R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 058 24

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED PROGRAMS FOR THE TRAINING OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS IN THE SOUTH.

BY- HORTON, AIMEE I.
FISK UNIV., NASHVILLE, TENN.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-291 PUB DATE JUN 66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8269
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$7.44 186P.

DESCRIPTORS- EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, *COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *FREEDOM ORGANIZATIONS, INTERGROUP EDUCATION, INTEGRATION STUDIES, *LEADERSHIP TRAINING, *NEGRO LEADERSHIP, LEADER PARTICIPATION, SOUTHERN COMMUNITY, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), CIVIL RIGHTS, RACIAL INTEGRATION, WORKSHOPS, NASHVILLE

THREE EXAMPLES OF RACIALLY INTEGRATED, RESIDENTIAL ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS CONDUCTED FOR THE TRAINING OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS IN THE SOUTH WERE EXAMINED. THE PROGRAMS STUDIED WERE (1) A 1955 WORKSHOP ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION, ONE OF A SERIES OF WORKSHOPS DEVELOPED BY THE HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL, AN ADULT EDUCATION CENTER IN RURAL TENNESSEE, (2) THE 1965 ANNUAL INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS CONDUCTED BY THE RACE RELATIONS DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION AT FISK UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, AND (3) A 1965 CITIZENSHIP SCHOOL TEACHER TRAINING WORKSHOP SPONSORED BY THE SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, THE CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATION HEADED BY DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING. EACH PROGRAM WAS EXAMINED AS A POTENTIAL MODEL FOR POSSIBLE USE BY INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE SOUTH CONCERNED WITH DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS. THE DATA ON WHICH THE DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF EACH OF THE THREE PROGRAMS WAS BASED DEALT WITH PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, EXAMPLES OF LEARNING EXPERIENCES USED TO OBTAIN THESE OBJECTIVES, STUDENT AND STAFF EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS, AND THE APPARENT EFFECT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMS AS VIEWED BY THE PARTICIPANTS. THE FIRST AND THIRD OF THE THREE PROGRAMS WERE JUDGED TO HAVE POTENTIAL USE AS MODELS IN OTHER INSTITUTIONS. (GD)

Title: AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED PROGRAMS FOR THE TRAINING OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS IN THE SOUTH

Investigator: Aimee I. Horton

Institution: Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee

Project Number: S-291

Duration: June, 1965 to June, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Up until World War II, the "derivative and dependent"[1] Negro leadership, as sociologist Gunnar Myrdal referred to it, continued to "represent" the Southern Negro community in its dealings with the Southern white community. As the segregated system began to be challenged, the "Uncle Tom" leadership which had served that system was also challenged. And "since the May 17, 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing the 'separate but equal' doctrine of race relations," a current student of Southern Negro leadership concludes, "the Uncle Tom leader has lost face among Negroes, and his influence among white men of power has diminished proportionally."[2]

Since 1954, the actions of Negroes themselves--the Montgomery bus boycott, the Southwide student sit-ins, the prolonged protest demonstrations in Alabama and Mississippi--and the strong affirmation of these actions by the Federal Government in the form of major civil rights legislation, court decisions and changes in public policy have contributed greatly toward setting aside the system as well as remnants of the old Negro leadership. What remains to be accomplished, however, is perhaps as difficult, or more difficult, than what has already been accomplished. In every Southern community there is an urgent need for new, independent and democratic kinds of Negro leadership. These new leaders must be able to mobilize local Negro support to push on in the tough job of changing persisting segregated patterns and discriminatory practices. At the same time, they must be able to participate effectively with responsible white community leadership in the solution of common problems of community living.

---

[1] In examining Negro leadership in the South, Myrdal observed that "practically all the economic and political powers are concentrated in the white caste" and that "the small amount of influence, status and wealth that there is in the Negro community is derivative and dependent," An American Dilemna (Harper & Bros., 1944), chap. 37, p. 770).

[2] Daniel C. Thompson, The Negro Leadership Class (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), p. 166.

What the newly changed social situation in the South requires, it seems clear, is educational programming to develop new kinds of local leadership--both among Negroes and their white counterparts.

Objectives

The present study is concerned with examining three examples of racially integrated residential adult education programs for the training of civil rights and community leaders in the South. These programs differ in their sponsorship, clientele, and educational objectives and in the kinds of learning experiences, including residential learning experiences, offered for achieving these objectives. The purpose of the study is to examine each as a potential model, in whole or in part, for other institutions and organizations in the South concerned with developing leadership training programs.

The study of each program will be confined to describing and analyzing: 1) objectives as defined by staff and participants; 2) examples of the learning experiences utilized to obtain these objectives, including residential learning experiences; 3) evaluation of the program by students and staff; and 4) apparent effect and effectiveness of the Institute as viewed by participants.

The first of these programs to be examined is a 1955 Workshop on School Desegregation, one of a series of workshops developed, beginning in 1953, by the Highlander Folk School, an independent residential adult education center located in rural Tennessee. The second program is the 1965 Annual Institute

of Race Relations, founded in 1942 by the Race Relations Department of the American Missionary Association and located on the campus of Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee. The third example to be examined is a 1965 Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a religiously-oriented civil rights organization headed by Dr. Martin Luther King, and held at a church-supported center in rural Georgia.

In the first program to be examined, participants were Southern Negro and white leaders of a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, all actively working on problems of desegregation in their several communities. In the second, participants were largely middle-class Negro and white teachers, ministers, churchwomen and others, "leaders and potential leaders" from communities of the North and South. Participants in the third of the three programs included a small number of concerned whites but were largely working-class Negroes from Deep South communities with a desire to help their neighbors achieve "first-class citizenship."

The curriculum for the Desegregation Workshop was problem-centered, moving from problem definition to a consideration of resources to the development of specific plans for community action. The Institute curriculum was, in large part, academic with emphasis on lectures by specialists to give participants a broad orientation to race relations problems and programs for change. The Workshop for Citizenship School Teachers took participants step-by-step through the process of preparing them for their new roles as teacher-leaders.

In each case, the experience in integrated residential living was considered by curriculum planners to be of some importance, but the several settings and efforts to plan activities related to that experience varied considerably.

Related Research

There has been no previous research on the three residential adult education programs for training community leaders which are the subject of the present study.

Only one study, in fact, has been identified which focuses on an integrated residential education program for the training of civic or community leadership. This study, a descriptive and evaluative study of the Encampment for Citizenship,[1] relates to a program for high school and college students rather than adults.

Beyond the notable lack of studies of these specific kinds of programs, there is little in the research literature of adult education on either residential adult education or on community leadership training programs. There has been some discussion of and debate on the special values of residential adult education in professional publications;[2] occasional articles describing residential adult education programs; at least one effort to survey the

---

[1] Algernon D. Black, The Young Citizens (New York: Frederick Ungar Co., 1962).

[2] Among the proponents, see Royce Pitkin, The Residential School in American Adult Education (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1956); among the critics, see John S. Diekhoff, "Residential Education: No Place Like Home," Adult Education, (Summer, 1960), 238-246.

residential adult schools in the United States and Canada[1] and a doctoral dissertation which describes and analyzes the range of such programs in the United States.[2] However, there has been no major research on programs of liberal residential adult education which attempts to assess the residential aspects of the learning experience. Of the research on community leadership training in recent years, an article in the Review of Educational Research observes, "While training of community leaders would seem to be rather crucial, there is little genuine research in this area."[3]

Procedures

The data on which the description and analysis of each of the three programs is based have been gathered in somewhat different ways.

The data on the Highlander Folk School Workshops on School Desegregation have been gathered in the following ways: a) minutes and other staff records of planning sessions; b) tape recordings and written records of workshop sessions;

---

[1] Myles Horton, "A Survey of Residential Adult Education in the United States and Canada" (Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee, 1954). (Mimeographed).

[2] Robert Schacht, "Residential Adult Education - An Analysis and Interpretation" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957).

[3] Joseph Matthews and Linnea B. Holland, "Procedures and Methods for Community and Resource Development," Review of Educational Research, XXXV (June, 1965), p. 225.

c) reports and other materials resulting from workshops; d) correspondence of staff and participants before and after the workshops; e) follow-up questionnaires to workshop participants as administered both by the Highlander Folk School staff and, recently, by the present writer.

Data on the Race Relations Institute and, specifically, on the 1965 Institute have been gathered from the following sources and by the following means: a) reports of past Institutes; b) pre-and post-Institute interviews or questionnaires administered to twenty Southern participants; c) attendance at the two-week residential Institute as a participant-observer of formal sessions and the informal residential activities; d) interviews with Institute staff members; e) follow-up questionnaires to all Southern participants in the Institute.

Finally, data on the Southern Christian Leadership Conference Citizenship Education Program and, specifically, on the 1965 Teacher Training Workshop have been gathered from: a) staff reports and tape recordings of planning and evaluation sessions during the development of the Citizenship School Program; b) pre- and post-interviews or questionnaires administered to twenty-five young adult and adult participants in the workshop; c) attendance at the five-day residential workshop as a participant-observer of formal sessions and informal residential activities; d) interviews with the 1965 workshop staff and with those responsible for developing the Citizenship Education Program; e) follow-up interviews with participants in the Selma, Alabama area three months after the workshop; f) follow-up questionnaire to all forty participants in the workshop.

