have done everything that needs to be done, but a great deal of it comes about not through formal instruction, but through the actual experience of living in a school with people of different backgrounds than one's own. The degree to which the school is successful in helping youngsters with learnings of this kind is a direct reflection, in most cases, of the climate of the school which is developed as the result of deliberate action by the administrators and the teachers who are responsible for the school, as well as by the interest of the parents and other community people in what goes on in the school.

That was the second question. I don't know what your first question was. I don't think I heard it.

Dr. LIEF. The first question had to do with teachers being unable to tell how many Negro children they had in a desegregated class, and this attempt on their part to appear without prejudice, I think, bears out your point that one must be realistic. Educators have to be realistic and know that children in a class have different needs.

Dr. FISCHER. Well, I don't know that it makes too much difference whether you record on a child's record card what his race is. I have never been able to get excited about that issue. I don't think it's wrong to record a child's race. I think it's wrong to discriminate against a child because of his race, but simply to acknowledge in writing that he is of Caucasian descent or of Negro descent or of Oriental background—this, in itself, is certainly not a reprehensible practice. On the other hand, I don't care particularly whether it's done or not, so long as a teacher or others responsible for the child pay some intelligent attention to the child's needs and make an effort to find out as much about his background as is necessary to teach him

well. I don't care what forms we use or how we fill in the forms. That's much less important.

Chairman HANNAH. Many people have had their hands up, and I want to apologize to any who do not get recognized, but I am going to ask Mrs. Cole if she has a question or two she wants to get on the record.

Mrs. COLE. Thank you, Dr. Hannah.

This morning there was some talk about teacher training and the need for special training of teachers to understand the problems, let us say, specifically of the minority-group child. I think that Dr. Schueler, if I pronounce his name correctly, of Hunter College who is here has developed a program at Hunter.

I wonder if he would care to speak to it.

Dr. SCHUELER. I'll be happy to, if this is the time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HANNAH. Go ahead, sir.

Dr. SCHUELER. Hunter College is one of the four senior colleges of the City University of New York comprising four senior colleges and three junior colleges. The four senior colleges among them prepare, have traditionally prepared, oh, between one-half and three-fourths of all teachers in the New York City area.

If, in the face of this, we then discover, as was indicated this morning, that the teachers don't seem to wish to be assigned to schools in underprivileged areas, we have to take a very urgent look at our own program and find out to what extent we can do something about it. For that reason, we attempted a year and a half ago a small pilot project, which will now be extended on the basis of lessons learned to much larger proportions.

The project, in brief, was this: The greatest problem area in the New York City urban schools is in certain parts of the city at the junior-high-school level, in which some of the schools, even though they may have quite good facilities, may have a turnover of as much as 40 percent of their teachers within a given time, in which there are perhaps 35 or 40 actual vacancies in classrooms that are being filled by teachers who are not qualified for these jobs and who are transients in every sense of the word, professionally and physically. It was decided to adopt, as teacher-training centers, a series of these schools. The condition for adoption was as follows: The school was to be in an economically and socially deprived area.

The ones we chose first were those in which about 75 percent of the children came from homes on home relief, in which the delinquency rate is the highest we find anywhere in the urban area, in which the schools, themselves, have difficulty in recruiting teachers, and had a very large number of vacancies and school turnover.

We made an arrangement with the appropriate agency of the board of education that if we assigned student teachers in their senior year of preparation, undergraduate preparation for teaching, to these schools specifically, trained them in a different way to work in those areas, in those schools, with those children in those neighborhoods; and, if these young student teachers, at the end of their training, still wished to be assigned to that school, were judged to be qualified by the proper New York City examinations, that they would be guaranteed positions in the schools in which they were trained.

This was done, and for the last year and a half we have worked with a small group of student senior volunteers. We're quite insistent that these have to be volunteers. We don't believe in forced assignment. The type of training which has been offered has been somewhat unique, in that we have attempted to familiarize each young person, as much as is possible within one semester of student-teaching service, with the community in which he is going to serve. The student is given contact with the community leaders, with the settlement houses, with the leaders, political leaders, with the newspapers. They even had a session, a rather dramatic one, but it's become a tradition now, with the leader of the Black Muslim group in Harlem. We thought it was necessary for them to see all sides. In other words, we combine the services of what we would call the sociological social work discipline with the traditional educational discipline.

In addition to that, we have had our own staff members, who, themselves, have discovered they have allowed the urban schools to pass them by—many of our staff members knew the favored suburban schools much more than they did the urban less-favored schools—to spend many, many days and hours in these schools that were adopted, to visit in classes freely, and become acquainted with the problems. These staff members were available to these young teachers on a day-by-day basis, whenever it was felt that they were needed.

As a result of the first three semesters of operation, of the first 32 volunteer young people, 25 are now teaching full time of their own choice in the schools in which they were trained, an average of 80 percent. In addition to that, we have discovered that the number of volunteers each semester has increased. The first semester, there were about 6; this semester, 19. The next semester we already know the number will exceed two dozen.

What are the lessons we have learned? The lessons are: First of all, we have tended in our cynicism to underestimate the idealism of young people. I think we would have to say we have failed in our inservice programs; that is, in working properly with teachers who are already in service. The demands of teaching, full-time teaching, especially in difficult areas, don't leave enough energy for teachers

to properly continue their training, and we feel that we have to get them before the situation takes over. We've discovered as well that by delivering a focus, a series of foci infection, into the schools of idealistic, well-trained young people, who know the children and know the community well and know how to deal with them, that these people become a resource for the next semester's student teachers and those who follow.

As a result, now, at the beginning of the third year of operation, in one particular junior high school, which is one of the classic examples of the so-called slum junior high school, 120, between one-fourth and one-fifth of the entire teaching staff is now the Hunter-trained young people, and these young people have been enlisted to help train additional teachers. We hope to build them into a curriculum study resource so that we can work with them and with these young people and develop materials, new procedures, and so on. However, it must be said that this is just the beginning. These are very effective beginning teachers. As such, they are quite more effective than some of the transient teachers and the older ones who may have been there.

Much more needs to be done. We are now exploring ways to work with them further in the first few years of their service, especially in two directions:

1. To find how to become more familiar than they now are, even more familiar, with the culture of the community and the children in that community that they serve. It is a fact in our city that the majority of the teachers do not live in the community in which they teach, especially if this is the traditional underprivileged urban community. Therefore, it becomes most important, in order to provide the proper communication between student and teacher, without which the educational process can't even begin, that these people, these teachers, understand the children and understand the community in which these children live. Therefore, what we intend to work on, and have the other institutions at the university work on with us, is to introduce much more of the content of community analysis and social analysis and social psychology and community study into the training of teachers.

2. We think it is most important, because of the students in these schools, that they [the teachers] also come to grips with their own attitude toward other cultures, cultures and societies other than their own—I mean there not only the Negro, but also the Puerto Rican, which is the other problem we have. We would like to work with these young people, in an intensive way, in a self-analysis of their own attitudes, their own processes of human relations.

This, Mr. Chairman, is just the beginning.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, sir.

Mrs. Cole, do you have one or two more questions? I think we must terminate this section of our discussion by 2:30 p.m., in 10 minutes.

Mrs. COLE. There is one question that was brought up this morning that really wasn't discussed. Dr. Jackson raised the question of the unqualified Negro teacher in the Baltimore public schools who, to a large extent, is a graduate of essentially segregated teachers' colleges in the State of Maryland. I would like to throw to the group as a whole, Mr. Chairman, the question of whether this is a situation unique to Baltimore or is it one of importance in other parts of the country.

Chairman HANNAH. Restate your question, the specific question.

Mrs. COLE. Well, essentially, is the teacher trained in the segregated Negro college in many cases less qualified than other teachers in the school system?

Chairman HANNAH. Who would like to offer to answer that question?

Dr. JACKSON. I would like to make just a statement, if I can.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Jackson.

Dr. JACKSON. Some of the best teachers that we have in Baltimore City are from all-Negro colleges. I didn't mean to say that all the teachers that we get in the elementary school, all the Negro teachers, were unqualified. Some of the best teachers we have had—I have heard this said by the assistant superintendent for elementary education—are Negro teachers.

I want to hasten to add, too, that all the good white teachers have not run. Many of them are still remaining in the desegregated schools, and all the good, qualified Negro teachers haven't requested transfers. Many of them have remained in the all-Negro schools. Also some of the unqualified teachers in Baltimore City are white.

Many of the 1,100 special substitutes I spoke about this morning are white, poorly qualified, have either taken our examination and failed it or don't have the educational background to take the examination.

Dr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, information.

This is Nichols.

I'm not clear on what Dr. Jackson said this morning as against what he said this afternoon. Am I to understand that the vast majority of Negro students in Baltimore are still in predominantly Negro schools, and am I to understand that you said this morning that none of the white teachers desire to teach in these schools? Do you have any teaching in these schools at the moment?

Dr. JACKSON. We don't have any white teachers teaching in the all-Negro schools, but if you understood me to say the vast majority of Negro students are still in all-Negro schools, that isn't correct.

Dr. NICHOLS. I see.

Dr. JACKSON. The majority of Negro students are in desegregated schools. Fifty-five percent of the Negro pupils in Baltimore City are in desegregated schools.

Dr. NICHOLS. But, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to follow up with this one question: By implication this morning you seemed to suggest that at least, let us say, 45 percent of the Negro students in Baltimore, in predominantly Negro schools, are basically still in an inferior teaching situation.

Dr. JACKSON. No; I didn't say that.

Dr. NICHOLS. Well, that is the impression you gave.

Dr. JACKSON. No. I said because of the white teachers who request transfers out of desegregated schools there has been created a number of vacancies in those desegregated schools, and what is happening: Many of the qualified—many; I didn't say all of them, and certainly not a majority of them—Negro teachers are requesting to go over to those desegregated schools, because many of them prefer to be on desegregated faculties, and many of those desegregated schools have better facilities than the all-Negro schools, but there are still a large number of Negro teachers qualified who have not transferred from the all-Negro schools.

Dr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman——

Chairman HANNAH. I am going to recognize the gentleman on this side for the last question.

Mr. OLIVER. Oliver from Nashville, Tenn.

I didn't want to ask a question. I just wanted to respond to Mrs. Cole's question by saying in Nashville we have no unqualified Negro teachers. Some of our very best teachers are Negroes. Nearly all of them have come from all-Negro or practically all-Negro colleges. We have far more well qualified applicants than we can use. We just employ the best.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Mr. Oliver.

Now, I should like to thank our panel very much, Dr. Fischer, Dr. Jackson and Dr. White. We're very grateful to you. This is a subject we haven't finished, but I am sure if we spent all the rest of the afternoon we wouldn't have finished it either.

We will excuse you, and while we ask the new panelists to take your places, suppose we take about 2 or 3 minutes and let you stand up but let's not leave the room, and in an hour we'll have a break.

Will Dr. Nyquist, Dr. Bond, Dr. Peters, and Dr. Chute move over toward the panel table?

Chairman HANNAH. Will Drs. Nyquist, Bond, Peters, and Chute please move to the head of the table?

Ladies and gentlemen, the second subject for conference discussion, "Factors To Be Considered in Planning Desegregation," will be presented to you by the panel that is now assembled.

The first speaker on the panel is Dr. Ewald B. Nyquist, deputy commissioner of education for the State of New York. Dr. Nyquist is a native of Illinois. Both his undergraduate and graduate work was done at the University of Chicago. Since 1945 he has pursued his professional career in New York State, first at Columbia and later at the State department of education at Albany. He became deputy commissioner of education 5 years ago.

We think it is fitting that Dr. Nyquist speak first on this panel because New York State was the first to take an active role in the solution of the problems of racial segregation in public schools throughout the State.

Dr. Nyquist, we shall be interested in hearing what you have to tell us.

STATEMENT OF EWALD B. NYQUIST, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, STATE OF NEW YORK, ALBANY, N.Y.

Dr. NYQUIST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have pretentiously chosen two titles for my remarks this afternoon. The first is a statement made by Agnes Meyer in reviewing Dr. Conant's last report on *Slums and Suburbs*, which contains the memorable phrase "social dynamite." That statement is: "Equality is the moral imperative of our era."

The wind of change is in the air. To use terms in the physical and natural sciences, nonlinear and pituitary growth characterizes much of the change that takes place about us. One of the contemporary revolutions familiar to us all has been described as the "worldwide revolution of rising expectations." We daily bear witness to the emergence of non-Western nations and almost primitive peoples, such as some in Asia and Africa, into modern life.

The growth into prominence of many heretofore obscure peoples, the rising expectations of multitudes everywhere to share in human dignity and the fruits of the second industrial revolution, are facts within the conventional wisdom, but I would not apply this term of rising expectations to characterize only increasing nationalism and the foment of political forces. There are obvious domestic manifestations, namely, the rising personal aspirations of individuals to be better than they are and to fulfill themselves as human beings, and this is done best through education.

In short, there is a clear irresistible movement of peoples everywhere who have been deprived or subjected to achieve equality and to thrust aside the accumulated injustices of the past. Thus, I say the moral imperative of our time is equality.

We are acutely aware in the State of New York, in the State education department, of these tidal forces and their implications.

As I said earlier, I have chosen a subtitle for my remarks. This one comes from the homely wisdom once uttered by one of my favorite people, Satchel Paige. He said: "Don't never look back. Something may be gaining on you." [Laughter.] Those States that have never moved, have not yet moved in new directions, might well heed Satchel Paige's admonition.

I do not wholly believe in the literalness of the repeated refrain printed in muted tones on the checks issued biweekly to New York State governmental employees. The symmetrical design of this repetitive phrase is placed thereon probably for the purpose of deterring those who would be tempted to alter the amounts by erasure. That refrain, ladies and gentlemen, is: "New York State has everything." [Laughter.]

This may appear to some to be an incontinent assertion of political ego. My interpretation of it is less felicitous, namely, that New York State has every conceivable educational problem, including de facto segregation.

Our State system of education is not monolithic. It is characterized by a wholesome diversity. It reflects the richest educational spectrum. The variety of sponsorship and governance suggests the composition of the population. It would be hard to imagine a more pluralistic society in terms of race, creed, and color, and ethnic origin of its people. I guess it ought to come to you with noonday clarity that New York's affairs are not simply polarized around, for example, a white Protestant ethnic. This makes it warmly interesting to be a governmental official in this State. In Albany, we have developed a ceaseless capacity for astonishment. We live with our eyebrows permanently lifted.

I should like to describe a few major aspects of our program in New York State which seek to give practical effect to this moral imperative of equality. There will be no novelty vectors introduced. There will be simply a "laundry list" of what our program is or proposes to be.

Now, in what I have already said and in what I am about to say, I do not wish to imply an unfavorable criticism of other States. You all remember the arrogant remark of the pompous Church of England cleric who summed up his judgment of his nonconformist colleague one day by saying to him: "We are both doing God's work, you in your way and I in His." [Laughter.]

One of the first things needed in any State, it seems to me, in dealing with the complicated social and educational problems of racial imbalance in schools is a massive official commitment on the part of the State to recognize the problem and to seek its solution. The State must present a chosen face.

Our governing Board of Regents, the head of our educational system, adopted a statement in January of 1960. I should like to quote a portion of it:

> Modern psychological knowledge indicates that schools enrolling students largely of homogeneous ethnic origin may damage the personality of minority-group children. Such schools decrease their motivation and thus impair the ability to learn. Public education in such a setting is socially unrealistic, blocks the attainment of the goals of democratic education, and is wasteful of manpower and talent, whether this situation occurs by law or by fact.

The Regents went on to say that they recognize the complex social and community problems, such as residential segregation, which influence the quality of education and the ethnic composition of our schools, and that, therefore, they could only deal directly with educational aspects.

Following the adoption of this statement, the commissioner of education filed a memorandum with the Board of Regents in August 1961 entitled "Goals and Plans for Education in New York State." I think two or three paragraphs in it are worthy of quotation:

> Each of the four million students in the schools and colleges of New York State is an individual, with unique abilities, talents, need, and interest. *The goal is to provide each of these students with an equal opportunity for a good education.* Many conditions now limit the attainment of this goal.
>
> One of these conditions is the existence of segregated and nonintegrated schools. Studies have indicated that minority-group children in such schools, especially Negro children, are educationally disadvantaged. Thousands more are educationally handicapped by the effects of low socioeconomic conditions and detrimental home backgrounds.
>
> Other factors limiting the use that children can make of the educational opportunities open to them include the too frequent failure of the schools to identify special needs and talents. Much talent is lost by such failure and many children are denied the opportunity to realize fully their potentialities as individuals.

The Regents then went on to generalize on the solutions, some of which I shall describe.

These two documents represent a firm commitment on the part of the State's highest educational agency to distribute educational opportunities more evenly and to deal with the social and educational problems of any racial imbalance in the schools, and this is our present position.

I'll spend the rest of my time discussing briefly how we arrived at this position, the programs we now have in operation, and some principles we learned in the process.

One of the things which helped us gain insights into our problem was enforcing what we have called the Education Practices Act. This

was the law against discrimination in admission to any college or university passed over a decade ago. It was given to the department to administer. There was no doubt about the existence of quotas for racial and religious groups, the differential application of admission standards, and traditions involving subtle and not so subtle discrimination. Studies were initiated; techniques were applied to determine the existence of discrimination. I might say, in administering this law—and outside agencies have acknowledged, I think, that we have been successful—we have worked wholly on a persuasive and quiet basis. We have not resorted to pitiless publicity.

The next thing we did was to extend the authority of the administrator of the Education Practices Act to cover the entire gramut of education from kindergarten up. No longer was he to be concerned only with college admissions or open occupancy in college housing and related matters. He and his office were to give specific attention to segregation in schools, discrimination in public school employment, and to the unequal quality of education which so often accompanies racially imbalanced schools. Consultative and advisory service was to be made available.

Out of our experience, I would say that establishing such an office with comprehensive responsibility is a must. Focus is provided. The efforts of many can be joined together; as a member of the policy making group, this staff person assures that the point of view and the program will not be lost among the many demands on education. I do not pretend that this step was originally greeted with shouts of joy and wild acclaim. I have, however, seen profound changes come about, even within our own State education department.

Another activity into which our pragmatic approach led us was a planned series of seminars and conferences. We quickly learned that superintendents of schools, as well as some of our own department specialists, were unsophisticated about intercultural relations. The lack of understanding of class and caste, social change, race, the nature of conflict, aspirations of minority groups, was not inconsiderable. The field of intergroup relations is new, but not so new as to explain this gap in knowledge.

For department personnel, we arranged a year-long seminar. A selected group from various divisions—I might say we have 2,000 employees in our department—were given time off, a day a month, to meet, discuss, and review case material. For such an important effort the best consultants that could be found were used. A foundation grant helped make it possible. The result was a trained cadre in all our offices, curriculum to guidance, adult education to elementary supervision. Consultation and help to local schools was expanded and made more consistent; other colleagues in each of the many offices

began to reflect some of the training as the seminar group passed on their newly acquired skills.

For superintendents of schools, the arrangements were different, but the objectives the same. We went on a retreat, away from all daily distraction, for 2 days of warm discussion, in informal surroundings. Again the best consultants were used and a "no publicity" promise was given so that candor and objectivity could be the basis of discussion. These meetings have had a pervasive effect throughout the State. It has been a firm foundation of support for succeeding programs. The changes in thinking in those who determine change in local districts is noticeable. I wish I could report that we were 100 percent successful with everyone who attended, but then ours is an imperfect society.

Two other approaches to the problems of racially imbalanced schools are required: On the one hand, the dispersal of heavy concentration of Negro pupils in certain bulidings of school districts; on the other hand, support and imagination in raising the quality of education and the levels of achievement.

Often the racially imbalanced school has become a forgotten school. The level of expectations of parents is not high. The socioeconomic status of parents is lower than elsewhere in the community; the experiences on which children base early learning are lacking; educational deprivation of many kinds exist for such pupils. Pilot demonstration projects in New York City and elsewhere have repeatedly shown that a tremendous amount of potential talent could be effectively discovered and developed, achievement raised, and motivation for learning stimulated.

Upon the regents' recommendation, the legislature and the Governor in 1961 enacted legislation providing for an appropriation of $200,000 a year for each of 5 years to be distributed as matching special grants to school districts. Sixteen school district programs were approved to intensify the educational process for economically disadvantaged students. There were many more requests than we were able to fill. We did not receive all the money from the legislature we wanted. Approximately 6,700 students, culturally deprived, with low socioeconomic backgrounds, were involved in these special projects the first year.

The approved projects embrace city, village, suburban, and rural schools at elementary, junior high, and senior high level. The projects incorporate a variety of approaches and educational services—what I think Mr. Fischer would call compensatory opportunity. These include smaller classes, remedial instruction, field trips, and special programs for cultural enrichment, extended pupil personnel services, flexible class and study arrangements, and the whole gamut. All of

this is done to identify potentially able students amongst culturally disadvantaged groups, to provide them with enriched and extended educational activities, and to motivate them to continue their education through and beyond high school.

The results, as expected, have been startling to the uninitiated. No longer do some schools feel forgotten. Morale of teachers and pupils has jumped. Achievement and motivation have risen. A new spirit is visible, spreading to other schools in many districts. This seed money has paid more dividends than almost any project we can recall. Although Project Able, as we call this program,—it is not an acronym, by the way—has been in effect for only a short time, an unusual amount of interest is being shown by other school districts and other organizations both in and out of New York State. I might say new State-aid legislation this year identified the underprivileged student, particularly in our big cities, as a major reason for increasing State aid to the large cities beyond what is normally provided to the other school systems for the first time. We can expect in the future to have school systems initiate their own projects with the examples set with the increased State aid now provided.

I might also say that since the advent of the National Defense Education Act we have used a significant part of Federal funds under title V, which deals with guidance, to help school systems initiate pilot projects of the sort I have described.

I cannot resist the temptation to quote an eminent scientist who was commenting on the modern insight that heredity is only a predisposition which can be molded by environment: "The potent genetic trait of educability is the common property of all mankind, on a par with walking upright or the 9-month pregnancy term." On such a deceptively simple premise is our Project Able founded.

Now, the second approach is that of carrying on desegregation as a process. But here we cannot make any progress unless we know on a systematic basis the racial compositions of our schools and of our classes. We have moved from the traditional attitude of being color blind to being color conscious when it is in the interest of improving the educational process.

We just conducted a racial census study of all school districts in the State. This census was carried out in all of the 880-plus school districts of the State. It involved every classroom in 2,700 different school buildings. It was a limited census: not all ethnic backgrounds were taken into account. In our instructions to the school districts we asked the school superintendents to include only grades 1 through 6, inclusive, and all special classes of children designated as at the elementary level. We did this from our knowledge of racial imbalance.

Where it existed, it primarily involved elementary schools. No pupil and no parent of any student was asked his race or ancestry. We used a social definition; that is to say, if in the community an individaul is considered to be Negro, white, Puerto Rican, or other, for the purposes of this study, he was to be so counted by the teacher. We requested that no record be kept of any information as it related to any individual. Class totals alone were reported.

We received full cooperation from the boards of education and the administrative officers. We found that 67 percent of all the school districts in the State were at least biracial, many of them multiracial. We found that, excluding New York City, 58 percent of the school districts in the State had Negro pupils attending elementary schools. Exclusive of New York City, 5 percent of the total elementary school population is Negro. Biracial schools account for 46 percent of all elementary school buildings. We feel from experience elsewhere and from our own statistics that in only about 4 percent of the buildings and 5 percent of the school districts is racial composition a matter of deep concern. These are districts and buildings in which the percentage of Negro-to-white pupils exceeds a certain percentage.

This report is not out yet, and since we have reporters here—I can't divulge certain statistics and things connected with this study—I'll deal in generalities here and there. The selection of this percentage as a cutoff point by the schools with low and high ratios of Negro-to-white students is an arbitrary one. There is no attempt here to define as de facto segregated any school which exceeds this percentage. Rather, as I said earlier, experience suggests, from this point up, school districts should give added concern to what might be happening in their own systems.

The study has just been completed and no action has yet been taken on it. This is literally true. It was done last week. There are several possibilities of future action:

1. Because of high mobility and rapid population shifts, we should probably take a census on a systematic basis in the future, perhaps biennially, for instance.

2. The department which has power to approve school buildings and school building plans, school building sites, in many districts of the State may wish to review and revise present school site selection requirements so that racial imbalance will be a factor in approval.

3. A conference with school administrators and school board members from the school districts which have a high concentration of Negroes may be arranged to discuss programs, plans, and procedures which can be initiated locally to correct for any effects of racial imbalance.

642146—62——6

4. Increased consultative services to school systems is a possibility.

I'm glad to report that the census, itself, alerted these systems, and in some of the crucial districts school administrators and school board members have undertaken corrective steps.

Throughout this report I have purposely omitted mention of New York City programs and policies. This was on instruction from your planning committee since representatives of New York City are here to participate in the discussion and will, undoubtedly, want to contribute during the conference some of their own insights. I have also omitted mention of our State commission on human rights, whose mandate includes discrimination in all other areas except education.

Finally, I should like to mention one other proposal which is receiving consideration in the department. It is based on the premise that schools are not a closed society or an island unto themselves. They are only one agency in an interrelated and interdependent series of activities where discrimination and segregation exist. Mr. McIver, in his *Toward a More Perfect Union*, underlines the necessity to break the self-perpetuating circle at a variety of points. To accomplish this, insofar as the schools are concerned, we are thinking of establishing perhaps a small three-man ad hoc group composed of outstanding people of the State who have deep insights into intercultural relationships. This small group would have several possible functions:

1. To advise and consult with the Commissioner of Education and the Regents on the actions which the department might take to correct racial imbalance, to identify talent in the culturally deprived, and to improve intercultural relations.

2. To undertake independent studies which will have the support of State funds.

3. To interpret to local communities central issues, to initiate discussions, and to seek support for locally developed plans to combat racial imbalance.

In this latter regard it seems to me that such an advisory group might carry out a most important function. So often what is needed in many local communities is some channel of communication between minority groups, the community at large, the school system itself, and even the State Education Department. It would provide a continuing means of exchanging information and viewpoints on matters of mutual interest. The word "dialogue" has been made shabby by fashionable overuse lately, but this is exactly what needs to take place in many communities, a means by which the parties interested in the problem of segregation and discrimination may conduct a continuing conversation for mutual understanding, the resolution of differences, and the reduction of tension.

We have an obvious analogue now taking place between the major religious groups, a dialogue in order to remove prejudice and, of course, for immediate purposes.

I am grateful for the opportunity to present some highlights of our own State program. While we have made a beginning, it is only a beginning. We have the humility to realize that so much remains to be done.

Thank you.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Nyquist, for that very interesting and encouraging report, and I am sure the members of the conference will have a good many questions they would like to address to you a little later.

The second speaker on this subject is the distinguished Negro educator, Dr. Horace Mann Bond, chairman of the Department of Education of Atlanta University.

Dr. Bond was born in Tennessee. He received his bachelor's degree from Lincoln University in Pennsylvania. He then went to the University of Chicago for graduate study and received both his master's and Ph. D. degrees from that institution. During his professional career he has been associated with a number of Negro colleges and universities—Langston, Alabama State, Fisk, Fort Valley State, and Lincoln University; in the latter two institutions he was the president before going to Atlanta University.

In 1953 Dr. Bond was a member of the research team that prepared the supporting historical briefs for the plaintiffs in the *School Segregation* cases before the Supreme Court. As an educator and a Negro leader, Dr. Bond has followed the desegregation process since 1954 closely. We will be interested in his views on what should be considered by a school system planning desegregation.

Dr. Horace Mann Bond.

STATEMENT OF HORACE MANN BOND, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ATLANTA UNIVERSITY, ATLANTA, GA.

Dr. BOND. Mr. Chairman, my understanding of my assignment is that I am to discuss factors to be considered in planning desegregation with particular reference to southern school districts. It is my further understanding, however, that the subject does not limit me to the scope of concern of those particular districts, but that I am free to go into the broader subject of what should be considered by school authorities in the South today.

All of us know, of course, that the unverbalized factors are too well known to all of us to warrant much attention here. The verbalized factors that southern school districts have considered are written into

an account of the litigation to date, and are very well reviewed in the 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights *Education Report.* They have considered—

Residential proximity;
Residence in properly established attendance areas;
Scholastic achievement;
Overcrowding in the white schools;
Possible racial tension or violence;
The alleged deleterious effect upon the Negro child who would be isolated if desegregated;
The adaptability of the Negro child, and the like.

Numerous other factors have been considered in the framing of the popular pupil placement laws, designed, among other aims, to give guidance to local districts—moral health and mental health, intelligence, suitability of the existing curriculum, the required emotional and social adjustment, and so on.

But I want to say that my presentation here today is somewhat affected by the great stimulation I have received already from this morning's session and from Dr. Nyquist's paper—and, so, I want to give my specific attention here to the question of the requirement of test applications, and so on, which has been placed in many of the regulations. My apology for doing this is that it seems to me that the structure and interpretation of tests is a matter of great importance to achievement of what one might call factual rather than apparent equality toward which many of the plans are directed.

The test has become a sort of an American syndrome, so to speak. It has been a minor obsession for me for the last 40 years, and the persistence of appearance of this index in the litigation and the plans seems to suggest it's also a sort of major national obsession as well. Now, all of this can lead us to the fact that Americans generally have little prior equipment for approaching the question of realistic interpretation of these devices.

My best justification for making this sweeping statement is to be found, I think, in the sense of shock Dr. Conant reveals in his book, *Slums and Suburbs.* He shows, if I may be forgiven for saying so, a sort of naivete derived from long disassociation with the facts of American social and economic class stratification. Before undertaking his survey duties, this distinguished scholar seems not to have had the slightest conception of the abyss separating the amenities of life and the educational facilities provided for different strata in the American public, and this is regardless of race.

Now, of course, our general public has good reasons for its confusion and mystification about these problems. On the one hand, we have had drilled into us from birth the idea that we live in a classless

society where all men are indeed created equal and where preferment depends upon the talents of the individual alone—"talents" in quotation marks. Additionally, our social order has been pervaded with the consequences of Darwinism and believes in the all-powerful force of genetic qualities. All men were born equal, but this came to mean born into an equal world. What later happened to those men resulted from inequalities, we believe, of physiological, neural, volitional, or what have you, types of equipment.

Now, all of this has been reinforced over a long period of years by somatic explanations of the "IQ." It will be recalled that the intelligence test—and I would like to put "intelligence" also in quotation marks whenever I associate it with test—as a mass instrument was born through the administration of the Army Intelligence Test to hundreds of thousands of recruits during World War I. Immediately after that war the first use put to the mass of material published in *Memoir XV* of the National Academy of Sciences was to apply their findings to the solution of a "racist" problem; the findings became one of the chief bulwarks of those wishing to discriminate in establishing immigration quotas against Italians, Greeks, and South Slavs, and against Polish Jews and Catholics.

You will recall that the volume bore the imprimatur of the greatest American psychologists—Thorndike, Thurston, Terman, and others. The contemporary mood of racism included, of course, the Negro, and Carl C. Brigham, with the approval of the committee sponsoring the publication of *Memoir XV*, added the testimony of intelligence tests to older arguments for the inferiority of the "lesser breeds without the law."

Now, you will recall that Brigham later quite decently recanted, but the older men never did. With the exception of Bagley at Columbia and Freeman at Chicago, an entire generation of "educationists" was taught to believe in tests as proof conclusive of racial inferiority; and it has taken almost two generations for Bagley's and Freeman's students to prevail in learned circles; but the knowledge has not yet filtered down to the American rank and file nor to school boards [laughter] where this device, as I have said, continually comes up as a basis for planning desegregation.

An active propaganda has likewise strengthened the old concepts. We have the spectacle of such a book as Audrey Shuey's *The Testing of Negro Intelligence* and Putnam's *Race and Reason* being circulated by groups financed by Wycliffe Draper of New York, as shown in the Washington Post series on the subject, and aided and abetted by Mr. Richard Arens, who was then the staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

What I wish to point out here is that school authorities all over the country, in my opinion, need to concern themselves with the implications of a possible alternative to the formerly predominating interpretation of tests as revealing physiological and inherited inequalities and basing structures either of desegregation or of education upon these results solely. I can begin with Dr. Shuey's interesting book in which she arrayed a cloud of witnesses in the form of more than 300 studies of comparative white and Negro "intelligence," finding in each specific study confirmation of the fact that the Negro children made lower scores than did the white children.

What Dr. Shuey refused to consider as relevant was that in every such pairing, one inevitably finds that the white group is a superior socioeconomic group in its respective community to the subordinated Negro group in the same community. I had the pleasure of reviewing Dr. Shuey's book for the *Journal of Negro Education*, and I pointed out that I could take her results and compare the white children whom she tested in these southern communities and the scores she reported with scores she reported in studies made in northern cities and prove that southern whites were of inferior quality. This, of course, goes back to the Army Alpha Test, when you had that interesting development that the Negro recruits from Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and so on, scored higher than the white recruits from the South, but the explanation then was that all the bright Negroes had left the South to come up North [laughter] and that was why. But there are other indications.