PART I

THE HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL RESIDENTIAL WORKSHOPS ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION WITH EMPHASIS ON THE 1955 WORKSHOP

Institutional Background: The Southern School that was Always Integrated

Even before the Highlander Folk School was established in a rural community near Monteagle, Tennessee in November of 1932, its founder, Myles Horton, conceived of the independent Southern adult education center "for the training of rural and industrial leaders" as an integrated institution. He wrote of the projected school in 1931 that its students would come from the mountains and from the factories and that "Negroes should be among the students."[1]

In the first years of the School when its curriculum primarily served the self-help needs of its impoverished white mountain neighbors in the surrounding community and county, Negroes came to the School as visitors

[1]These early notes were written while Horton was visiting Danish folk high schools and imagining a residential school to meet the needs of the South (Myles Horton, "Christmas night, 1931, Copenhagen, Denmark" in the files of the School).

and speakers.[1] A Negro TVA staff member and sociologist Charles S. Johnson of Fisk University were among the early speakers.[2]

In 1935, when an All-Southern Conference for Civil Rights and Trade Union Rights was chased out of its meeting place in Chattanooga, the whole Conference took refuge at the Highlander Folk School and carried on its sessions there while mountain neighbors stood watch to prevent further interruption.[3]

By 1940 when the School had become a center for workers' education serving the Southwide industrial union movement, the School's staff and Executive Council put into effect an explicit policy, informing all unions sending students that they should notify them in advance that there would be no discrimination.[4] The School's records contain a number of statements

---

[1]Correspondence in 1933 from a Negro college, Knoxville College, which states, "At this time we know of no student or graduate who would be a good candidate or would be desirous of enrolling . . ."indicates that effort was made very early to integrate the student body. (Letter from William M. Seaman, Knoxville College, December 11, 1933).

[2]From the early thirties throughout his life, Dr. Charles Johnson remained a friend of the School. Writing after an early visit to say that he was forwarding one of his books, he commented that he "would rather present it to the Highlander Folk School than to any other library I can think of . . ." (Letter from Charles S. Johnson, Director, Department of Social Sciences, Fisk University, January 10, 1935).

[3]Zilphia Horton, "Community Reaction to Negroes at Highlander," c. 1946 (in the files of the School), p. 2.

[4]"The staff and Executive Board, feeling the urgency of and working toward a possible solution of the inter-racial problem, decided in 1940 that the time had come when a non-discrimination policy should be put into effect." (Ibid., p. 3).

by Negro workers-students in the forties whose faith in the unions and in democracy was strengthened by their participation in an integrated workers' education session at Highlander. As a young Negro committeeman from a UAW local in Memphis put it:

> When I first joined, I had an idea that there were a few people who didn't feel about Negroes like those I had been brought up with in Memphis. And when I came to Highlander, I was fully convinced. Here, it's a matter of giving the CIO a chance to carry out its constitution. Just can't help it here in the mountain.[1]

Later, in the early fifties, when the School developed a curriculum for small farmers to assist the National Farmers Union organizational efforts in the South, it worked with rural students on an integrated basis. Negro and white farmers came together for residential sessions at the mountain school and returned to their communities to work together in the local Farmers Union chapters in Alabama, Virginia and Tennessee.

Thus, by 1953, the Highlander Folk School had become known to many throughout the South, loved and respected by Negroes and those whites who believed in the rights of Negroes as members of unions, as farmers, as community leaders, as human beings and hated by those who were determined, in the words of a Negro civil rights leader, Reverend C.T. Vivian, "to maintain the status Crow." It represented a unique residential center and meeting place in the South where Negroes and whites could come together for a week, two weeks or a month in an informal setting to live and learn and work together on common problems and share in a variety of social activities.

---

[1] Zilphia Horton, "Bob Jones Speaks His Mind," n.d. (in the files of the School).

A Curriculum for "the coming upheaval in the South"

At a special planning meeting of the Highlander Executive Council in April, 1953, the question was raised, "What is the most pressing problem for the people of the South that Highlander can tackle?"[1]

George Mitchell, director of the Southern Regional Council and a member of Highlander's governing body replied:

> The next great problem is not the problem of conquering poverty, but conquering meaness, prejudice and tradition. Highlander could become the place in which this is studied, a place where one could learn the art of practice and methods of brotherhood. The new emphasis at Highlander should be on the desegregation of the public schools in the South . . .

He went on to emphasize that the reason for the immediacy of the program was "the coming upheaval in the South" as a result of the Supreme Court decision "either outlawing segregation in the schools or enforcing equal facilities."[2]

In response to the challenge, the Council together with other Southern leaders invited to participate in the meeting,[3] proposed that the Highlander Folk School develop an experimental curriculum for preparing community leaders,

---

[1]Report of Special Highlander Executive Council Meeting, April 27-28, 1953, Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee (in the files of the School), p. 1.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Those taking part in the meeting, along with Highlander Council and staff members included union leaders such as William Buttram, Tennessee Director, Communication Workers of America and J.P. Mooney, Tennessee representative of the United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers of America and ministers and theologians such as Dr. Robert McNair, St. Luke's Theological Seminary, University of the South and Rev. Richard Henry, representing the Unitarian Service Committee and the Tennessee Valley Unitarian Church.

Negro and white, to implement the expected decision.[1] The result was two summer workshops in July and August, 1953 on "The Supreme Court Decisions and the Public Schools" and subsequent workshops on school desegregation in 1954, 1955, 1956 and 1957.

In undertaking to develop the first curriculum in the South to assist local leaders in desegregating their schools, Highlander was acting in a manner consistent with its convictions and experience regarding the educational needs and democratic potential inherent in social crises and movements. As it had responded to the needs of unemployed mountain people in the depression with a curriculum to develop leadership for their own economic and political organizations, as it had responded to the needs of an inexperienced rapidly expanding labor movement with a curriculum to develop local union leaders and educational programs for the membership, so it responded to the "coming upheaval" of Southern school desegregation in the beginning of a broader civil rights movement by offering a curriculum to develop widespread local leadership among Negroes and concerned whites.

Underlying each of these curricula were two basic assumptions: that society and, specifically, the South, to become more democratic had to have more widely-shared and effective community and organizational leadership and that such leadership could be most readily developed, most highly motivated to learn, in a time of social crisis.

---

[1] A footnote to the Special Meeting Report states, "Alfred Mynders, editor of the Chattanooga Times, predicts the court decision on segregation in the public schools will come early in June."

The Residential School as an Educative Environment

The kind of environment which the Highlander Folk School provided as a setting in which and from which to learn was, and had always been, of great concern to its founder-director and staff. They were deeply mindful of Dewey's warning that "any environment is a chance environment . . . unless it has been deliberately regulated with reference to its educative effect."[1]

Along with a problem-centered curriculum to help students understand and deal with "the world in which we live," Myles Horton wrote in some early notes, the School must try to give students "an idea of the world we would like to have." Here, the School became a kind of demonstration community.[2]

From its first tentative months of existence, when the unorthodox adult school served primarily the surrounding community of some seventy-five families together with a resident student population of six, a conscious and painstaking effort was made to practice democracy in educational planning and living arrangements. Great importance was placed on co-operative decision-making, involving community and resident students with staff in determining the educational and social activities to be offered as well as co-operative sharing of responsibility for such physical chores as school housekeeping,

---

[1] John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), p. 22.

[2] Myles Horton, "Folk School Idea," c. 1933 (in the files of the School).

growing food and chopping wood.[1]

When Highlander's primary educational focus became the problems of integration and strengthening Negro leadership for full citizenship in the South, the educative environment of the residential school assumed added meaning and significance. Myles Horton, writing of this significance during the civil rights period observed:

> Residential adult education appears to be especially appropriate for dealing with human relations problems. All people, and particularly people who have been limited in their opportunity, need a setting in which they can be relaxed and where learning takes place by means of a variety of educational experiences. People need to be together outside discussion, lecture and study periods. This opportunity is provided in a residential setting.[2]

He cited, too, the educational significance of Highlander's being an integrated institution not only in terms of its students, but in terms of its staff and policy-makers. This integration of the School at every level, he concluded, "is a demonstration of the democratic way of life for which it is educating leaders."[3]

---

[1]These work aspects are specifically described in a report of the first year's activities:

> "All the work of the school is shared by teachers and students alike. All do some manual or housework everyday. There are no salaries. All are giving their time and services to the common cause. Life here is simple. Almost ascetic at times."

"The Highlander Folk School: (Monteagle, Tennessee, n.d.). (Mimeographed.)

[2]Reply from Myles Horton to some questions posed by Dean Charles Gomillion, Tuskegee Institute, regarding Highlander Folk School's contribution to civic democracy in the South during 1959 (in the files of the School). (Mimeographed.)

[3]Ibid.

Horton had also been concerned, from the beginning, that the School not become a utopian or unreal setting. Here he expressed the hope that "the tie-up with the conflict situations and participation in community life," would keep the School "from being a detached colony . . ."[1] The environment of the School as a center for civil rights education was, of course, in no danger of becoming utopian. For although Southern Negro and white community leaders came together in a tension-free atmosphere where they could know and appreciate and learn from one another as human beings, their problems, the problems of a segregated South, were underscored by the sharing of experiences. As Gunnar Myrdal had pointed out in his major study of American race relations:

> When Negroes are brought together to discuss and plan for any purpose, this by itself makes them feel a new courage to voice or at least to formulate to themselves, their protest. They cannot avoid reminding each other of the actually existing reasons for serious complaints.[2]

Nor was it likely, on the other hand, that the environment would become primarily a permissive setting in which to voice protests and express the frustrations of being black (or white and determined to be decent) in a segregated society. For as the Highlander director explained it:

> Residential-ness cannot be separated in my mind, however, from a clear-cut and challenging purpose--not a purpose blue-printed from beginning to end, but a direction clear enough to stand out like a lodestar. Residential adult education to me means not only a physical arrangement and setting, but a clear and simple purpose as well. To bring out the best in people, their imaginations must be stretched.[3]

---

[1] Horton, "The Folk School Idea."

[2] Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944), Vol. I, p. 744.

[3] Horton's reply to questions raised by Gomillion.

Thus, with the large and clear-cut purpose before them of achieving the desegregation of schools in their communities, the participants, however difficult their situations, were motivated to move as rapidly as possible from stating their problems to working together on practical solutions. And if the kind of community which they would like to achieve seemed far-off, they had the tangible experience of living and learning together in close and democratic interaction to strengthen and reinforce them in the possibility of achieving it.

Description and Analysis of the 1955 Workshop, "The South Prepares to Carry Out the Supreme Court Decision Outlawing Segregation in the Public Schools"

In examining the records of the Highlander Folk School workshops on school desegregation, year by year, from 1953 through 1957--the planning meetings, recruiting of students, curricula, workshop reports, follow-up contacts and correspondence with students returned to their communities--the interrelatedness of the several workshops, the way in which the results of one workshop built on and affected the following ones becomes strikingly and significantly evident.

Also evident is the way in which each workshop relates to the specific period, the point in time in which it occurs, the stage of development of desegregation efforts in the several communities, in the South and in the courts.

Planning the 1955 Workshop: The Role of Former Participants

In planning the workshop on desegregation for 1955, an Advisory Com-

mittee[1] including students and consultants from former workshops worked with the Highlander staff and Executive Council. Among the students were Mrs. Anna Kelly of the Negro Y.W.C.A. in Charleston who had attended the first workshop in 1953 and returned home to initiate a program involving other Negro leaders in educating the general public; Mrs. Septima Clark, also of Charleston, a Negro elementary school teacher and civic leader who, since participating in a 1954 workshop, had been assisting with the Highlander Community Leadership Project in the South Carolina Sea Islands; and Mr. and Mrs. Will Thomas of Bessemer, Alabama, Negro civil rights and community leaders who had made some hard-won progress in their community following attendance at a Highlander workshop in 1954.

Like the students invited to assist in planning the 1955 workshop, the consultants were persons who had themselves been involved in civil rights action. Among these were Miss Irene Osborne, American Friends Service Committee staff member, who played an important role in the successful efforts to integrate public schools in Washington, D.C., and who described the process to Highlander workshop groups in 1953 and 1954 and Dr. Charles Gomillion, Dean of Students, Tuskegee Institute, a thoughtful educator and human relations specialist and a leader of the Tuskegee Civic Association working in the community and through the courts to achieve Negro rights.

During a workshop planning meeting, it was pointed out, based on the School's previous workshops and follow-up field activities, that by "con-

---

[1]The following people agreed to serve on the Advisory Committee: Mrs. Septima Clark, Dr. Charles Gomillion, Mrs. Rebecca Gershon, Henry Harap, Miss Irene Osborne, Miss Anna Kelly, Mr. and Mrs. Will Thomas, William Van Til and Mrs. J.H. Wilcox.

centrating on a few communities where we have friends or former students, we can build a nucleus of informed leaders who are able to start and carry forward a plan of community action for public school integration."[1] The staff field service, it was recommended, should be continued and, if possible, staff consultants and students for the coming workshop should be drawn from these areas.

It was also suggested that the workshop curriculum, along with providing opportunities for students to analyze the problems and plan for school desegregation in their own communities, might provide the opportunity to analyze and propose plans for three or four typical Southern communities representing different housing patterns and traditions of segregation.

Conceiving of both planning and evaluation as integral parts of an on-going curriculum development process, the pre-workshop planning meeting arranged for a post-workshop meeting of Council, staff and Advisory Committee with a threefold purpose:

"1) to evaluate the past summer's workshop; 2) to plan the next year's resident programs; and 3) to make any policy decisions required."[2]

The Workshop Participants: Varied in Background, Similar in Motivation

Not surprisingly, the Negro and white community leaders who attended the action-oriented Highlander Folk School workshops on school desegregation tended to be highly motivated men and women. The borchure circulated to 1955 workshop applicants stated in simple but explicit terms that those eligible included

---

[1] Minutes of the Executive Council Meeting, March 26-27, 1955, Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tennessee (in the files of the School). (Mimeographed.)

[2] Ibid.

anyone working with local "educational, religious, fraternal, or intercultural organizations or otherwise in a position to provide community leadership."[1] There were no academic or other requirements and scholarships, it was indicated, were available. Thus, persons of varied educational and socio-economic backgrounds were enabled to participate.

More important, the majority of students, as had previously been the case, were recruited by former students who, because they were enthusiastic about what they had gained from the residential workshop experience, encouraged others who might share the local leadership responsibilities. In this way, Mrs. Anna Kelly of Charleston, South Carolina, after participating in the first workshop, had encouraged Mrs. Septima Clark to attend. Mrs. Clark, in turn, influenced Esau Jenkins, self-educated Negro small businessman and Johns Island, South Carolina civic leader. After he had participated in several workshops, Mr. Jenkins, along with expanding his own civil rights role in Charleston and the Sea Islands, sent numerous other Island students to Highlander workshops, as well as, helping to develop workshops himself.

Other students were identified and recruited by Highlander staff on field visits to communities attempting to work out their problems of desegregation. For example, the report of a staff visit to Tuskegee, Alabama in February, 1955 indicates:

> Met with school teachers, clergymen, N.A.A.C.P. leaders, Civic Association representatives and Tuskegee students who analyzed deadlock between white and Negro communities and discussed possible solutions. Visited town and rural schools and planned for the training of additional community leaders at Highlander next summer.[2]

---

[1] Highlander Folk School, "The South Prepares to Carry Out the Surreme Court Decision Outlawing Segregation in Public Schools, July 24-August 5, 1955."

[2] Highlander Folk School, Twenty-third Annual Report, October 1, 1954-September 30, 1955, pp. 2-3.

Notably, most of the forty-some participants in the 1953 Workshop on School Desegregation came from communities in Alabama, South Carolina and Tennessee where Highlander's former students were living and where staff was or had been involved in field activities.

The Problem-centered Curriculum

In evolving a curriculum to develop local leaders able to deal with the problems and patterns of school desegregation in their several communities, the situations confronting workshop participants furnished much of the basic content and the organizing centers for the learning, which, it was hoped, would occur.

Johns Island, South Carolina leader Esau Jenkins and several other Sea Island participants provided one complex of problems for the workshop agenda: the problems of arousing and inspiring some two thousand Negroes, isolated, psychologically as well as physically, from changes in the nation, in the South and even in near-by Charleston; dominated, still, by the plantation world of their parents, a world where the government, the schools, the jobs, the whole system controlling the lives of Negroes, belonged to the white man. How to convince people of their rights to better schools and health services? Of their rights to vote for those schools and services by electing officials to represent their interests? Of their rights, in fact, to vote, to be citizens?

A middle-class, Northern-born white couple, Anne and Ken Kennedy of Knoxville, Tennessee presented another set of not-so-difficult problems: the problems of a Joint Citizens' Committee for School Integration attempting

to activate a conservative school board in an urban Appalachian city where Negroes were a small, inactive minority.

Other problems described were those of the Deep South community of Montgomery, Alabama where Mrs. Rosa Parks, an N.A.A.C.P. official, youth advisor and weary civic leader, described the unchallenged patterns of segregation in schools and in all aspects of community life and observed, as she heard reports of progress in other communities, that Negroes in Montgomery were "too timid and would not act."[1]

Still others were the a-typical community problems as viewed by Tuskegee Institute faculty members and Civic Association members in an area where Negroes were in a clear majority and frequently had more education and better jobs than whites (both at the Institute and at a near-by Veterans' Administration Hospital), but who were prevented from voting and whose children were forced to attend segregated schools.

And along with these were the problems brought by white ministers and university students from Tennessee and by union members from Tennessee and Alabama who were often less clear about community problems, but were seeking to understand and define useful roles.

In the course of the workshop, each local leader described his community and its problems as he perceived them. The group, in turn, attempted to identify and analyze the common or underlying problems of the several communities. With this kind of interactive approach to learning, every participant had the opportunity to function both as a student and as a teacher. On

---

[1] "Report by Rosa Parks on the Montgomery, Alabama, Passive Resistance Protest," March, 1956 (in the files of the School).

the problems of his community, he was the first-hand authority, bringing with him his years of observation and experience. At the same time, in getting a different and broader perspective on his community and in dealing with its school segregation problems, he could learn from what others, whether staff or consultants or fellow adult students, had succeeded in accomplishing elsewhere.

Of this process, one of the consultants to the 1955 workshop, Irene Osborne wrote:

> The workshop sessions rely on group discussion in which the common problems of different areas are used as material for discussion. Staff persons and invited consultants take part in the total process, lending help when needed, but not dominating the discussions and not converting the sessions into an academic routine. Participants learn, and learn a remarkable amount in a short time, because they are doing it themselves and because the work stays close to the needs which they feel.[1]

Finally, divided into two groups, participants worked to develop practical plans and guidelines for action when they returned home. One of these, A Guide to Community Action for Public School Integration[2] was a rewriting, in the light of the Court's decision of 1954 and subsequent developments, of a guide, Working Toward Integrated Public Schools in Your Own Community, which had been developed by the members of a 1953 workshop group and shared widely.

---

[1] Letter from Irene Osborne, August 9, 1955, to Dr. Franklin D. Patterson, Phelps-Stokes Fund (in the files of the School).

[2] See Appendix for copy.

The other was a carefully composed series of recommendations, addressed to community leaders, entitled Basic Policies for Presentation to Local School Boards which included courses of action related to: 1) Pupil integration; 2) Teacher and administrative integration; and 3) Necessary educational preparation.