Let me also call to your attention that an infinitesimal number of Negro children qualify for National Merit Scholarships. If one does a national map of the source of these scholars by congressional districts, you find that most of them in Chicago, for example, in Illinois, come from the district just north, Oak Park, River Park, and so on and so on. There are none in the First Congressional District of Chicago, which is the historic black belt; none out in the Fifth Congressional District, where you get into the second-generation immigrant area, and, as I have said, if you spot these people geographically, you see this is a national phenomenon. The State quotas for example, show in your district, of course, Dr. Nyquist, up above well around the lakes very few, if any, National Merit scholars. Most of them come from Long Island, Westchester County, and so on, and the Bronx. [Laughter.] Well, this configuration is suggestive, of course, as to a fact.

May I add, as to the location of these National Merit winners, none of them ever come from the Eighth Congressional District of Kentucky, which is 98 percent white, and which is also a county where I spent most of my childhood and from which my forebears came. I

pointed this out to Congressman Siler from that district in the hope to propagandize against a system of national Federal scholarships. I don't know how enthusiastic my reception was, but statistics are useful in many cases. [Laughter.]

Now, the city of Atlanta has adopted a plan which now is under attack in the courts, one which calls for a series of tests and the like, and Atlanta is also a good city to discuss from the standpoint of the implications of what I am talking about. In 1955 the Atlanta school system authorized a testing survey of the city as a sort of a tentative approach toward compliance with the Supreme Court desegregation decision, and in this study the test scores were reported from 97 elementary schools, 17 high schools and the teachers, by race. An inspection of this document readily displays the difficulty of segregating Negro children by the employment of test scores. An inspection of the graph for the 97 elementary schools shows at the high end fourth-grade classes scoring well above the fifth-grade standard of attainment in their median scores. At the other end of the graph, where practically all of the Negro schools are located, fourth-grade classes have median achievement scores below the third-grade level.

But there are two interesting exceptions to this general pattern in the Atlanta schools. The schools were coded and it's not possible to tell where they are. This is one of the inner secrets of the school board, but one can tell at a glance when you look at those top schools you are looking at schools like the River School out on Beach Street; you're looking at schools from the Bulkhead and from the Emory University neighborhood, and so on and so on. With the development of a highly stratified Negro residential section, where a new school has been placed, I have been willing to bet my bottom dollar that among the first 15 schools in Atlanta, when they have another testing survey, will be the Collier Heights School, where all the physicians and the lawyers and the schoolteachers have recently migrated, plus a few policy people as well. [Laughter.]

But there is another interesting exception to it, and that is if you study the high school scores by interpolation you can find that if the same standards that were applied to the Negroes in entering the white high schools last year had been applied to the students in those white high schools, in the best white high school, which obviously is an upper class high school, 22 percent would have flunked the English test, 42 percent the social studies test, and 40 percent the mathematics test.

Now, a previous study in Rockford, Ill., by the team of Eels, Tyler, et al.—Dr. Havighurst was involved in this study—displays perfectly the results of stratification. Now, what I have here are some reproductions from the Atlanta survey, which I regret to say I don't have

enough to distribute, but the Rockford study shows this perfect stair-step business; the lower class school shows the lowest test scores, and you graduate on up to the upper class.

During our recess I did try to do a little homework and produce a facsimile of a portion of this Rockford graph or any other graph, which you see, may be visible to you, with the A school indicating what you would expect in an upper class community, what you get, on down to the lower class community in Rockford or Atlanta or anywhere else in the United States, and that is the distribution which I think has tremendous significance for our American system.

Now, then, there has recently been a study out in California that was reported at the February meeting of the American Educational Research Association that went into this for southern California schools. From it we can pretty well predict that the correspondence is going to be perfect between the percentile scores and community gradation of social status. Children in a lower-class community can be expected to score about the 20th percentile in any national test, that is, median score—that is at a point where 80 percent of their classmates nationally counted will score above that point—while the children from an upper class community may be expected to score at the 80th percentile, at a point where they will exceed the scores of 80 percent of their classmates nationally counted.

Now, in Atlanta or in any other city the range of attainment within any given school, Negro or white, is such that there is at least one child in every Negro school, either by law or by de facto segregation, who could qualify for admission in a desegregated school, even the highest scoring school in the city; that is to say in the poorest school in Atlanta, so far as test results are concerned, the poorest Negro school, which is the poorest school, the range is such that there are some of those Negro children who are going to exceed the lower quartile of the white children at the very best school—and, so, with interpretations of the courts being what they are, the use of tests in planning desegregation on this basis seems to have a doubtful future.

I would like to commend school authorities in the South, indeed all over the Nation, for recognizing what I think is a civil right. I was immensely stimulated by the very nice phrase that was used by Dr. Fischer, the question of "compensatory" opportunities. I believe Dr. Thompson has been referring to some of the privileges afforded at Howard University as being a sort of compensatory mechanism on the part of the Federal Government, but this phrase of Dr. Fischer's reflects a conviction, which has increasingly grown on me, if we are to avoid a system of apparent equality, that is no equality at all.

Dr. Conant says:

> One lesson to be drawn from visiting and contrasting a well-to-do suburb and a slum is all important for understanding American public education. The lesson is that to a considerable degree what a school should do and can do is determined by the status and ambitions of the families being served.

Now, my notion is that every child, be he white or Negro, has a natural civil right to opportunities that are provided by the State and directed precisely to the point of providing a remedy for that status, whether imposed, as Dr. Fischer suggested, by the action of the State or whether, in my opinion, incident to the society and its operation in which the child has been born; otherwise, if no remedy is applied, the child's status will irrevocably fix for him a place in the social and civic order. He's not going to be able to pass with satisfactory marks the civil service test. He won't be able to pass the mental aptitude test. He won't be able to get a good score in the graduate record examination or in the national teachers' examination. He is condemned per se to occupy this status, the class into which he has been born, whereas these children from more verbalized and more literate families of better circumstances economically and legally as well must, of necessity, under our prevailing system, have an insuperable advantage from the very first.

Now, the fact that we can provide compensatory opportunities is testified to, I think, in a most brilliant way by what has been done by Mr. Plaut and Dr. Schreiber and the rest, and the developments suggested by Dr. Nyquist with reference to, say, the simple device of lowering the size of classes, and so on. May I take this opportunity to say that it was demonstrated, I think, right after the Civil War when you had hundreds and thousands of devoted New England schoolmarms coming to the South, volunteering to work, under a system of ostracism, with the most despised people in America, and, by their action, creating what were superb schools that took illiterate ex-slaves or people from a totally illiterate background and, in truth, as one can find numerous testimonies, made scholars and gentlemen and gentlewomen out of these people in the course of one single school generation.

I say it's also been done in contemporary days in a small way with enormously limited resources in other parts of the country; but the necessity is, as Conant says, appalling, and the effort to establish this civil right, that is, if it can be granted that it is one, must consequently be massive. The amount of expenditure involved is truly massive, but I should hope that we would sometimes take a step toward it.

A gentleman came to me just before I came to the platform here and complimented me on a book I wrote 30 years ago, and I shuddered because the last chapter of that book was to portray the planned pro-

gram, not of desegregation but of equalization for the Nashville public schools. I estimated that, beginning in 1932–33, in 20 years Nashville could equalize expenditures for whites and Negroes in that city by a little gradualism applied every year. Well, I don't think many people read my plan, and certainly no one acted on it. So, the equalization was achieved by other means far before the 20-year date I had said, and, in fact, 20 years after I wrote that I was industriously employed in trying to convince nine learned gentlemen that what I thought was equality in 1933 was no equality at all in 1953.

Therefore, I was taught long ago the danger both of planning and of prophecy, but I do want to express one hope: That before I die the civil right of every child in America to receive, either from his home or from his community, that balanced attention—that is the phrase I should now change—that compensated opportunity—that will give him truly a maximum opportunity, regardless of his status, his previous and present familial and community environment.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Bond, for that very stimulating presentation. I know there will be many comments and questions addressed to you in a few minutes.

We will now proceed to the third speaker on the panel, who is Dr. Richard M. Peters, a member of the Chapel Hill, N.C., Board of Education. Unlike most of the doctors here today, Dr. Peters is a doctor of medicine, having received that degree cum laude from the Yale University School of Medicine in 1945.

He is a North Carolinian only by adoption, having been born in Connecticut. Since 1952 he has been a member of the faculty of North Carolina Medical School, where he is now an associate professor and director of thoracic surgery in the university hospital.

Like many university faculty members elsewhere, Dr. Peters has a keen interest in the community in which he lives. Last spring he announced his candidacy as one of three new members of the school board. He was subsequently elected. The new board members made history in North Carolina when on the same day, with the support of a holdover member, they voted to abandon the application-for-transfer method of desegregation and rezoned the attendance areas for all schools into a single system without regard to race.

Dr. Peters will tell us why he thinks this change was made at Chapel Hill, and anything else that he cares to tell us.

Dr. Peters.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD M. PETERS, MEMBER, CHAPEL HILL BOARD OF EDUCATION, CHAPEL HILL, N.C.

Dr. PETERS. Members of the Commission and participants, I want to emphasize first that I speak as an individual, not necessarily express-

ing an opinion of the Chapel Hill Board of Education nor of the University of North Carolina. I have been asked to outline the factors, adjustments, and problems considered in planning a shift from pupil placement method of desegregation to redistricting and geographic assignment. Mrs. Cole also asked me whether I felt I could give you the reasons for the change in Chapel Hill.

It would seem best to define precisely what is the present policy of the Chapel Hill Board of Education.

Starting with the 1961–62 school year, all children entering the first grade were assigned on the basis of geographic districts without regard to race. All children in the upper grades were reassigned to the schools they had previously attended. Individual applications for reassignment were acted upon in the usual manner formerly used for pupil placement. It is the stated policy of the board that any child who is a member of a racial minority in the school that he attends can request transfer to another school where this will not be the case.

The Chapel Hill School District includes the contiguous towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro and the immediately surrounding suburbia. There are 15,000 people in the district, with an additional population of 9,000 university students. There are approximately 3,850 children in the school district, 2,750 white and 1,100 Negro.

The town of Chapel Hill, itself, is made up principally of university faculty and upper-middle-class industrial scientists and business people. Carrboro is more typical of a southern industrial town. The Negro community is concentrated between these two, being part in Carrboro, part in Chapel Hill, and the rest about the periphery. The Negro population is made up principally of service personnel and household help of a low economic group. There are very few of the middle class and no economically wealthy Negroes in Chapel Hill.

Integration is not new to Chapel Hill. In 1952 the first Negro graduate student was admitted to the law school under court order. One year later a Negro was admitted to the medical school voluntarily. In 1957 Negro students were admitted to the undergraduate school by court order. At first these students were segregated in one dormitory. In the last few years no such practice has been carried out. As a matter of fact, it is a firmly enforced policy of the university that they shall be permitted to participate fully in all aspects of the university life, and, I am happy to say, just as I left the university the chancellor had directed and they have completed now the removal of any signs any place in the university which designate that there are different facilities for different races. This has been particularly important in the hospital, as you can imagine.

In the winter a little over 2 years ago when the sit-ins were started in Greensboro, N.C., they quickly spread to Chapel Hill. In the course

of 8 to 10 months the majority of the eating places had desegregated either voluntarily or under pressure. A good deal of the pressure in these circumstances was applied by university students and faculty. Finally, last spring, pressure was applied by picketing and boycotting to force desegregation in two movie houses. This pressure included a petition to the theaters by some members of the faculty. I may say off the record that the legislature was in session at the time considering the university budget and there was considerable spirit.

In July 1959 a Negro boy applied for admission to the fifth grade in the Carrboro School. This was the white school where there was the greatest resistance to integration. This school was clearly far nearer to his home than the Negro elementary school. To make the problem easier for the board, the family unofficially stated they would accept assignment to a less sensitive white school. Despite this, the application was turned down and the dean of the law school resigned from the school board, stating that the board had no legal ground on which to stand. He was replaced by a person who supported the majority opinion. A physician who was the chairman of the board and a Negro minister were the two who voted in favor of the reassignment to a white school. The board stated at that time that its policy would be only to accept applications from Negro first-grade children for reassignment to white schools. The following fall under this policy they did reassign four Negro first-grade children to a white school, not the Carrboro School. The original case of the fifth-grader had already been taken to the Federal District Court.

The issue of segregation was very important in Chapel Hill and all of North Carolina during this time as Mr. Sanford fought successfully to prevent a step backward by defeating a radical segregationist who was running for Governor. This required the careful mobilization and vigorous activity of the liberal and moderate groups in the State in June and again in the fall when we carried the State for Governor Sanford and President Kennedy.

One year ago, after a vigorous campaign in which the well-organized liberal forces previously mobilized in Chapel Hill went to work again, all three vacancies on the school board were filled with people pledged to the desegregation plan finally adopted by the present board. Continuing on the school board were two people opposed to desegregation, and the physician and Negro in favor of it, giving the board now a 5–2 majority in favor of change. It must be emphasized that the idealists who demanded eradication of all vestiges of segregation were restrained, and the moderates mobilized to take effective political action. This could not have been accomplished without vigorous political activity and a good voting record by our Negro citizens. They are a politically effective group in Chapel Hill. The rea-

son then for desegregation in the Chapel Hill School District was evolution backed and supported by vigorous exercise of citizenship by the moderate and liberal groups, Negro and white, with all respecting everyone's right to vote.

During the school board campaign the position taken by the three newly elected members was that forcing the Negro to apply for his rights placed an undue burden on him. It permitted economic and social pressure against any change in previous practices. Since the new members did not take office until July 1, 1961, it was necessary to try to delay assignment until the new board took over. The board chairman with the cooperation of others did achieve this. Accordingly, before the first meeting of the new board, a policy of geographic desegregation had been worked out and was then adopted by the board. The original districts proposed by the school superintendent placed the major burden of desegregation on the Carrboro School, where there was no support but rather the most vigorous opposition—and I might say it was not the area that elected me to the school board.

After careful consideration, the board instructed the superintendent to redraw the districts so the Negro children would be distributed throughout the schools—and, parenthetically, you might say the consideration in this regard was not only for the white schools but for the welfare of the Negro children, feeling that in the schools where they would be favorably received they would have a better opportunity than if they were all in a school in which they would not be favorably received. The largest white school which originally would have had only 2 Negro children got 28. With this the direction from which the screams came was changed and we were accused of gerrymandering and some less pleasant terms. I personally found these criticisms less tolerable because they were less candid, citing harm to property values as their reason. This, perhaps, was fortunate, however, because it must be the last consideration of any school board.

By the middle of July the policy was set. Almost simultaneously in a series of meetings the applications of two Negro children for reassignment to enter the white junior high school were accepted, and one was rejected. Also, during the summer, 2 years after the application of the first Negro student, relief was given by the courts and the board reassigned him to the eighth grade in the white junior high school. This is an illustration of the unfairness of the slow process inherent in forcing the use of judicial relief. This patent injustice had a big role in Chapel Hill's demand that a reasonable approach be adopted. Later, one other Negro child, newly moved to the Chapel Hill district, was reassigned to the white junior high school.

Two children of new graduate students living in university housing were assigned to the third and fourth grades in a white school which all other children living in their development attended. I would emphasize they were assigned, not reassigned. I list these other assignments and reassignments because there was pressure to limit desegregation to the first grade. This limitation can be a problem and, in our opinion, is unfair. A policy which limits desegregation to first-grade assignment is designed to slow integration, not to make it orderly. It can and probably should lead to judicial action. With the two plans of geographic assignment, progressing a year at a time, and individual reassignment action, relief can be obtained for all and the end of the problem can be foreseen. All but the last of these assignments were completed by the middle of July. This allowed 6 weeks before school started for the heat of controversy to subside—and I must admit that I went to Michigan for 3 weeks—and adequate time for the reassignment requests to be acted upon.

It is important to be willing to let all people give full vent to their feelings in words as long as it is done in an orderly fashion. In this regard, the people in support of the plan should be asked to be at hearings to speak, so the floor will not be left to the opposition. We had some eloquent statements by our supporters which were important to our success.

As might be expected, all the white first-grade children assigned to a Negro school, even those of families with sincere integrationist leanings, were reassigned to white schools at their parents' request. All but two of the Negro children assigned to the white school in Carrboro requested transfer to the Negro school and these were permitted. The development of the necessary social changes was now in the hands of the school board, not the court.

When school opened, there were no difficulties whatsoever, and precautions were taken to be sure none would occur. The principals were assured and advised that the board would support them in disciplinary actions to prevent any unpleasantness of any kind. It seems to me the most important issue here is fairness and steadfastness of purpose on the part of the board and its responsible agents.

The importance of this is well illustrated by one of our opposers who stated to me: "Well, we have to respect you, and that's a help, when you ran for the school board, you said you would do this; when elected, you did it—and, despite opposition, you did it as fairly as could be done, but I still don't like it."

Finally, we had no school without Negro children in it. State law gives parents the right to ask for tuition grants if their children are in a mixed school. In a heated board meeting, the board decided sending two children whose parents made an issue of this to the

neighboring county schools was an undue hardship and recommended tuition grants. There was a lot of turmoil in the State capitol as none of the machinery was available and there was no money for this. Some months later the State authorities ruled the private school these children were attending did not meet State standards and on this technicality did not bring this part of the law to a test.

As far as the State in general was concerned, there was mixed reaction. Many people thought we were asking for trouble, others that we had eased their path. I am sure their conclusions depended on each person's prejudices.

Finally, let me give some overall observations on the results of these changes. They cannot be without problems, but once the decision was made last fall and firmly adhered to, desegregation no longer loomed as the major continuing problem of the board. Now the perennial problems of finances and space are substituted, both developing as acute crises. In the spring of 1961, before our actions, the plans had been nearly completed for the construction of a new Negro elementary school. Many questions arose about the advisability of continuing on this course, but the majority of the board and the community, particularly the Negro community, I would like to emphasize, felt these plans should be carred through. The new school was expanded from 8 to 12 rooms and should be ready by this fall. We hope it can be used to replace the elementary rooms to be torn down at the old school and to house all the present seventh-graders who are in a combined junior-senior high school. There have been groups who think we should set this up as an "integrated" school, but the board has resisted this. We think we might then end up with white, Negro, and integrated schools, three types rather than two types of schools, a horrible alternative.

Instead, we realize that there are special problems of education for these Negro children and this school is going to be used to attempt to solve these, with the definite hope that later in its history it may be one of our truly desegregated schools. I am glad to say Dr. Frank Porter Graham has allowed us to name the school after him in that hope.

In moving the seventh grades to this school, special effort will be directed at preparing them to profit from the later stages of their education. If these efforts can be coordinated with the development of supervised study halls and strengthened guidance counseling, our excessive dropout and failure rate for Negro children may be corrected. We will then need to develop a vocational education program fitted to the opportunities in our area for those children who need it. If these boys and girls are trained for jobs so that they are needed and wanted, not just accepted due to pressure applied, their dignity and their self-respect and that of the community will be enhanced.

You may ask whether these programs are related to a solution to the desegregation problem. I think they are dependent on such a solution. Until mutual respect and trust can be established in the community regarding desegregation, it overpowers all other issues. When this threat and uncertainty is removed from both the white and Negro communities, then the problems of education can be approached. The Negro child who wants and needs the educational environment of the white school knows the door is not closed—and "white" at this point is in quotes. The white community, on the other hand, realizes this bogus threat of desegregation is actually a straw man and they are prepared to grapple with other issues.

A system such as ours for desegregation which will hopefully remove this as an important issue in our school system, if it is to remove it, is dependent on good schools. I pray the people responsible for providing finances for public education will realize we are dangerously short of the physical facilities and the overall means to finance the personnel to carry out these tasks. The South is poor; we will have to have Federal aid. The children presently in school must not and cannot be cheated of an education. Unless it is provided now, they will be lost. This means during this transition period that the particular needs of the Negro child and Negro school must be met at the same time as this same thing is done for the white child in the largely white school. The fortunate children who are not isolated by race may show us the way out of our blind alleys in the future.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Peters.

In accordance with the commitment that was made earlier this afternoon, we will now take a 5-minute break and then return for the last panelist and the question period.

(Thereupon, at 3:35 p.m., a 10-minute recess was taken.)

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, since these microphones are not movable, it's important that we speak into them if we are going to be heard. For that reason, I'm going to ask—I see Dr. Chute is taking a place in front of the microphone, and those of you who ask questions, if you will speak into the microphone, we will be able to hear all right. I think there have been some speakers who have been a little hard to hear. It is because they have not been speaking directly into the machine.

We will proceed with the final speaker on this afternoon's panel, who is Dr. Oscar M. Chute, and he represents another university town, Evanston, Ill.

Dr. Chute is another New Englander by birth and education. He received his undergraduate degree from Colby College and his master's from Harvard. After war service he earned a doctorate at the University of Illinois and then went to Evanston as the assistant superin-

tendent of schools. He has been superintendent of the Community Consolidated Schools, District 65, since 1947.

Dr. Chute will tell us what Evanston has done to reduce racial concentrations in its schools during his superintendency.

Dr. Chute.

STATEMENT OF OSCAR M. CHUTE, SUPERINTENDENT, EVANSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, EVANSTON, ILL.

Dr. Chute. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I told Mrs. Cole over the telephone that I didn't know that I had very much to contribute, but that I could learn a great deal by coming to this conference. After listening to these papers that have been presented, I am of the same opinion, and perhaps I would like to go back and rewrite my little talk, but I'm not very good at adlibbing. So, I'll just read what I prepared back in Evanston.

My own experience, both as a student, schoolteacher, and administrator, has been in northern cities and towns. In my remarks I do not presume to be able to give advice to any particular person or community in effecting changes that will reduce or eliminate discrimination with respect to color, race, religion, or national origin.

I am the son of immigrants to the United States whose families came to this country from a foreign society which together with the grudging climate and soil did not allow real opportunities for their children's future in that agrarian economy. As children, my father and mother were denied opportunities for education because of the pressing need to earn their own way as members of large families. As adults, my father and mother were determined to hold open the doors of educational opportunity as long as possible for each of their eight children. I give this bit of personal background because I think it is related to my lifelong motivation in wanting to provide the best possible education for every boy and girl as long as possible for those who can be led to want it.

Having visited schools and homes at some length and depth in a number of other countries with older traditions, I am convinced that we have an active ideal of educational opportunity that is one of the most precious assets of this country. We are here today, as I understand it, to explore ways and means by which we can make this ideal a reality for an ever larger number of our young people.

My own administration in the grade schools of Evanston goes back for 15 years. During that time the pupil population in 1 school has been, with a few exceptions, entirely Negro, with 10 other schools out of a total of 20 having from 1 or 2 Negroes up to another school with over 50 percent Negroes. With respect to Jewish children, we now

642146—62——7

have a few in most schools, with several schools from 40 to 90 percent. These figures are rough estimates, because we keep no statistics on this subject in our school records.

During the past 15 years, children have attended schools in their own neighborhood. Transfers from one school to another can be made at the request of a parent for an educational reason or even for the convenience of a family, but not because of the ethnic background of the child or school involved. These cases are decided by the school superintendent after consulting enrollment figures and talking with principals to be sure that we are not overcrowding an already crowded classroom in another school.

Children in special education classrooms that are located in a large number of our schools are completely integrated as I understand the term. I am talking about the handicapped, such as the blind, the crippled, and the mentally retarded children. These are the only children in our district transported at public expense.

Boundaries of established schools have not changed for at least four decades. We have built a number of new schools in recent years to serve new neighborhoods. The boundaries of these new schools were determined with respect to the numbers of children present in the neighborhood as well as the potential enrollment. Safety factors relating to main traffic arteries, the age and the consequent maturity of children to cope with traffic are studied carefully. Other considerations have been the racial and religious makeup of the pupil population. In developing boundaries for one of the newer schools, we evidently overemphasized this latter aspect of our problem and in presenting the matter to the parents of the children involved they persuaded the board not to establish the boundary where they had tentatively set it, but to change it slightly so that their children would have to travel to a school two blocks nearer their homes which made both schools more homogeneous than we had originally intended. This was not a major problem, but it reminded me that in drawing boundaries for schools we ought not to exploit children or disregard their safety and convenience in the name of integration.

We have several neighborhoods whose thoughtful citizens are anxious about the future of their immediate area and the composition of the local school population. Several delegations of parents and neighborhood organizations have met with the superintendent and talked with the board of education asking the board to do something about their neighborhood schools. We are currently gathering figures to show our board of education what the near- and long-term pupil population problems may be in each of our school neighborhoods.

It is obvious that a board of education has the responsibility to provide equality of educational opportunity to all of the children of

the district attending public schools. One of the questions currently being given thoughtful consideration by our board is:

> What is the obligation of a board of education in our school neighborhoods to change boundaries of schools as the neighborhood changes in the racial and/or the religious makeup of its population.

Other considerations in the current school situation in our district are as follows:

1. We must make sure that our employment of staff in all categories is on the basis of qualifications other than race, creed, or color.

2. We must continue inservice training programs for our staff in intercultural education. We must help each other to recognize our own prejudices and deal with them intelligently.

3. We must provide equal facilities of staff and plant to all children on an equal basis. If we are to provide smaller classes or individualized instruction, it must be on the basis of educational need and never on the basis of color or religion.

4. Our program must provide in the education of children material that will, under skillful teachers, lead to genuine respect and appreciation for the cultures of other people. This must be related consciously and directly to our own intercultural schools and community.

5. We must not yield to individuals or pressure groups who may lead us to overreact to headlines or fear at the expense of children.

6. We must help parents to accept an intercultural school setting for their children not as a liability, but as a possible opportunity for their boys and girls.

7. And most of all, we must keep our eyes focused on the child and his development in an intercultural city, as is our Nation, as is our world.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Chute.

Now I shall turn to the members of the Commission for questions, and then when the Commissioners have asked their questions and we have moved to the members of the conference, in order to be fair, I think we will try to get a question from each one of the tables, A, B, C, D, E, F, and G, and start over again, because I noticed the last time around that some people had their hands up and were missed and I think it would be a little fairer that way, and when we get to that point I will ask Mr. Bernhard to help with the identification. We will try to recognize first the first hand up.

Mr. Vice Chairman, do you have some questions you would like to ask of Dr. Nyquist, Dr. Bond, Dr. Peters, or Dr. Chute?

Vice Chairman STOREY. I will pass this time. Thank you.

Chairman HANNAH. Father Hesburgh.

Commissioner HESBURGH. I have one question for Dr. Chute. Dr. Chute, do you find that you have any difficulty getting teachers for the school that is predominantly or almost totally Negro?

Dr. CHUTE. No, sir.

Commissioner HESBURGH. You don't. Do you find any differential in the quality?

Dr. CHUTE. No, sir. One of the screens that we try to impose on candidates for teaching positions is their hesitancy or their reluctance to teach Negro children or children of other than their own particular group, and if there is a candidate who shows some reluctance or fear or anxiety about the subject we tell them to look elsewhere.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Very good.

One question for Dr. Peters, if I might. Dr. Peters, I could see your influence as a Yankee on this board. I was wondering if there were any natives of North Carolina or if most of the others were natives of North Carolina on your school board.

Dr. PETERS. I think there are two who are not native North Carolinians, myself and one of the ladies on the board who was recently elected. The others are native of the South.

Commissioner HESBURGH. I was just trying to get some reflection of the local backing for all of these actions, which I think were fine, but I think its important if we can get local following. I gathered from your remarks that there was a good deal of local following, some opposition, but in general, people aren't getting schizoid about it.

Dr. PETERS. Well, as far as the election was concerned, I was not the lowest runner on this, and I think they are tolerant of the fact that I may not have a soft southern accent, but I am interested in it.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Thank you, Doctor.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Rankin.

Commissioner RANKIN. I would like to ask Dr. Bond: You mentioned the Shuey volume, but you just mentioned the name, *Race and Reason*. Have you reviewed that volume also?

Dr. BOND. No, sir. However, I have ordered it. I happened to tune in on the radio last Tuesday, and just at the time when Dr. Carl McIntire was offering a free volume of *Race and Reason* to anyone who would write him at his foundation in Collingswood. I'm making a little plug for it. I've forgotten the name of the foundation, but I have advertised this at Atlanta University to all of my students as an opportunity to get a free book, and I hope a number of them will take advantage of it. But I have read some of the advertisements, some of Mr. Quentin's letters, and I'm sure it's a very interesting document.

Commissioner RANKIN. Thank you.

Dr. Peters, do you have any evidence that other cities in North Carolina are watching your work in Chapel Hill and plan to follow your lead?

Dr. PETERS. There are people from other cities in North Carolina here. I think there's somebody here from Asheville. I know they did change their system shortly after we did, and perhaps they could better answer whether our action had any influence on them.

Commissioner RANKIN. And would your change have been more difficult if Carrboro, for instance, had been four times the size of Chapel Hill? Could you have accomplished it, do you think?

Dr. PETERS. I don't think I would have been elected. [Laughter.]

Chairman HANNAH. Dean Griswold.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. I would like to ask Dr. Chute a question because he has what might be called the most mature integrated system that I have heard about lately. Evanston has been a relatively stable community for a long time apparently. Do you have any experience—do you have any figures—about the dropout situation with respect to the school which is primarily Negro as compared to other schools? Do you have any information in that area which would be helpful?

Dr. CHUTE. The dropouts do not affect our grade schools. You see, we have two school systems in Evanston—one a grade school district that runs up through the eighth grade, with a seventh- and eighth-grade junior-high-school system which has a separate school board, coterminous in area, however, with the grade schools, separate fiscal taxing powers, and so on, and I think that, because of the compulsory age limit of 16 in Illinois, the dropout problem would hit the high school and not the grade school. We would not have very many children reaching the age of 16 before the end of the eighth grade.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. No. I didn't understand that you were dealing only with the first eight grades. A slightly different question, but one perhaps having a similar element in it and which might be applicable to you: Do you note any difference in disciplinary problems between the schools, depending upon their racial makeup?

Dr. CHUTE. I think that we have more disciplinary problems in those neighborhoods where both parents are working. We have more disciplinary problems in those neighborhoods representing homes that have perhaps more of a struggle economically, and I think that this would relate to a neighborhood that was predominantly Negro more than it would to a white, but we have some mixed schools that provide some difficulties along this line.

I know that the classic opinion is that Negro children present more problems from the standpoint of discipline than do white children.

I was very interested the other day when, in preparing for this conference, I was moved to ask a junior high principal, who was showing me a list of seven children who were giving him a hard time, as to how many of these seven were Negroes. Two out of the seven were Negroes. Now, this is a small bit of evidence, of course, I don't know what the numbers would show. I go back to something that Dr. Fischer said—that many children have problems, and I think, from my standpoint, we try to handle these problems as they are revealed in the classroom and on the playground going to and from home. I would have no notion—I certainly don't have any impression—that we have more problems that seem to defy solution among the Negro children than the white.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Thank you. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HANNAH. Dean Robinson.

Commissioner ROBINSON. I have no questions.

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Bernhard, I skipped by you last time. I will give you an opportunity.

Mr. BERNHARD. Commissioner Griswold brought up the question of dropout, and, Dr. Peters, you spoke of the special efforts which you hope will be made with seventh-grade children to correct what you described as the excessive dropout and the failure rate. Can you indicate the kind of things that your board has in mind specifically in attacking this problem?

Dr. PETERS. Well, I think the first thing we should say is, as our superintendent put it well, there is no equality when things are separate, and the opportunities offered in the Negro schools are certainly deficient. The valedictorian of our Negro school was unable to pass examinations necessary to qualify for the university, and in this sense I think our dropout rate is dependent on the lack of opportunity and the lack of equal schooling for these children. In terms of correcting these deficiencies—we have reading deficiencies and arithmetic deficiencies and inability to study at night—we would hope that we could get at these things, in the first place, by getting better guidance and getting a teacher who would be motivated or a principal who would be motivated to demand more from these children than is demanded in our Negro schools, to try to develop a vocational program, which will mean that these boys have educational opportunities.

As you know, vocational problems now center around agriculture mostly in this area and distributive education. Distributive education is a blind alley for most Negro children, and agriculture is not that important now, and we are contemplating trying to work out programs where they might work in a health field, where there are great opportunities and great needs for technical help.

This type of opportunity, which will make education serve their needs rather than frustrate them by preparing them for something

which isn't available, I think can lead in that direction. Our children who wish a college education should be prepared to move to the white schools, and that should be one of our goals. These children probably will need the environment [of white schools]. I think [a factor] was left out of the earlier discussion, and that is that the pupil-to-pupil influence is just as important as the pupil to teacher. If the horizons of most of the pupils are not aspirations for college then the child who has that aspiration is at a great cultural disadvantage in the school if he is trying to achieve something that most of the other children are not interested in.

Chairman HANNAH. Further questions, Mr. Bernhard?