In composing both the Guide and the Basic Policies, the working committee presented its material to the whole group, including staff and consultants, for discussion and revision before turning it over to a small committee for final editing.

Along with the basic method of group discussion for identifying and analyzing problems and the use of small working committees to prepare written materials, an experimental planning project was undertaken as recommended by the Highlander Executive Council. Several typical Southern communities with varied patterns of segregation, for example, Charleston, where Negroes and whites live in the same areas; Atlanta, where Negroes live in segregated areas; and a Tennessee mountain community with only four or five per cent Negro population were selected for special analysis. After finding out where the lines of the neighborhoods and the location of the schools were in these communities, students worked on suitable plans for desegregation. According to a summary report of the workshop, "This project provided one of the most interesting and valuable experiences of the session."[1]

---

[1] Highlander Folk School, "Synopsis of Program, Workshop on Desegregation, July 24-August 6, 1955" (in the files of the School). (Mimeographed.)

Evening programs throughtout the workshop offered participants a variety of other kinds of social-educational experiences and suggested ideas for programs which they might adapt to their own communities. Folk music, square-dancing, improvisations and films[1] were utilized.

What was Valued, What was Learned: The Residential Experience

Yet, as these Negro and white community leaders evaluated their Highlander workshop experience, in response to two quite different questionnaires,[2] they did so, most often, not in terms of the information and resources obtained for solving problems, but in terms of some aspect or aspects of the residential experience. Negro and white, college-educated and self-educated, their comments express with deep personal conviction what Royce Pitkin, President of Goddard College, suggests or infers regarding the effectiveness of residential education for adults in his essay on the American residential school.[3]

---

[1]The films included were: De-segregation in the Public Schools" (Edward R. Murrow); "Picture in Your Mind," "Songs of Friendship"; "One People: The House I Live In"; "Heritage"; "Born Equal"; "Of Human Rights"; "Bouncry Lines"; "Man--One Family"; "Brotherhood of Man".

[2]One "Questionnaire on Leadership Training" was prepared and administered by the Highlander staff in 1955; the other "Follow-up Questionnaire" which attempted to get at what participants felt was most important to them about the workshop experience was administered by the writer in 1966.

[3]Royce Pitkin, The Residential School in American Adult Education (Chicago, Illinois: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1956).

Pitkin points out that "when adults are in residence in relatively small groups, a considerable degree of intimacy develops fairly quickly."[1] He suggests that the resulting informality makes for ease in participation and in acquiring new ideas and outlooks.

The achievement of this kind of informality and intimacy by a group of Negroes and whites in the South was, of course, a unique experience for most participants in the Highlander desegregation workshops. Almost all of them, therefore, commented, in some way, on what it meant o them. Of the learning growing out of this experience, a workshop member from Tuskegee Institute wrote:

> I have changed my attitude toward leadership from that of domination to one of companionship, I have never before had the opportunity to actually live in wholesome friendship with other groups who were interested, and unafraid, in my problems.[2]

Another Negro leader from the rural Sea Islands stated simply:

> It showed me how wonderful it (is) to live, share and become co-operative with others.[3]

Noting that "learning is enhanced if emotional strain or tension is low,"[4] Pitkin observes that adults in the residential school setting seem

---

[1] Ibid., p. 34

[2] Letter from Woodrow Cooper, Tuskegee, Alabama, May 28, 1955, to Myles Horton.

[3] Response by George Bellenger, Johns Island, South Carolina, to Highlander Folk School Questionnaire, August 1, 1955.

[4] Pitkin, The Residential School, pp. 34-35

relieved of many of their tensions; seem able to respond to the various challenges to learn without embarrassment, to learn, in fact, with increasing confidence.

Speaking of this atmosphere for learning, a Negro beautician explained:

> . . . at times when in a group, much of the information is lost because of the tenseness of the group as a whole and you cannot relax and receive what is being offered. This is not true at Highlander for there is no tension at all and one can absorb more easily. I felt as though I had been coming there for years and years.[1]

It should be added that this same beautician acquired sufficient confidence as well as competence to be able to participate in a Highlander-developed literacy and voter education program in the Sea Islands as the first teacher in a so-called Citizenship School.

Another workshop participant who spoke specifically about the group atmosphere and its effects on her was Mrs. Rosa Parks, soon afterwards leader of the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Fellow participants recall that Mrs. Parks, during the first several days of the workshop was extremely shy and quiet.[2] Of this experience, she wrote:

> I learned about informal group participation for serious problems and became more relaxed and communicative with others working toward the same goal of freedom from racial prejudice and injustice.[3]

---

[1] Letter from Bernice Robinson, Charleston, South Carolina, July 19, 1955 to Myles Horton.

[2] Interview with Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Kennedy, Knoxville, Tennessee, May 24, 1966.

[3] Reply by Mrs. Rosa Parks to Follow-up Questionnaire on Workshop on Desegregation, May 20, 1966.

In considering the residential school as it contributes to the physical-emotional-intellectual learning process, Pitkin observes that in this setting "the adult is free to move, to talk . . . to be a live, active human being and not simply an occupant of a seat in a given row."[1]

Illustrative of the varied opportunities for learning during the Highlander Folk School desegregation workshops, a middle-class white couple whose contacts with Negroes had been limited primarily to formal occasions such as church-sponsored gatherings and civic meetings, stated that most important in their experience was coming to know Negro workshop members, not in group discussion, but "in the kitchen, washing dishes together."[2] (for the Negro participants, the "washing dishes together" may have been quite another learning experience, as it was in the case of an earlier Highlander student, a Negro union member from the Deep South, who recalled of the session which she had attended, "It was the first time I ever worked in a kitchen where I was in charge and a white man was doing the dishes!")[3]

Another kind of educational value of the residential school, not discussed in Pitkin's essay, is cited frequently by participants in the Highlander Folk School workshops on desegregation, especially by Negroes. One woman from Alabama called it "Democratic living in practice" which, she stated, "for the first time in my life . . . was mine to observe."[4]

---

[1] Pitkin, The Residential School, p. 35

[2] Interview with Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy.

[3] Interview with Mrs. Ernestine Felder, Charleston, S.C., c. August, 1964.

[4] Letter from Mrs. Beulah C. Johnson to Mr. F.D. Patterson, Phelps-Stokes Fund, July 27, 1955.

And Esau Jenkins of the Sea Islands, looking back to when he first ventured to spend ten days in a Tennessee residential center with Southern white people wrote:

> Whenever I want(ed) to see part of this great democracy at work, I use(d) to go to New York. It was very significant and exclamatory to me to find democracy at work in Monteagle at Highlander Folk School which place makes me feel that he is counted as a human being, and one of God's people . . .[1]

The Effects of the 1955 Workshop

In evaluating the apparent effects of the two-week residential learning experience on the actions of participants, follow-up correspondence and field visits by staff provided the primary basis.

Some of the effects were in the form of continuing but intensified efforts on the part of returned workshop members to bring about desegregation of schools or other facilities or to encourage greater participation of others in civic affairs. Thus, correspondence and reports from Knoxville, Tennessee, participants in the 1955 workshop indicate that they were the "gadflies" within the Knoxville Joint Committee, made up of representatives of Negro and white civic organizations working for public school desegregation. As advocates of positive action, they brought before the Committee the ideas contained in the Highlander Workshop paper, "Basic Policies for Presentation to Local School Boards" and challenged it to draw up a positive plan of desegregation for presentation to member organizations and the school board.[2] Subsequent

---

[1] Letter from Esau Jenkins, Johns Island, South Carolina, April 28, 1955 to Myles Horton.

[2] Jack Painter, Report on the Knoxville Joint Committee, August 22, 1945.

correspondence and reports indicate that dissension within the Committee resulted in its dissolution but their efforts did, apparently, mobilize the more active organizations represented on the Committee which continued to work for and finally achieved complete school integration.

Another such behind-the-scenes effort occurred in a rural county in East Tennessee where Negroes were a tiny minority but where two participants in the 1955 workshop, a young Negro teacher and a young white Baptist minister, worked together over a period of time to identify and organize support for school integration.[1] Again, positive steps were not quickly achieved, but constructive elements, within ministerial groups, the Negro community and among sympathetic white leadership, were mobilized and finally succeeded in achieving school integration.

A third example of the workshop participant who continued, but in some new ways, to work on local problems was a Negro labor union and N.A.A.C.P. leader from Bessemer, Alabama who attended Highlander school desegregation workshops in 1953 and 1955. After the first workshop he set up voter registration classes, organized educational panels and forums on current events and worked with and through other organizations in his community to encourage Negroes to vote and to take an active part in desegregation efforts.[2]

---

[1]Francis Manis, Field Reports, Tennessee Council on Human Relations, 1955.

[2]Will Thomas, Reply to Highlander Folk School Questionnaire on Leadership Training, April, 1955.

During the 1955 workshop, he served as a participant-resource person describing his activities as well as gathering additional ideas to strengthen community efforts in Bessemer.

Some examples of effects, both direct and indirect, are more readily identifiable. Esau Jenkins, on returning from the 1954 workshop to Johns Island, South Carolina, wrote back to the Highlander staff that he had decided to attempt to "integrate" school leadership on the Island by running as the first Negro candidate for School Trustee since the Reconstruction Period. He was defeated, but he succeeded in arousing Negro interest in qualifying to vote and in demanding improved school and community services.[1]

Certainly the most dramatic action taken by a participant in the 1955 School Desegregation Workshop was by Mrs. Rosa Parks. Her refusal, some months after her return home, to give up her bus seat to a white passenger not only was the first act in the prolonged Montgomery Bus Boycott but was viewed by many as the first major event in the Southwide civil rights movement. Although Mrs. Parks was certainly not "taught" at the workshop the action that she was to take, she was taught by her experience there the possibility of living as an equal in an integrated society. The woman responsible for sending her to Highlander wrote after the Montgomery Bus Boycott was underway:

> But now comes your part . . . the effect that the School had on Mrs. Parks. When she came back she was so happy and felt so liberated and then as time went on she said the discrimination got worse and worse to bear after having, for the first time in her life, been freee of it at Highlander. I am sure that had a lot to do with her daring to risk arrest as she is naturally a very quiet and retiring person . . . .[2]

---

[1] See Citizenship Education Program Study, p. 92

[2] Letter from Mrs. Clifford Durr, Montgomery, Alabama, January 30, 1956.