Mr. BERNHARD. This morning there was some discussion about the limitations of Negro teachers imposed by the inadequate quality of their own educational experience. I wonder whether your school board has considered the possibility of using some type of specialized white teachers who might work cooperatively in as well as out of the schools and the classrooms with the Negro teachers as part of a program to upgrade the achievement levels in the all-Negro schools which you indicate still operate in parts of Chapel Hill.

Dr. PETERS. I think this question has been raised a number of times. It can be asked in another way, I think: Would we accept an application from a white teacher who wished to teach in the Negro schools? We certainly, I believe, would. I don't know. All of our institutes, of which we have many, are on a desegregated basis, and have been for some time. The teachers always attend the same teaching areas.

I think at the moment we are so pauperized that any really progressive move like this is partly dependent on being able to reward that teacher for what she will do. At the moment, as I said, we have passed from the problem of desegregation to how to pay for it, and all of these things are considered, and hopefully we have tried interesting some foundations in this, but at the moment we haven't.

Mr. BERNHARD. Maybe you can corner some of their representatives that are here now.

Dr. PETERS. Yes.

Chairman HANNAH. Mrs. Cole.

Mrs. COLE. It seems to me we ought to hear from some of the people here who are especially qualified to speak on dropout and who have studied it, Dr. Hannah. Dr. Hale of Oklahoma, from Langston University, has been concerned with an increase in dropout in desegregated schools. Dr. Schreiber is here and has studied it at the NEA. It's such an acute national problem that I think that should be pursued.

Chairman HANNAH. Do you want to ask the gentleman from Langston to comment?

Dr. HALE. A year ago our State superintendent of education reported that he estimated some 400 Negro pupils had dropped out of

the public schools of Oklahoma. This year he made a similar report, but it was a little vague. I haven't been able to quite understand it because I made so much out of the first report, but I think there's no doubt in anybody's mind that we do have a big problem. Now, what the entire dimensions of this problem are I don't know. I think we understand some of the reasons for it.

Oklahoma made what I considered to be a good step forward. When the Court decision came, Oklahoma immediately desegregated its schools, took the Negro high school principals and sent them to the white high schools. The Negro high school teachers for the most part were dismissed. In the same report that I mentioned earlier, the superintendent mentioned that some 500 Negro teachers had lost their jobs within the past five years.

Now, at the high school level is where we seem to have the problem. There are very few Negro teachers in the desegregated schools. Admittedly, as was pointed out this morning, you can't divorce a person from his history. Many of these youth come with not the richest kind of backgrounds. They are not encouraged to remain in school. We have our truancy laws, to be sure, but nobody particularly cares about that. They are not encouraged to remain in school and, as a consequence, they drop out.

I was talking just this past week with the director of our training school for boys, and he said:

I understand you're concerned about this problem. You want to know where these students have gone, where these youngsters have gone. When I came to this office, 5 years ago, we were receiving around 30 and 35 boys per year. Now we're receiving 150 and 200 per year, and I think that's part of the answer where these students are going who are dropping out.

Then I think there is the problem of limited occupational opportunities. There aren't many in Oklahoma, and it's difficult to say to a youngster, "you ought to study and you ought to apply yourself" when he doesn't see any end to it, when there's no tradition of success that would inspire him and motivate him to try and continue his education and development of his own personality.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Schreiber, do you want to comment?

Dr. SCHREIBER. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Daniel Schreiber of Washington, D.C.

I, first, would like to comment on the problem of North Carolina. These are studies done by different groups within different States. This first study was done by a group that was interested in college projections. Among the 18- and 19-year-olds in the State of North Carolina, approximately 30 percent of the whites are in school as against 15 percent of the Negroes. For the age group 18 to 24—and this would include young men and women in professional schools—approximately 19 percent of the whites are in school and 9 percent

of the Negroes. Another way of looking at this is that, although the Negroes make up 25 percent of the population in North Carolina, only 15.5 percent are in college.

In the State of South Carolina, using grade 1 as a base—and I wasn't able to get the breakdown by race—approximately 75 percent of the students who enter grade 1 do not finish senior high school.

The State of Arkansas has just finished a study, State department of education, and here we have Negroes and whites; so, we can get some comparisons. This deals with the 1961 graduates. The schools were divided into 2 parts—large school districts having populations of 8,000 or more; small school districts having populations between 250 and 500.

In the large school districts, whites, 65 percent graduated from school, using grade 5 as the base; Negroes, 44 percent.
Small school districts: Whites, 85 percent; Negroes, 37 percent.
Almost two-thirds of the Negroes in the small school districts did not graduate from senior high school.

Breaking this down still further, using grade 12 as a base—here you would expect most of the students to graduate:

Large school districts: Whites, 93 percent.
Large school districts: Negro, 89 percent.
Small school districts: Whites, 89 percent.
Small school districts: Negro, 76 percent.

In other words, one out of every four Negro youngsters in the small school district who has attained the 12th grade does not finish it.

In Union, Tex., where we were able to break down white against Negro and then compute the number of youngsters in the public schools, using Census Bureau reports, 25 percent of the public school population are Negroes; yet 40 percent of the dropouts are Negroes.

A study done in Virginia by the State education department in terms of IQ's:

Tests given in grade 2 and grade 8 showed that city white children had approximately 100 IQ, in the grade 2 as well as grade 8. County whites had the same IQ's.
City Negroes in grade 2 had a 94 IQ; in grade 8, an 89.
County Negroes in grade 2, 92; in grade 8, 85.

Among our large northern cities, using grade 9 as a base, Chicago has a 50 percent dropout; St. Louis, 50 perecnt; New York City, using its academic high school as its base, 37 percent; using vocational high school as a base, 63 percent. The range in New York City, dropout range, in the academic high school is from 5 percent to 67 percent, and in the vocational high schools the range is from 16 percent to 84 percent. Study that last figure closely. For every 100 youngsters who went to school, only 16 will graduate 4 years later.

In Los Angeles the annual dropout rate is approximately 8 percent, with a range from 4 percent to 26 percent. We haven't identified the school which has the 26 percent annual dropout, but I think you can well guess in what community it is.

So, by and large where we have been able to break down white against Negro, the Negro dropout rate is one and a half times as high as the white dropout rate.

Thank you.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you, Mr. Schreiber.

Now, we will ask the first question at table A, the far table. Does someone have a question they would like to ask someone of the panel or some comment you would care to make?

Mr. BERG. I am Selmer Berg of Oakland, Calif.

I would like to ask Dr. Bond if he would mention or discuss very briefly some of the types of compensatory opportunities that he referred to in Dr. Fischer's paper that would be desirable to have in schools where we have disadvantaged pupils.

Dr. BOND. Sir, the first one that occurs to me is diminished class size as a highly practicable one, though this is also very expensive, the reduction, let us say, from the 35 or 30 limit to 15. Now, this doubles your structural cost; but, as I say, this is the first thing that occurs to me.

A second thing that occurs to me is what was done in the Harlem project, and that is the employment of people, as I understand it, at least, who were practicing educational social workers, so to speak. Now, Dr. Nyquist, Mr. Plaut, and Dr. Schreiber could tell more of the things that were done in project—

Dr. SCHREIBER. Forty-three.

Dr. BOND. 43, School 43, because he dealt with it. He, in fact, is the father of it, and so on, and the prescriptions that were laid down by that project would be first.

Now, beyond that, I am thinking of all sorts of enrichments, and even, if you will forgive me for introducing what may be a fantastic idea—but I do want to call to your attention the fact that this is a situation that exists in all societies, even in the Communist Russian society. I mean if you make an analysis both of the membership of the Communist Party—back when sputnik went up in 1957, I made a little analysis of the heroes of science that were listed. The list was published in Pravda and reprinted in the New York Times, and though it's very difficult to get family backgrounds of Russians, it's very interesting to note that people like Tamm, who is the great optics man, and so on, is listed in one Russian encyclopedia as the son of a scientific professor, scientific worker. Well, as a matter of fact, he was the son of Professor Tamm, who was a man in optics before him, a professor of physics at Kiev, I believe, and so was Lebidev, and, of course, you know Kapitsa was the son of a brigadier general in the Russian Engineering Corps, and what not and what not.

Now, one of the things the Russians are doing, if you will notice, which I cannot believe is aimed at this point of inherent stratification,

is the development of boarding schools. If you will notice, the last budget raised the appropriation for boarding schools from 1 billion to 4 billion rubles, so to speak. Now, that, of course, is an extreme application of it, and not at all even practicable to consider at this moment, but I say again the only prescription I have is the application of more money to the situation in as many different ways as is practicable—and call upon Dr. Schreiber, really, to mention, if he doesn't mind, some of the things that were done in that project.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Schreiber, do you want to comment?

Dr. SCHREIBER. Thank you.

Before I speak of our program, in terms of compensatory services offered, I would like to call attention to a small experiment which was completed recently in the milltown or, rather, the sharecropper town of Millington, Tenn., an experiment undertaken by Dr. Brazziel of the Norfolk branch of the Virginia State College. A group of Negro children were registered and their parents had to be registered also. The teacher worked with the parents, they met once a week at a regular workshop. Additional money was spent for reading readiness material. After a year the following results came through:

In terms of reading readiness, the experimental group was in the 50th percentile. They were normal, and the distribution was normal.

The control groups, as in the past with previous groups, had reading readiness percentiles of the 15th order.

In terms of IQ—I have mentioned before the Virginia State county IQ and, so, too, for this community, the IQ for grade 1 was about 92—for these children the median IQ was 106, so that even if one takes into consideration the Hawthorne effect, the stimulation of being part of an experiment, the IQ would still be around the normal range. This was made possible because the school system was able to free the teacher a certain number of hours per month to work with parents.

In the Montgomery [County, Maryland] school system the Board of Education has assigned two teachers to work with parents of disadvantaged children. They are in the community. They are developing leadership. They have set up home study groups, a program that was described here last year, by Mrs. Carla Eugster. The improvement shown in terms of attitude, attendance, and learning has surprised the board to such an extent that this, I believe, will become an ongoing cost to the Board of Education. This is a marvelous thing, that the Board feels that they must get out into the community and make an effort. This would be the compensatory service.

Another compensatory service would be the use of additional guidance counselors at the elementary school level. Most children set their aims at the early age of 9, 10, or 11. I heard one Negro girl tell us, when we asked her whether she was going to college, and she replied that she would—her answer to "Why are you going?" was as

follows: "I can become a better maid." In other words, her level of achievement, her self-concept, was so low that she could not think of anything else. Through guidance, through teacher stimulation and teacher attitude, we can get children to raise their self-concepts.

I think the compensatory aspect of teacher training within a school, as was mentioned earlier, of freeing teachers, as Dr. Nyquist mentioned, of freeing part of a staff is most important. Dr. Ralph Bunche, when he gave the gold key award to his fourth-grade teacher, said, "I suddenly perceived that she believed in my ability, and I responded accordingly." So, if we can free teachers, help them with inservice courses, so that they can better understand the child in front of them, regardless of what the color of that child is, children will respond.

I also believe that for compensatory services or educational opportunities, classes for the disadvantaged must be small. This is not necessarily a Negro problem. The State of Maine is faced with the same problem with the French Canadians who are coming in. Their dropout rate is one of the highest in the country. Southern California has a problem with the Mexican-Americans. I think we owe it to the children to say: If the society or your family cannot give you the advantages that the middle-class society gives its children, then the school will offer these so the children will not fall too far behind at the elementary school level. I recommend—and I know it's expensive—class size of 20 children per teacher, this to be backed up with psychological services, guidance services, psychiatric services, where necessary.

For a teacher to identify an emotionally disturbed child or child who needs additional help and then do nothing only frustrates her in her future work and frustrates teaching later on in the school system, so that in our program we not only have guidance counselors, but use of psychologists, use of social workers who visit homes, and we discovered that approximately 25 percent of our homes were so disoriented that they needed outside help, and there again the school must give this service.

Another aspect which Dr. Nyquist mentioned was the cultural trips. I'd like to quote from a speech that Dr. Crewson of his division made after talking to a child who had gone on a trip to Glen Falls to visit an American museum. This was a Negro child from a slum area in the city of Utica. The child looked around and said, "Now I know why people are willing to die for their own country." You'll find that children from this background do not travel outside their immediate environment, and a school system should make this available.

In the city of Houston, Tex., under the town perservation project, they are taking children on trips. They are engaging members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce to act as big brothers. Somebody

has to work on this. The school system must make a man available. This would be compensatory education.

Before I close may I just give you some figures on the last Higher Horizons class that graduated. Our final report isn't complete, but I pulled out some figures on IQ, and the reason I stress IQ is because this affects the teacher attitude and also college admission. After 3 years, the 81 youngsters who were present for 3 tests, showed an IQ gain on a verbal test of 13.2 points. The boys had a gain of 17.6 points; the girls 10.5. The boys made a greater gain because they started lower. Five times as many children showed gains as showed losses.

We broke down the IQ of 110. This usually is the criterion for college going. Whereas in 1957, 26 percent of the group had IQ's above 110, in 1960, 58 percent had IQ's above 110, more than twice as many. Forty-two percent of the youngsters are continuing their education beyond the high school, and this compares with 13 percent in the past. Sixty-six percent graduated from senior high school, compared with 40 percent in the past.

A few youngsters will be getting out this June. They failed in one or two subjects, but we expect them to graduate, and this will bring our high school graduation rate up to 72 percent, so that compensatory services will make a difference in college-going rate and graduation rate of disadvantaged children.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Schreiber. Who at table B has a question. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSTER. Bill Foster, University of Wisconsin Law School. I would like your reaction, Dr. Bond, on what is probably unanswered in answerable terms. So, I guess I seek a curbstone opinion.

In a traditional sense, the pattern in the Southern States of dual schools has posed, it seems to me, a rather real problem in the sense of whether we move in the direction of geographic area assignment, which, of course, in the larger urban communities will probably mean distinctive Negro schools for a long while to come. On the other hand, we have the pattern, much mentioned this morning by Dr. Fischer, Dr. Jackson of Baltimore, which, in effect, did away with school zones, and Baltimore had none, in fact, but that would do away with school zones, and place the question at the option of the individual youngster, through his parents, to choose a school limited only by the question of the school being filled.

Having in mind a long-range projection on this thing, do you have any particular preference for a move in the direction of zoning as a means, first, of doing away with duality of school systems or does your inclination prefer the choice system, which may be entirely racial in the dual sense of schools and community?

Dr. BOND. Sir, I really have no answer for that. I do hesitate to make any projections, having been bitten so many times.

I will say this interesting thing has developed in Atlanta, where a need was stated for a school building program that was estimated to cost, oh, several millions of dollars. I forget how many rooms. Dr. Stephens here can tell us, but recently there was brought to the attention of the School Board the fact that if they utilized all space in existing school buildings in Atlanta, instead of needing somewhat on the order of 100 or 200 rooms, new rooms, they could utilize only 17 new rooms. Well, I don't know if that economic argument will ever have any effect, you see, with reference to the approach to the problem, but it is conceivable, I think, that it might. At least I know the Atlanta School Board is now faced with the question as to whether to float an expensive bond issue, which would be for the purpose really of relieving overcrowding in the Negro schools, or of integrating a little more, because a lot of these schools, white schools, are half full, have empty rooms, and so on and so on. So, I really wouldn't express any opinion or projection, sir, if you will forgive me.

Chairman HANNAH. A question at table C. Yes, sir.

Mr. HURT. James E. Hurt, Jr., St. Louis Board of Education.

I think we have been discussing this afternoon the planning of desegregation insofar as the educational warrants are concerned, but I have always had a concern about the job opportunities of the boards of education of the cities that we are talking about. In other words, we have talked about integrating our faculties, but what about our work force? It seems to me we have to forget the idea that young children—everyone wants to be a teacher, a lawyer or a doctor—but it seems as though today the fields are in the use of your hands. So, in motivating these young people I think it would be very nice if we could show them that Negroes are working as plasterers, plumbers, clerks in a central office of the school system, and things of that sort. I wanted to ask this question this morning, but I didn't get a chance.

I don't think—well, the gentleman here from New York may be able to help me along this line, as to what is happening along the line of desegregating or integrating the work forces, other than the certificated employees—in other words, the noncertificated employees of the system—because I think here is where we can give a lot of motivation, where a child can see a Negro painting, a Negro fixing the plumbing, and a Negro in the clerical office when he walks in, other than just having a Negro and a white teacher.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Nyquist, do you want to try that one?

Dr. NYQUIST. I'll have to deflect that one, Mr. Chairman. I can't respond to it with anything of substance at this particular point, except to say that I think a great deal needs to be done in many of the

school districts in aggressively seeking opportunities to employ Negroes in the work force of the school system. That's my only comment.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Peters.

Dr. PETERS. I would like to comment to this, to state that all of our maintenance employees and all the people who do this are Negroes, and one of the problems, as I see it, is to raise the horizon of these people above that and to get them into the more technical jobs. The opportunities of manual labor in our society are constantly decreasing, and we must have more education. I would say, from my experience, all of the maintenance, the plastering, the painting, and so forth, is where the horizon now rests, and I would hope it would not remain there.

Mr. HURT. I would like to just speak to that point. I don't know how it is in your community, but in St. Louis our teachers are some of the lowest paid employees that we have. Our plasterers, our plumbers, our electricians make thousands of dollars more. In other words, I think our highest salary is $7,600 for a teacher, but we have plumbers that make $10,000. We have plasterers that make $8,000 and $9,000, and the idea that we must recognize that mentally all children can't, and economic conditions won't allow them to become teachers, but many of them can become plasterers and plumbers, and I think this is where the money is being made today. We have to get away from the professionalized field. [Laughter.]

Chairman HANNAH. Is there a question at table D in the back of the room? Table D. The lady.

Judge KOHLER. I am also interested in the average child, rather than the talented child, because I am interested in vocational education, and I agree with this gentleman that there is a good deal of discrimination in practice even as regards the interpretation of the Federal vocational education laws, which do not admit a reimbursement under certain circumstances. In other words, the average youngster, to get anyplace, must be trained, and the training in many communities depends on the Federal money available.

Now, I am wondering if both Dr. Bond and Dr. Peters haven't found it to the disadvantage of the Negro youngster that the Federal ruling requires that there be an availability of employment in order to secure a Federal reimbursement.

I'm wondering also if the Federal ruling for reimbursement for vocational education money that requires that there be a 50–50 formula, half on work in the shop, half academic, which, of course, precludes the youngster who is the late bloomer and who might be motivated in the academic, provided he could be able to be in a shop. I am also wondering if that provision, an interpretation, I am afraid,

rather than the law, which lets a young person who is out of school secure free education only if he's in the trade for which he's asking. In other words, if he is a stock clerk and discovers, after he leaves school, that he wants to be a plumber or another kind of craftsman, Federal reimbursement is only available to those school districts providing the training if the youngster is in the trade. In other words, he can't secure free education. Even this paragon of virtue of New York that Mr. Nyquist cites, that he talks about, doesn't provide training for the youngster who is not in the trade.

I'm wondering if these aren't particularly handicaps to the southern communities, where the employment would not be available, and, therefore, the youngster would not be guided to the vocational training.

Chairman HANNAH. Judge Kohler, before we ask Mr. Bond to answer the question, would you identify yourself for the record?

Judge KOHLER. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Mary C. Kohler of New York City.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Bond, do you want to comment?

Dr. BOND. Mr. Chairman, I was desperately looking around to see someone I knew who knew more about vocational education in the South than I do. There must be somebody here who has more intimate acquaintance. My last direct contact with this was about, oh, 20 years ago or so, when at that time in Georgia, I know, there were great handicaps arising from all of these difficulties of part-time work, but I'm really not up, abreast now. May I ask for some volunteer who knows more about it than I do.

Chairman HANNAH. Do we have a volunteer who would like to comment on this question?

Mr. PORTER. I am Woodford Porter from Louisville. I had a question for Dr. Peters that related to this particular subject.

Chairman HANNAH. We will let you answer a question and ask one at the same time.

Mr. PORTER. I'll try to do that. The vocational program, as it is directed toward Negro youth in the South, has traditionally been one that has directed the Negro youth to the traditional jobs for Negroes, and Dr. Peters in making his statement said that they have aspirations to start a vocational school and to upgrade a vocational school that will still direct Negroes into service-type employment, and this type of employment is rapidly diminishing, and I wondered if the people connected with education in the South, who actually are formulating the programs, are taking into consideration the disservice rather than the service they will be doing the Negro youth by continuing this type of vocational education. It also comes to my mind that this Commission might try to tie in the consideration of discrimi-

nation as it exists in the trade unions with the educational programs as they are formulated by different school districts. I think all of these things are interrelated. They cannot be separated.

I know in our school system in Louisville we have an Ahrens Trade School which is recognized as being one of the better trade schools in the United States. However, there is a reluctance on the part of Negro boys and girls to enter certain phases of the trade school program because they will not be accepted into the unions after they receive the education. They cannot go on the job and get the apprenticeship program. Now, these are the things that have to be tied together and cannot be isolated, and I think in planning in the other areas of the South that this part of the picture should be seen also.

I did have some brief remarks to make on the dropout program, and I think that we in Louisville have experienced a desegregated school system long enough to have sort of a picture of what is happening, and we have found this, after approximately 6 years of desegregated schools: That the dropout rate amongst Negro youth has decreased rather than increased, and the dropout rate in the school system as a whole has increased, which seems to say to us that the motivation for going on with educational opportunities, taking advantage of them, has been stimulated by the integration of schools.

We have schools in our area that graduate classes on an average of 400, and 75 percent of these people will go to college. That's a school in an area that has a high socioeconomic status. We had a white school, a formerly all-white school, that only sent approximately 19 percent of its students to college. In the 6 years following integration, last year, they sent 33 percent of their students to college. Now, I won't say there is a direct tie-in, but I'm highly suspicious that the increased enrollment of Negro students in this particular school accounts largely for the large number of their graduates who are now going to college, and I think this integrating of the schools actually has proved a very, very motivating factor for Negro students to continue their education. At least the Louisville story seems to reflect this.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Peters, do you want to comment?

Dr. PETERS. I would first like to comment that I was not suggesting that the Negro go into service and that these were not the jobs that I was talking about. I think Dr. Conant has pointed out in his high school report that successful vocational programs were those which provided for jobs that were available in the community.

Now, in our community the biggest industry is hospitals. There are about $20 million of budget for hospitals within 12 miles of Chapel Hill. Now, hospitals are no longer in need for people in the service sense that you are talking about. We want technical people. The

university area is there. We have a big cry for research technicians. We need technicians, and that is the kind of training I mean, technical training for these people, and it seems to me that, by providing what I mean by technical training, electronic technicians, chemical technicians, and other things, which can be trained in high schools, we can break up, in answer to your question, the problem of vocational training which, in my short experience on the board, is so constricted by regulations that it is very difficult to use it in the broad sense and to experiment with it. You can't use it in your junior high school. You can't motivate children. They have to be beyond the ninth grade for us to be able to have vocational money, according to the people that have advised us, and I should hope that we would get new job opportunities in our vocational program.

Now, we know that these people will be accepted in these jobs because there are no people to fill the jobs now. Those are the jobs to train these boys [to fill] and particularly, I would stress to the South, to train the boys. One of our problems is that it [the Negro family] is largely a matriarchy. Get the boys to stay in good jobs, where there is the steady job, not the household-help job which is the steady job, so that this boy will have a father whom he respects; then he will stay in school, too. I want to find jobs which will give them careers, and then I think we will move out the next generation maybe going into either the professional or the technical, not service, which is what we are thinking of.

Chairman HANNAH. Is there a question from table F? Yes, sir.

Dr. STEPHENS. I am Rual Stephens, Atlanta Public Schools. I would like to address this question to Dr. Peters.

First, I want to commend the progress made in the Chapel Hill situation, and to observe that this progress presumably was made possible by the support of the school population, the adult population. Now, I recognize the duty of a school board is both to reflect and shape public opinion. The question is this: To what extent do you think that it is your duty, as a member of the board, to go beyond public opinion, making that type of progress?

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Peters.

Dr. PETERS. I never considered myself a follower, and I think that the board has every obligation to try to stay as far ahead of its constituency as it can and survive.

Dr. STEPHENS. What was the last statement?

Dr. PETERS. And survive.

Dr. STEPHENS. And survive. [Laughter.]

Chairman HANNAH. Is there a question at table G, the far table? If not, we'll come back to the gentleman at the end of the row in table F.

Mr. SMITH. My name is Charles U. Smith from Florida again. Partly in answer to the lady's question about vocational training, we made a study in Florida last year and we found the opportunity for vocational and technical training for Negroes is about eight times less than it is for whites, in number and variety of opportunities.

The vocational training for Negroes in Florida is primarily barbering, cosmetology, auto mechanics; none of the new technologies that Dr. Peters referred to. Even at the university. [Florida Agriculture and Mechanical University.] For example, there is no place in Florida where a Negro student can get a major in physics, and that's where Cape Canaveral is. Perhaps he can go to the University of Florida in a few years.

I did want to make another type of observation. It seems to me in considering factors to be considered in planning desegregation, we have tacitly assumed that we are dealing with areas and communities that are willing to admit the possibility of desegregation. I'm just thinking about areas where there's a glaucoma, in Birmingham, in an area where—I think perhaps Dr. White knows something about this—there is no public commitment or even private commitment that any kind of desegregation is going to take place.

How do you take this factor into consideration in planning, and such planning must take place, I suppose. I think, while much of the discussion is very good, and certainly gives a different perspective, that those of us who happen to be from areas where attitudes are a little more firmly crystallized, and certainly a little more rigidly held, have to consider some factors that are more basic even than the ones, many of the ones, that are being discussed here. I wonder if some members of the group would care to comment on this type of factor.

Chairman HANNAH. Well, I think, sir, that's a very good question and presents really the topic for discussion tomorrow morning, preparation for desegregation, and the point you raise I think we might better answer at that time, if that's agreeable to you.

There was a gentleman fifth from the end over here that had his hand up and we passed by.

Mr. BLAKENSHIP. A. H. Blakenship from Gary, Ind. I really had two questions. One of them has been alluded to, but I'm wondering, as we're thinking about these processes, where the policy in relation to adult educational opportunities comes into the picture. It seems to me that is an important part. If we are to develop the young people, we also have to help their parents in many instances.

The second question I would like to ask also is related to something that was only mentioned indirectly, but that is with the extremists on either side, the one who is impatient to have everything completely

desegregated immediately and the individual who is completely opposed, and then in both cases there are opportunists who label that "communism." I'm concerned about the effective techniques in handling that kind of criticism.

Chairman HANNAH. Before I turn to the panel for volunteers, I can only comment that the members of this Commission—I don't know if they can give you the answers—we had the experience when the Commission was first appointed of pretty generally being referred to in some sections of the country as Communists. Do you want a comment beyond that one? Does some member of the panel want to comment on the questions asked by Mr. Blakenship? I see no volunteers.

Dr. PETERS. Well, I will say that this is something that, it seems to me, can happen to anybody who takes a liberal opinion. I have had the unfortunate experience of seeing my father fired by the Federal Government for that, finally being cleared by the U.S. Supreme Court. I believe that it's a testimony to the fact that anyone will remove our civil liberties given a chance, but the best way to lose them is to be afraid of that appellation.

Chairman HANNAH. Anyone of the panel want to comment on the continuing education part of the question? Dr. Bond, do you have any views on this one?

Dr. BOND. Well, I do, sir. With reference to that previous question, what Mr. Schreiber mentioned with reference to the education of the parents, that is, coeducation of the parents with the children in this compensatory effort, seems to me of enormous importance. Out in St. Louis there is a principal, Mr. Shephard, Dr. Shephard, who has done wonders with his school through carrying on a joint program of cooperation, but also of education, and if there are any foundation people around let me drop a little brainstorm I would like to operate in Atlanta if I had a little money.

I would like to take a little school there. Any school would do. I would like to organize the community in a continuing education program, in which, at whatever level they are, they study what the children are studying. I would like to buy some tape recorders; I would like to buy some phonographs, and I would like to have recordings of the lessons, recordings of everything else; in short, to carry on together what once I did with adults in Nashville, when I was teaching at Fisk University, when we organized what we called a people's college, and we got free teaching from the WPA, fortunately, and had a very wonderful time with these grown-up people. This costs money, and I would just say, in answer to this question, I think the matter of continuing education, beyond the point of just enlisting parent cooperation, but turning the whole school community into an educational

outfit, the children and the parents as well, is really one final possibility for getting a long way in compensating for these matters.

Now, there is a committee on—at least a group—working on the continuing education of adults in the liberal arts—and there is a Negro community, but this is on a little higher level than that to which I refer—various colleges in the South cooperating in this enterprise in the liberal arts. I think it's financed by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, if I'm not mistaken.

I hope that is a staggering answer to your question, saying at least I'm all for it.

Chairman HANNAH. I am going to recognize two more questions. The gentleman at the end of row F and then row E.

Mr. RILES. My name is Wilson Riles. I am from the Department of Education in California.

Dr. Nyquist and Dr. Chute referred to something that we have a concern about; that is, Dr. Nyquist, I think, made a racial census, and Dr. Chute didn't know exactly how many ethnic minorities he had in his district. Now, the question comes up in California: A number of years ago intergroup relations organizations advocated removing certain data from pupil's records. Well, with some resistance, most school districts over the years complied. Now, in cases where we need to find out what the racial complexion is in a particular district, we have no data, and many school superintendents say, "We don't know," and they are resisting census.

Now, my question is this—

By the way, Dr. Philip Hauser in last month's issue of the *American Statistician* makes this statement. He says that—

> It would seem that we cannot as a group of scientists and administrators accept a proposition that knowledge, any kind of knowledge, is a dangerous thing. Information, itself, is always neutral. It may be used for harmful purposes, but it may also be used for beneficent purposes.

My question is this: Should the pupil's records include data relating to race, religion, and national origin? In other words, should we reverse this position of intergroup organizations of a few years ago so that we might have information to use for benficent purposes?

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Bond or Dr. Nyquist.

Dr. Chute.

Dr. CHUTE. I think we stopped keeping such data for the very reason you suggest. On the other hand, as we need information, we can get it very quickly, and had I known you wanted a piece of information today, I would have brought it.

I think we get bogged down with statistics in files in our school district. I don't know about other school districts, but we have more facts about things than we know how to use or that we ever use. In fact, we collect data just because we've always done it. Consequently,

I think we were quite happy 4 or 5 or 6 years ago when it was brought to our attention that data kept in a file, in individual pupil's files, in a central office that related to religion and national origin and race and so on, just might be prejudicial at some point to a youngster, to a decision made with respect to a youngster, and actually the number of times we used that data was so few and far between that it seemed to us it would save us some staff time not to keep it, but then to collect it as we were trying to solve a problem

Chairman HANNAH. Any other comments from our panelists on this one?

Dr. NYQUIST. Just to reaffirm what he said, I strongly feel the same way—that the danger of misuse being what it is, the fact you don't use it very often—not to do it, I think you come out ahead. It happens to be forbidden in the State of New York. When you do need the information, you can get it on the basis of the way we have, which is legal, and I am sure if people identified themselves or if you asked them to identify themselves in this study that we made that the percentage of error from the statements that were made by the teachers would be extremely small.

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman at the end of row E here.

Dr. PHILLIPS. I can assure you, sir, I am aware of the time. Craig Phillips from Winston-Salem and Charlotte, N.C.

I have a very brief question, but one I think needs to be asked and I would like to ask Dr. Peters if he might verify or at least correct an opinion which I hold, which might also correct an impression that was left by Dr. White this morning and maybe answer Dr. Rankin's question, too, concerning this whole business of improved attitude and atmosphere.

It's my feeling there's a tremendous improvement in atmosphere toward progress in racial relations at least in North Carolina, and I think in the other States in the South. A number of years ago the three largest cities in the State began a genuine implementation of the pupil assignment act, and along with this some less tangible, and less reported, but I think more important activities, such as the integration of the professional staff development and special programs, industrial education programs, throughout the State, placement in summer programs, and this sort of thing, have gone on.

I would like to ask Dr. Peters if the genuine implementation of the pupil assignment act in our State plus these other less tangible activities have made it more possible for his system to make this next step of initial assignment, and isn't it a preview of action that will take place in the near future and in other places in the State because of this sequential development of attitude?

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Peters.

Dr. PETERS. I guess I would best say I would probably be a prejudiced observer in answering this, but I think it has made a great difference in the community, in that there has been a progressive drop-off of these things, and I think that those things which to me, not being a Negro, would be most difficult to take—the constant insult of, "No; you can't," or, "This is barred to you"—have constantly fallen in the community; but even more important, it seems to me, is that the people who were most radically opposed to this have found, really, desegregation wasn't as bad as they thought it was going to be and they aren't constantly plaguing us with this issue. So, I think, as each step is made, that unless the radical segregationist is in control and other people are not in there, it becomes easier because people realize that, really, it isn't that important an issue.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, and I would like now to express our appreciation to the members of the panel, Dr. Nyquist, Dr. Bond, Dr. Peters, and Dr. Chute.

Apologies to some of you who raised your hands that we have not recognized. I want to retain your cooperation for tomorrow, and I think one of the good ways to do that is to adjourn on time this afternoon.

Before we proceed further, Mr. Bernhard, you have an announcement or two.

Mr. BERNHARD. At the beginning of the afternoon session I adverted to some travel cards which weren't there. Apparently they will not be there, and if anybody has questions about travel, please go around to the desk, right outside the door here, and some of the staff people will help you out with any questions you have and any forms that should be filled out.

Before we adjourn, it's very important to tell you to please take every bit of material that you have before you that you brought in or found here from the room. It will be used within an hour by people from the State Department and the National Academy of Sciences for a get-together with Colonel Glenn and Mr. Titov, and we want to be sure the room is as clean as we can leave it. I would appreciate it.

Thank you.

Chairman HANNAH. Before we adjourn, I would remind you that we will reconvene tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock. We will start the program at 9 sharp, and the subject tomorrow morning is "Preparation for Desegregation."

Thank you very much.

(Thereupon, at 5:05 p.m., the conference was recessed, to reconvene at 9 a.m., Friday, May 4, 1962.)

CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Fourth Annual Education Conference
on
Problems of Segregation and Desegregation
of Public Schools

WASHINGTON, D.C.

May 4, 1962, Morning Session

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION, MAY 4, 1962

The conference reconvened at 9:05 a.m., Chairman Hannah presiding.

Present: John A. Hannah (Chairman); Robert A. Storey (Vice Chairman); Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh (Commissioner); Robert S. Rankin (Commissioner); Spottswood W. Robinson III (Commissioner); Erwin N. Griswold (Commissioner).

Also present: Berl I. Bernhard (Staff Director); Mrs. Elizabeth R. Cole (Chief, Public Education Section); Mrs. Ruby L. Martin (Attorney); Mrs. Jane M. Lucas (Attorney); Mrs. Willy R. Davis (Secretary); Mrs. Patricia E. Brown (clerk-stenographer).

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, it is 5 minutes after the announced time, and we will call the session to order.

Yesterday afternoon we were discussing factors to be considered in planning desegregation and we cut off the discussion at 5 o'clock, the announced time for closing yesterday's session. There were some points that were not well covered, or not completely covered, and some of you had questions that you wanted to ask but had not an opportunity to ask. Rather than ask the panel to resume their chairs in front of us here, we are going this morning to call upon two or three people to comment upon the situation in their own communities, with which they are most familiar, and then provide an opportunity for the conference to ask them questions.

You recall yesterday morning, when we opened this session, we gave a little of the history of these educational conferences, and pointed out that the first one was held in Nashville, Tenn. Mr. Oliver, the Superintendent of Schools at Nashville, was a little concerned when informed we were coming to his city because they had just put into effect their first plans for the desegregation of their schools, and I think he was afraid that we were going to disturb what was a calm sea. He has attended, I believe, all of the conferences since, and has contributed a good deal to the progress that has been made, not only in Nashville but, by way of example, in other communities.

I am going to ask Mr. Oliver this morning to briefly outline the experience that they have had in Nashville and make any comments that he would care to, as well as expose himself to questions from any member of the conference.

Mr. Oliver. Thank you, Dr. Hannah. Our plan of desegregation, as the members of the Commission of course know, but as some others here may not know, is a gradual plan—desegregating one grade each year, beginning with the first grade. Each elementary school has a zone of its own, determined by geography and the scholastic population, without regard for race, and every parent residing in this zone may send his children to this school if he wishes. He may also request that his children be transferred to another school outside of this zone if he wishes, in order that they may attend a school where the majority of the students will be of their own race. This is a simple plan, entirely without confusing circumstances or conditions. We are now nearing the end of the fifth year of this plan.

Up to the present time it has worked very smoothly and without any incidents that would interfere with the educational interest of any child concerned. It is our hope and our firm belief that it will continue to work smoothly throughout the remaining seven grades and thereafter. It is our determined resolve that it shall. We believe, more and more, that it is a good plan, based on logic and sound reasoning. We don't say that it is the best plan for any other community, but we do believe that it is the best plan for Nashville, Tenn.

It is interesting to note that the number, and also the proportion, of Negro students attending the school with white children is increasing each year. In 1957 there were only 10 [Negro] students, I believe, in the first grade.

Now, according to our last official checkup, which was made last fall, there are 86 in the first grade, 73 in the second, 41 in the third, 44 in the fourth, 26 in the fifth—a total of 270 and an average of 54 per grade. Whatever it was that made Negro parents reluctant at first to send their children to school with white children seems to be disappearing.

Because of geographical reasons the number of schools in which children of both races are enrolled remains about the same. In 1957 there were 7, I believe; in 1959, 10; and now there are 8. Two schools which were attended by both races have been closed. Race had nothing at all to do with their closing. We have one new thing this year. We have one school which is predominantly Negro in which two non-Negro students are enrolled. One of them is a white child. The other, I believe, is a Chinese-American and like nearly all the little Negro children who are attending predominantly white schools, these two are doing well. They seem happy and contented and they are succeeding normally with their work.

Our experience and observation convinces us more and more that it was wise for us to begin in the first grade, because nearly all of the children who begin in the first grade do very well. Those who begin in higher grades usually do well too, but of the students who have had difficulty adjusting socially and educationally, most, probably all, have been students who did not start in the first grade. We did have one little fellow who started in the first grade, failed 1 year and had to be retained, but of course that is nothing unusual.

Dr. Hannah, that is probably all the time I should take. I would be happy to try to answer any questions that anyone would like to ask.

Chairman HANNAH. Mrs. Cole, have you a question you would like to ask?

Mrs. COLE. Mr. Oliver, in your opinion there are definite educational advantages in having children begin a new experience like this at grade 1?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; I think so. Changing from an association which has been almost altogether with members of his own race to a school situation in which the majority of the children are not of his own race is quite an experience for a child. His reactions to his fellow students, his teachers, his general environment, are important; and our experience convinces us that both socially and educationally, the nearer the beginning he gets into this situation the better it is. He does better work. He gets along more happily. In every way he is more successful, we think, based on our observations, if he starts in the first grade.

Mr. SHEPARD. I would like to ask Mr. Oliver a question—two questions really. On what basis are permits for transfer allowed from the residential zone; and are any tests of any sort applied? If not, is there any experience that he might comment on, without any testing whatsoever?

Mr. OLIVER. No tests whatsoever are given. If a child lives in the zone in which a certain school is located, that is his school. He doesn't have to take any tests or get any special permission to attend it. That is where he belongs. Now, if he doesn't want to go to that school he has to make an application for a transfer to a school outside of that zone.

Chairman HANNAH. When he makes his application, are there any requirements other than just the request? Is there any testing at that point?

Mr. OLIVER. No testing whatsoever anywhere. He just says he wants to go to another school and tells us which one he wants to go to. He has a first, second, and third choice, and we are almost always able to grant the first choice. In fact, I think we have always granted the first choice. There isn't anything I am much better informed about than these requests for transfer, because I personally have read and

signed every one of them that has been made since the beginning—no tests whatsoever.

Dr. DUNCAN. I would like to ask Mr. Oliver whether any special provisions have been made for these Negro children, over and above what have been made for the other children.

Mr. OLIVER. Any special provisions?

Dr. DUNCAN. Yes; for improvement of achievement. Has he had to make any?

Mr. OLIVER. I wouldn't say we have made any special provisions other than what we would make for any child. Of course, any child who is in a situation and seems to be having a little more difficulty than someone else gets special attention from the teacher, but we haven't made any particular, special arrangements.

Dr. MILLER. I would like to know if you have any test results of performance of Negro children in the integrated schools. If so, how do these test results compare with results in all-Negro schools and all-white schools?

Mr. OLIVER. We have a report from our school psychologist made a year or possibly 2 years ago. I haven't any specific reports since that time. At least, I do not have one available. These tests recorded grades of ability and achievement, and they indicated that achievement is normal on the part of the Negro student with respect to his ability in the desegregated school.

Mr. MCDANIEL. My question relates to the possibility of having two grades desegregated at a time in the light of the success of the one grade, to do a more speedy job in terms of desegregating.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not quite understand the question.

Chairman HANNAH. The question was: Is it your view that, instead of taking one grade each year, what would be your reaction to taking the first and second, the first three, the third and fourth, and the next and so forth, in order that you would complete the desegregation process earlier? I take it that was the question?

Mr. MCDANIEL. Correct.

Mr. OLIVER. We, of course, considered many ways. We considered, especially, three grades at a time. We think that one grade at a time is the best way. That is what we think, and our experience has convinced us more and more that we are right. It seems rather slow, but I think that it is getting the job done for us better than we could do it in any other way.

Commissioner RANKIN. Has the acceptance of your plan by the community grown noticeably stronger during this 5-year period?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is amazing to see how well our community has accepted our plan. Yes, sir; the acceptance has grown stronger as time has passed, and I think that our plan is approved and accepted

and supported generally by most of the people of both races in our community. Of course, there are some who think we are going too slowly, and there are some who think we shouldn't have done it at all, but by and large our plan is accepted in the minds of most of the people in our community, and the acceptance is growing as we proceed.

Mr. RICE. I would like to ask Mr. Oliver if transfers to and from these desegregated schools are given without question at all times during the school year, or prior to the beginning.

Mr. OLIVER. Nearly all the requests are made at the beginning of the year. We would consider a request made any time, but the normal procedure is for a child to make a request at the beginning of the year.

Dr. MAYS. I would like to ask Mr. Oliver how frequent are the requests made for transfer of white students when Negro students enter that school?

Mr. OLIVER. When Negro students enter a school which is predominantly white the whites are not in a position to ask for transfer to get out of that school. That is their school. So far as I know, we have never granted a request to a white student to get out of a school just because a minority of Negro students had entered the school.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. How many Negro students are there in the Nashville system?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, we have about 30,000 students in the Nashville system, and approximately 12,000 of them are Negro students.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. And so, in 5 grades you have 240 Negro students in integrated schools, which is less than 3 percent, as I figure it quickly?

Mr. OLIVER. 270, I believe.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. All right, 270—maybe a little more than 3 percent—it doesn't make it much more impressive does it?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, because of place of residence there are a great many of our schools that couldn't have both races in them unless we transferred students to schools rather distant from their homes.

Dr. PICOTT. In view of what appears to be the success of this plan, I wonder if you have thought about what some consider a next step; i.e., integration of teachers at any level?

Mr. OLIVER. We have thought about it. We have had it suggested to us. Up to the present time we haven't seen any occasion that would justify our doing it. It may be done later on. Of course, our teachers all work together. They were working together long before 1954. You have reference, I think, to putting maybe Negro teachers in schools where most of the students are white students. We haven't done that. That is not a part of our plan.

Chairman HANNAH. Before we go on with further questions of Mr. Oliver, are there other representatives of southern school systems that have already desegregated who would like to comment on their experiences—that were similar to Mr. Oliver's or that differed from them; or have other points that they would like to put on the table at this time? I think we had better talk about the southern schools first.

Are there other representatives of southern school systems that have already desegregated to some degree, that would like to comment?

Mr. TUCKER. Little Rock, desegregated in 1957, beginning at the high school level, at which time I was not on the school board, and the incumbent board has inherited its plan. We have found that while there is much to be said for beginning at the elementary level, we find some advantages in beginning at the upper end of the scale. I think perhaps the time at which the desegregation is commenced might be a factor in that.

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Tucker, in view of your experiences in Little Rock, if you were to start afresh—have you come to any conclusion as to whether or not you would prefer to start with the first grade, across the board, or start at the high school. You made a general comment. I am not sure whether it was clearly understood.

Mr. TUCKER. All the experience I have had, of course, has been with children beginning at the upper level. However, we have progressed to the junior high level, last September. But to answer your question, I believe that if we were going to begin in 1962 to desegregate initially, perhaps beginning at the first-grade level would be preferred. From the point of view of hindsight, looking back to 1957, I can see some advantages that Dr. Blossom had in working out the plan to begin at the 12th grade.

Chairman HANNAH. Has anyone any questions he would like to address to Mr. Tucker?

Mr. BERNHARD. Mr. Oliver: have you had any Negro students who have been placed, or have gone into, a desegregated school, seek transfer back to a segregated school?

Mr. OLIVER. I have had a few students who transferred——

Mr. BERNHARD. It would be "zoned" rather than transferred?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. I have had some who have asked to be permitted to go back to the all-Negro schools.

Mr. BERNHARD. How many? Do you have any idea?

Mr. OLIVER. Very few. I don't know how many, but not very many.

Mr. PORTER. I might give you this information from the Louisville story: in 1959 we had 7.4 percent of our pupils in all-Negro student bodies. In September 1961 we only had 3.4 percent of the students in all-Negro student bodies.

As regards transfer, we have a free transfer privilege at the elementary level. That is, if there is room available in a school and a student of either race requests transfer, that transfer is granted. At the high school you more or less have a free choice, with the exception of the trade school, which has to be rather selective because of the limitations resulting from the size of the school. The transfers we found, in Louisville, were not too many, but of the number that were received, approximately 60 percent of the transfers were requests by Negro students to go back to all-Negro schools from mixed schools. That has been our experience.

Chairman HANNAH. When they give you the reasons why they want to transfer back, what are they?

Mr. PORTER. Generally, they want to be with their friends, and want to go back, so there is no purely academic reason ever given, other than the fact that they would rather be with their friends.

We do have some teacher desegregation, which was started 2 years ago—10 teachers in 5 schools, 2 junior high schools, and 3 elementary schools. Now this has spread considerably because we have combined schools in the Louisville system, and we have schools that had formerly all-Negro faculties and formerly all-white faculties. New schools were built, and these schools combined, and the faculties merged. This has worked without any friction or complaint from anyone, or any source.

Chairman HANNAH. Before we ask for additional questions of any of these three gentlemen, are there other representatives of southern schools that have desegregated who would like to make some comment?

Mr. ASHMORE. I don't know whether I represent the Deep South. We are sometimes referred to as being south of the Deep South. We are in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. We began to desegregate this year on a very small scale, but at all grade levels from grade 1 and the kindergarten up, without any difficulty whatsoever.

While we have a very small percentage of our Negro students in white schools, we have done it on the basis of zones that were already in existence, and wherever there was a request to move in or out of the desegregated schools we honored it. We found fewer white students moving out than we did Negro students requesting to stay in their own Negro schools.

Chairman HANNAH. Are there other southern school systems?

Mr. RICE. As you know, Dade County desegregated about 4 years ago. We started out with one school. Now we have about 10 or 12. We began with four students. We now have over 600 Negro students in desegregated schools. In fact, we have 1 school in which there are approximately 500 Negroes and 125 white students. The situation in this particular school naturally we watched with much interest be-

cause it was the first in which we had any such magnitude of integration. It has worked very smoothly, with some problems, of course.

We operate, as is known, under the pupil assignment law and in many cases, and in many situations, we necessarily have to play it by ear, in studying the community and the situation involved, to determine how to move successfully. We have one philosophy, and that is that nothing breeds success like success, and we feel that every instance in which we integrate must be a smoothly working operation, to enhance its development in others.

Miss SHIELD. Fairfax County has approximately 100 schools in our county, and of the 100 schools, approximately 7 are Negro schools, so this will give you a measure of the Negro population in our county. We have some Negro students at all levels of instruction.

I would like to comment on what one elementary principal said to me in preparation for desegregation this past year. He said, "We are not going to talk about the two Negro children in Miss Ellis' room. We will speak of all of the children as the 'Robertson children' if they are Negro, or the 'Brown children' if they are white, calling them by their family names." I think this shows a very excellent attitude which has permeated throughout the school system.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much. Are there other southern school systems that would like to comment?

Mr. HURT. I guess St. Louis is considered a southern city with a northern atmosphere, or a northern city with a southern atmosphere. At any rate, we desegregated right after the Supreme Court decision and I think we have been successful in a very thorough program.

We had two teachers colleges prior to desegregation, one being a Negro college. We carried the Negro professors over to the previously all-white school and we have an integrated faculty at the city college. This is where we get most of our teachers. It is known as Harris Teachers College.

We have five districts in the city of St. Louis. The schools are divided into five districts, and we have Negro directors in two of these five districts. They have white principals and teachers under them. We have Negro teachers in the other three districts, under white principals. We have white consultants under Negro directors.

Just recently we had an apprenticeship program at our Ofallon Technical High School. They were able to have a breakthrough, whereby Negroes applied and were certified to go into the pipefitters apprenticeship training program. But once the two Negro students were in, the Pipefitters denied them the use of the National Pipefitters Book. The board of education went on record as saying that all children would be taught out of one book, and gave them 10 days in which to allow them to use the one book. The Pipefitters refused,

so they had to withdraw the book, and recently they have withdrawn their equipment, and we think that they are going out of the program.

We were successful in passing a $23,180,000 bond issue because of overcrowding in our schools and, at the last Board of Education meeting, the Board of Education voted that all contractors, subcontractors, and subcontractors of the subcontractors, will have to comply with the nondiscrimination clause in the building program for our schools.

So I think we are moving very well in the desegregation program, educationwise and jobwise too.

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, we have now had some comments from Nashville, Louisville, Little Rock, Fort Lauderdale, Miami, Fairfax, Va., and St. Louis. Now, if you have questions you would like to address to any of these ladies and gentlemen, let us have them.

Dr. THOMPSON. Several people have said that it was better to start to desegregate in the first grade. Some have said it is better to start to desegregate in the 12th grade and go down. I would like to know what criterion is being used. Is it better for the Negro children? Is it better for the white children? Is it better for the Negro parents? Is it better for the white masses? What criteria are being used to decide that it is better to start down and come up, or up and come down?

Chairman HANNAH. Who would like to answer that?

Dr. THOMPSON. I would like the gentleman from Nashville and the gentleman from Little Rock to do so, since they differ somewhat, to answer this question.

Chairman HANNAH. We will start with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. OLIVER. The principal person to be considered is the student. We have kept that in mind. We have felt that it might be a little easier to comply with the law, at least to a token degree, if we started in the 12th grade. We felt that we would have very few students that would transfer to white schools if we started in the 12th grade. We felt that we would have more if we started in the first grade. We felt that a student going into the white school in the 1st grade would have a lot better chance of making adjustments socially and educationally than if he transferred in the 12th grade.

Now I wouldn't say that our plan is best for every place. I wouldn't say that at all. Different plans may be best for different places, but when we chose our plan our principal consideration was the welfare of the students who would be in desegregated schools.

Mr. TUCKER. I think, although I was not a part of the school board at the time, it must be remembered that Little Rock's plans were initiated in 1955 voluntarily, and I would suppose that the plan to begin at the 12th grade was chosen for several reasons. It was due to the

new construction program that was then underway. It was due to living patterns. But I think perhaps the overriding consideration was to minimize the initial steps of desegregation which, as you may recall, were attended with something less than complete success in the initial phases of the Little Rock experience.

But there are considerably more opportunities for selecting those Negro pupils [in the 12th grade] who have demonstrated the academic achievement and the emotional stability in order to make the plan work and, as I said a moment ago, I think perhaps beginning in 1962 you would have different criteria in mind than the board at Little Rock had in 1955.

Dr. MAYS. Just a comment, Mr. Chairman. I think I am right in saying that Louisville began across the board. Is that right? Nashville began, I believe, in the first grade; Little Rock in the upper grades. It seems to me that in the absence of any particular criteria it is a matter of preparation, and if the community educates the people and gets ready for desegregating the schools it will succeed anywhere you start. It seems to me that the different ways of doing it would suggest that.

Dr. LETSON. I would like to comment on one other point in relation to starting at the 12th or the 1st grade, as one that changed his mind somewhat after having a little experience with both.

I think there is a considerable advantage in starting at the 12th grade, or at the upper levels, as a beginning point; that is, in the initial implementation of integration—for the primary reason that a large part of the preparation and training will involve students, and at the 12th-grade level or at the upper high school level it is possible to do an effective job with students. Your opposition at the other end of the line comes from parents primarily, and parents don't have quite the same relationship with the school. On the basis of careful preparation of the community, I think it is a decided advantage if you are making a beginning, in the initial stages, with those who can reasonably consider, reasonably discuss and come to personal, individual decisions about their own actions.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you, Dr. Letson. We will add Atlanta to the list. Now are there questions you would like to address to any of these gentlemen?

Mr. FOSTER. This is to you, Mr. Oliver.

With the more mature experience that you have now had at Nashville—carrying on through your fifth year—does it now make sense to open up at least on an individual, if not a geographic basis, an opportunity for the youngsters in grades 6 through 12 to present themselves to you for admission into desegregated situations? Certainly the experience of Dr. Letson, Mr. Tucker, and others suggests, with

respect to the youngsters at a high school level, that at least some fraction of those youngsters in the upper grade levels are equipped to come in and to undertake that experience. Certainly one of the deficiencies, it seems to me, in the stairstep, starting at the bottom, is that it totally excludes from having any opportunity for desegregation those children in the grade levels above that point at which the stairstep is taken. Have you given thought to this, sir?

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to make this comment there. Some other school systems have desegregated just certain schools within a system. Now if I were going to desegregate just certain schools, maybe three or four schools, I might start with the 12th grade, but we desegregated our whole school system at one time so far as the 1st grade was concerned. If I were going to require some sort of petition or application in order for a Negro child to get into a white school, I might start in the higher grades. But when you just throw open all the doors of a school throughout the whole system, we think that the first grade is the best place to do it, and my feeling would be that the reasons which justified our asking the courts in the first place to approve this gradual plan justify our continuing that plan all the way through.

Dr. Hannah, I would like to make this comment, if I may. You referred to the fact that when the first meeting of the Commission was held in Nashville I was a little bit uneasy. That is true, but I want to say to you that it did not take long to remove my uneasiness, and throughout all these meetings which I have attended I have been impressed by the seriousness, the earnestness, and the dignity with which they have been conducted. They certainly have been of very great help to me in my school system.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Mr. Oliver, Dr. Miller?

Dr. MILLER. I told my story before, but I think there has been some aftermath that might be rather interesting. I think Delaware has been treated in a rather unique fashion by the courts. I think our State board of education is the only one in the United States that has been ordered by the court to formulate an all-State plan of desegregation. This was done, starting with the first grade, following the Nashville plan, which we found very successful until it was challenged by the NAACP as being too slow, and it was again thrown into the court. The court ordered the State Board of Education to make another all-State plan of desegregation, which was done 2 years ago. The whole State is now desegregated.

In 1954 the State Board of Education took a very firm stand with regard to desegregation of the schools of the State, but on a voluntary basis at that particular time. Following the edict of the State Board of Education, numbers of schools in the northern part of the State, of course, were desegregated.

I believe that the plan that we introduced 2 years ago, the step-by-step plan, helped to build up a frame of mind within the communities which had previously resisted desegregation entirely, very vigorously, and very articulately, to the point where they knew that every possible legal resource had been resorted to and that they had no longer any recourse—since I believe that they now have certainly taken the attitude that the U.S. Supreme Court is the supreme court of the land.

Now, of course, we have regular periods of registration that we set up. The State Board sets these up every year—two or three of them—which provides for all possible contingencies. The registration is on a purely voluntary basis and it has been working very well, I believe, although there are still some schools in the southern part of the State which are just as a token, I would say, desegregated—but no registrations have been made in the past couple of years.

As for what the future will be, I think we can foresee a fully desegregated condition where there are Negro pupils in all of our school districts, having a decent program of education. There are a few schools which do not now have that kind of a program.

Chairman HANNAH: Thank you. I will recognize one more gentleman and then I am going to try to change the subject of our discussion for a few moments.

Dr. NICHOLS. This may be premature and I am not sure where I should address it.

Prior to 1954 most statistics indicated that southern schools generally were spending less per capita than most northern schools, and that the Negro students in separate schools were getting less than the white students per capita.

My question is this: thus far in the patterns of desegregation has there appeared, or will there seem to be, a need for additional funds? Has the cost per capita gone up in these States? Will it seem to go up? Is there any problem of additional financing that will go along with extensive desegregation?

Chairman HANNAH. Does anyone want to volunteer the answers from their experience with reference to the cost that is encountered with desegregation.

Mr. Oliver?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no change in the cost as far as I can determine. The cost remains about the same.

Chairman HANNAH. Any other answer to that question? Mr. Shepard, I think you had your hand up and I want to recognize you before we leave this.

Mr. SHEPARD. I think I would be derelict if somewhere in these proceedings I did not say a little about New Orleans, because I am sure I represent a community in which the thinking is far behind just about

anyone's in this room. In fact, my attendance at this conference was questioned seriously by a member of my board, and also by a large segment of my community, but I felt that I could certainly learn quite a lot up here and that thinking has been justified. In New Orleans, I read very carefully the paper that was sent me concerning the Commission's position in this area, and I feel that a basic point must be preserved, even as we attempt to move ahead in this desegregation problem. That is the thinking of this Commission that the American system of public education must be preserved without impairment. The problem, therefore, is how to comply with the Supreme Court decision while preserving and even improving the public education.

Now we have been criticized, of course, in every area, with people saying, "What, since 1954—it is now 1962—has happened in New Orleans concerning desegregation?" We represent, of course, one of the areas, according to Dr. White's paper, which chose to have a court order force us to desegregate, and I am sure that in the State of Louisiana there was no other choice.

One of the things that I have gained from this conference is that we have no real problem, but I am sure that this is not true because as far as any speed in our particular area of the country is concerned, you must remember that the city of New Orleans is the only close area where any colored children are in white schools.

There is no other parish or county in the State of Louisiana; there is no county in Mississippi; there is no county in Alabama—where there is any desegregation. We feel very strongly that we are going, as a board, to take the initiative at this point. We do not count the era from 1954 to 1960. We feel that we had every right to use every legal and honorable means to oppose this particular situation. The legal situation has been made crystal clear.

We, in 1960, therefore, under court order, desegregated, or attempted to desegregate. We still have a school in the city of New Orleans that has 22 pupils in it, 5 colored children and 17 white children, a school which formerly had 458 children. The second year, in 1961, we did much better, having six schools desegregated, with still the same school empty.

We feel now, as Dr. White mentioned in his paper, that the initiative should be with the board. We believe that we are going to move toward something like the Nashville plan and that pressures should be lessened by plaintiffs in courts rather than intensified, and that we are, as a board in the city of New Orleans, acting under the Supreme Court order: that it is in the hands of the local boards. They are the ones that know the educational possibilities and problems of the community. We should be allowed to take the initiative without such

pressure at this moment, and move toward compliance with the Federal court order.

Chairman HANNAH. Did you want to comment, Dr. Letson?

Dr. LETSON. I did want to come back to that question of finance and merely say that: (1) there will always be a need for additional financial resources; (2) the fact that there is a per pupil difference in expenditures as calculated between white and Negro schools is very seldom accounted for by the fact that there is any difference in the basis upon which the funds are actually distributed. The difference comes about because of the operation of several factors in a school system. For instance, inadequate school building facilities will tend to cause a higher per pupil ratio. That, in turn, will in the final analysis work out at a higher white expenditure than in the all-Negro schools. Yet I do think that the point should be clear that I know of no southern communities at the moment who are making a difference in the basis upon which school funds are allocated to these schools.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you, sir. Now I would like to move to another part of this same subject for a few minutes and then we will pick up our panel according to the schedule for this morning.

In the cities with large numbers of Negroes and other minority groups, of course, there has been much commotion and discussion of the fact that substantial numbers of schools are segregated due to residential patterns or for other reasons. These gentlemen have no knowledge that I am going to call on them—I would like to call upon Mr. Williams of New York, Dr. Carl Robinson of Highland Park, Mich., and Dr. Drachler and/or Dr. Remus Robinson of the city of Detroit, and then any others who would like to comment with reference to their problem, and the progress that they are making. We would like to hear any comments they would care to make and then we will open for a few minutes this whole matter of handling the desegregation of de facto segregated schools in the big cities.

Mr. Williams, would you like to comment with reference to your open enrollment system in New York—or anything else?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Dr. Hannah. I think I had better comment at this point, after hearing some of the comments yesterday, that the programs in New York City cover the whole gamut. Probably the two that are best known are the Higher Horizons program, which was discussed at length, and the open enrollment program, which also has been well advertised.

We have as a basis for our operation the philosophy that it is educationally advantageous to pupils to have them educated in a mixed racial setting. This does not mean that New York City ignores in any way any of the other educational concomitants that go to making a good sound education. We think it is important as a consequence

of this philosophy, that we take it into account when we are selecting school sites, when we are zoning, or when we are doing any of the other features that determine where a child goes to school.

Then we have the matter of the place to which a child is to go in terms of his ability. For example, we often offer a parent the opportunity to send his child to a gifted class which may not be in a nearby school. This moves the child to a distant school. This, we think, is an educational advantage which a parent should be permitted to select.

We think the same thing is true of the matter of determining whether a parent wishes to have her child educated in a mixed racial setting, because we see it as an educational problem. We do not see one thing as educational and the other thing as a manipulation. We see them both as educational matters. Consequently, we have introduced the open enrollment feature.

We have this year a little over 3,000 youngsters whose parents have decided that they would like to have them educated in a mixed ethnic situation. We bus the children. This has been featured greatly—the fact that we do provide the school bussing. As a matter of fact, the total number of children that we bus around New York City comes to something like 50,000.

Chairman HANNAH. Would you restate the figure—50,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Approximately 50,000 children. The vast majority of this bussing took place long before we had any organized program of integration. It is done because in New York City we have not been able to locate sufficient schools sufficiently close to pupils, and with sufficient room to accommodate them. Therefore, we have found it necessary to bus them if they live beyond certain distance limits. So most of this occurs for utilization, or because the children are not physically normal children. A small number has been added to this because of the open enrollment program.

The Higher Horizons program is the other feature by which we try and deal with the educational problems that exist for those pupils who remain in the de facto segregated schools. The matter of raising the aspirations both of the pupils and parents, the matter of trying to develop in the pupils and the parents the belief in themselves and the belief that education is the path through which they can reach success. One of the tremendous gains that we feel we have made is the fact that we have more parents today who are enthused at the possibility of success for their youngsters through education.

Some years ago I recall that the cry was that, by and large, minority-group parents were apathetic. Well, this is not true to a great extent now in New York. They are very much interested. They are very much concerned. Sometimes they are off on the wrong track

and we have a headache as a result of it. Nevertheless, we think it is better that they are this concerned, that they are this excited about education, that they are coming down to the school trying to find out what is going on, how their children are doing, what they can do to help, and so on.

I recall yesterday there was some talk about adult education, and how this can be continued or improved or extended. We find that this is a type of adult education that is taking place because of the interest that has been aroused in the programs that we are conducting in New York City.

We have no reason at this point to doubt that we are on the right track, both in Higher Horizons and in open enrollment, and we are proceeding accordingly. We have every indication that these are both wholesome developments. We think that the other facets that we have are proving themselves out. We are not satisfied that everything possible has been done. We are not satisfied that these are perfect. We think there are many improvements that can be made. But we are proceeding in the belief that we are providing for these youngsters an education that is essentially more democratic in nature and meets the kind of society that we hope will eventually evolve in our Nation.

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Williams, when you say "open enrollment" this may not be quite clear to some of the members here. Could you, in a few words, define what "open enrollment" means in New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I will be happy to. We select two groups of schools—those schools which are 90 percent or higher Negro and/or Puerto Rican in their populations. We call them "sending" schools. Schools which are 25 percent or less Negro and/or Puerto Rican, we call "receiving" schools.

We permit any child in a sending school, upon the request of his parent, to be transferred to a receiving school. We have certain controls. The receiving schools, by the way, must also be 90 percent or less utilized, so that we do not introduce an overcrowding situation. To the extent that we have room in the receiving schools, these transfers take place. This is what we call our open enrollment program. It occurs, I should say, for the pupils who are entering the third, fourth, or fifth grades of the elementary schools or pupils who are entering the seventh grade of the junior high schools.

Chairman HANNAH. One more question. You indicated that you were getting more acceptance or enthusiasm on the part of parents, and I gather you were talking about enthusiasm or acceptance on the part of the parents of Negroes or Puerto Ricans. What is the situation with reference to the parents of the white students in these schools that were formerly entirely or largely white? Is there greater acceptance, or do you still have problems?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are still some problems. It is an uneven picture. We have many places—I would say the majority of places—in which things are going very well. We try to do some preparation. We try to introduce the parents to each other, and sometimes the pupils to each other, prior to the movement taking place, and in the majority of cases this goes very well. We have some instances where there is reluctance and to some extent a resistance, but nothing in connection with the open enrollment program that we would consider to be very serious or of an explosive nature.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you. I would now like to call on Dr. Robinson of Highland Park, where they have been using a modified Princeton plan, to make any comments he would care to.

Dr. ROBINSON. I think one of the things I should do is to begin to put us a little in context. We are unique in many ways. First, we are a relatively small school system—something over 6,000 students. Of course, we are in the State of Michigan, which has for many years had a fair employment practices act, and I think our board has normally moved to that. We have had our integrated schools historically; particularly there has never been any problem in the secondary schools. Our staff, for over 20 years, has included both professional and nonprofessional staff members, with no regard to race. I should also say that our district has used a hard-and-fast zoning proposition, with relatively little opportunity to transfer from one school to another. Actually, we had never felt that we had any problems of integration. We felt that they had been worked very well until a year ago.