Thus, the residential workshop, in addition to helping participants develop practical guidelines for school desegregation provided them with an example of what could be and made them more critical of what was.

The School Desegregation Workshop as a Leadership Training Model

The Supreme Court decision of May, 1954 was very explicit in its conclusion that "in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place." The decision, however, which ordered an end to segregation in the public schools offered no procedures of deadlines. How and when desegregation was to occur was left to local authorities and initiative. In the midst of a white South largely determined to resist or delay action as long as possible and a Negro South largely unaccustomed to assuming any leadership role within the total community, the Highlander Folk School held its series of integrated residential workshops on the desegregation of schools. They were, as has been indicated, the first such workshops in the South with the objective of preparing local leadership to carry out the Supreme Court decision in their various communities.

In several ways these workshops on school desegregation achieved their objective. They managed to assist the school desegregation process in a number of Southern communities, however slowly; to develop, test and revise practical materials such as A Guide to Community Action which were widely distributed and used and to prepare a number of Southern Negro and white community leaders, socially and psychologically not only to work together for desegregated schools but to live together in a desegregated society.

Because of the effectiveness of this series of workshops at the several levels, they represent a workable leadership training model which should be useful to other institutions and organizations in the South. There are at least four major reasons, analysis would indicate, that the model has proved a workable one:

1) the immediate social relevance of the workshop's educational objective which was defined in relation to urgent social needs of a given time, region and group of people;

2) the kinds of participants selected, who, although they represented a wide variety of ages and socio-economic and educational backgrounds, were all working with some local church, labor union, civil rights or community organization to change community patterns of segregation;

3) the several kinds of learning experiences offered including the opportunity for participants to think through their problems and develop specific but flexible plans for coping with them and to live and participate in a variety of social, educational and work activities within a "desegregated" residential community; and

4) the functional relationship between the outcomes of one workshop and the planning and agenda of the next--whereby a group of participants in one workshop served as an advisory committee for the next; the materials produced by a given workshop were a resource for the following workshop and participants who, like Esau Jenkins or Mrs. Rosa Parks, assumed major leadership roles in their communities became staff and resource persons, sharing their experiences and insights.

A GUIDE
TO
COMMUNITY ACTION

For Public School Integration

HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL
MONTEAGLE TENNESSEE

CONTENTS

A GUIDE TO COMMUNITY ACTION

WORKING TOWARD PUBLIC SCHOOL INTEGRATION

The Supreme Court has directed that a "prompt and reasonable start" be made to eliminate all segregation in Public Schools. Since local city and county school authorties are primarily responsible, interested citizens and community groups should find out what plans are being made for desegregation. If there are no plans or if there are unsatisfactory plans you may find that some of these suggestions for group action can be adapted to your situation. All are based on actual experiences of community groups in the South.

THE BEGINNING GROUP

A small group of people who are seriously concerned about working for public school desegregation meets informally in someone's home. There may be as few as two persons or as many as six or eight who start the original group. It is most desirable that this be an integrated group, but if this is not possible, start with what you have. Plan to integrate your group as quickly as possible. The group will begin to enlarge itself by drawing in other interested individuals. Enough members must meet fairly regularly to carry the continuity of the program decided upon.

It is likely that some of the people in the group will be members of organizations such as Parent-Teacher Association, League of Women Voters, United Church Women, National Association For the Advancement of Colored People, Young Women's Christian Association and the Southern Regional Council. In some communities there will be several of these organizations which are publicly committed to support school desegregation.

The object to the group is to get the eventual support of these organizations for the various steps leading toward desegregation. The League of Women Voters, for instance, may agree to work toward strengthening school tenure laws so that

teacher integration will not mean loss of jobs for qualified teachers of any race or color. The PTA may agree to support interracial seminars and discussion groups for teachers to better prepare them for understanding each other and for handling mixed classes of children. The NAACP may feel that its job is to develop better understanding among its own members as well as to see to it that the local school board does not evade its legal responsibilities. As soon as you have three or four such organizations agreeing to work on problems related to school desegregation your group is ready to form a Joint Committee.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE

The term "Joint Committee" is one which was developed out of the experience of citizen groups working over a period of years in such places as Washington, D. C., and Knoxville, Tennessee, and is used here to describe this type of community activity.

What Is Its Purpose?

To bring about prompt and orderly desegregation of public schools through maximum support from existing community organizations.

To stimulate cooperation among all groups for the continued improvement of the public school system before, during and after the transition period.

Who Are Its Members?

A Joint Committee consists for the most part of people who are active members of a wide variety of community organizations such as churches, unions, League of Women Voters, NAACP, PTA, Urban League and Civic Clubs. In addition there may be individual members who can contribute actively to the planning and work of the Joint Committee even though they do not represent an organization. Just as the original informal group starts with a few people, the Joint Committee can start with the support of only a few organizations and add to its membership as it goes along.

How Does It Function?

The Joint Committee works as a fact-finding and educational group, offering services, acting as a clearing house for infor-

mation and drawing up specific statements and plans for action to be submitted to participating organizations. It issues no statements, seeks no publicity and takes no action in its own name. It does not attempt to take away power or prestige from existing organizations but rather is set up to coordinate and supplement their efforts.

Joint Committee members from existing organizations should be specifically authorized to represent their organizations. It should be made very clear, however, that organizations do not commit themselves to any policy or course of action by designating a member to represent them on the Joint Committee. They may decide to endorse or act upon some of the Joint Committee's recommendations and to reject others.

Once a statement of policy or a plan of action has been decided upon by the Joint Committee, copies of the proposed plan should be mailed to each member. He in turn is responsible for presenting it to his organization for consideration.

A deadline should be set for the organizations to arrive at a decision on the proposal and to reply to the secretary of the Joint Committee. The secretary then issues a statement, signed *not* by individuals but in the name of all organizations which have given approval.

When personal action is to be taken by members of the Joint Committee, such as a conference with school board member, each person speaks as an individual or as a representative of his own organization, *not* as a Joint Committee member.

Most Joint Committees will naturally have a few energetic, devoted persons who attend most of the meetings and assume responsibility for making plans; others will attend meetings when subjects of special interest are discussed. This should not prevent the Joint Committee from working and planning ahead, on the basis of majority agreement among members present. On the other hand, less active members should not be permitted to fall by the wayside. Notify all members of Joint Committee meetings by post card or telephone. Larger groups may send out a simple newsletter, or copies of the

meeting's minutes to all its members. But every effort should be made to keep in close personal contact with all the members, by visits or phone call.

Be on the lookout for more organizations to participate in the Joint Committee. You should draw leadership to share in the planning and carrying out of the work from as many organizations as possible. As new members join the group, plan some job that they can perform. Encourage them to assume responsibility, and to use their own methods and ideas.

SUGGESTED LINES OF ACTION

Some of the following suggestions can be used by the informal beginning group as well as by the Joint Committee.

Get the Facts

A good first step for your committee is to get the facts on schools in your community. Visit classrooms, talk with teachers, students and parents about sanitation, heating and fire protection. Find out how large the classes are and whether school buses are overcrowded. Present these facts to your city or county officials and to members of your board of education. Give comparative figures between white and Negro schools. Explain how both white and Negro children suffer because of segregation. Point out the costliness of a dual system in terms of quality of education as well as size of school budget and ask the school board to consider the psychological disadvantages of segregation to all children.

Understand the Board of Education

Who are its members? What are the factions? Who are the most sympathetic members and to what degree? What is the relationship between the board and the superintendent? Find and use the means available for contact with the board in order to keep informed and to let them know that citizens are interested. Attend board meetings. Find out what the rules are about citizens speaking at board meetings and consider how you may effectively use the privilege. Make repeated personal visits and contacts with board members. Make oral presentations and write letters to the board.

Work for A Better Board of Education

If your board members are elec' d, organize a slate of candidates whom you feel can do the best job. If the board is appointed, work with the appointing agent and bring public pressure to bear. You need people of integrity who are interested in school problems. It is very important to have Negro representation if you are to plan intelligently for the integration of races. Active citizen support at the polls is essential if you are to have good school board officials.

WHAT TO SAY TO SCHOOL BOARD

Make some or all of the following suggestions to your school board. Be flexible and ready to change your emphasis as the situation develops.

Submit to the board, for its adoption, a statement of basic policies which should govern desegregation plans. The statement should specify that both pupil assignment and all personnel management should be carried out without regard to race. (Highlander workshop statement available).

Gather information on the mechanics of successful desegregation in other areas and share your findings with the board members.

Present facts on teacher loads, number of shifts, travel time and distances to show that some children are being discriminated against.

Arrange workshops or seminars for public school teachers where they may work together in seeing the role of teachers in an integrated school system and the responsibility of the teacher in affecting attitudes. Work this out with school officials and secure their cooperation. Assistance can be secured from human relations agencies and from colleges and universities.