At this point, in a rezoning for an elementary school, one of the elementary schools which had been substantially Negro over the last 5 or 10 years was again reassigned on a zone similar to that which had been in effect for many years. This school was substantially all-Negro. At this point Negro members of our community—I would say also that it was not entirely Negro members, many of the leaders, the people who felt that this was wrong, were white—objected to this zoning, to the point of taking it to the Federal courts.

The case was never decided, in that a mutually agreeable solution, at least on a temporary basis, was arrived at in the judge's chambers rather than by taking it to a decision. This particular position was a rather simple one. The school involved was a K–6 school. I should also add that we are a very close district. There are only 3 square miles in our entire school district. Obviously, with 10 schools, we cover the area pretty closely.

The solution that was arrived at was a temporary one, at least in part, but it basically was to reassign the school in question, first to a kindergarten through grade 3 organization, rather than a kindergarten through grade 6, and thus to increase its attendance area substantially

and to integrate, therefore, by means of this device, the older children—the grades 4 through 6—attending another school district which was nearby and, again, had been integrated over a period of time. I think probably that describes our problem, and our solution, at least briefly at this point.

Chairman HANNAH. Now I would like Dr. Drachler or Dr. Robinson, from Detroit, to take a few minutes to tell us something about their experiences and problems there; and then we will open this subject up for discussion.

Dr. ROBINSON. Detroit has a school system of approximately 28,500 children, and almost half of them are colored. This has recently become known as a result of a study which we began 2 years ago. I might go back a little further than that. In 1957 we had a study by a group of representative citizens to determine our school needs for a 10-year period in five areas. These were, first of all, school-community relations, personnel, curriculum, plant, and finance. This was quite a basic study and it has a great deal to offer in terms of the topics that we have been discussing for the last 2 days here.

First of all, this was the first opportunity for citizens of Detroit to really have a look at the school system, and they did a very excellent job in proposing recommendations for the 10-year period, following their report. During the period that we were examining their report, one particular suggestion that impinged on equal educational opportunity was used as a focus for the study of equal educational opportunity, which I have mentioned previously. I say that because, following the original study, beginning in 1957, we moved into a study of opportunity, which has just been completed. Some 180 recommendations have been made to the Board of Education, impinging on all of the problem areas that we have been discussing here today and being, in fact, a citizens' mandate to the Board of Education and a blueprint, a plan, for the future of Detroit public schools, as felt desirable by its citizenry.

Now both of these committees were representative and cross-sectional types of committees—real community leadership. Some of the problems of Detroit are certainly those of large cities where concentrations develop. Particularly, the school system is dependent upon public support for its program by action of the voters in terms of millage. Where we find the abnormal attitudes that we know exist in all of our cities, we use the study technique to bring citizens into a knowledgeable relationship with school board problems. We have used the technique also to be sure that we had support, both financial and educational, and in programing. I think that we have been tremendously successful in advertising the background and the clear

mandates that sometimes are not quite clear in terms of board and administration in progressive community-related programs.

Now we have problems in Detroit that are in focus not only because of our citizens' report but because of groups who feel that we have discriminated against them on the basis of race, and we are at the present time not joined in suit, but are in prospect of joining a suit, in this area. I am sure that the discontents flow around the points of teacher assignment, where our citizens' committee on equal educational opportunity said that the Board of Education policy had not been implemented administratively. The case impinges, and citizens are concerned—about the so-called large Negro area, which is likened to one of containment.

One of our 9 administrative districts consists of some 50,000 youngsters, largely all-Negro, whereas the other 8 districts range from 25,000 to 30,000 in the composition of the administrative district. This district is pointed out as being the real example and proof of a racial discrimination in Detroit. It does happen that there have been many developments in Detroit—urban renewal, highway development—which dislocated large numbers of the occupants of formerly lower central Detroit, and most of these people did move into the area encompassed in the central district.

Now we feel that there hasn't been any question at all about Board policy for many years in terms of the actual goals and the actual philosophy of the Board of Education in the city of Detroit. It has been spelled out in an important pronouncement, and in the bylaws of the Board. We do know that we have, as a Board, not been satisfied with the implementation. I am sure that there is no real difference of objective or goal between the citizenry and the Board of Education. I therefore feel that the resolution of the problem will come naturally and simply, without travail.

We are concerned about the apprenticeship and vocational programs. We have not made progress in apprenticeship participation on the part of the Negro youth. Just last Tuesday we decided that we would look very seriously at this program, to the effect that we would request and demand assurances from the cooperating parties in the apprenticeship training area, and our citizens have gone so far in their own report as to suggest that if satisfactory arrangements could not be made to have free and easy access to the programs, we should close them down.

We know that in the area of parent and community school relationships we are growing. We have demanded that our responsible people develop contact in an organized manner between schools and the community. We feel that this is also a vehicle for improvement and sensitivity to the mutual needs. This area is growing.

We think that our problems in Detroit are clearly in focus. We think that we have been fortunate enough to feel that we are going to have the right answers by pressing the importance of having study groups in problem areas so that we have clear support for what will come. I am sure in my own mind that these problems are difficult ones to solve in any large metropolitan area. We have approximately 550,000 Negroes in Detroit and, as I said before, half of the youngsters in school, approximately, are colored. But, with the exception of the districting and the teacher placement and the work programs, where we must have cooperation between industry and labor as well as the schools, I think we have laid a sound basis for the natural solution of most of the problems and a basis for support for decisive action in the problem areas.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Robinson. Dr. Robinson is an elected member of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit—a medical doctor, and very highly regarded there.

Dr. DRACHLER. I would like to supplement Dr. Robinson's remarks with several of the specifics which may be of interest to other individuals.

First, on this point of citizen involvement, I was personally involved in both the citizens' advisory committee as research director for the program, and also as a member of the equal educational opportunities committee. To those communities who have not used citizen groups, our experience has been a very encouraging one, and I want to indicate just one or two items of our Board policy which helped to do this.

In the first place, our Board called upon its citizens not to evaluate schools necessarily as they are but, as Dr. Robinson indicated, to look ahead. This sort of took the pressure off the staff, and the feeling that they were being evaluated in terms of what they were currently doing but, indirectly, the citizens were able to indicate in their recommendations for the future what they did not like that they saw currently, and it was a very effective technique.

I think the other aspect of it was that the Board declared that teachers are citizens and placed them on committees too, in small numbers—a very small proportion of the entire group. Nevertheless they selected the kind of staff members who, they felt, knew the system and could interpret it and at the same time not be sensitive or overdefensive in their work with citizens.

The third point that I want to make about it is that our experience was that even in so-called educational matters—where we educators often had the attitude, "this is a professional problem, and what do citizens know about this matter?" I think it is significant to indicate that the hunch, though the recommendations that citizens sometimes

made seemed to be oversimplifying the problem, nevertheless their hunch, their intuition that something had to be done, even in a curriculum area—was almost always correct. On matters on which citizens disagreed, in educational matters, we found that educators equally were not in full agreement on solutions for those problems. The net result was the release of a tremendous amount of energy for the citizens' committee.

For instance, to study our 300 schools in a given week, with a prepared manual, some 3,000 citizens went out and evaluated every single school building in the city of Detroit. This not only was helpful to us, because it involved thousands of hours of work, but it also prepared the climate for our future building campaign.

The other recommendation which relates to this issue of boundaries that was discussed here was the recommendation that our committee made: granted that distance and safety and utilization of buildings govern the making of boundaries, nevertheless wherever the Board is in a situation where they can observe these three principles and draw one boundary line that will separate ethnic groups, or draw another boundary line that will bring them together, the latter should be the policy of the Board of Education.

The other matter that I think might be of interest was our bussing policy. At the request of the Board, the superintendent did a capacity study of the entire school system for each building. On the basis of that capacity he found that we had some 5,000 to 6,000 children who were on half-day sessions. We decided that there was enough room for these youngsters to have a full-day session, and bus them to another part of the city.

There a policy was developed unlike New York in this respect: we said that the nearest school that has spaces to house these youngsters until building relief comes in a year or two or three should be the school where we bus our children, regardless of the ethnic composition of the children who are being bused or the children who are receiving. By and large, with the exception of one strike, which was really not a parents' strike but I think some property owners who organized some fears, we found that when our policy was consistent and our practice was consistent with our policy, we had overall community support.

Our "open enrollment" is also different. It works this way: based on the capacity study, we have declared some 20 to 25 schools throughout the city that are [utilized] under capacity ["open"]. We have published, at the request of the Board, the names of the schools in newspapers, and publicized them otherwise. Any parent in any part of the city can go to any school that is on its open list. Any child can go there. The parent simply fills out a transfer and says, "this

school is on the open enrollment list and therefore I want the child to go there." He does not have to give any reason.

The second part of the request transfer is that if a parent feels that his child is in a school where he cannot obtain a full program for his needs, he may request a transfer anywhere in the city—not necessarily to one of the 20 schools on the open list. Now, for that second request the parent must give a reason. He must prove his point. Thirdly, he may request for some personal reason—health, psychological, and so forth—so this is how this has worked. We have had no difficulty about it.

By the way, we bus approximately 6,000 children, and have now less than 1,000 children who are on a half-day session. The only reason they are on half-day session is because the Board passed a policy that where a school will have relief—that is, a new building—within less than a year we will not bus these children. Where it will take more than a year, then we do need to bus them.

I think one aspect which has not been mentioned and which I would like to bring out possibly for discussion and some enlightenment on the part of others is this: we have had recently some experiences in certain parts of our city, particularly on so-called frontier lines where Negroes are beginning to move in for the first time, of a change in attitude. Instead of not accepting the newcomer, there is acceptance, and there have been organized in Detroit three community councils in those areas where the response of these community councils was—they were organized by citizens with the cooperation of the school system—that they wanted to make sure that people are welcomed in the community and then take all steps to prevent a scare, a run from the community, and to educate the community to a changing neighborhood. One of the genuine concerns of citizens in these three councils seems to be a genuine fear which is not related, I think, to any kind of bigotry, that the educational standards in the school will drop as a result of a changing neighborhood. They want to know what the school can do to make sure—to assure the parents in that community—that standards will not drop; that their own children will not suffer as a result of the changes. This seems to be a genuine concern, and I think it is quite a challenge to the educators to make sure that we learn from previous experience, and what we know nationally, to see that this fear of parents is eased.

The last point that I would like to make is that, by and large, my experience has been that very often we have underestimated our citizens. Generally speaking, our citizens accepted the changes. They cooperated with the Board, and the fears that many had that if you place a Negro teacher in an all-white school, or if you bring in children from other parts of the community, this will necessarily create grave problems, were not realized.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you, Dr. Drachler.

We have opened up a very large subject that we could go on with indefinitely, but we are going to have to return to our printed program. I am going to recognize the lady in the back row, who has asked to be recognized, and then we will take a 5-minute break and pick up this morning's program.

Dr. BURRELL. I would like to raise a matter that has not been discussed, but probably, in effect, in some respects has to do with citizen involvement and adult education. It seems pertinent in the approach to factors in a realistic consideration of desegregation and permissiveness in the choice of schools, and relates to desegregated housing.

My question is: what is being done, if anything, to involve citizenship in adult education in the awareness of the fact that desegregation cannot really become a reality, nor can there be permissiveness of choice, as long as housing remains as it is?

Chairman HANNAH. This is a question that is a little out of the educator's field, but does anyone want to volunteer a comment?

Dr. BURRELL. May I make a comment? I realize that, but educators cannot work in a vacuum. We are concerned with effectiveness of education, but we must work with the community, and this is what I am concerned with.

Mr. GILLIS. In answering that question I am going to take 1 minute to state that while the Supreme Court passed the act in 1954, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts preceded it by an act in 1949 called the Massachusetts Fair Education Practices Act. I will read the title, which is three lines as follows: "To secure fair educational practices, equality of educational opportunity, and to eliminate and prevent discrimination in education because of race, religion, color, or national origin."

That act wasn't necessary for Boston because since 1635, with the opening of the public Latin School, we have had integration, and at the present time any child may go to any school, in any grade of any system, provided there is a seat vacant for him, after the neighbors have been accommodated, provided the course fits his needs and provided, if transportation is necessary, his parents will pay the carfare.

Now we do take up problems such as the previous speaker suggested, in our home and school associations.

We have, in connection with each school within a district—and a district may have four or five schools—a home and school association.

Any problem, including that suggested, may be discussed by those fathers and mothers with the teacher, the principals, supervisors, and the assistant superintendent. The Superintendent himself will attend if invited. We attempt to solve that problem by open discussion. The population of the city is about 700,000, and about 10

percent Negro. The population of the schools is 90,000-plus, and the number of Negro children is higher than 10 percent. I offer that as an example, Dr. Hannah.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Mr. Gillis. Now, because again we have the cafeteria problem, and we must adjourn at 11:45, we are going to take a 5-minute break, and when we return, will the four panelists—Dr. Dodson, Mr. Bloom, Dr. Letson, and Dr. Carmichael—take the chairs at the appropriate place please?

(Thereupon, at 10:40 a.m., a 5-minute recess was taken.)

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Williams of New York has asked that he be given a minute to clarify a question that has arisen with reference to the differences between the New York and Detroit situations. Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Dr. Hannah. I refer to part of Dr. Drachler's remarks, when he said that, unlike New York City, Detroit has a bussing program for the purpose of better utilization of schools. Perhaps I did not make clear in my remarks that this is a program that has been ongoing in New York for some time. The vast majority of the normal schoolchildren who are bused in New York out of the 50,000 to whom I referred are bused for purposes of school utilization, so that they don't have to have a shortened schoolday but can attend a school where they get a full schoolday.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you, Mr. Williams. We will move on now to the panelists. I think they have all prepared papers. Some have submitted them. We will appreciate it if they can digest their comments so that they will keep within the 15- or 20-minute assignment given to each.

We now move to the subject of preparation for desegregation. Your program says that the first speaker was to have been Dr. Dan Dodson, a specialist in intergroup relations, professor of education, and director of the Center for Human Relations and Community Studies at New York University's School of Education. Unfortunately, Dr. Dodson is not here, but his assistant, Dr. Jeanne Noble, is here to represent him and to take his place in the program.

Before introducing Dr. Noble I would like to tell you something about Dr. Dodson, inasmuch as I think that Dr. Noble is really presenting Dr. Dodson's paper. Dr. Dodson is not a Yankee but, like our Vice Chairman, came from Texas, where he received his early education. He is a graduate of McMurray College in Abilene and received a master of arts degree from SMU. He then went on to New York University for his doctor's degree.

Dr. Dodson has been active in civic affairs in the New York area since he joined the New York University's School of Education faculty in 1936. But, of particular interest to this group is his contribution to

numerous studies of school systems and communities with relation to ways and means of reducing racial concentration in the schools. These studies included New Rochelle, Levittown, and Bethpage, N.Y., and Mahwah, N.J. Most recently, he was a member of the committee producing a study of "Englewood—Its People and Its Schools," published in February 1962.

Dr. Dodson's qualifications to speak on "Preparation for Desegregation" are outstanding. We regret he is not here, but we are very happy to have his assistant, Dr. Noble, who will present his statement.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAN DODSON, DIRECTOR, CENTER OF HUMAN RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY STUDIES, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, DELIVERED BY DR. JEANNE L. NOBLE, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK

Dr. NOBLE. Certainly a person from Georgia could never stand in the shoes of someone from Texas, but I am delighted to read this paper of Professor Dodson's and can say wholeheartedly that I agree with the points that he is making and am very much attuned to the philosophy which he has presented throughout the Nation on this question.

New York University has had a long and sustained interest in human relations issues confronting public education. The School of Education established the Center for Human Relations and Community Studies, which I have the honor to now direct, in 1947. When the Commission on Community Interrelations was closed, the major staff came to our Graduate School and established the Research Center for Human Relations. While seemingly duplicative, and immensely confusing to the general public, the developments illustrate the concern the institution has shown for the problems of the intergroup field, of which race relations is but one.

In addition to numerous consultations with school systems on the general problems of intergroup relations, we have had the honor to be invited to work specifically with the Washington, D.C., school system at the time they desegregated. The late William E. Vickery of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and I led the six supervisory staff sessions the first time they were ever brought together as one school system.

Together we explored what they would do if and when they were ordered to desegregate.

We organized a team and studied the racial imbalance in New Rochelle, N.Y. Our report preceded the Federal court test and became a part of the evidence in that case. We have just finished consultations with Greenburgh School District 8 in Westchester, and with Engle-

wood, N.J. Our research center did the study for the Public Education Association which became the model for the study of de facto segregation in most of the large communities of the country. We are at present employed by the Commission on Human Rights to assist in the evaluation of the "open enrollment" program of the Board of Education of New York City. This lengthy recitation of involvement is made in order to provide a base for the observations which follow:

1. There is very little preparation made ordinarily for desegregation unless and until a community is brought to confrontation with the issue. Most of the time this involves conflict in some degree. It is illogical to assume that people who are comfortable in their dominant power role in the community will relinquish the community structure which they have created and on which their status depends without resistance. Confrontation is produced through legal decisions, community pressure, political pressure, or other such designs.

2. Professional school leadership is rarely instrumental in determining the policy of who is going to school with whom. This is largely a political science matter. It is usually settled by lawyers, judges, politicians, or nonschool community leadership. Power, rather than educational merit, usually determines the outcome. Educators may be put through the paces during studies or otherwise interpreting policies, but they are rarely the decision makers. Some have gotten great credit for what has been done once it is accomplished, but such accolades have frequently been because our press felt a great need to advertise our successes, rather than because of a frontline role played by the professional educators.

3. Because the initial stages of desegregation involve power groups which do not include the professional staff, it is highly important that there be a clear concise statement of policy on desegregation, and that it be rooted firmly in the authority of the community. In other words, there is the need for educators to feel the support of the authority of the community, and to feel secure that the authority is legitimate. It is not an accident that segregationists both in the South and the North try to attack the legitimacy of the court's decisions. In a like manner there is need to feel that political leadership is not being pushed by organized pressure groups, rather than operating on their own initiative.

If groups who oppose desegregation feel that by "hollering" they will get a hearing, they are going to "holler." Implementers of public policy must move from clearly defined policy, and with mandates which are unequivocal. Sometimes these are from State departments of education. Other times they are from the courts. At others, the policy must be wrought out of the white heat of community controversy.

4. Although professional educators are usually not key persons so far as responsibility for decision making is concerned, their responsibility for interpretation of educational matters to power figures is important. In this role they could help enormously if they were clear about what they believe good education to be. Some places where they are ambivalent include:

a. The merit of a desegregated educational experience for all children—not just Negro children. A good case could be made that the major thing we are teaching our children in today's world is how to hide. We are hiding in lily-white suburbs, we are hiding in large-scale homogeneous redevelopment projects. We are hiding in our churches, according to many observers of the American scene. While there has been a great return to the church since the war, there is little indication that it represents a return to the Lord. Now, all of a sudden, the neighborhood school has become sacred. It might be added that the nearer Negroes get to it the more sacred it becomes. The concept was borrowed from the idea of the community school. The community school, however, never was intended to be a "turf" which shut out life. Its strength was because of the very opposite connotation. It was that all the community's children would go to school together.

b. The real issue before us is how to lead *all* the community's children to meaningful encounters with each other to the end that they develop the skills of citizenship commensurate with the demands of the times in which they live. Do educators really cherish this value as a part of the growth and development of all children? If they do, what weight are they prepared to give it in relation to other weights which enter into the decision as to where children shall attend school? For the most part, professional educational leadership has been remiss, in my judgment, in its leadership at this level. For the most part, permissive zoning, open enrollment, or transfer have been the concessions made to pressure from the community that desegregation be accomplished. This has meant that a few concerned parents of Negro background have had to take the responsibility for arranging these encounters for their children as a civil right, rather than that the school system arranged the encounters for all the children as a part of an educational experience. Only a few communities have resorted to open enrollment, redesignation of school plants—such as the Princeton plan, and use of urban renewal and other city planning resources to bring about desegregation as a school's responsibility for good education for all children.

c. A third thing about which there is confusion is the import of the de facto segregated school. Conant in *Slums and Suburbs* draws a clear distinction between de facto and de jure segregation, and indicates his belief that there is nothing wrong with segregated schools, provided they reflect the neighborhood; are not the result of assignment because of race; and provided they offer as high quality of education as do the other schools which are not segregated. On the other hand, there is little, if any, evidence to indicate that a de facto segregated school can be made equal in its educational program. If the entire culture conceives a "Jim Crow" school as inferior, does this in fact make it so? If it does, does not the requirement that a youth attend it violate his civil rights? I believe it does. The all-Negro schools tend to be older. The staff tend to be those marginal to the system—the novitiates and the superannuates. Academic standards fall as the school approaches all-Negro proportions. Morale which makes a climate conducive to learning is lost. The evidence is growing that segregation which is de facto is inherently inferior the same as that which is by law. To this point, however, it seems easier for judges to see these limitations of racially segregated experiences than it is for educators. It would help if educators possessed more clarity about these basic factors of growth and development.

d. It would help if educators knew more of the skills of group leadership so that grouping practices within the school buildings did not frustrate the policy goals even where desegregation is accomplished. Some school systems capitalize on the disadvantage of the Negro youth because of his traumas of the past, and group on so-called ability bases, and provide a high degree of segregation. Sometimes one is led to think it is only coracial education in the same building. Homogeneous grouping is still another device to help us hide respectably in too many instances.

5. In summary, perhaps the major problem relates to how educators see their role in leading children in the growth and development process. Piaget has written perceptively of the art of matching up the maturation phases of youth's growth with experiences appropriate to each phase. Not the least important of this process is the development of self-other. It is important for youth to learn himself as against other-selves. It is equally important, however, that the ranges of "ourselves" be increasingly widened.

For us all there is the growing sense of alienation which leave us with the feeling that a considerable part of us is not really "ourselves." Some have referred to this as "the stranger within us." I would submit that it is impossible to come to confrontation with this

"stranger," which is the part of us without coming to grips with the issue of the stranger among us. In other words, neither the minority nor the majority can psychologically cope with the alienation of his soul successfully without successfully facing the confrontation of "self-other" that is implied in race relations. Perhaps if educators could see this and be able to interpret it to the communities with whom they are planning, this would be the most important contribution of all.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you.

Our second panel speaker this morning, Mr. Sam R. Bloom, is the only panel member who is not an educator. His business is advertising, which may be described as educating the public at large. [Laughter.] His activities as a member of a leading business group in Dallas, which carried out a program to prepare the community for desegregation of the schools there, certainly was educational in nature.

We are looking forward to hearing Mr. Bloom tell us the story of the work of his organization to insure a peaceful initial transition in Dallas.

Mr. Bloom.

STATEMENT OF SAM R. BLOOM, MEMBER, DALLAS CITIZENS COUNCIL, DALLAS, TEX.

Mr. BLOOM. I sincerely hope that the Commission is interested in rights in a pure sense, because I find myself a minority of one. I am the only panelist without a doctorate. [Laughter.] Dallas is fortunate in that it has an organization called the Dallas Citizens Council. This organization has no relation to the White Citizens Council. [Laughter.] It is made up of the chief executive officers of 250 of the city's leading business firms. This is the power structure I think you were referring to. The Dallas desegregation program was conceived and guided by the Dallas Citizens Council. It was carried forward under the direction of private citizens in their capacity as citizens.

I'm sure you will permit me here today to speak for myself, and I know you'll understand if I lapse into first-person narration that I'm not talking in terms of personal accomplishment—but simply to avoid the hazard of speaking for someone else without authorization.

In Dallas we regard school desegregation as inseparable from the larger social problem of which it is a part. We believe that how wisely and well we handle the school desegregation depends upon how we approach and handle the overall problem. We believe that any program for the peaceful desegregation of a city's schools must seek to

reach and influence the total population—not just parents—or whites—or Negroes—but the total population.

This is why in Dallas we didn't limit our program to school desegregation. Our position was that desegregation must be an adult experience before it becomes a child experience. Because of its immediate and crucial nature, school desegregation served as the instrument to carry advances on several fronts, such as desegregation of eating facilities, stores, hotels, and so forth.

We in no way, and at no time, became directly involved with the school system's decisions, administration, or policy. One of the dangers of do-gooders is that they begin to make decisions for the schools, police, etc.—which we think is a fatal mistake. We relied on the press, the city's elected and appointed officials, the police—and the schools—to perform their individual functions well, and in keeping with the spirit of our total program. We do feel that the decisions they made may have been influenced by the climate we created throughout the Dallas community. For example, our police chief stated: "In Dallas we can go ahead and do our job because we know the community is behind us."

Let me say I believe there's a weakness in expressing the desegregation problem only in terms of moral principles, and the person who does so gives moral motivation, but no means of accomplishment. And, too, there's a grave danger in oversimplifying the problem.

In Dallas we decided to approach desegregation not as moralists but as mechanics dealing with practical reality, even though in doing this, we risked being charged with "selfish interests"—with "doing the right thing for the wrong reasons." We knew that whatever we did, it would seem too little and too late to some, while to others our efforts would seem too fast.

And so it is as a mechanic that I'd like to tell you what we did in Dallas, how we did it, and, more importantly for you perhaps, why we did it.

In Dallas we believe that when men have a climate where they are free to speak out, they can rise to great heights. People are not really that bad in Little Rock or that good in Dallas. People are not so much segregationists as they are afraid of losing status or of being on the "wrong" side. Given the chance, most people will choose the decent way, most people will take responsibility for themselves and their neighbors. We found much less hate and bigotry than even the most optimistic of us believed existed.

Another conviction of ours is that leaders are people. It's important to remember that leaders as well as private citizens can be afraid to speak out, afraid for their business, professional, political,

even their family life. Negro leadership faces the same fears—of losing status and being on the "wrong" side in the Negro community.

In addition, the moderate Negro leader has some very special problems: He cannot retain his leadership without the help of the white man, and some concrete progress for his community. Yet he finds it difficult to let the man who is best able to do so provide that help—I mean, sincere white leadership.

Early in 1960 the Dallas Citizens Council formed a special committee of seven to work on the question of desegregation. Soon after, a like number of leaders from the Negro community came forward to offer their assistance. I would like to say here that they have been devoted, intelligent, and fine citizens, not merely for this committee but for the total city of Dallas. These two groups fell heir to the school desegregation problem.

The first thing, of course, was to evaluate the danger to our city. We knew we could not afford the price of violence; deteriorated economy, weakened moral fiber, loss of pride and self-respect. Above all, we could not let our children suffer. We knew that if we abdicated our responsibilities in Dallas, we could expect to see the extremist elements and self-seekers rush in to fill the vacuum.

The leadership of the city—which, by the way, from the very beginning included the press—reached the following conclusions:

If Dallas was to avoid violence, Dallas leaders must exercise leadership.

They must help establish a behavior pattern which could be followed by the community as a whole.

They must stand up and be counted for law and order.

The next problem was obvious: how could we get the public to go along with us?

The answer, of course, was that Dallas leaders must develop and vigorously pursue a program of public conditioning. And during the process of public conditioning, incidents must not be permitted to occur which might give extremists on either side an excuse to disrupt the peace of the community. This meant self-restraint—self-discipline—on the part of both white and Negro citizens.

Our first job was to find a banner under which our citizens could rally regardless of personal feelings, and free of emotion. We decided that our program must advocate neither segregation nor desegregation in the schools. It must reach beyond the personal pros and cons of the immediate issue to something upon which all of us could agree—an appeal to law and order, and to preserving the peace. We must admit each citizen's right to his own opinion, but then emphasize the citizen's individual responsibility to respect the law and maintain the peace in Dallas. Let me say here: we never were so

optimistic as to suppose we could influence everybody in Dallas. We never tried to engage or to influence the extreme segregationist. On the contrary, we wanted to avoid him, to let him sleep as long as we could. [Laughter.] Another person we did not try to change was the man of violence. This, of course, is a police problem.

Our program had two main objectives:

1. To establish a behavior pattern of good citizenship in the upper 10 to 15 percent of the community.

2. To influence the lower one-third of our citizens for peaceful transition through every communications means available to us.

In establishing the behavior pattern, our work commenced with a declaration of principles, a timetable, and a technique.

The declaration defined our terms and objectives in three areas: (1) Dallas opportunity; (2) setting an example of good citizenship; (3) the family's responsibility.

These documents were prepared in consultation with psychologists, clergymen, and other persons skilled in the technique of opinion molding. They became our central, permanent statement, upon which all our verbal and visual communications were based.

Our timetable listed hundreds of fraternal, professional, and civic organizations in Dallas, and scheduled target dates for meetings with major groups to solicit their support of the program.

We used the controlled-audience technique and approached, first, people with open minds who were in a position to unlock doors. In the beginning, we went to meetings on invitation only.

This meant that dissenters would be in a minority and that an atmosphere of acceptance would prevail. Naturally, we were not always successful in keeping the opposition quiet, but as and when demagoguery, selfishness, and stupidity came into view, there would be an awakening among the rest of the group, a new awareness of what such people really are like.

We believed that to be effective, our literature and other communications tools must not be anonymous.

Our first meetings, therefore, were held with three influential organizations who agreed to lend their names to our program as sponsors, as well as to work actively in its behalf: the Dallas Bar Association; the Dallas County Medical Society; and the Greater Dallas Council of Churches.

We also secured endorsement, and the right to quote other influential persons and groups: the AFL–CIO Council; city and county law enforcement agencies; elected and appointed public officials.

Our first plans for communicating with the general public called for a pool of speakers to be supplied by these supporting organizations.

But we decided instead on a documentary film. Taken together with a controlled audience, a film has certain advantages over a live speaker. With a film, content and emphasis of the message can be controlled. Also, because a film is inanimate, dissenters don't feel obliged to argue vocally with it. [Laughter.] On the other hand, your proponent feels that nobody has yet spoken for his position as a human being. He wants to stand up and declare his position, and when he does, more and more proponents do likewise. Time after time as we showed our film, I saw this great welling up of vocal enthusiasm, which seemed to play as great a part in molding opinion as the film itself did.

Because it would have to reach a broad cross section of the public, our film had to speak to several levels of society. We, therefore, built into it appeals to morality, to health, to patriotism, to civic pride, to practical interest, and we even included a threat of jail.

We believed that the women who rioted in Little Rock and New Orleans had seen themselves as crusaders for a cause, not as law-breakers or as hurting their children. We believed that carefully selected newsclips of actual riot scenes would make this difference clear.

We also decided that our message would be believable only if our speakers were local leaders speaking in practical terms, each within the context of his profession, and as the representative of a group. The advantage of representing a group instead of speaking as an individual I am sure I won't have to detail for you.

We began showing "Dallas at the Crossroads," as we called our film, on July 10, and in the 8 weeks before the opening of school we showed it hundreds of times in churches, to employee groups, service clubs, women's organizations, labor meetings, veterans' groups—in fact to every group it was possible to contact in the city. We gave it mass showing over both Dallas TV channels during the week before the opening of school.

Now a very brief word about our other tools.

We prepared a pocket-sized booklet, also entitled "Dallas at the Crossroads," and distributed hundreds of thousands of copies to viewers of the film, and through other channels. Payroll inserts were prepared and distributed with tens of thousands of Dallasites' paychecks. Thousands of posters were prepared to display in the dark spots of our city—cafes, beer parlors, etc.—showing happy children with the legend "Keep Dallas safe for them—avoid violence."

As the civic climate improved, people began to move more freely toward desegregation in a number of areas. They did this for a variety of reasons—financial, moral, in order to move with the tide—and often in spite of special and very real problems.

Every activity has its special problems. They are pressing. They often are difficult to solve, partly because they are distorted by emotional and psychological factors and have roots so deep in history, but more importantly because they often confront us on more than one level of responsibility.

Let us consider for a moment one area that was crucial to the success of our program—the press. We believed that our program had a better chance of success with a minimum of publicity in the initial stages. The press, of course, has a long-term responsibility to the community, and a short-term responsibility to report the news. We did ask them to redefine what is news from the standpoint of immediate and long-range community welfare. Dallas news media gave us wholehearted cooperation every step of the way. We kept the news media informed of the aims, methods, and progress of the program. This was a calculated risk, but at no time did media fail us. They gave us very able editorial support when the program began. They showed the greatest discretion in what they printed, and in the weeks immediately preceding the opening of the schools, they increased their editorial support.

National news media also treated us fairly and favorably. It is true that they broke the Dallas program story earlier than we would have preferred. All we could do was catch the ball and run with it. Our local press and television followed with every support, and what we feared would be a setback turned out to be a key step toward success.

As I have already mentioned—Dallas leaders were convinced from the beginning that desegregation must be an adult experience before becoming a children's experience. We kept stressing the parents' responsibility to set our children an example of good citizenship and to establish family values and personal standards in all private areas not related to the law. We felt that to give reality to this appeal, it was vital for adult Dallasites to experience desegregation of certain public facilities prior to the opening of the schools.