In some communities lay groups, or citizens' advisory committees, are being appointed by the board of education. We recommend that such committees be interracial and that they include no one who is a "yes-man", or whose job or financial security might be placed in jeopardy as a result of the committee's actions. All members should be committed to accomplishing desegregation in as prompt and orderly a manner as possible. Citizens' advisory committee meetings

should be open to the public and interested people and organizations should be invited to participate. A citizens' committee can help to take pressure off the school board and permit it to act more constructively. It may help in gaining public understanding and acceptance of the desegregation plan.

Cooperate with agencies such as NAACP when the school board is being petitioned by parents to admit Negro children or when legal action is necessary.

Work with non-administrative organizations concerned with school policy and educational excellence. PTA's should be urged to meet together interracially even if immediate organizational merging is impossible. State and local color bars should be removed and PTA organizations integrated all the way up. Promote integration of teachers' activities and professional associations. (Future Teachers of America, National Education Association, etc.)

BUILDING PUBLIC SUPPORT

Some suggested ideas to stress are:

"We have a responsibility to implement the Supreme Court decision."

"We can have a better school system after we integrate."

"Experience shows that desegregation is a feasible and constructive experience."

"We cannot solve these severe problems without desegregation."

"Desegregation is more effectively accomplished in a single step than in a series of steps with delays in between."

Be willing to change the emphasis of your message as developments occur. Work with the press. Encourage emphasis on school news. Get to know the reporters who will have the most to do with school news. You can often give them leads to information which will help them to get good stories. Talk with editors and editorial writers. Issue press releases action you have agreed upon.

Radio and TV stations will give some free time for programs in the public interest. Interpretations of the meaning of the court decision, the story of local school conditions, reports on the experience of desegregation, discussions by students themselves—these and other ideas which you will have can make excellent programs. Discussions of integration can be included in programs on human relations, mental health, and child development.

Help other groups find speakers and materials. Offer to come to their meetings to make a report on what you are doing.

Build a mailing list of interested persons including leaders in organizations, ministers, and other active people. You can send out reports of projects, facts about the schools, and announcements of any meetings to which the public is invited. You may want to send out a regular bulletin or newsletter or distribute important printed material.

Select projects which you are able to do. Do not expect that you can do all of these things at once or that all will be equally effective. Use the talent you have and the channels available to you.

In anticipation of the 1954 Supreme Court ruling on Public Schools, Highlander planned early in 1953 a series of workshops to develop plans for an orderly transition from segregated to integrated schools.

A "Guide To Action" was first drafted by parents, teachers, clergymen, industrial workers and farmers who gathered at Highlander for a five week workshop during the summer of 1953. Experiences reported at similar worshops in 1954 and 1955 have been incorporated in this revised edition of a "Guide To Action." Each suggestion is based on methods that have demonstrated their value in one or more Southern communities.

These workshops have been made possible by individual contributions and by grants from the Field Foundation, Inc.

HIGHLANDER FOLK SCHOOL
October 1, 1955

HIGHLANDER

Highlander Folk School, chartered in 1932 for "adult education, the training of rural and industrial leaders and general academic education", keeps open house in the Tennessee mountains for people and ideas. Adults, without reference to color, religion, schooling [illegible] economic status gather here thro[illegible] the year. Students and teachers live [illegible]normally in half a dozen houses around a lake. Here they study, discuss and plan how best to meet the challenging social, educational and economic problems confronting individuals and communities in the South.

Highlander Folk School
Monteagle, Tennessee

TRAINING LEADERS FOR CITIZENSHIP SCHOOLS

OUTLINE OF TRAINING WORKSHOP

(one week in length)

Sunday

Teachers and supervisors arrive in the afternoon, register at the main building, and are assigned to living quarters.

6:30 Dinner (same hour every evening)

8:00-10:00

Singing
Introductions
Presentation of the Citizenship School Idea

Following the singing period of about twenty minutes, participants will be asked to introduce themselves, and tell something about the communities from which they come.

A Highlander staff member or a consultant will present the Citizenship School idea, explaining how it originated, and how it is related to the total community.

The Citizenship School is a new kind of school, where adults learn how to help themselves and their neighbors to become first class citizens, and to use their voting power effectively for realizing the opportunities of citizenship. The process of "citizenship" is learned and practiced with the learning of reading and writing which is the first step in making citizenship possible. Learning and purpose for learning go hand in hand.

Participants will be given an opportunity to ask questions.

At the close of the program participants will sign up for voluntary duties of serving meals and washing dishes.

Monday

Demonstration Classes* in
The Citizenship School Idea
Reading (taught as Voting and Registration)
Voluntary Skill Period
Singing
Review of Content for Citizenship Schools

9:00-10:30

Demonstration Class The Citizenship School Idea *

The leader (a Highlander staff member or a consultant) will take the role of teacher. Using the content of the Sunday evening presentation, he will question the participants on the understanding they now have of the Citizenship School, its background and specific purposes, its relationship to the community as a whole, and its way of relating learning to community action.

The importance of the vote will be emphasized as key to civic opportunities (i.e. job opportunities, legal rights, tax supported services, use of public transport, integration of schools, etc.)

The leader will emphasize the importance of literacy as basic in securing and using the vote effectively. For this reason literacy is basic to the Citizenship School plan, and reading and writing are learned in terms of Citizenship, first of all voting and registration.

(This class is one which can give supervisors and teachers an idea of how an introductory class in the local Citizenship School might be handled.)

10:30 Coffee Break (same time every morning)

During the break the teachers and supervisors will be asked to write down one or two questions, or points that need further clarification, about the Citizenship School idea, and to hand them to the leader before the 11:00 session begins.

11:00-12:30

The group will review and criticize the demonstration class. Using questions handed in, the leader will guide participants to clarify and sharpen the focus of the first two sessions.

*These are the only demonstration classes offered during the week.

[illegible] (every day)

[illegible]

Demonstration Class in Reading (taught re: Voting and Registration)

This class illustrates the Citizenship School method, and shows that what is learned must go hand in hand with the purpose for which it is being learned.

In the registration class the subject matter is voting and registration, and the lesson in reading is tied directly with the voting process, which is the first step in exercising responsibilities of full citizenship. (In this respect the concept of the Citizenship School differs from that of many literacy education programs.)

The demonstration class is one which might take place several weeks after the students have begun to learn reading in the local Citizenship School.

The text for the lesson is the voting and registration requirement, which includes in most states a difficult literacy test. The students will learn to read and to understand the test, with the idea of going on registration day to try to pass the test and become registered voters.

Ordinarily it would take years to learn to read well enough to pass this test, deliberately made difficult for purposes of keeping Negroes from voting. But adults who are motivated by a determination to become citizens, can learn fast, and some classes are ready within a month's time for the reading lesson on voting.

After an introduction of this kind the Highlander leader will take the role of teacher, and will conduct the reading class exactly as he would do it in a local Citizenship School.

4:00-[illegible] Free Time (every afternoon at this time)

Voluntary Skill Period

Participants will be taught how to operate tape recorders, record players, film and slide projectors. Records, tapes and films which have been tested in Highlander schools will be used for practice.

8:00-10:00

Singing
Review of Content for Citizenship Schools

The singing period, which will be a part of every evening session, has two purposes. First of all it is for pleasure. Second, it demonstrates ways in which group singing can be used and taught in the local schools. Familiar songs will be sung, and there will be practice in song leading. Singing, with the use of song sheets, also gives valuable practice in reading.

Following the singing period the Highlander leader will review informally the various subjects which have been taught and used in Citizenship Schools. He will show how reading, writing and arithmetic are learned as tools in the process of learning and assuming civic responsibility.

This session is meant to fill in further the picture teachers and supervisors have of the three-month school term, and to emphasize again the interdependency of content learned and purpose for learning it--i.e. citizenship responsibility.

Tuesday

Arrangements for Classes
The Time for the Class
The Place for the Class
Materials and Texts
Voluntary Skill Period
Role Playing on Arrangements for Classes
Speaker on Current World Events

9:00-10:30

The Time for the Class

Class groups number about 20 persons. There may be as many as four classes in a given school, and as many as three or four schools in a given area, working under one supervisor. Each class has its own teacher, and room.

The school lasts three (consecutive) months. Employment, climate, means of transportatio , etc., will be factors in determining the time of year.

Classes are held two evenings a week, and are two hours long. Days of week and time of day for class will depend on type and time of employment of prospective students. The supervisor needs to have his area classes scheduled so that he can visit all of them in the same week.

11:00-12:30

The Place for the Class

Discussion will be held on proper size for the room; heat, light, convenience of location, etc., and also the kind of public or private building which might be utilized. This may be a school, church, community building, club house, place of business, or even a private home.

Teachers and supervisors will be advised about making contacts with community leaders to get help in finding such places, and arranging for their use.

Suggestions will be made about ways of securing equipment such as tables, straight chairs, blackboards, etc.

At the end of the session each teacher and supervisor will be asked to begin making a plan for the arrangement of his own schools and classes, and to include in it, from day to day, plans for procedure which he will initiate when he returns to his community. These will be handed to the Highlander leader before the end of the week, or discussed with him, in preparation for the oral presentation which the participant will make of his plan, on the final day.

2:00-4:00

Materials and Texts

Teachers will be given samples, and told how and where to order in proper quantities, the materials needed for classwork. These are writing pads, pencils, cardboard cut in proper sizes, etc.

Text materials will be displayed, including state registration requirements and literacy tests, with explanations of level of instruction represented in each one.

4:00-6:00

Free Time
Voluntary Skill Period

8:00-10:00

Role Playing on Arrangements for Classes
Speaker on Current World Events

Following the singing period, the arrangements for classes will be reviewed through role playing. The session will serve as a reminder to the group that they are now preparing for the final presentation of plans on Friday afternoon.

At this time an outside speaker may be introduced. He will be prepared for this particular audience, and will speak on some aspect of current world events. A discussion will follow.