The eating facilities in Dallas department stores seemed the natural place to start. As I have said, in order for the moderate Negro leaders to retain their influence, they had to be able to carry some word of progress back to their people, and the stores were one of the areas experiencing direct pressure from the Negro community. The store manager, of course, has the responsibility to keep his stockholders satisfied, his employees working, his store in business. If he is to desegregate, he faces the possibility of loss of business. He may even have an in-store problem with employees reluctant to wait on Negroes.

Our original plan called for tests over a 2-week period, but the first test on July 26 went off without incident, and supplementary tests were abandoned. Dallas stores were desegregated from that day.

There is scarcely an area in Dallas community life that is not touched in some special way by the desegregation problem—our hotels, our theaters, our professional people, doctors, lawyers, our labor unions, our employers, even our churches. These individual problems have been conscientiously studied, and progress has been made on a broad front—both before and since the desegregation of our schools.

By way of conclusion, may I leave with you one or two of my personal beliefs reached through our experience in Dallas. First, I believe that the solution of a community's special problems can best be worked out on a local level through the exercise of strong civic leadership and the development of a pattern of decent community behavior. Secondly, I believe that time is essential to the development of public attitudes which will accept social and economic change peacefully and with good will. I don't mean time to circumvent, to procrastinate, but time in which to move solidly, wisely, and constructively. Next, I believe that to be effective, any program of social or economic betterment must be based on a practical understanding of the special problems which beset citizens in specialized areas, and an effort must be made to meet these problems on a basis of realism.

Also, lest I leave the impression that it is primarily a white affair with gains for the commercial community only, let me say that I believe the Negro as well as the white, the moralist, the intellectual, the mechanic, all have much to gain. It is vital to remember that the haters are aging. By working our problems out in a climate of peace and order, we can save our children from hate and prejudice. We can help them to avoid our mistakes. Indeed, the greatest mistake made in some cities through violence is the development of a whole new generation of haters.

Finally, I believe that this is a continuing problem, not just something that is over with the desegregation of a city's schools. I think the community, and the schools, should have an interest in the continuing problems of minority groups.

They need help, guidance and counseling on a sustained basis.

I believe that moderate leaders of both races working together with self-restraint and patience will achieve social improvement for the total community. This is the way we tried to go, and still are trying to go, in Dallas. Yesterday you spent quite a bit of time on areas related to the school problem and I would like to have you know that in Dallas we have, and continue to work on, job opportunity, housing, and higher education—and all of the other phases that we believe contribute to the solution of this total problem.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much for that very fine report. You and the others in Dallas deserve real commendation for the way you handled this problem.

Now I should like to introduce the third panelist this morning and then we will break for lunch and resume at 1:30 with the fourth panelist, proceeding with our discussion thereafter.

Dr. John Letson, the next speaker, is another Southerner by birth. He received his undergraduate degree from Auburn University in his home State. His graduate study was done at Columbia University, where he received both his master's and doctor's degrees.

For his professional career, Dr. Letson returned to the South. He served as superintendent of schools in Bessemer, Ala., and Chattanooga, Tenn., prior to assuming his present post as Superintendent of the Atlanta Public Schools in July of 1960.

Dr. Letson will tell us about Atlanta's preparation for the desegregation of its schools in September 1961. Dr. Letson.

STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN W. LETSON, SUPERINTENDENT, ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ATLANTA, GA.

Dr. LETSON. By way of preface, I would like to say that Dr. Rual Stephens is the Deputy Superintendent of Atlanta Public Schools and is a part of this conference. He has been from its beginning, and as references are made in this factual report to the contributions of the school administration, I wish to point out specifically his valuable contribution in this area.

Also by way of preface, I would like to say that communities differ and that it is essential that plans be individually tailored in terms of the circumstances that exist in a given school and a given school system. This is a factual report of events that have transpired in the city of Atlanta and through those facts we hope we may give some enlightenment in terms of a little broader purpose, or purposes, that we think have been achieved.

The story of Atlanta's desegregation of four high schools in the fall of 1961 is a chronicle of a great city in the process of change, a picture of a Deep South community that chose the right course and the right alternative when given the facts without emotion. It is the story of courageous leadership by many public officials, of responsible presentation of all the facts by the press, of free discussion of issues by religious and lay organizations, and a no-foolishness attitude on the part of the police department. It is the story of a series of developments on both the national and local scene from which emerged one pitiless piece of logic: comply with the law or perish. Atlanta chose to comply—with dignity, then with pride. And, finally, it is the story of a plan for the opening days, conceived by the administrative staff of the schools and executed, with the assistance of the police department, with a care for detail that characterized the D-Day landing. The crank, the crackpot, the lunatic fringe—homegrown and imported—

didn't have a chance to be himself. For a few days at least he was a model citizen. [Laughter.]

When the Supreme Court spoke in 1954, the man on the street greeted the pronouncement with masterly calm. The reaction, if any, was, "It can't happen here."

In January 1958, a class-action suit was brought in Federal Court, to enjoin the Atlanta Board of Education against the practice of racial discrimination. In June of 1959 the court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs and ordered the board to submit a plan of desegregation by the following December. But the Atlanta Board of Education could not submit such a plan without running counter to Georgia's massive resistance laws, which automatically forced closure upon any school or school system admitting a single Negro to a white school.

At this point, resistance to integration was so irrational that even school people and ministers scarcely dared to advocate the continuance of public education.

But voices of reason began to be heard in the land. In November 1958, the Atlanta League of Women Voters, after a delineation of the ethical and legal issues by Mr. Ralph McGill in the Atlanta Constitution, sponsored an open meeting to discuss ways and means of keeping schools open. The climate of opinion was such that the steering committee felt a public declaration in favor of open schools would be undesirable and premature. At this time the man on the street desisted from raging against the Supreme Court, the President, the Congress, the Yankees, and the race mixers only long enough to sputter, "Never, never! Better no schools at all."

In December 1958, less than a score of white parents chartered HOPE—Help Our Public Education. This organization took no position about integration or segregation. The members committed themselves, however, to the unqualified objective, however, of open schools. By March 1959, an open-schools movement had spread to other large towns throughout the State.

Meantime, well-financed and well-organized opposition had taken form in the States Rights Council, the Klans, and the White Citizens Councils.

In late November 1959, the Atlanta Board of Education submitted a stairstep plan of desegregation, beginning with the 12th grade and proceeding a grade a year until all grades would be desegregated. This plan was approved by the Federal court in January 1960.

Since the plan was headed for an unavoidable collision with State laws requiring closure, pressure mounted to repeal State massive resistence laws, but there was no outward sign of change except that an appointed legislative and citizens committee, which came to be known as the Sibley Commission, conducted public hearings through-

out the State to assess public sentiment about closing schools. The hearings were televised and widely publicized. The hearings brought out two important points; the issues became finely drawn. There was a strong sentiment throughout the State that schools must remain open, even at the cost of integration. This latter development profoundly impressed the politicians, who have a keen ear for noises which may reverberate in a ballot box. [Laughter.]

The man on the street or lounging on the courthouse steps was thinking straighter now. And he wrestled with a decision which was ultimately inevitable because he was a man basically sensible and decent.

In May 1960, the Federal court stayed integration of the schools for 1 year, declaring that the integration plan would become effective in the fall of 1961, "whether or not the General Assembly of Georgia at its session in January 1961 passes permissive legislation." The Georgia Legislature was given one last chance to prevent closing of the schools by abolishing massive resistance laws.

By the fall of 1960, advocates of open schools engaged themselves in widespread activity to avoid the impending clash between Federal and State laws. There individuals and groups included important religious bodies, business leaders, lawyer groups, educators, and civic organizations. Forums and discussions throughout the State permitted the possibility that integration was inevitable if schools were to remain open. Further, the conclusion most often reached was that schools must remain open come what may.

Concurrent with the opening of the 1961 Georgia Legislature in January, a crisis developed at the University of Georgia. Two Negroes had been ordered admitted to the State university. The probability of closing the University of Georgia caused dismay. Disorder and near rioting were permitted to climax entry of the two Negroes at Georgia. State officials hesitated to close the university where many legislators, their sons and daughters, and their neighbors attended. Governor Vandiver, in a dramatic reversal of position, offered a "Child Protection Plan," accepted by the legislature, which in effect nullified school closure laws and permitted certain face-saving provisions in die-hard communities.

The battle for open schools had been won.

Atlanta school officials proceeded to execute the provisions of the pupil placement plan, whereby applications were to be received and processed from Negro students desiring to transfer to the 11th and 12th grades of white high schools.

Briefly, these procedures were as follows:

1. Application of Negro students for transfer under provisions of the placement plan.

2. Administration of special standardized tests for aptitude and achievement.

3. Interview and decision.

From about 300 applications that were issued, some 133 students actually submitted requests for transfer. Of the 133, 48 were selected for further testing and 17 for interviews. Finally, 10 students, outstanding in academic ability and achievement as well as traits of personality and character, were selected for transfer to 4 white high schools. Throughout these procedures, the press and other news media were kept fully informed. These media handled developments and facts responsibly and factually.

In the summer of 1961 and organization called OASIS (Organizations Assisting Schools in September) was formed to create a climate of calm, dignified compliance with the law. This organization comprised church, business, service, and youth groups of the community. OASIS sponsored or stimulated hundreds of meetings. This phase of developing a public opinion receptive to compliance with the law was regarded as a key phase of successful desegregation when schools opened on August 28.

The administrative staff, after consultation with the police department and community leaders, formulated a detailed plan covering all phases and aspects of school life in the opening days. Representatives of the news media, parents and nonschool people generally, and, in fact, all persons except students and teachers, were barred from school premises and the streets adjacent to the school grounds. Parking on school property or in the vicinity of the school was banned except in the case of teachers holding parking cards. Traffic was tightly controlled. Loitering was forbidden. Parents could leave their children at the school but were required to move on. Delivery of the Negro transferees was accomplished by Negro city police in civilian clothing whose movements and deliveries were carefully staged and exactly timed. All parents of students in the four desegregated schools were informed by a letter from the principal about regulations concerned with the opening of the school.

Relationships with the press and other news media deserve special mention. School officials, with substantial help from the mayor, provided what may have been a unique opportunity for receiving and transmitting in a central location all the events and possibly newsworthy developments. This concept proved to be both practical and fascinating from the viewpoint of the news agencies. The council chambers at the City Hall were converted into a vast pressroom. Ticker tapes, a dozen television sets beamed at the four high schools, direct radio contact with these schools, and an open and amplified two-way telephone communications installation provided reporters

642146—62——11

with more complete and accurate coverage of news and developments than a ringside seat at any one of the schools. Periodically, principals of the four high schools were interviewed by way of the direct-line amplified intercommunication system. Representatives of the newsgathering agencies were cooperative and grateful. Their articles and news reports fully reflected their gratitude and were characterized by responsibility and fairness. It was a most profitable public relations project.

What were the factors and steps most effective in creating a climate of acceptance toward desegregation? At the risk of oversimplifying a complex situation, the following seem paramount:

1. The Atlanta Board of Education sought by all legal means to avoid integrating the schools, although from the beginning the Board clearly stated its intention to comply with all legal requirements. There was not created a body of hostility toward the Board, with accusations that they were "integrationists" and so on. Hence, when the Board announced its intention to desegregate, the feeling was general that the Board had exhausted the legal possibilities of maintaining segregation.

2. The mayor, the police department, and the newspapers consistently took positions of moderation and, when necessary, spoke in favor of continued open schools, with integration if necessary. The mayor was nearing retirement, but he was a colorful, wise, and astute politician with a popular following and a long record of efficient city management. The newspapers were consistent and responsible in their exposition of the facts. The chief of police was hard boiled, practical, and incorruptible.

3. The evolving and developing pattern of court decisions elsewhere in the South were covered in the newspapers with full interpretation and implications. The intelligent had only to read the history elsewhere to predict the outcome in Atlanta.

4. The crisis at the University of Georgia precipitated an impasse in an area where the Governor and legislature were emotionally vulnerable. Come what may, the University of Georgia would not be closed. That this climax antedated the Atlanta crisis was most fortuitous no one can deny.

5. A most important factor was the vast reservoir of Atlanta citizens who were committed to fairness and justice to all the citizens on the basis of Christian and democratic principles, who were fearful of interrupting the economic progress of the city and State, who were knowledgeable politically and sophisticated generally, and who were basically decent, law-abiding citizens.

6. Lastly, and with appropriate modesty, the Board, working with the administrative and teaching staffs, exercised proper timing in

their move from apparent apathy to strong and courageous leadership. It was neither precipitant nor laggard. It acted when action could be effective. In the leadership phases of molding and shaping public opinion and in the specific detailing of plans and operations, the Board of Education, working closely with staff members, appropriately combined the guile of the ward heeler and the idealism of a missionary. It was a fortunate wedding of practicality and good judgment.

As part of the process of preparation that preceded these events, the Board of Education issued a policy on the teaching of controversial issues, clearly establishing the fact that the school personnel throughout the system were encouraged openly to discuss, on the basis of facts, and on the basis of the policy that had been enunciated, the conditions that the school system faced. This policy on the teaching of controversial issues contributed to many discussions throughout the school system. Students themselves participated, and teachers felt a greater freedom than they had previously felt, in the discussion of the issues that confronted the community on this occasion.

There was a position taken by the school system that the schools and the school staff would assume the responsibility for the preparation of students themselves for this event. This meant that community groups directed their attention primarily toward activities and meetings and discussions that were carried on throughout the community in community organizations, but the job that was assigned to the school staff itself was the preparation of students and we hope there was progress in the direction of developing a broader understanding of the basic issues involved.

The other key point was that from the beginning there was completely open information. The press was given all of the facts from the very beginning. Citizenship throughout the community was kept completely informed of developments, in terms of the application of the pupil placement law, and in terms of other details relating to this problem.

The school system received considerable assistance through personnel who attended a human relations workshop. These individuals served as resources in our various schools and contributed to a developing understanding on the part of the total school staff.

It is recognized that Atlanta's program was probably directed and based upon the lowest common denominator. At the same time, it was a recognition of the facts and the realities of the situation as they prevailed.

It is quite apparent to all of us who have been, and are, working in the city of Atlanta that great progress has been made during the past year, through the outstanding performance of the students who

were assigned, token though it may be, through the acceptance of these students in the schools in which they were placed, and great progress on the part of the community in accepting the realities of the situation and moving toward a more understanding basis of its final solution.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Letson, for that encouraging presentation.

For those of you that were not here yesterday, we remind you that it is important that the members of the conference arrive at the cafeteria as soon as possible, to get there before the congestion occurs.

We will now adjourn until 1:30, when we will resume the statements by the panel and then go on with the discussion.

(Thereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the conference was recessed, to reconvene at 1:30 p.m. of the same day.)

CONFERENCE

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Fourth Annual Education Conference
on
Problems of Segregation and Desegregation
of Public Schools

WASHINGTON, D.C.

May 4, 1962, Afternoon Session

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 4, 1962

(The conference reconvened at 1:30 p.m., Chairman Hannah presiding.)

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, it is a few seconds after 1:30.

The last speaker on our panel is Dr. Benjamin E. Carmichael, who has been Superintendent of the Chattanooga, Tenn., Public Schools since September of 1960. Unlike many of the previous speakers, Dr. Carmichael does not come from somewhere else. He was born, educated, and has pursued his professional career, except for a brief period when he was Assistant Superintendent for Marlboro County, S.C., schools, in the State of Tennessee.

Prior to assuming his present post he has been associated in various capacities with George Peabody College for Teachers, where he received his doctorate in 1954. One of the series of five valuable studies of education in the South, "Trends in Public School Enrichment Services," published in 1954 by the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration at Peabody, bears his name.

The Chattanooga public schools are under Federal court order to desegregate next fall, and Dr. Carmichael will tell us about his program to prepare for this event. Dr. Carmichael.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN E. CARMICHAEL, SUPERINTENDENT, CHATTANOOGA CITY SCHOOLS, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Dr. CARMICHAEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I think a brief explanation might be in order at the outset of the paper, reporting that, in the agreement with Mrs. Cole to prepare this paper, I first concentrated primarily upon the preparation of the professional staff for desegregation. I, since, have added a few comments and generalizations on total preparation in Chattanooga and shall include those.

It has been stated that we are under court order to desegregate the schools of Chattanooga, September of this year.

We have profited, of course, from the efforts of Dallas, having used its film with some of our planning groups in the beginning, and of

Atlanta, which has shared with us the experiences there in preparing for desegregation. I, too, am indebted to my administrative staff for the preparation of materials, for leadership in the program to this point, and in many ways too numerous to report to this audience.

Speaking as one who has observed, listened, and analyzed every conceivable sentiment, the Supreme Court's decision of 1954 threw the Chattanooga Board of Education into a dilemma of almost untenable dimensions. By its commitment to uphold the law of the land, the board was forced to abide by a decision whose implementation would revolutionize the customs and usages prevailing in its community for more than a century.

Feeling that it was obligatory, however, the board had no choice. Within 2 months after the Supreme Court rendered the implementation decision regarding desegregation of public schools, the Chattanooga Board issued a public statement of compliance based upon respect for and acceptance of the law. It declared—

> We will not be a party to what is an attack upon the very foundation of our way of life and all that it has meant and all that it will mean to the welfare and happiness of all of us. We believe that this vital point is necessarily a part of our decision.

Further, the Board recognized the Court's concern for "practical flexibility" in moving from a segregated school system and for an assessment of local situations prior to making initial moves. It stated:

> As we seek a solution we will make every effort to acquaint the entire community in conferences and through other media of communication of the varied aspects involved. This is not your Board's decision alone. It is a community decision. Although the Board will officially make the decision, each individual in our community must accept his responsibility in solving this question.

A statement released on October 12, 1955, reaffirmed the Board's policy to respect the Supreme Court's decision regarding desegregation of public schools, attempted to remove misunderstandings arising from the original statement, and announced its consideration of the selection of members for an interracial advisory committee. It reminded citizens at this point that—

> The Court has placed control of the situation in our hands as long as we act in good faith, and we intend to act in good faith at all times.

Promptly after the advisory committee was chosen, attempts were made to hold meetings to lay the foundation for peaceful desegregation. Acts of violence broke up the sessions and aroused community antagonisms to such an extent that the board was forced to alter the approach in favor of a breathing spell in which the spirit of good will might be restored in the community and an atmosphere created in which free discussion was possible without bitterness and hate.

From then, in 1955 to April 1960, when Mapp et al. entered their complaint, charges against the board fomented and perpetuated com-

munity unrest. Complaints included these and others: that the board operated a biracial school system, maintained segregated professional staffs, and kept separate school funds for the two races. Some charges were true and frankly admitted by the board; others were not true and just as openly denied by the board. But the damage was done, for erupting hostilities were fanned by indiscriminate use of true and untrue complaints.

During this period, the Chattanooga Board continued its program of elucidation and acted witthin what it deemed good faith with the Supreme Court's decision. Over and above regularly scheduled meetings and conferences, the Board met more than 200 times to study the problem of desegregation.

The adminstrative staff sought to fulfill its responsibilities by furnishing data, surveying the literature and research, and reporting to the Board. The Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents individually and simultaneously worked out four separate plans and analyzed their strengths and weaknesses in terms of pupil welfare and community reaction in the process of preparing a final plan to propose to the Court—and each of these now represents a separate type of plan prepared in the beginning for study by our staff and Board. One would have continued the program of elucidation. One would have desegregated all grades in all schools. One would have desegregated a grade a year beginning with the first grade. One would have desegregated selected schools, with the use of pupil assignment. These possible solutions were studied in much the same way as are solutions to all other administrative problems.

In their study, the administrative staff and Board of Education used the consultative services of Dr. Thomas F. Pettigrew, Professor of Social Psychology at Harvard University. Recommended as an expert on desegregation because of his extensive research experiences in communities which had desegregated since 1954, Dr. Pettigrew had studied several major desegregation accomplishments since the Supreme Court's decision. From his analysis of such communities as New Orleans, Little Rock, Houston, and others, Dr. Pettigrew had identified several basic factors to be considered in provisions of a plan for a peaceful transition.

Taking these factors into consideration, the plan was formulated with a view toward—

Avoiding violence;
A kindergarten approach to desegregation;
The mobilization of the moderates;
The avoidance of class conflict;
The use of a name encompassing all citizens within the plan;

Avoiding the fallacy of generalizing from one desegregated accomplishment to a proposed one; and

The influence of a limited nonviolent desegregation experience, on subsequent desegregation, of course.

The main elements of the final plan, based on these considerations, provided for a selection of schools to be desegregated, and to be desegregated in the first three grades in September of 1962.

The Board adopted this plan and argued its merits in the Courts on the validity of the very principles undergirding its selection and provision for reconciling public and private needs. The Court, in the final decision, likewise took into account these considerations.

As a major phase of the study that led to the adoption of the selected school plan, the administrative staff met with the school principals during the fall of 1960. In order to allow for full participation, the principals were divided into 4 groups, ranging in size from 10 to 15. These brainstorming sessions were particularly fruitful, as ideas were advanced, examined, and rejected or selected for implementing the Board's planning for desegregation. Principals identified special problems affecting different types of communities and suggested several reasonable approaches to handling them.

Evaluation of these sessions was highly favorable. Principals in an overwhelming majority recognized the inevitability of desegregation and pledged their best efforts to the accomplishment of the Board's plan and to peaceful transition from biracial schools. The interaction and exchange of views among racially mixed groups strengthened the administration's stand to proceed boldly toward teacher preparation.

Involvement of teachers had been and continued to be one of several phases of preparing for a desegregated school system. A division of responsibilities was established: The police department took charge of security and law enforcement; a citizens committee assumed responsibility for community preparation in general; and the Board of Education and our staff were responsible for developing teacher and student understanding and acceptance.

I might report parenthetically within our own administrative staff we further divided the responsibilities. The division of business administration, which has charge of operating and maintaining buildings, assumed the responsibility for the security of the buildings; the division of administration, which has responsibility for organization and what have you, assumed the responsibility for working out a plan for registration, first-day details, and what have you; and the division of instruction, and with my help more on this particular area, assumed the responsibility of the preparation of teachers and pupils and parents as it can be done through the schools.

The first major effort to present a positive front to the total teaching staff in planning for a desegregated school system was the address made by the Superintendent to all personnel on March 27, 1961. Professional responsibilities were carefully delineated, and there was no mincing of words as to the key role of teachers as employees of the Board of Education. Reference was made to Dr. Charlotte Epstein's analysis of the position of teachers as significant people in the "drama of conflict and resolution," and of the imperative need for teachers to deal with the Court's decision in ways consistent with professional goals. It was admitted that teachers, like lay persons, are beset with doubts, misapprehensions, and confusions, but it was underscored that teachers have two distinct advantages: they have learned to seek out facts and they have developed skill in utilizing these facts.

The background of the progress since 1955 was reviewed by the Superintendent, and the responsibility facing the Board was analyzed: how to remove racial discrimination and also maintain an efficient school system which would provide quality education.

Very specific suggestions were discussed with teachers, including such recommendations as their role in:

Counsel and influencing others;

Controlling the tone of one's voice in talking with others about this problem;

Securing facts and scotching rumors; and

Emphasizing the necessity for keeping trouble and trouble-makers away from the school.

The importance of abiding by the Board policy of moving peacefully into a desegregated school system was underscored by the unequivocal statement that teachers are employees of the Board and have no alternative but to conduct themselves within the Board commitment to upholding the Supreme Court's decision.

Following this general meeting, school personnel were informed about the status of the suit and about the Board's plans for desegregation through regular reports to the building principals. However, it was considered of major importance during the 1961–62 school year to deal more directly with the problems with all school personnel. The Superintendent, together with at least one other central office staff member, met with groups of student leaders and teacher representatives from each of the 15 junior and senior high schools to discuss the inevitability of desegregation by the fall of 1962, the 2 choices of reactions open to the community, and the influence of adolescents among younger brothers and sisters.

Further, two inservice education days in January 1962 were devoted to a full discussion of the problems and approaches to a smooth transition period. A leadership training conference held early in the month

was a major factor in the success of the two clinics. All principals, 42 teachers selected for group leadership in the clinics, and central office personnel participated in the training conference.

Dr. Harry Bard, Assistant Superintendent of Baltimore schools during their transition, and Dr. Morton Sobel, recognized authority in human relations, led school personnel through a sort of dry run of the activities scheduled for the total teaching staff. Other resource persons, including principals and teachers from neighboring school systems which had already initiated desegregation, assisted in the conferences.

Participants discussed in small groups the implications which Dr. Bard's and Dr. Sobel's challenges carried for classroom practices and for the improvement of human relations. Much of the group work centered around the problems pinpointed in a systemwide problem census. These fell into such categories as: (1) social relations; (2) parental relations; (3) teaching-learning situations; (4) community relations; (5) teacher-pupil, pupil-pupil, and teacher-teacher relations; and (6) administrative problems. This last category included 135 specific questions. One of these was the expression of fear on the part of white parents that tuberculosis, scabies, and venereal diseases are rampant among Negro children. Another one was concerned with the desires and welfare of the minority. What about the desires and welfare of the majority? And so forth—many, many questions of this sort which teachers were encouraged to ask that we might deal with in these sessions.

The experience of the leadership training conference prepared teacher leaders for the situation likely to arise at the systemwide sessions. The schedules for the secondary school personnel on January 18 and the elementary school personnel on the 19th were identical. A 30-minute telecast on desegregation was presented by the Superintendent. Brief statements of aggressive community support were made during the presentation by the mayor, the county judge, the sheriff, the commissioner of fire and police, the attorney general, and the president of the chamber of commerce. Following the orientation and challenge, a classroom practices clinic and a human relations clinic were held by John Brewbaker, consultant with the Southern Regional Council, and Dr. Sobel. Small groups of approximately 25 each discussed the implications for the school system of the facts brought out in the two clinics. Each group was composed of a teacher leader, a teacher recorder, at least one community representative, a teacher from a desegregated school system, a principal, and teachers selected alphabetically from the roster of professional personnel. Several other special consultants assisted us on that day. One of the teachers is in this audience, Mrs. Anderson, from the Clinton High School.

They made wonderful contributions, in our opinion, to the work on those 2 days.

Brief written reports made by the recorders and anonymous evaluations by all participants indicated that the staff of over 1,000 generally considered the sessions appropriate and effective.

The concentrated systemwide activities were followed by carefully planned programs in individual and area schools. These are continuing at the present time and will continue through 1962–63 and as long as necessary. The purpose of this fanning out of activities is to reach every teacher and to provide opportunities for discussion in the security of one's own and neighboring schools. A 6 months' plan to serve as a suggested guide outlined the following resources:

a. Review of publications appropriate for easing the transition into desegregated schools, such as *Who Shall Be Educated*, *Action Patterns in School Desegregation*, *A B C's of Scapegoating*, *Prejudice and Society*, and *What We Know About "Race."*

b. A rumor clinic film.

c. A variety of films and filmstrips carefully selected to show sound education practices for intergroup relationships and to present facts about different races, cultures, and so forth, such as *A Morning for Jimmy*, *The Burden of Truth*, *Point of View*, and others.

d. Talks by community leaders with a commitment to the American beliefs in the dignity and worth of the individual and with the know-how to handle the topic of desegregation with faculty groups and students. These have included college professors of sociology and psychology, central office personnel, and others from the community.

Principals were and are being required to submit reports on the 1st and 15th of each month outlining the steps already taken and the proposals for future meetings. Summaries of sample reports for the first month follow:

a. Three feeder schools and their junior high school held a joint meeting of all faculties to view the film *The High Wall*, and to discuss its implications for peaceful desegregation. Officers of the four parent-teacher associations and other community leaders were invited. Plans called for a second program 3 weeks later when a panel would spearhead the discussion on ways to effect desegregation in individual classrooms.

b. A 1-through-9 school selected for desegregation in its primary grades next fall reported that every teacher was familiarizing himself with *Action Patterns in School Desegregation;* that every teacher was holding class discussions as to the local plans for easing the transition and was to make a pupil-attitude study.

c. An elementary school outlined some seven specific activities carried on during the first month of individual school concentration on this problem. There are: (1) Faculty meetings have been devoted to the suggestions for orderly desegregation as outlined in *Action Patterns.* (2) Teachers have emphasized the importance of the freedoms and privileges of peoples in a democracy through classroom study of the Bill of Rights and of the Constitution; they have used the Golden Rule for younger children. (3) A Chinese student from the University of Chattanooga spoke in assembly; teachers followed up in their classrooms with an analysis of the likenesses and differences in customs, dress, speech, and so on, of various races.

Teacher, student, and patron preparation for orderly desegregation of the first three grades in selected schools this fall continues to be a prime responsibility of the administrative and supervisory staff and of building principals. One of several administrative problems that are continuously being solved, this particular problem is receiving a disproportionate amount of time and study because of its potentially explosive nature.

All schools—elementary, junior high, and senior high—are earnestly engaged in learning experiences designed to accelerate readiness for a desegregated school system. Recognition is given to the varying degrees of readiness in different communities and different schools, but the policy of the Chattanooga Board of Education will be upheld: to respect the supreme law of the land, to effect a peaceful transition into a unitary school system, and to maintain quality education for all children.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Carmichael.

Now we will proceed by giving first the Commissioners and then the members of the conference an opportunity to ask any questions that they would care to of Dr. Noble, Mr. Bloom, Dr. Letson, and Dr. Carmichael.

Mr. Vice Chairman, do you have any questions you would like to address to——

Vice Chairman STOREY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any questions, but more or less an observation and an introduction: May I say to you four that you have been very helpful and your statements have been very encouraging and challenging.

On behalf of my own city, I want to thank Mr. Bloom and Mr. Maceo Smith, who represents the Negro committee of seven—and Mr. Chairman, I would like to present him. Where is Maceo Smith? Over here. These two gentlemen did a great deal in bringing this about in Dallas. The observation I want to make is that, under the leadership of the committee of 14, 7 white and 7 Negro, the initial

introduction to the public was a mass meeting called of the cross section of business leaders of our city. This was called and sponsored by the Citizens' Council of Dallas—and, as Mr. Bloom says, not the White Citizens' Council—and the thing that impressed me so much was the theme and motto that came out of that meeting was that "There will be no violence and we will obey the law," and the pattern that was set brought about this solution. In behalf of my own city, I want to thank Mr. Bloom and Mr. Smith, as well as the other participants, for bringing about this conference and these results.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you, Dean Storey. Dr. Rankin, do you have questions or comments?

Commissioner RANKIN. I have one question. I would like to ask if these citizen groups are continuing in operation. Has the need for them disappeared or are they continuing to function in the different cities?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, for Dallas, they continue and at an ever-increasing pace. We find more problems every day to challenge us. We are about convinced now that as freedoms are won in Dallas, and as job opportunities and economic improvement are made, we must tackle what apparently is the breeding ground for that, and that is the cotton patches of east Texas. We're not sure we can solve our problems within our own city.

Commissioner RANKIN. Is that true in the other localities?

Dr. LETSON. The formal groups in Atlanta, HOPE and OASIS, are not officially still in operation. In a large measure, the functions they perform have been absorbed and assumed by the regular organizations in the religious area as well as other community groups. Certainly the business leadership, through the chamber of commerce and regularly constituted groups, is continuing its concern for this issue and, we believe, carrying it on successfully and well.

Dr. CARMICHAEL. It doesn't apply to ours.

Chairman HANNAH. Is that all, Dr. Rankin? Dean Griswold.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. I have found this presentation very helpful and very encouraging because of one of the concerns that I feel in this area, which was highlighted the other day by Mr. Rukeyser, I believe, who said the courts aren't very well qualified to run the schools, and with that I would heartily agree.

It seems to me that one of the problems that we have had to face and deal with in this area is that far too many people in too many parts of the country have left their responsibility solely to the courts, that this is a matter in which the responsibility is general, that the courts shouldn't be expected to run the schools. The courts having declared the law in very clear terms, the responsibility is on other people outside the courts to bring the situation into conformity with the Constitution. Therefore, as one who has spent a good deal of

time talking with lawyers who have been trying to bring cases, to bring things about, it is especially encouraging to me to hear from, in the first place, school administrators, but even more so from school board members and from businessmen such as Mr. Bloom because, although the school administrators can do a great deal by way of exercising leadership, their hands, of course, are often tied by the school board members and the school board members may feel that their hands are tied by atmosphere and situation in the community, and the organization which Mr. Bloom has described as a means of developing and mobilizing community sentiment seems to me to be extraordinarily good and useful. Therefore, as I say, I am very happy, indeed, to see this description and demonstration of the fact that it is possible to take this matter out of the hands of the courts, because I heartily agree with Mr. Rukeyser that it should not be in the hands of the courts, and that leads me to a question which I would like to ask of Dr. Letson.

I certainly do not want to underestimate the difficulty of the problem in Atlanta or in a good many other cities, including Nashville, and including a good many other cities where nothing affirmative has been done. Nevertheless, as I understood Dr. Letson—and perhaps I was wrong—the great effort in Atlanta—and I repeat—it was a great effort—has led to there being 10 Negro students in the integrated schools; is that right?