The Highlander leader will show how the same kind of plan may be used in the Citizenship School program.

Wednesday

Determining the Instruction Level of Students
Class Programming
Practice in Planning a Program
Voluntary Skill Period
Use of the Educational Film

9:00-10:30

Determining the Instruction Level of Students

A discussion will be held on how the teacher can find, through individual conference and testing with simpler and then more advanced material, the level of learning of each student, and how to divide the class into beginning and advanced groups.

11:00-12:30

Class Programming

By describing in detail the procedure in a typical evening class, the Highlander leader will show the teacher how to plan a program for a class in his local school.

The program will include the opening general session, with suggestions about what content to include; and it will show the way in which beginners and advanced students work in separate groups, but with the same teacher, on their different texts and workbooks.

Suggestions will be made about how to assign homework, and how to plan the closing period of the class. This will usually be a general session, with a social period, and some special feature, such as an outside speaker or documentary film.

The closing general session for the local school is important because it is the time when announcements are made of community activities, and when students are invited to assume civic responsibilities.

2:00-4:00

Practice in Planning a Program

The group will spend the afternoon making and discussing program plans, and learning, with the help of the Highlander leader, to visualize a typical class. Role playing will be used.

4:00-6:00

Free Time
Voluntary Skill Period

8:00-10:00

Use of the Educational Film

A brief educational film on Citizenship will be presented and discussed, as an example of the way in which films may be used in the local schools. Students will be given lists of appropriate films, and told how to order them.

Thursday

Area Schedules
Record Keeping
Recruiting Students for Schools
Voluntary Skill Period
Review of Recruiting Session

9:00-10:30

Area Schedules

Each supervisor will be helped to make out a tentative schedule for all the schools and classes of his or her area, to cover the three months' period of the term. The supervisor must know exactly when and where every class is being held, and plan to visit each one as often as possible.

In addition to class schedules, special dates should be put into the term plan, for instance those on which certain movies, or speakers, may be presented to all the schools together in an area; and dates of registration days in the area. There are usually civic meetings announced several weeks ahead of time which should be included, and the closing night program for the term which will be participated in by all the schools, should be scheduled at the beginning of the term. Some dates should be set aside for teachers' meetings.

10:30-12:30

Record Keeping

The teachers are taught how to enroll students, and how to make an attendance chart which will carry, in addition to the record of attendance, other pertinent information such as age, sex, whether or not the student is registered to vote, and if so his registration number, etc.

2:00-4:00

Recruiting Students for Schools

Recruitment should be limited to those individuals who have already expressed interest in self-improvement.

One method of recruiting always available is the personal visit with the interested individual. Those who have attended civic meetings, and have indicated willingness to be on the roster of prospective students will be called on personally by the supervisor or teacher.

Leaders of civic organizations may help with recruitment, as well as support the schools by publicizing them in public meetings. Local ministers may help in the same way, and supervisors and teachers may be given opportunities in church services to interpret the program and to secure additions to the roster of prospective students.

Interested leaders, ministers, and church workers may also assist the supervisor in making personal calls, and students will urge others to become students. Recruiting sometimes becomes the service of a great many persons, but the supervisor is the person behind the recruitment program.

It is well to have handbills and announcement fliers to use in meetings, and to leave in homes where visits are made. Although the newspaper and radio have had some use in publicizing the Citizenship Schools, it is wise to avoid such publicity until the schools are well established in the community.

4:00-6:00

Free Time
Voluntary Skill Period

8:00-10:00

Singing
Review of Recruiting Session

Following the singing period the rest of the evening will be used for role playing typical situations which are likely to arise in the various aspects of recruiting, as discussed in the afternoon session.

The home visit may be acted out, or a talk with an official of a civic club, or with a newspaper editor.

One group may prepare sample announcements and handbills which might be used for distribution.

Role plays will be discussed and criticized.

Friday

Determining the Level of Community Experience
Presentation of Plans for Follow-Up
Closing Banquet

9:00-10:30

Determining the Level of Community Experience

This session is meant to lead the group into a discussion of wider civic activities in which the Citizenship School should be involved.

Organizations now existing in communities, and which support integration, will be discussed. Some of these may be Negro organizations, some bi-racial. Some are affiliations of national bodies, some are local. The Citizenship School is a co-operating organization.

Personal experience with integration will be discussed, and supervisors and teachers will explore the depth and extent of their own commitment to integration and what they may expect of their students.

The group will be asked to include plans for civic action in the presentations they have been outlining for discussion on the final afternoon.

11:00-12:30

Participants will have time for study and individual conference with Highlander leaders and consultants in working out the presentations for action which they will make in the afternoon session.

2:00-4:00

Presentation of Follow-Up Plans

Students will present the plans which they have been making during the week. These will show the ideas teachers and supervisors now have, for what they will do in their own communities, and how they will use what they have learned in the training week.

This form of review has three purposes: first, it gives the student the experience of "talking out" some of his ideas, and forces him to clarify them for himself as well as for others; second, it affords the student the benefit of the group's reaction and suggestions, as well as their approval and support; third, it produces, in the student, a feeling of having made a commitment, in the presence of his peers.

4:00-6:00

Preparation for Closing Banquet

Participants will learn some of the details which make these occasions attractive, for example how to decorate tables, and arrange the room, and how to make use of out-door materials for decorating.

6:30

Closing Banquet

This time the week will be reviewed in role playing and skits.

[illegible] Monteagle, Tennessee

QUESTIONNAIRE ON COMMUNITY BACKGROUND

FOR TRAINING WORKSHOP

1. Information affecting mechanics of schools

Considering problems arising from seasonal employment, etc., what three-month calendar period is best suited for the schools in your area?

(List schools and months as follows:
Promise Land -- January, February, March
Edisto -- December, January, February)

Considering hours when people work on jobs, what hours are best for classes in your area?

(List schools and hours as follows:
Promise Land -- 7:00-9:00 P.M.
Edisto -- 3:00-5:00 P.M.)

Does there exist in any communities of your area, a problem about finding a place of meeting, or about meeting publicly, on account of community disapproval, Negro or white? Explain.

2. Information affecting content of courses.

What are the requirements for voting in your area?

1.

2.

3.

Is there a literacy test?
Yes___No___

If so, is illiteracy a serious problem?
Yes___No___

Is registration, providing requirements can be met, made difficult?

Yes___No___

If so, is it because of harassment or intimidation? Explain.

By forcing Negroes to wait, closing polls, etc.? Explain.

Because of timidity, or lack of knowledge about how to go about it? Explain.

Are there any agencies or movements in your community actively at work to increase Negro voting? Explain.

Is there any white cooperation in increasing the Negro vote? Explain.

ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

June 1963 - June 1964

Number of persons trained 502

Number of states represented 12

Number of classes conducted after training 413

Number of persons in classes 6,581

Number of persons registered 25,963
(Students and others influenced by Citizenship Training)

NUMBER TRAINED AT FIVE-DAY WORKSHOP

Dates	Students
June 17 - 21, 1963	57
August 19 - 23	65
September 16 - 20	36
November 18 - 22	68
January 6 - 10, 1964 (Penn Center)	43
February 17 - 21	63
March 23 - 27	46
April 27 - May 1	36
June 15 - 19 (Bricks)	42
June 22 - 26	46
	502

NUMBER ATTENDING REFRESHER COURSE

Dates	Students
August 16 - 18, 1963	52
January 3 - 5, 1964	35
	87

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS PER STATE

Alabama	44
Arkansas	8
Florida	7
Georgia	75
Louisiana	32
Mississippi	82
North Carolina	64
South Carolina	132
Tennessee	21
Texas	6
Vermont	11
Virginia	20
	502

NUMBER OF CLASSES CONDUCTED (STATE & COUNTY)

State & County	Classes
Alabama	
Calhoun	2
Dallas	4
Etowah	7
Jefferson	9
Montgomery	4
Perry	7
	33

Arkansas	
Clark	4
Georgia	
Bibb	3
Chatham	20
Dougherty	4
Emanuel	18
Jefferson	2
Lee	2
Muscogee	2
Richmond	2
Tatnall	13
Telfair	5
	71
Louisiana	
Caddo	5
Calcasieu	3
Rosedale	1
Rapides	1
	10
Mississippi	
Bolivar	7
Coahoma	4
Forrest	6
Holmes	7
Leakes	3
Leflore	43
Madison	1
Oklibbeha	1
Sunflower	1
Washington	4
	77
North Carolina	
Bertie	1
Craven	4
Onslow	1
	6

	3
	2
	7
	1
	3
Charleston	4
	1
	2
	2
	3
	1
	2
	8
	6
	10
	1
	5
	21
	3
	15
	3
	10
	3
	116

	1
	3
	3
	4
	11

Texas

	2

Virginia

	5
	4
Pittsylvania	15
	3
	27

OTHER ACTIVITIES [illegible] MEMBERS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES

[illegible]

1 Transp[illegible] People to the Courthouse

6 Recruit[illegible]

4 Financial Support to Civil Rights Organizations

2 Organizing Secret Societies

2 Informing [illegible] of Legal Rights (i.e. Unlawful Arrest)

3 Awakening of Awareness of Good Citizenship

15 Helping [illegible] Get Social Security

12 Helping Widows & Disabled Persons Receive Pensions & Welfare Aid

2 Seeking the Help of Businessmen to Encourage Better Business Transactions

4 Encouraging Ministers & Teachers to Participate in Civil Rights Struggle

6 Instruction on Civil Rights Bill

4 Encouraging Negroes to Seek Better Jobs

1 Assisting in School Desegregation

2 Assisting [illegible]

3 Teaching [illegible] to Sign Own Checks

1 Setting up Committee to Implement Civil Rights Bill

1 Sponsoring Educational Trips

6 Community Work

2 National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

6 Work in Mississippi Project on Registration

1 Seeking [illegible] for Community

8 Seeking [illegible] Streets for Community

[illegible] Action

[illegible] Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)