Dr. LETSON. That is correct.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. That, of course, is——

Dr. LETSON. It started out——

Commissioner GRISWOLD. I don't know the number, but——

Dr. LETSON. I beg your pardon. It started out as being 10 approved. It did not wind up as 10, but as 9 going into the white schools.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Well, there will be dropouts even in the best of plans, but, whatever it is, I suppose that is less than a hundredth of the Negro students in Atlanta.

Dr. LETSON. Considerably less.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. What I was coming to—and here again I hope I am understanding the need to proceed carefully; nevertheless, it seems to me, instead of it being a straightline curve, this might be an X-potential curve. It might start slow, but go up rapidly. What are the plans in Atlanta for really extending this—not 15 next year and 25 the third year and 32 the fourth year, but what are the plans for really accomplishing the objectives which are stated in the Constitution of the United States and, indeed, go back to the Declaration of Independence?

Dr. LETSON. Thus far there has been a public statement about the liberalization of the plan for next year. It is a matter of record that that is the intention of all concerned in the city of Atlanta.

The question as to when the full implementation of this program in all of its implications might be accomplished is one that would be extremely difficult to answer in terms of positive predictions. As I said in the beginning, each community is different, and a part of the success of this undertaking or of a similar undertaking is measured in accordance with the sensitivity of all concerned as to where is the point, what is the point, that would suggest a degree of possibility and at the same time suggest progress in the direction in which all are going. I feel very strongly that it would be possible to move sufficiently fast in the city of Atlanta to completely undo the good that has thus far, in my opinion, been accomplished.

Commissioner GRISWOLD. Well, I would understand that and think I would probably agree with it. I wasn't trying to ask when you think that complete integration will be achieved. When do you think something more than the merest token of integration will be achieved?

Dr. LETSON. Well, I think it is on the way now. I think the curve that you drew is approximately correct in terms of the thinking of a great majority of the citizens in city of Atlanta.

Chairman HANNAH. Is that all, Dean Griswold? Dean Robinson.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Dr. Letson, as I understand, your present method is an assignment plan——

Dr. LETSON. Yes.

Commissioner ROBINSON. And, thus, interviews constitute a part of the operation of that plan. What are the criteria that are applied to determine whether or not an assignment will or will not be granted?

Dr. LETSON. Of course, the plan, itself, includes about 17 various items. It was a plan submitted to the Federal court and approved and is quite similar to to the one that was in effect in Alabama and possibly other States. The criteria that were really used and given major emphasis in the consideration of the problem last year: one was place of residence in relation to the school.

Two was the reason for transfer—reason for requesting the transfer (there was consideration and recognition given to a request for transfer that had a legitimate educational purpose). Three was one of ability to carry an academic load.

It was recognized on the part of certain of the professional staff in the school system that this beginning was going to subject a rather terrific emotional pressure upon the students involved, and it was our very definite belief that educationally and in terms of a proper concern for the welfare of the individuals involved it would certainly be unfair at this initiation of a plan to subject these students also to an extreme difficulty in terms of an academic load. So, the last criterion was based upon the average attainment of the class to which the pupil was requesting admission.

642146—62——12

Commissioner ROBINSON. Was the test, a standardized test administered?

Dr. LETSON. Yes.

Commissioner ROBINSON. What test was it?

Dr. LETSON. The Stanford Achievement Test in most instances, and there was also an intelligence test given in a few cases, although this year—and this also has been announced—it is our plan to administer no special tests. We are utilizing the tests that are a part of the pupil's permanent record.

Commissioner ROBINSON. You gave the figures when you first spoke, Dr. Letson. Would you let me have them again? Am I correct there were 47 students who were submitted to the tests?

Dr. LETSON. No. There were 133 submitted to the tests; 47 were selected on the basis of those tests for further consideration and interview.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Do you consider this plan to be a permanent plan or simply a transitional arrangement?

Dr. LETSON. I think it is generally agreed—and certainly if you review the decisions of the court—the permanence of these plans is somewhat in question.

Commissioner ROBINSON. I would like to clear up one other small matter. Am I correct in my understanding that the one Negro applicant—in other words, the 10th applicant, the one who did not further attend school, did not do so because he went off to college on a scholarship?

Dr. LETSON. That's correct. The one that did not attend accepted a scholarship to college rather than go to the school, and we did have one student that requested a return to the original school during the course of the year.

Commissioner ROBINSON. I have a couple of questions for Dr. Carmichael. Am I correct in my understanding that, while you will this September desegregate the first three grades, there is something about your plan that will involve the desegregation of all schools to be completed by 1968?

Dr. CARMICHAEL. Yes.

Commissioner ROBINSON. I further understand that there is something in your plan that involved the immediate desegregation of some special programs.

Dr. CARMICHAEL. Yes.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Would you tell me what programs they were?

Dr. CARMICHAEL. Yes. May I review the plan for you briefly, the steps in it?

We proposed the desegregation of the first three grades in selected schools in September this coming year and the special programs for the orthopedically handicapped, the classes for the perceptually handicapped, the classes for the multiple handicapped, and some classes for the educable mentally retarded. The number of schools selected were nine white and seven Negro for this year.

Next, the second year, in 1963, all elementary schools will be desegregated in the first four grades—all others, you see.

The third year, 1964, the fifth and sixth grades will be desegregated in the elementary schools. Our elementary schools are 1 through 6. Therefore, in 3 years the elementary schools will be desegregated.

The fourth year, 1965, the first grade, the seventh, the seventh grade, of the junior high schools will be desegregated. Then the following year, the eighth and ninth grades of the junior highs.

Then in 1967 the 10th grade of the senior high schools, and in 1968 the 11th and 12th grades of the senior high schools.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Dr. Carmichael, we have had some discussion thus far in this conference about the desegregation of schools a single grade at a time, and your plan, in most respects, involves the idea of desegregating more than a single grade at a time. Could you advise us as to the considerations that led to the decision to undertake that as a part of your plan?

Dr. CARMICHAEL. In our original proposal to the court we proposed only the desegregation of the first three grades in the selected schools for the first year on the basis that it is impossible to predetermine arbitrary steps that should be taken in desegregation. We proposed that we submit each year additional steps to be taken, which might involve more than one grade or two grades or three grades, and might go further than an elementary school or a junior high school. In other words, our original proposal was to leave it open and to make decisions in subsequent years based upon administrative reasons.

You understand, and we all know, that there are instances in which we should take steps to desegregate. It's reasonable. It's administratively feasible, and so forth; but, due to the thinking of the court and the thinking of the plaintiffs, we had to come to some arbitrary fixed plan over the period of time, although we argued strenuously against this. I could not defend why it should be a grade a year or at a certain grade at a certain year, you see. The judge asked me about this directly. I could say, however, that the chances were that more problems would occur at the first year of a new organization of the school, such as the junior high or the senior high school, and, consequently, in my opinion, it was the court's decision to recognize that and then to expedite the following year.

Commissioner ROBINSON. Was this because of the concern of the court as to the length that a grade-a-year plan of operation would take; in other words, that the whole process might be completed by 1968?

Dr. CARMICHAEL. This was really the court's decision. In defending it, we had defended a grade a year because when you're forced to take some arbitrary position you've got to take it.

Chairman HANNAH. Is that all, Dean Robinson? I think we will now turn to the members of the conference first for any questions that you would like to ask these panelists, and then after we have completed that we will go into a general discussion, and I will turn to the other end of the room. Is there anyone at the far table that has any questions they would like to ask? Yes, sir.

Mr. TUCKER. I am Everett Tucker from Little Rock. I would like to ask Mr. Bloom—I don't know whether I failed to hear him or not, but I didn't recall that he mentioned the chamber of commerce in Dallas as having a part in the preparation there.

Mr. BLOOM. Sir, I did not mention it. They were involved incidentally. They're a good organization. They do very effective work. They're not considered a part of the power structure or the strong instrument of the town.

Chairman HANNAH. Any other questions at the far table? The next table, table F. Are there any questions you would like to ask any of the panelists? Yes, sir. Mr. Smith.

Mr. A. MACEO SMITH. I should like to make a comment, and then ask a question.

We take the position in Dallas that to desegregate the schools we will have to desegregate the community. So, we took that step in planning for the desegregation of the schools. It is our understanding—and may I say that the execution of the judgment on this stairstep plan is left within the discretion of the district court. So, we plan to do such a good job in the total desegregation of the community that we can hasten to the court following that and ask that the whole matter be settled across the board. We are in the process now of continuing this total program, and the results, of course, are well noted now.

I should like to ask the general question of the conference, whether it be from the Commissioners or from the panel, whether or not we shouldn't go back to the court now in view of the success that we've made in Dallas and ask that the Dallas public school system at an early date be completely desegregated rather than wait the 12 years under the stairstep plan.

Chairman HANNAH. Any member of the panel want to volunteer an answer? I see no great enthusiasm for answering that one.

Mr. CHARLES U. SMITH. I have another question. I should just like to ask for my own information about the composition of the committee in Dallas, whether it was—how did it come into existence? Maybe I missed this, but I do want to get this down. What was, say, the occupational composition, and to what extent were university people important or not important, and what would Mr. Bloom regard as an ideal type of composition for such a committee?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, they were all volunteers, both white and Negro. There were no educators involved. I don't know what the qualifications were. I guess it takes a little bit of courage, a sense of responsibility for your citizenship. I hope I won't offend when I say to you that, from my limited experience, rarely is it true that intellectuals are helpful. [Laughter.] They jump over all of the practical problems to get to the end.

Individuals of all colors, race, and creed are attractive, but in mass they're ugly, and I think it takes some understanding. Probably if there was a common denominator it was the capacity to understand how to live with and move and handle the average man on the street. Does that answer your question?

Mr. CHARLES U. SMITH. Just one small problem, please.

Dr. LETSON. Mr. Bloom, am I correct in assuming that you are placing the educators in the intellectual category? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOOM. We did not.

Mr. CHARLES U. SMITH. Did your volunteer committee have the tacit or otherwise approval of the city officials, the governing officials?

Mr. BLOOM. We gained the support of all elected officials. We did not start with them.

Chairman HANNAH. We're going to come back to——Is it table E?

Dr. PICOTT. I have two questions, if I may. One grows out of the fact that some communities have desegregated without court decisions—and I have in mind asking Mr. Bloom the question: Would he think that where schools have moved ahead already without involving the rest of the community—just the school part has been desegregated—would it be helpful for them now, even at this date, to try to emulate Dallas in some respects?

Mr. BLOOM. I, personally, feel they would be morally derelict if they didn't.

Dr. PICOTT. The second question, if I may, Dr. Hannah: The materials that you have available, particularly film—could you give us a little idea about cost and so on?

Mr. BLOOM. Well——

Dr. PICOTT. It was a public relations job, I know. I read about it.

Mr. BLOOM. A public relations job at cost. The largest donor was a hundred dollars. The cost of transporting the materials throughout

the United States now, which is done free, is about 25 percent of the cost of accomplishing the job in our own community. They come to you postpaid and free.

Dr. PICOTT. I want to get——

Chairman HANNAH. What did the film cost in the first place, probably?

Dr. PICOTT. Yes. That's what I wanted to ask him for.

Mr. BLOOM. What did the film cost in the first place? Well, Mr. Cronkite gave us his services free. NBC and ABC and CBS provided the film clips without charge. All we had was the camera work and the film. I would have to guess, but I would say about $3,000.

Chairman HANNAH. Were there any other questions from table E? Dr. Noble, I think you had your hand up.

Dr. NOBLE. No. I simply was going to side with my colleague on the left [Mr. Bloom] with respect to Mr. Smith's question. I think it is the fact that the power structure, the men who hold the power in the palm of their hands, actually initiated this social change that makes the Dallas situation much more effective than in other places where educators or intellectuals have had to work from within, as Dr. Dodson mentioned in his paper.

There is a role for us [the educators] to play in feeding information and in being helpful when they will let us, but there is nothing we can do when those people who control the balance of power in the finance market and otherwise in a city refuse adamantly, as they do in certain other cities, to let this social progress move forward.

CHAIRMAN HANNAH. Table D. Dr. Mays.

Dr. MAYS. As a fellow Atlantan, I would like to ask Dr. Letson if he has any data on how the nine Negro students were received by their colleagues, which may have a bearing upon a number who would apply for transfer this fall and next.

Dr. LETSON. Yes, Dr. Mays. We have a lot of data. The four schools varied somewhat in terms of living up to a little more than the letter of the law. In general, these students were well received in the schools. In general, it has been a remarkable accomplishment. They have made good records. In some instances their parents have been affiliated with the parent-teachers association. Quite recently two of the students in one of the high schools attended the banquet for honor students. There have been many occasions when it was apparent that these students were well received in their schools. There have been a few incidents on the other side of the ledger—minor ones, I would say—and, in general, the sum total would be considerably on the plus side.

Chairman HANNAH. The lady.

Dr. MASON. I have a question for Dr. Dodson. In his absence, perhaps Dr. Noble can answer the question.

I agreed 100 percent with the statement which Dr. Dodson made. It would help a bit if we knew more of the skills of group leadership so that grouping practices within the school buildings did not frustrate the policy goals even when desegregation is accomplished.

Now, I'm wondering if this should be carried a step further. Is it important that in sending Negro youngsters to integrate our all-white schools that the makeup of the student body be considered? I ask this because in schools which are designated as segregated in small northern communities, these schools usually have the youngsters who have had the least opportunities provided by their families. Now, if these youngsters are sent to schools which are all white, which may also have a very homogeneous population in terms of having youngsters who have had the most opportunities provided by their families, we have difficulty—we, as educators, have difficulty—in changing attitudes. The youngsters are accepted. However, this being the first contact with white youngsters, the Negro youngsters feel very inferior and the white youngsters feel more superior.

Is it important, then, that we make sure that in these homogeneous schools, these all-white homogeneous schools, that we bring in youngsters of different backgrounds, not only Negro youngsters, but white youngsters, so that these youngsters, both white and Negro, can have an opportunity of seeing a cross section of American society?

Dr. Noble. Yes. I think Dr. Dodson would agree with that, Dr. Mason. I think he has been toying with the idea, I know in one school system—not toying, but advancing the idea—that we might group within one school all of the fourth grades of a given community, instead of the first, second, third, and fourth, whatever the organization is, in these plans. This would give us some classes, of course, that for certain periods within the schoolday would be an advanced class, but they may be in another class for music or for basketball or for some other activities. Children aren't always advanced in all aspects of the school's curriculum, so that there are other ways of grouping youngsters that perhaps are a bit left of the usual educational practice that we have only begun to experiment with.

I think he advanced this idea in New Jersey very recently, and it is a matter of public record, thinking perhaps that the open enrollment plan may not be the answer to all of the problems in large city school systems.

Chairman Hannah. Are there questions at table C? The lady.

Dr. Grambs. I would like to address a question to Dr. Noble, if she will, speaking for herself or Dr. Dodson, as she chooses. I'm sure she's quite capable of doing both.

Yesterday we heard from Dr. Fischer regarding the relevance of racial composition in educational enterprise, and his position, as I

gather, was that this was immaterial and irrelevant, and that if an open-door policy were maintained it became the responsibility of the individual child or parent whether or not this was a relevant factor in their school decision.

It seemed to me, as you read Dr. Dodson's remarks, that he does not take that position. I wondered if you could expand on this somewhat——

Dr. NOBLE. No.

Dr. GRAMBS. And clarify the position taken.

Dr. NOBLE. He would not take this position, nor would many educators at New York University take this position. We would certainly think that it is most important to structure the school situation so that young people have an opportunity to learn with people who are different from them. I didn't hear Dr. Fischer's paper. It's disappointing, as it was reported in the Post today. One would have to assume—one would have to carry his idea further and say—perhaps we shouldn't be interested in Africa or other nations because they're far removed from us.

Dr. Dodson's point is that just as we make it possible for youngsters to have hot lunches or to supplement their educational diet with those things that help to make them healthy and well rounded, so it is that we have to aggressively structure the composition of a school so that they learn with girls, boys; higher, upper, middle income youngsters; Negroes, whites, Jews, Catholics, and anything else that we have in the population. He would hold that, since it is so important that Americans be truly democratic in the world that really has been waiting for us for 8 years to decide whether or not we're going to realize the American dream, we had better get down to business in the schools of making it possible for children to learn that folks are different from them.

Chairman HANNAH. Other questions at table C? Table B. Yes, sir.

Dr. DUNCAN. I would like to ask Dr. Carmichael—at least I got the impression that the school people were making a tremendous effort toward desegregation in the present circumstances. Do you think that the place of the power structure varies, perhaps, according to whether the court has commanded that such take place as over against the situation where the community voluntarily goes into the situation to desegregate schools? What is the place of the power structure in the Chattanooga situation at the present time.

Dr. CARMICHAEL. The place of the power structure in Chattanooga at the present time is very similar to that discussed by Mr. Bloom in Dallas and Dr. Letson in Atlanta. We have a citizens' committee, and working in that committee is really the power structure of the

city. It's going about that task and is performing much as it did in these two cities.

Insofar as the place of it, whether the community is doing it voluntarily or under court order, I think there's no real difference in its function, except, as Mr. Bloom pointed out, it should take such a lead in either instance.

Dr. DUNCAN. May I continue?

Chairman HANNAH. Go ahead.

Dr. DUNCAN. Would there be any difference in the efforts of the school people whether it was under court order or voluntarily done in relation to the power of the power structure?

Dr. CARMICHAEL. I would not see any.

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Gillis.

Mr. GILLIS. I would like to ask Dr. Noble a question. We have several nationalities living in Boston. Should we then search out particular groups in each nationality and make sure they're distributed in the city at large?

Dr. NOBLE. Well——

Mr. GILLIS. I agree with what Dr. Fischer said yesterday. I can't see any particular value of transporting a handful of one type of child to another end of the city and transporting another handful from that end of the city to the first. So, we have a large Chinese colony. Should we distribute the Chinese? If we attempted to, they would kick the roof off the administration building.

Dr. NOBLE. Well, of course, you are dealing with very small numbers in terms of what the human problem is in the whole of the United States.

My answer to that would be that we're having to bus, we know, because of the housing situation, and we know—and I go along with the Dallas idea—if you're going to desegregate the schools, you're going to have to desegregate the whole of the community. If these people are significant numbers of folk who live in Boston, then I would think it would be important that these youngsters be distributed so that all of the people, all of the young people growing up in the schools, would have an opportunity to learn with the people who make up the composition of the racial and ethnic group within the city of Boston.

Mr. GILLIS. My dear doctor, before you came in this morning I told the group we had been integrated since 1635, and that now——

Dr. NOBLE. Then this is a hypothetical question.

Mr. GILLIS. The children can go any place they want to, but I can't see forcefully taking one group or by law telling them, "You must go to another end of the city because there are people there who are different."

Chairman HANNAH. Any questions at table A? The lady.

Dr. BURRELL. I don't have a question, but as an educator and not an intellectual, in response to the comment on Mr. Bloom's discussion, if I had not heard it before, I wouldn't have had to ask the question that I did earlier. I think it's encouraging to know that there is a citizens' involvement and adult education in a community that feels to successfully desegregate schools one must desegregate the community. I think it's exciting to know that this can be and is being done, and I hope it will be done more effectively in other communities.

Chairman HANNAH. Are there other questions from table A? Someone—Yes, sir.

Dr. JOHNSON. I would like to make a comment in reference to Superintendent Gillis' comment I think we have to keep in account.

From the various studies and information which we have in New York State, the enclave which may be nationality or religion has a total different kind of performance in school than the kind of school building where you have a high composition of Negro students. What I'm saying in essence is that the opportunities which religious and nationality groups have in this society of escaping, less visibility, and so on, has an impact on their educational achievement, so that you will find normal achievement among youngsters who are of various nationalities or religions even though that particular building may have a heavy concentration of that religion or nationality. This, however, is not true when race is involved. So, we, as educators, I think, have to take this into account.

Now, I would not go as far as Dr. Noble in describing an ideal world, but I think in terms of educational achievement, advancement, and the development of youngsters, race is a definite factor and does play a part and, therefore, has to be taken into consideration.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Nichols of Berkeley, I think in private conversation you indicated something about the uniqueness of the California situation due to the large number of, or relatively large number of, Orientals that you have. Do you want to comment on that situation?

Dr. NICHOLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are very gracious.

I thought that it would be well to mention Berkeley, because I think that Berkeley, Calif., which is a community adjoining the San Francisco Bay, in some respects as a northern city is typical and in other respects it is atypical.

We are the home of the University of California, which needs no introduction, a small community of 111,000 people; 19.6 percent of our population is Negro, 6.6 percent Oriental, and a considerable number is Mexican-American.

We have 16,000 pupils in our schools, 13 elementary, 3 junior highs, and 1 comprehensive high school with an enrollment of about 3,100

students. Thirty-two percent of our school population is Negro, 7 percent Oriental, and 3.2 percent Spanish-speaking and a number of other groups, so that this small community has a minority percentage in its schools of 43 percent.

Berkeley is an interesting city where the intellectuals and the business people and the people who are in the lower socioeconomic level do cooperate considerably. We have a hill section which is composed essentially of the people who are working at the University, at the faculty level; a large number of not wealthy, but considerable people; mostly white; and a flat area, so called, adjoining the bay, which consists principally of this minority-group population; and a foothill area which is mixed.

Most of our students in Berkeley, at the elementary level, Negro students, attend schools that are predominantly minority—one school about 99 percent, one school 95 percent, the other 85, and the other around 55. Our junior high schools break down with one of about 35 percent Negro, another about 85, and another very few Negroes, almost all white. But the high school, which has a minority population, about the ratio in the total figure which I gave you, somewhere around 43 percent minority, is a comprehensive high school, so that eventually all of the children from all over the city end up at the one high school.

In 1957 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People sent me before the Board of Education to make a presentation—at that time I was not a member of the school board—concerning certain items, eight in number, over which we had considerable concern. These, of course, were quite evident to us and could be documented statistically because of the comprehensive high school which all of the youngsters finally attended. We were concerned about identical opportunity, since we could document that some of the schools in the community did not offer the same program as was found in other schools in the city. We were interested in inservice training for teachers, many of whom were coming into classrooms in minority areas with little or no past experience and with a great number of fears, resulting in a day's work often which said, "If you can keep them quiet and happy, this is education." We were interested in incentive counseling, since many of the youngsters were being directed away from college prep courses, and we were interested in the distribution of teachers and a role of leadership at the administrative level.

Now, Mr. Chairman, following that presentation, the Board of Education in Berkeley immediately responded by calling together a citizens' committee which produced subsequently what was known as the Staats reports, a committee headed by Judge Redmond Staats of our city. Secondly, the administrative leadership of our schools, under the leadership of the Board, then began to put the issues we

presented into the context of a total approach, considering the high potential youngsters, the average students, the low achievers, and the mentally retarded.

Now, this was a very sensible approach to us, because in the city of Berkeley, unlike many cities, the white students are not the highest achievers. The Oriental students in our community defy even IQ ratings in terms of their classroom achievement. Person for person, they obtain, do better, and go farther than any segment of the students in our schools. The white students would be second; the Negro students would be third; and our Spanish-speaking students, I suppose, would be probably in the lowest achieving group.

Also, we have in our community a considerable number of foreign students attending the University of California who send their children to school in Berkeley. They come from a different culture and a different country. I happen to be functioning also, Mr. Chairman, as a member of a committee for African students. We have brought some 31 Kenya students to this country fresh out of what we commonly call the bush. These are Negroes in one sense and by one description, with tremendous motivation, who, in spite of the fact they have only recently come from what one might call a primitive culture, are able to enter our schools and function quite adequately, and many of them in a superior fashion.

We, therefore, have concluded that the low achievement on the part of certain minorities within American society ought not be treated with a polite name of a subculture or a cultural differential, but as a social aberration which must be corrected by an aggressive approach on the part of educators and the total community alike.

Since 1957, though some of these statistics were compiled prior to 1957, the Board of Education of the city of Berkeley and its administrative staff went immediately to work on a comprehensive program for our entire system.

At the present moment we employ 62 Negro teachers, constituting 8.5 percent of the total teaching staff, 29 Oriental teachers, constituting 4 percent of the teaching staff. We have two principals, Negro principals, in the Berkeley school system, one in a predominantly Negro school, elementary school, and one serving a totally white school in the hill section of our city. She was recently elected the president of the administrators organization of the city of Berkeley.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I requested this privilege because there are certain interesting things, I think, that we did in addition to the foregoing program.

First of all, I think Berkeley illustrates that the leadership of school boards, as the elected people in the community, is crucial in carrying to the community the kind of program that must be finally carried out;

that the administrative people can only go so far. The willingness and the aggressiveness of board members in the end give the superintendent additional latitude and reinforcement to really move ahead many times in areas where he would like to, but is afraid to. Secondly, we worked and are continuing to work at this business of boosting the salaries and prestige and morale of our teachers.

The Board voted the 2-to-1 ratio salarywise, which gives Berkeley a salary scale comparable to the best systems in the Nation so that we can get the best teachers, and we insist upon the best, and an inservice training program that makes our teachers feel more adequate and competent when they go into the classroom. We are also doing all that we can to correct a deficiency which Dr. Fischer spoke of yesterday, but did not indicate that anything substantial was being done about it, the fact that our teachers' colleges and universities are still turning into the American educational system, particularly in our big cities, teachers who have little or no experience in dealing with the tough problems of education where you have atypical situations.

Thirdly, Mr. Chairman, I think that since we adjoin a university community, I would like to point out that Berkeley has in operation one of the most exciting teacher-aid programs that you will find anywhere in the Nation, where over 125 students from the University of California are working in the classroooms, first in the so-called atypical schools, but the program has been so successful that all over the city now a demand is being made for the incorporation of this program in all of the schools of the city.

We now have before us a mandate from the School Board to the Superintendent to bring before the Board a comprehensive master plan that will bring the entire student body of our city much closer to their potential achievement level than statistics indicate they are now reaching. We feel that this ought to be done without regard to cost factors and leave it to the Board and the citizens of the community to decide whether or not they can pay for such a program.

We have also before us at the moment a citizens' committee proposal for the appointment of a committee to look immediately into de facto segregation in the schools in the city of Berkeley. The Board has already publicly admitted that de facto segregation is a fact; and secondly, that it is undesirable and that the Board has some responsibility in dealing with this matter. I do not yet know what shall be done.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to mention one strong conviction of the Board of Education of the city of Berkeley which was alluded to by the spokesman for Dr. Dodson. When Dr. Fischer in his paper the other day—and I think Dr. Jackson also—referred to the fact that white teachers find it difficult to maneuver in the atypical teaching

situation, it points up again and again a book like "The Ugly American", which Dr. Burdick from the University of California wrote, concerning the general incompetence of American white people in dealing with the atypical situation where race is involved, not only at home but everywhere in the world. We, therefore, feel that whatever can be done within the city of Berkeley ought to be done in every American city to make Americans comfortable and competent in their growing experience, in their associations, in their education; that racial association is a part of the learning process which will, and I think can, make Americans competent everywhere in the world, we are trying to influence, work and lead.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment, after listening to the reports that have come in from so many of the communities North and South, that basically I see no difference in the challenge confronting both northerners and southerners in this matter. The northern problem is slightly different, but basically we're committed to the same general task. I think that southerners sometimes feel a bit self-conscious because northerners are judgmental. I am a southerner myself, like most Californians recently in that State, but I think we need to keep in mind, especially those of us that are involved in this conference before the Commission on Civil Rights, that the North boasts of its Abraham Lincoln who freed the slaves and the South of its Thomas Jefferson who basically gave us the framework for the Constitution. I think, looking back at the past and then looking at the task before us, we have one job—to fulfill the requirements of freedom for all Americans and make the American people competent people who can hold the torch of freedom high here and everywhere. Thank you very much, sir.

Chairman HANNAH. Thank you very much, Dr. Nichols. We will now return to completion of the questioning of the panel, and there was a gentleman way over in the corner who wasn't recognized.

Dr. THOMPSON. It has been generally agreed that desegregation takes place more rapidly and with less friction when you can get the total community working together, and so, I would like to ask this question of Mr. Bloom.

In Dallas it seems that the Negro and the white leaders were cooperating. He reported that they had a cooperative mass media, which means that the newspapers and the radios and television did cooperate in the program; and then, third, there was a firm policy on the part of public officials. They made clear that they intended to maintain law and order.

Now, how do you get such a thing going in a community where there is absolutely no communication between Negro and white leaders, where the daily paper sounds more like the official organ of the

white citizens' council than it does a mass media of the public, and where the law-enforcing officials take a vacillating, even a reluctant, stand?

How can you get such a movement going?

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Bloom.

Mr. BLOOM. Well, I'm glad you asked because I was afraid—I have the habit of speaking so directly so I won't be misunderstood—that maybe I was giving the wrong picture of a power structure. I think the assumption that the power structure of a city or the press or its city officials, elected officials, are going to just fall in a slot or that they did this in Dallas is a great mistake. We did have a meeting, as the dean spoke of. The principal participants were visited many times before that meeting and conditioned for it. I think you go through the chore of overcoming interference, one man at a time and one problem at a time. I think there are general assumptions that you can make, and it's naive not to make them. The press is going to report the news as it sees it and believes it, and I think in most cases competently and certainly honestly. I think a politician is going to pursue his own career.

I think there are a lot of assumptions you can make as you overcome this interference.

Now, in retrospect, it sounds simple, and maybe I oversimplified it in stating it to you, but we tried to present the problems to each individual, and an individual that was in a strong position in a group, and we did this through the device of bringing home to him those things that affected his particular area. Could I describe some of them for you? I think I referred to dual responsibilities. We have, for example, a chore for the bar and the courts. We have unequal application of the law in our courts. Unfortunately, if a Negro commits a crime against a white man, they're apt to throw the book at him, but if it is within his own Negro community, the same justice does not apply that applies to a white man. We have, therefore, failed—we have completely failed—to establish the same regard, the same respect, for law and order within the Negro community as we have within the total community.

This applies in medicine, for example. Many of our best physicians and hospitals facilities were concerned not about the matter of segregation or the Negro, but about medical standards. We brought a very successful, very prominent Negro doctor before a group of psychologists, and he said, "These men are right. I am not qualified. I was when I left school. I have not had the benefit of good equipment, of consultation, and 30 years after I got out of school I'm a quack." Now, we have the chore of trying to provide competent Negro doctors. We have the money to do it. This is quite a chore.

The theater man is confronted with the problem. He does not like to admit it, will not talk about it, but he has a policing problem, and again we had the theater owners with the psychologist, and the psychologist said, "Look, you put teenagers shoulder to shoulder in a dark house and show them an emotional picture for 2 hours, and the result is problem." Now, it is a problem. They have growing policing problems. They do not like to admit it to parents, to the public.

Hotels: Now, we know that hotels have to be policed 24 hours a day. A house dick isn't a novelty. We just don't see it very clearly. It is a great chore to police a modern major hotel.

Now, all of these people are confronted with problems, and what we tried to do is to do two things: We tried to (1) win the individual over who was in a strong position within a major group of influence—the bar, medicine, and so forth. We also tried to show him that he and his profession were making some contribution and needed some correction. We hope very much that the bar and medicine and others are working diligently at their own problems as well as ours, but—and I want to apologize for one other thing—I do not consider, sir, practicing educators as intellectuals. I was thinking of intellectual do-gooders. [Laughter.] But they just did not fall in place. We worked for them in Dallas. Does that answer your question?

Dr. THOMPSON. Yes. Thank you very much.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. PORTER. I have a question to Dr. Carmichael. In reference to the Chattanooga situation, I would like to know: If there had not been a court order, would the power structure of Chattanooga applied pressure to the professional staff or to the school board to come up with an acceptable plan of desegregation?

Dr. CARMICHAEL. No.

Chairman HANNAH. Any questions any other member of the conference would like to ask?

Dr. DRACHLER. I would like some clarification, and possibly Mr. Bloom——

Dr. DRACHLER. I was somewhat concerned about the comment that Superintendent Gillis from Boston made about the matter of forced bussing.

To my knowledge—and I would like Mr. Bloom or anyone else to correct me—I don't know of any large northern city that forces children to be bussed for the purpose of integration. There are options for youngsters to do this rather than forcing them to do this, if I understand this correctly.

Now, if this is so, in the option, I see a certain value, the psychological value, for any youngster, be he Negro or white, to go to another school if he so desires, and also the benefits that would come to both

Negro and white children who may be in exclusive schools for an opportunity to be together.

I think this is a value and a process which I think has to precede integration that may follow later on, but I did not know of any city in the North that has a forced program.

I was very happy that the gentleman from New York corrected me, because I did not mean to imply that New York did the forcing contrary to Detroit. I just simply meant to say that they were different, and I am pleased that he made that correction, but I don't want to go away from this conference with this impression that there is a plan afoot in any large city to take people, different ethnic groups, and simply mix them up in a forced way. If there is a plan, I would like to be corrected and know where it is. Mr. Bloom, is there such a program?

Mr. BLOOM. I am going to wind up with a Ph. D. for sure here.

Dr. DRACHLER. Dr. Noble. I am sorry, sir. Dr. Noble.

Dr. NOBLE. I am glad you worded it like that, because I was getting very distressed by the gentleman from Boston thinking there was a forced plan afoot any place. I don't know of any city in the United States that would have such a plan.

The interesting thing about Conant's report is that most people caught the part where he mentions that there's a great dynamite building up in the slum city, in the inner city, where so many Negro youngsters and disadvantaged youngsters are grouped together in school, but I become upset because I have the feeling that he also painted a picture which was understated. There's dynamite really building up out in the suburbs. This kind of isolation from problems, this antiseptic way of life, where youngsters have only the best and know only the best and are not confronted with the real problems of life, except perhaps through a film or whatever other audiovisual device there is [dynamite], these youngsters, to me, are just as underprivileged as are the youngsters who are in inner city. So, I think what Dr. Dodson is trying to say is that we can build an attitude so that youngsters will move out and parents will think that it is good to seek encounters with youngsters who may not on first sight have the highest IQ in the world, but might have other kinds of experiences that could add to the education; but I don't think any of us are going on record saying we should forceably bus people all over cities, huge urban cities, for the purpose of desegregation.

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Smith.

Mr. A. MACEO SMITH. Maceo Smith, Dallas, Tex. I, like Mr. Bloom, don't want to leave the impression that this Dallas situation was accomplished easily.

There was a great responsibility on the part of the seven Negroes on this committee to assume responsibility. During discussions and negotiations for desegregation in Dallas, the Negro members were called Uncle Toms by Negroes and Communists by white people. So, we had this responsibility to assume. Some white people and some Negroes. Now, the whole process in this, it would seem to me, adds up to the fact that where a community decides to do a job, it takes time and travail and the responsibility must be championed.

In some cities—the gentleman from Little Rock asked about the chamber of commerce—the chamber of commerce may be the power structure. It happened in Dallas, that the Dallas Citizens' Council is the power structure. It is a super-chamber of commerce, let's say.

Moreover, we had to organize Negro leaders. We called a meeting of 125 Negro leaders and formed what we called the Negro power structure, which was a Dallas community committee. We met weekly, at 10 o'clock on Saturday morning, to reflect the views of our association, the progress of the same and to solicit leadership amongst the Negroes, leaders, and separately, in the planning, in their communities, and so forth, to avoid possible sitdown strikes and boycotts and what have you.

Now, I would like to pose a question, Mr. Chairman, if you will, since I didn't get an answer before. I would like to direct this one to Dr. Carmichael, and possibly to Dr. Letson, on this basis: That it seems in Dallas now, since we started out to desegregate the total community in order to desegregate the schools peacefully—should we now, since we get the general opinion in this conference that it is a community problem, by and large—as to whether or not the school board in Dallas should petition the courts—we seem to be a little ahead of them in this whole matter now—as to whether the school board, as the elected officials of the people, should reflect, by action of the board, itself, the acceleration of this plan or whether or not we would need to go back to the courts for acceleration. I would like to direct these questions—as to whether or not the school board should somehow reflect the community action and voluntarily petition the courts, the court, in the Dallas situation, or whether the citizens should have to go back to the courts in order to make it easy for the school board.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Carmichael and Dr. Letson.

Dr. CARMICHAEL. In formulating an answer to that question, I, if I may, would like to add a word to, comment further on, what I gave a minute ago. I gave it briefly because I think that was the answer, but as you project 10 years ahead in a community you cannot predict what the reaction will be; but, as I pointed out, I base that on the fact that our board of education had taken such a position some 6 years ago,

7 years ago, and attempted to follow through, you see, and the experience it had on that.

In answer to the question raised by Mr. Smith, I am not going to attempt to suggest what I think the Dallas Board of Education should do, but I'm going to comment on what I think the Chattanooga City Board of Education should do or could do.

I would take you back to my reference to the arbitrary plans which are adopted. It's my own conviction, although the court in our decision wrote [a timetable] into it, that this does not restrict in any way an acceleration of this plan. Once such is recorded and adopted as the plan, then great difficulty is encountered in accelerating that plan, in my opinion. This, you see, would be my basis or one of my bases for arguing against arbitrary projected plans, and I think others in our same positions who experience these kinds of plans will probably agree with me on this sort of thing.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Letson.

Dr. LETSON. One further comment: Basically, I think I would agree with Dr. Carmichael, with the possible exception that the speed with which a plan is implemented—this is not involving the question of going faster than a grade a year, but the speed with which it is implemented in terms of the framework that is established—addresses itself to many factors—one on the basis of those students who are interested and [two] the basis upon which they are interested in taking advantage of the opportunity they have through that plan.

I think as a community proceeds in its understanding and in its growing—well, I think you could properly say liberalization in terms of a plan—I think there are many ways in which it can be and is speeded up within the framework of the plan, itself. I also agree that the community will determine, in the final analysis, whether the board of education can do this or can do that, and the question of school integration bears a direct relationship to community climate and to the steps that the community as a whole have taken and are anticipating in terms of the broadening of the total program of integration throughout the community.

Chairman HANNAH. Mr. Oliver, did you have a question?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Hannah, I didn't have a question. I just want to make an observation, if I may——

Chairman HANNAH. Go ahead.

Mr. OLIVER. And I don't refer to any particular person here. Just thinking, it seems to me that some bit of the thinking expressed in our conference here goes considerably beyond desegregation of the public schools and somewhat beyond any decision that the U.S. Supreme Court has made. I think that forced, artificial integration is about as distasteful and as foreign to American thinking and as much a viola-

tion of civil rights and liberties as forced segregation would be. Who am I, who is anyone else, to set up a formula and say that, according to that formula, young people should be mixed as to race, as to culture, as to wealth, as to social standing or diet or anything else?

We're dealing with desegregation, and we have our hands pretty full in dealing with that, and I think it's unfortunate if we go too far beyond desegregation of public schools.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Havighurst.

Dr. HAVIGHURST. Were you going to have a period of more general discussion?

Chairman HANNAH. We will move into it right now with you, sir.

Dr. HAVIGHURST. Well, I wanted to stress a point which was made in Dr. Dodson's paper and has been referred to rather indirectly by two or three speakers, and I suppose really it's being referred to by Mr. Oliver, too.

If the Commission is going to be interested in the problem of de facto segregation of northern cities, then I suppose we should take cognizance of the fact that we are in the same situation as that of a man who is swimming upstream at the rate of 2 miles an hour while the current is carrying him back at the rate of 5 miles an hour, and this is because there are some great population trends in our big cities which are making for more and more economic and racial segregation.

I'd like to make two technical statements here. One is about the proportion of American boys and girls who are in effectively, economically segregated schools as compared with 1940. I believe that the proportion of American boys and girls who are either in substantially lower-class schools or in substantially middle-class schools has increased since 1940, and this is due to the growing stratification of our big cities, that is, the flight of the white middle-class to the outer edges of the city and to the suburbs, and then to the growing concentration of both Negro and white lower classes in the center of the cities. So, there has been a growing economic segregation.

The second is that in the northern cities the proportion of Negro youngsters who are in effectively segregated schools has increased since 1940; that is, these efforts at moving the thing backward are rather small in comparison with the effect of the trend in the metropolitan areas of this country toward racial and economic segregation.

That leads me to the position that the schools must, in my judgment, if we are to do anything about either racial or economic segregation in the northern cities, take part along with other agencies in the task of urban renewal. At the present time physical urban renewal has aided the process of segregation. We know that. Somehow there has to be a program of social urban renewal in which we move back to a more mixed-class type of local communities within the cities, and to

a considerable extent now, those school systems with rigid attendance requirements, rigid rights, assist—they favor—the process of segregation. Therefore, my view here is, insofar as the Commission might be interested in the problem of segregation and desegregation of northern city schools, the Commission probably would have to pay some attention to overall social urban renewal and might have to call the attention of the school systems and of school boards to the fact that they are involved, willy-nilly, in this process of growing segregation.

Chairman HANNAH. We appreciate your comments, Dr. Havighurst, and we will make some reference to it as we conclude this conference, not too far down the road.

Instead of having a recess, because some of you want to get away, I think we shall go on for a few more minutes in such general discussion as you would like to participate in, and then we will have a concluding statement and hope to adjourn by 4 o'clock, so that those of you who want to get away can do so. The gentleman over here.

Mr. BERG. We have talked a good deal about the structure of desegregation, some about implementing in essence integration. I agree with the gentleman who spoke just a moment ago that probably this deserves much more attention than we have been able to give it yet.

I would like to introduce the question and ask a question: Is there anyone that has had any experience in dealing with the phenomenon of resegregation?

Chairman HANNAH. Does anyone want to volunteer a response to that query? Would you state it again, please?

Mr. BERG. The question is whether anyone has had any experience or whether anyone has any suggestion how to combat a trend toward resegregation.

Chairman HANNAH. From Louisville.

Mr. PORTER. I thought you wanted to know about experiences. I wish I had the answer to resegregation. We had segregation, desegregation, and now we are experiencing resegregation. The answer I don't think can be supplied by school people. I think this is a thing that's going to have to come from another area because of the apparent disregard by the people who deal in real estate for human rights, human feelings, as we consider them.

I was reaching for some statistics, but I happen to know of one school that's very close to me that started off about 5 years ago with possibly 100 Negro students in it and 500 white. Today it's got less than 100 white students and over 500 Negroes, but this has been brought about not by the choice of transfer of white students, but by the panic buttons being pushed by white real estate agents coming into the area and convincing white families that they ought to move

out. Now, how to stop this is, I think, outside of the realm of the school board.

Chairman HANNAH. Well, it is one of the matters, of course, that has been a real problem with this Commission, and to which we have given a good deal of attention, but I think if we start on that this afternoon we will not get away at 4 o'clock. Does anyone else want to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Oakland? Yes, sir.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am Lawrence Knowles from the University of Louisville School of Law.

I've been working with Mr. Porter in Louisville, and in the free transfer idea I would like to comment that the resegregation comes about first, this comes from the location of house buying and different exodi, I guess. But once the white children or the Negro children reach a mascot ratio—that's 5 percent or less—then everybody goes. Until they reach a mascot ratio they will stay. If there's 25 percent white or 25 percent Negro, the children will stay. When they do reach a ratio of 5 percent or 10 percent perhaps, then everybody leaves.

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman from St. Louis raised his hand, and earlier today he asked me to ask the question as to how many school systems are praticing the open registration scheme. Now, you ask the question yourself, sir, so you get it asked the way you would like to have it asked.

Mr. HURT. I would like to ask two, then, if you don't mind.

Chairman HANNAH. All right.

Mr. HURT. I would like to ask that question first, because we are interested in this as far as integration is concerned now. I would like to know—I have Baltimore, Detroit, New York, and Boston. I was just wondering if there is any other school system that practices the open [enrollment] system.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. VINCENT. I will speak for Milwaukee—that we've had a free transfer policy for approximately a hundred years.

Chairman HANNAH. Are there other school systems?

Dr. MASON. We are under court order, so that the youngsters from the predominantly colored Lincoln School have free transfers—just the one school.

Chairman HANNAH. Are there other school systems that practice free enrollment, free registration? The far row.

Mr. BLAUSTEIN. Blaustein from Rutgers University.

Philadelphia has an open school policy allowing free transfers. We have recently completed a survey in Philadelphia, indicating there are 15,000 students who are outside of their residential district. Of the 15,000, there are about 5,000 whites and 10,000 Negroes.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. HURT. May I ask: In these cities where they have the open registration and free transfer—in how many of them is it qualified if there is room, if there are vacant seats?

Chairman HANNAH. Let's put it the other way: Are there any where that qualification is not involved? I think that's true everywhere, that caveat. Was there someone down here who wanted to comment on this open registration?

Mr. ASHMORE. I want to ask a question about it.

When you have more requests from any school than you have accommodations for those youngsters, who makes the decision, and upon what criteria—and if you do, then do you have freedom of choice?

Chairman HANNAH. May we ask the gentleman from New York to answer that one?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. We do it on a basis of priority, assuming the pupils are in the proper grades to be given the option. All of the request slips we try to get out at the same time so the parents can have approximately the same starting point in making the decision. Then, on the basis of the priority of returns, we give them the first possible choice among the choices that they list. Very often we find we run through their choices and we have no room because they have returned them late, in which case, if, after the whole process is completed, we still have vacancies, we may make a second round, telling them what is still available. If nothing is available, we merely turn it down.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Robinson, would you comment, from Detroit?

Dr. REMUS G. ROBINSON. Our process is essentially the same, except that we list the number of schools, list the schools by name, so that the principals as well as the parents seeking relief make multiple choices, and they are, of course, responsible for the conduct of the child to and from the school. Ours is relatively new, about a year and a half. So far we haven't any reports on how many take advantage of this.

Mr. PORTER. I have found possibly what might be a partial solution to this de facto segregation. In planning new school buildings this happened accidentally in Louisville. In building two new schools we found schools that were predominantly white and were predominantly Negro. We combined these schools and found the student body stayed at a level after we got them together. I mean there was no decrease in the percentage of the students in these schools. Now, I think that was more by accident than by design, however.

Mr. HURT. May I get to my second question?

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman beyond you first.

Dr. INGRAM. Does this sometimes result in an all-Negro school?

Chairman HANNAH. The question is——

Dr. INGRAM. I am thinking of a situation where the white population, the white student population, is very, very small. Would this result then, could this result, in a Negro school? Has anyone experience on that that would answer my question?

Chairman HANNAH. The gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We permit out of our sending schools—of course, any pupil has the option, whether applied or not—we take this calculated risk because at the 90 percent mark we consider it a de facto segregated school, and we feel if we lost this population it would still not materially affect the situation. However, our experience has been that these schools have not lost their white population to any considerable degree. A very small percentage of those now in the open enrollment program—I think in the order of about 3 percent—are white students from the de facto segregated minority-group schools.

Chairman HANNAH. Other volunteers? You had a second question, the gentleman from St. Louis.

Mr. HURT. Yes. I wanted to ask a question on bussing of children, because we have a great concern in St. Louis. We are bussing about 4,000 now, will move up to about 6,000 in September. Of course, we passed this bond issue, but it won't give us relief for about 3 or 4 years. But the concern is, a number of citizens of the community are concerned, about the fact that in the bussing of our children we have what we call contained units. In other words, a class is bused with a teacher to a receiving school. They enter the school after school has started in the morning. They leave before school closes in the afternoon. They have a different lunch period, and there are many things that are different that make them different from the rest of the students in the receiving school. I was just wondering if, in these other schools that are having the bussing problem, they bus their children as contained units. This was the question I wanted to ask.

Chairman HANNAH. Dr. Robinson from Detroit.

Dr. REMUS G. ROBINSON. This pattern was the initial pattern in Detroit, but it was soon abandoned because it fomented and enlarged the problem areas. We now feel that it is better to take a number of youngsters at different grade levels in the school and send them in this manner; or, if we bus a section or class that they should be distributed throughout the school rather than be contained.

Mr. HURT. I was wondering if New York had any experience on that.

Mr. WILLIAM. No. We do not bus them as contained units. We do roughly what they do in Detroit. We advise the principals that are receiving these pupils to disperse them in the best way possible. We do have to give consideration to ability grouping, class organization, and so on, but to the extent possible we disperse them throughout the school.

Chairman HANNAH. Yes, sir.

Dr. JACKSON. The situation is just a little different in Baltimore. We don't bus children in Baltimore, except the handicapped children and those on part-time to other sections of the city where there is vacant room. When we do bus part-time children, we bus them by units, by class and teacher. The whole class and teacher are bused to that next school.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL UNSOLVED PROBLEMS BY HON. JOHN A. HANNAH, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Chairman HANNAH. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sure it is clear to all of us that we could continue this discussion profitably for some length of time. We know who some of our colleagues are and the problems and answers they are finding, and the hope of the Commission is that not only do we have the advantage of the record that has been made here four our guidance, but that from this conference there may come opportunities for those of you with problems, to which others have suggested partial answers, to get together and exchange ideas, to the mutual advantage of both.

Now, during this conference we've discussed the educational problems inherent in racial segregation in the public schools, and we've discussed those problems that arise upon desegregation of previously separate schools and those that arise upon desegregation of schools which have been substantially or wholly segregated.

The adverse effect of segregation upon the pupils segregated, in terms of development of their full potential as useful citizens, has been emphasized. Since the damage is said to arise from segregation itself, the cause of the segregation loses its importance. The toll in human terms is the same whether it is due to law, custom, or residential pattern.

Broadly viewed, the problems of racial segregation in schools are parts of a still larger educational problem: the unequal educational opportunities for all who have in some way been isolated from the mainstream of America. The isolation may stem from a variety of factors. Among them may be rural origins; want of economic resources, language handicaps, racial or ethnic barriers to assimilation into employment, schooling, housing, and, indeed, much of the whole spectrum of community life. Important also are problems growing

out of disorganized family life and often the absence of any family tradition for education.

Eradication of inequalities in opportunity for education when thus broadly viewed becomes a matter for national concern. The problem is not exclusively regional, racial, ethnic, nor religious. Closing the gaps which give rise to the inequalities will call for vastly increased energies, thought, and money, if we are soon to make good on that cherished ideal of America, equality of opportunity.

The educational problems seem in the main to be three:

1. A generally lower scholastic achievement of Negro children as a whole as compared to white children.

2. An inferior learning situation in Negro and predominantly Negro schools in many of our large cities. For schools in rural areas the problem has been one of long standing. The general movement from rural areas has tended to transplant the education problems to urban school systems where further problems have emerged in the form of overcrowding and excessively high pupil-teacher ratios.

3. Less competent teaching in Negro and predominantly Negro schools. Some Negro teachers, themselves the product of segregated education, cannot meet the prevailing standards for certification of white teachers. In some of the cities of the North and West there has been a tendency to assign the least able and experienced white teachers to the largely Negro schools.

Programs to improve scholastic achievement and raise the educational goals of culturally and economically disadvantaged children, largely members of minority groups, have been referred to by some of our participants. These are all to the good. But if segregation in and of itself is harmful, these must be looked upon as transition measures, and the time factor in eliminating segregation takes on importance.

In many places in the South, desegregation is proceeding at a snail's pace, if at all. In the still segregated areas, it appears that no start will be made until the conclusion of long and costly litigation. The need to speed the process is clear. This fact leads to the question of developing local leadership in the South to work for general public support of voluntary compliance with the law of the land, and we've had some very effective testimony by Mr. Bloom and others in that area.

In the North, pressure on school boards to break up racial concentrations in the schools has been building up rapidly since the *New Rochelle* decision in January 1960 and the more recent *Hempstead, Long Island* case forecasts increased demands for action and for extra funds for educating culturally disadvantaged people. The development of local leadership to create the kind of climate needed to accept

the required adjustments seems no less urgent in the North than in the South.

Early school dropout among minority-group youth is recognized as an acute, unsolved national problem. Insofar as it is the consequence of repeal of compulsory attendance laws, the remedy is clear. But it is not confined to these areas. In some places it has been suggested that dropouts increase with desegregation; in others that it declines. The stultifying effect of segregation itself and the lack of employment opportunities on a nondiscriminatory basis has been suggested as a cause. The conclusion seems obvious that we do not fully understand the educationl problems of minority group youth and hence do not meet them. Aside from the cost in human terms, the cost to the Nation in unemployment, welfare, and delinquency is great. Early school dropout stands high on the list of unsolved problems.

We've heard much in these 2 days which is important in pointing toward further steps to be taken. While much more needs to be learned about the complex processes involved, the experiences described here reveal that much has been learned in the 3 years that have elapsed since the first of these educational conferences was held at Nashville.

Various plans for achieving desegregation have been discussed, and it's clear that there is no one ideal plan that fits all types of communities. A reclassification of schools, the so-called Princeton plan, seems applicable in some small cities. Redistricting all schools without regard to race appears to work well in a medium-sized city. School authorities have shown ingenuity in working out appropriate plans in such places. The large city with a sizable minority-group population concentrated in one area, poses a different problem, and one which now appears to have no entirely satisfactory answer. Judged by the results, free choice of school, free transfer, open enrollment, bussing seem to be palliatives and may not be satisfactory as permanent solutions. The continued movement away from the farm in all parts of the Nation and the continued migration of southern Negroes to the urban centers of the North and the West make the solution of the big-city problem most urgent.

This conference has heard interesting accounts of successful community programs to pave the way for acceptance of school desegregation and of school programs to prepare the professional staff to discharge their responsibilities in new situations. The procedures described could be adapted for use in any community. Is the unsolved problem one of devising means to help the children, both white and Negro, understand what is expected of them as young American citizens? The behavior of their elders, parents, teachers, and others is, of course, a powerful influence on the children as an example of

what is acceptable. Is more than this needed to introduce a change for which their previous experience has not prepared them?

At an earlier conference of this Commission, Dean Fischer, who appeared here yesterday, expressed the view (and this is a quote from remarks he made at our Nashville conference) that:

> The school, aside from the church, is the one institution we create in society to influence the content of men's minds and the quality of what goes on in those minds.
>
> The influence of the school is related to much more than merely what the school teaches. What the school *does* is much more influential than what it verbalizes, and, so, we believe that this is one reason why in the schools we must not simply wait for things to happen. We must help, in sound psychological and educational ways, to encourage the right things to happen. This is what education is for.

That's the end of the Fischer quote.

There must be sound psychological and educational ways in which all the problems we have discussed can be solved. This Commission believes that each of you, and many other people of good will, will find those ways and help to reach the goal we all earnestly desire—equal educational opportunity for all American children.

Now I should like to conclude with some observations on the role of this Commission.

Yesterday morning, when we opened this conference, I made a brief statement with reference to the history and role of the Commission.

When this Commission was created by the Congress in 1957, after prolonged debate, it was given a definite responsibility to investigate the deprivation of the right to vote based on race, creed, color, or national origin, and some ground rules were provided with reference to the form in which complaints should be filed. Then there was some general language that provided it was another role of this Commission to investigate infringement of the civil rights of people based on race, creed, color, national origin, where these infringements were based on actions of government, Federal, State, or local.

The Commission was appointed originally by Mr. Eisenhower. Necessarily, in accordance with the terms creating it, it had to be bipartisan, with no more than three members of one political party, and Mr. Eisenhower constituted the first Commission with three southerners and three men from the North. Some of our members have since left for one reason or another. None of us were experts in the field of civil rights. All of us, however, regardless of our background, soon came to the conclusion that there is no problem that faces America, the solution of which is more important to this country. That became my conclusion and the conclusion of my fellow commissioners after a year and a half of work, and we so indicated in our first report to the President and Congress. Nothing has happened since to change our minds. It is important from the standpoint of

maintaining tranquillity at home and of moving this Nation in the direction it must move if it's to preserve its essential values.

Beyond that, it is essential if this country is to play effectively the role which has been thrust upon it in world affairs. You well know about a third of the world looks toward Moscow or Peking for guidance; about a third of the world is allied in one way or another with the United States and the nations of western Europe, and about one-third of the world is not committed to either; and that third of the world is almost exclusively nonwhite. Most of us that have worried about this problem of the survival of this basic philosophy of ours in the world—as some of you know, I have had a role in the Defense Department in various capacities over a period of years, and this now is only a personal opinion—I am sure that the dominating factor of the generation in which we live is this continuing struggle with Soviet communism, whether it gravitates around Moscow or Peking, and that this Nation has had no alternative but to maintain great military strength. But I am as certain as I am that I am sitting here this afternoon that this struggle will never be won on a battlefield. It could be lost there, and once lost, of course, it's lost; but we could become involved in a war with the Soviet Union and still lose the struggle with the Communists. The probabilities are pretty good, coming out of a devastating war, the kind of war there is likely to be, that we might win the war, but find ourselves in a situation more favorable to the espousal of Communist doctrine than anything we have known.

The winning of this struggle depends upon what happens in the minds of the people in this uncommitted third of the world. If you travel around the world as much as I have and as Dean Storey has and Father Hesburgh has, and some of you have, particularly in the nonwhite areas, you know that the questions that are the most difficult to answer are these questions that are asked, the import of which is to explain the difference between our historical philosophy and action, and to explain the kind of incidents that have occurred in Little Rock, in New Orleans, in Poplarville, and elsewhere. So, even if the solution of this problem was not important to the United States, it's of great importance in effecting the role of this Nation in the world.

Now, it has been brought out in the questioning that schools are only a part of the problem. This Commission, as is indicated in the act, has no responsibility to do anything about civil rights. We are only to find out what the facts are and to make recommendations to the President and the Congress, as we did in 1959 and in 1961, and will again in the fall of 1963. The Commission was created for 2 years, extended for 2, and now extended for 2 years more.

The Commission is convinced that, of course, as you think about this problem of civil rights, and are called Communists by some, as we have been, criticized from both sides for not moving fast enough, for not being liberal enough by some, and by being altogether too radical and liberal by others, you finally have to develop some sort of notion as to what it is you are trying to accomplish. What is the role of government? What is the role of right-thinking people? What should it be? And, so (again I am speaking not for the Commission, but as an individual)—certainly it is not to create unrest; certainly it is not, as we are accused by the white citizen councils, to mongrelize the races.

We finally come up with a notion that the objective has to be, sooner or later—and the sooner the better—a situation in which every young American, regardless of his color, his national origin, or his religion, shall have an opportunity for all the education that he can make use of, because it's the only way you make it possible for him to develop the potential God gave him. We became convinced that the one resource that this Nation cannot afford to squander, with all the wealth of the United States, is the potential capacity of its young people to make useful contributions to society. This we cannot squander. One becomes convinced, after a little study, of course, that there is no such thing as a potential ability all concentrated in any one race, religion, or geographic place.

Some criticism has been leveled at Dr. Conant for some of the things he said in his book, *Slums and Suburbs*, but it is an interesting thing—and we are talking to educators primarily in this group—that the most effective spokesman for public education in the United States in 1962 is a man who was associated in his productive years until recently, with privately supported education. He is the most effective defender of public schools that we have at all levels, and he's largely responsible for attributing to education a phrase that he calls "social mobility."

One of the problems with educators is there are so few of us who have thought through what it is that education is trying to do. The great contribution that our educational system has made in the United States is that we make it possible, ideally, for every bright youngster, regardless of the accident of birth, to have an education—through primary school, through high school, through the university, and graduate school—who wants to start even. The youngster born into the least advantaged home, through education, can start even with the youngster born into the most advantaged home, but this hasn't always extended to Negroes and some others. This is one of the objectives certainly.

Then, if we can achieve that one, there must be an opportunity for this youngster, having developed a potential to make a contribution

to society, to get employment that will make use of it. Here we get into this whole business of employment opportunity.

Then, if we can achieve that one—and here we're making pretty good progress in this country—there must be an opportunity for this man, regardless of race, now making a social contribution, to enjoy the same advantages and opportunities that all others making the same contribution are able to enjoy, and here we get into this whole business of housing. This has been the one commodity that is not available to the Negro—and to some members of some other minority groups—even though he has the money to pay for it.

Then we get into this whole business of the administration of justice and other areas.

Well, the point I want to make is, it is all tied up together. Education is a part of it; employment opportunities are a part of it; housing is a part of it; free use of public accommodations, administration of justice, and all the rest.

The gentlemen that sit on this Commission have given a lot of time and thought to it over a period of years, and we have, I think, unanimously recognized that it is important. As I have already indicated, it seems important to us. But we can't do anything about it, except to serve as sort of a conscience for the American people and to make reports and recommendations to the Congress and to the President. Here we need the understanding and help, particularly of educators and of all other right-thinking people, if we are going to make progress at different rates and at different places, if that's the way we're going to move.

Now, education is not our problem. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has the responsibility for administering Federal educational programs.

Three years ago it was clear that, in accordance with the Supreme Court decision of 1954 and subsequent court actions, there needed to be some place where the people in Chattanooga or in Dallas or in New Orleans could look for information as to what the experiences of others had been, where desegregation had taken place smoothly and where there had been much commotion, and that was the reason for the first conference in Nashville—to make it possible to make a record as to what the facts were for the guidance of other cities, communities, bound to have to go through the same sort of an experience. So, we had a second conference in Gatlinburg, and a third conference in Williamsburg, and this is the fourth one.

Now, whether we should go on beyond this, of course, is something for time to tell. It is the feeling of the Commission that this is a responsibility that could be more effectively taken over by the U.S. Office of Education. If they will not, of course, we may have to go forward.

In conclusion, this is only a small part of our responsibility, and we can only serve, as you have helped us serve, by making a record of what the facts are in the big cities of the North, the little cities, and the middle-sized cities, the rural communities, the border States, the South and everywhere else. And, so, to all of you who have participated in the panels and to those of you who have come from all over the country to participate—to you we are grateful.

Every word that has been spoken has been recorded, and we hope within about 60 days to have in your hands a complete record of everything that has been said, and if out of it comes something that will be helpful to you and to others, we're satisfied. At least you know who some of the people are that are concerned as you are concerned, and maybe as individuals there will be avenues for communication opened up to you and to others that might not otherwise have been possible.

In conclusion, thank you very much.

(Thereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the conference was concluded.)

INDEX

Questions or Comments by Commissioners, Participants, and Staff

Page

Ashmore, Mr. Myron L. 119, 189
Bernhard, Mr. Berl I. 92, 93, 109, 118
Berg, Mr. Selmer H. 96, 187
Blakenship, Mr. A. H. 105
Blaustein, Mr. Albert P. 188
Bloom, Mr. Sam R. 165, 170, 171, 172, 181
Bond, Dr. Horace Mann. 90, 96, 100, 102, 106
Burrell, Dr. A. 135, 176
Carmichael, Dr. Benjamin E. 165, 168, 169, 170, 174, 175, 182, 183, 184
Chute, Dr. Oscar M. 90, 91, 107
Cole, Mrs. Elizabeth R. 60, 63, 93, 115
Dines, Mr. Aaron. 54
Drachler, Dr. Norman. 42, 132, 182
Duncan, Dr. Samuel E. 116, 174, 175
Fischer, Dr. John H. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59
Foster, Mr. G. W., Jr. 99, 122
Gillis, Mr. Frederick T. 135, 175
Grambs, Dr. Jean D. 113, 174
Griswold, Commissioner Erwin N. 38, 39, 40, 55, 91, 92, 117, 165, 166
Hale, Dr. William H. 93
Hannah, Chairman John A. 123, 128, 172, 176, 191
Havighurst, Dr. Robert. 43, 47, 186
Hesburgh, Commissioner Theodore M. 34, 36, 37, 90
Hurt, Mr. James, Jr. 100, 101, 120, 188, 189, 190
Ingram, Dr. Evan W. 190
Jackson, Dr. Houston R. 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 53, 63, 64, 191
Johnson, Dr. Theron. 176
Kaplan, Mr. John. 56
Knowles, Mr. Lawrence W. 188
Kohler, Judge Mary C. 101, 102
Letson, Dr. John W. 122, 126, 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 185
Lief, Dr. Harold I. 58, 59
Mason, Dr. Barbara. 172, 188
Mays, Dr. Benjamin E. 56, 117, 122, 172, 183
Miller, Dr. Carroll. 116
Miller, Dr. George R., Jr. 123
McDaniel, Mr. Vernon. 116
Nelson, Mr. Richard J. 55
Nichols, Dr. Roy. 52, 53, 63, 64, 124, 176
Noble, Dr. Jeanne L. 172, 173, 174, 175
Nyquist, Dr. Ewald B. 100, 108
Oliver, Mr. William Henry. 64, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 123, 124, 185
Peters, Dr. Richard M. 50, 51, 90, 91, 92, 93, 101, 103, 104, 106, 109

Page

Phillips, Dr. A. Craig ---- 108
Picott, Dr. J. Rupert ---- 51, 52, 117, 171, 172
Porter, Mr. Woodford R ---- 102, 118, 119, 182, 187, 189
Rankin, Commissioner Robert S ---- 37, 38, 90, 91, 116, 165
Rice, Mr. James W ---- 117, 118
Riles, Mr. Wilson C ---- 107
Robinson, Dr. Carl L ---- 129, 130
Robinson, Dr. Remus G ---- 189, 190
Robinson, Commissioner Spottswood, III ---- 41, 92, 167, 168, 169, 170
Rukeyser, Mr. Merryle S ---- 57
Schreiber, Dr. Daniel ---- 94, 96, 97
Schueler, Dr. Herbert ---- 60
Shepard, Mr. Theodore H ---- 115, 124
Shield, Miss Esma ---- 120
Smith, Mr. A. Maceo ---- 170
Smith, Mr. Charles U ---- 42, 105, 171, 183
Stephens, Dr. Rual ---- 104
Storey, Vice Chairman Robert G ---- 33, 34, 89, 164
Thompson, Dr. Daniel ---- 121, 180, 182
Tucker, Mr. Everett, Jr ---- 118, 121, 170
White, Dr. J. B ---- 41, 51, 52, 56
Williams, Mr. Frederick H ---- 126, 127, 128, 129, 136, 189, 190, 191

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1962