[illegible] Community Clean-Up Drive

4 Recreation Programs

2 Volunteer Hospital Work

25 Participation in Demonstrations

3 Organizing Citizenship Clubs

2 Discouraging School Drop-Outs

1 Encouraging Military to Participate in Civil Rights Movements

3 Working in Mississippi Summer Project

2 Attending Classes in Mississippi Summer Project

1 Bail Bond Solicitor

1 Deputy Registrar in Freedom Registration

6 Work in Food & Clothing Project for COFO in Mississippi

1 Help Elect Persons for Public Office

9 Attending Precinct Meetings

15 Negotiate with City Officials

PART II

THE 22ND ANNUAL INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS, 1965,

AN ADULT EDUCATION PROJECT OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST AND

FISK UNIVERSITY

Historical Background of the 1965 Institute

"To Stem This Tide": The Founding of the Institute

Shortly before he founded the Institute on Race Relations, Dr. Charles S. Johnson, with a group of colleagues in the social sciences at Fisk University, published a summary of racial tension areas in the United States entitled, To Stem This Tide.[1]

As a man deeply concerned about the tension and conflict which were sweeping the nation during World War II, he took action in two far-reaching ways "to stem this tide": he helped establish the Race Relations Department of the American Missionary Association as a national service and research agency of that century-old organization in 1942 and, in 1944, he founded within the Department, the Race Relations Institute.

In describing the social crisis context in which the Institute was founded, its present director, Dr. Herman Long, who was a staff member of the first Institute, stated:

---

[1]Charles S. Johnson and Associates, To Stem This Tide (Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1943).

> It was a period of race riots all over the country and widely spread racial rumors. There was hardly a major American community that did not expect a riot. It differed from the present situation largely because the preceeding years had not been years of forward movement. No single major advance had taken place and we were caught in the throes of war, fighting against Nazi ideology and power, while at the same time, at home we were guilty of a widespread, unchanged situation of race exploitation. . . .It was a period when the American community was seriously divided and when there were no constructive theories on which to base programs of reform. . . . There was a need to find the basic policies and programs which were essential for change. There was a need to discover both the small and the big things which community leaders would be able to do in order to assist change.[1]

In early statements regarding the role and objectives of the Institute on Race Relations, Dr. Johnson stressed both the sharing of knowledge on race relations problems and the development of leadership to deal with those problems. Thus, he wrote in the Forward to the report on the Second Annual Institute in 1945:

> There have been few places where the accumulated wisdom and experience in this field could be made available to students of the problem and persons interested in providing themselves a secure background for intelligent action.[2]

And in the same forward, he stated:

> One of its objectives has been to train new leadership for dealing intelligently with problems of group relations and for public education in this field.[3]

---

[1]Recorded response to interview questions by Dr. Herman Long, August, 1966.

[2]Charles S. Johnson, "Foreward," Race Relations in Human Relations, Summary Report, Second Annual Institute of Race Relations, Fisk University. (Nashville, Tenn.: Race Relations Dept., American Missionary Association, 1945), p. i. (Mimeographed.)

[3]Ibid.

Again, in 1949 in his keynote address to Institute participants, he spoke in terms of a dual purpose: "To develop sufficient understanding and to devise ways of dealing with these issues constructively and soundly."[1]

Thus, although he himself was a distinghished scholar, Chairman of the Department of Social Science of Fisk University and subsequently President of the University, he was never satisfied with achieving or helping others to achieve merely an academic understanding of racial problems. His conern for knowledge, for understanding, was always coupled with a concern for helping to find workable solutions. And, it should be added, he was convinced that such solutions could be found. "It is no more impossible to correct civil malpractice in Alabama and Georgia," he emphasized in addressing the Institute, "than it is to eliminate gangsterism in Chicago or remove the influence of Tammany from New York politics."[2]

To achieve the Institute's broad academic and social objective, two basic kinds of formal learning experiences were offered, lectures and discussions, along with various opportunities for informal learning within the residential situation. Of the formal aspects of the curriculum, Dr. Johnson explained:

> During the class hours, as they might be called, successive topics were in turn presented by an authority, discussed by a panel of experts, and threshed out by the membership-at-large.[3]

---

[1] Human Rights and Human Relations, A Report of Discussions of the Fifth Annual Institute of Race Relations, Fisk University (Nashville, Tenn.: Race Relations Dept., American Missionary Association, 1948), p. 11. (Mimeographed.)

[2] Ibid.

[3] Race Relations in Human Relations, p. ii

Out of this "threshing out," in large and small group discussions, early reports indicate, conclusions emerged which represented "to an extraordinary degree . . . a consensus not only as to facts but as to the action needed."[1]

Significantly, the founder and early planners of the Institute were as concerned with the kinds of informal residential experiences enjoyed by participants as with the caliber of the lecturers and the intellectual rigor of the discussion which followed. "No less important than the intensive course of study and discussion," Dr. Johnson stated, "was the opportunity provided, outside of class hours, for informal and friendly association, for the enjoyment of music and poetry and for the fellowship of men and women of like interests even though of different racial backgrounds."[2]

In order to appreciate the value placed on the social group experience, with some ninty Institute members "varied in background, in age, in sex, in occupation, as well as in race"[3] living, studying and working together for three weeks, one must view it as Dr. Johnson and his staff did, in the context of the racially troubled time. In this context, the fact of a group of concerned Negroes and whites from the North and South coming together in a residential setting for an extended time was of social and educational significance as well as the race relations focus on their deliberations.

---

[1] Ibid., ii-iii.

[2] Ibid., p. iii.

[3] Ibid., p. ii.

The Institute Over Two Decades: Changing Themes and Problems, Unchanging Excellence of Speakers and Resource Persons

Over the two decades following the founding of the Race Relations Institute, many research and problem areas and many kinds of public and private programs for change were examined. Year by year, the emphasis and the focus changed.

Thus, the first and early Institutes placed considerable emphasis on race and race theories; on the sociological background of race relations and on psychological aspects of race conflict and prejudice, looking primarily to social science research for their knowledge and insights. These same Institutes, in their consideration of promising programs and techniques for change focused, in large part, on the efforts of private institutions and organizations.

More recent Institutes have been concerned, increasingly, with political, economic and legal problems and processes for change and, they have drawn upon the knowledge and experience not only of the academic community but of various agencies of government and of civil rights organizations. At the same time, the kinds of programs and techniques for change considered have moved from an emphasis on private to an emphasis on public policies and programs.

Similarly, the themes of the Institute have reflected the growth in knowledge, the broadening of social perspective regarding the nature and significance of what white Americans, in a simpler more hierarchical society and state of mind, referred to as "the race problem." Thus, an early theme of the Race Relations Institute was "Race Relations in Human Relations"[1]

---

[1]Second, Third and Fourth Annual Institutes of Race Relations, 1945, 1946 and 1947.

followed by "Human Relations and Human Rights"[1] and, in turn, by "Implementing Civil Rights."[2] In the second decade, the broadening focus of concern and responsibility was suggested by such themes as "Human Values and Public Policy"[3] and "Human Rights And The Public Interest."[4] Throughout the years, a perusal of annual reports would indicate, one element remained unchanged: the continuing excellence of the speakers and resource persons who addressed themselves to the various subjects and themes, whether as scholars or as representatives of public and private agencies and groups working for change.[5]

---

[1]Fifth Annual Institute of Race Relations, 1948.

[2]Sixth Annual Institute of Race Relations, 1949.

[3]Eighteenth Annual Institute of Race Relations, 1961.

[4]Nineteenth Annual Institute of Race Relations, 1962.

[5]Thus, in early years, distinguished social scientists included anthropoligists Robert Redfield and M.F. Ashley-Montague; sociologists Ira DeA. Reid and Louis Wirth; and psychologists Gordon Allport and Kenneth Clark. Those presenting programs and techniques included Will Alexander of the Rosenwald Fund, Lester Granger of the Urban League and Robert C. Weaver of the American Council on Race Relations.

And, in recent years, the lecturers on legal problems and precesses, for example, have included not only the director of the Race Relations Law Reporter, Vanderbilt University, but Attorneys Thurgood Marshall and Constance Baker Motley of the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund. And those considering programs for change have included, along with such respected members of the academic community as Director Dan Dodson of the Human Relations Center, New York University and manpower specialist Eli Ginsburg of Columbia University, less known and authoritative administrators and specialists from such public agencies as the Kentucky Commission on Human Relations, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, the Federal Housing Administration and the Puerto Rican Department of Labor.

The Institute lectures deserve to be compiled and their contents analyzed, year by year, for their significance as records of an important period in American race relations history, for the valuable body of research knowledge which they contain and for the authoritative information on a variety of programs and techniques for change represented, the accumulated social wisdom and experience of more than two decades.

This project, however, as an adult education study, is concerned primarily with examining one specific Institute, the 1965 Institute, as an example of a racially integrated residential adult education program for the training of civil rights and community leaders in the South.

Description and Analysis of the 1965 Institute: "Human Rights in the Great Society"

Its Unchanged Social-Educational Purpose

The 1965 Institute, "Human Rights in the Great Society," both in statements by its director and staff and in descriptive materials, make explicit its continuity of function and underlying purpose with the first Institute in 1944. In keeping with Dr. Charles Johnson's emphasis on knowledge for social use, the Institute continued to be concerned with making available the "accumulated wisdom and experience" toward developing the "leadership for dealing intelligently with problems of group relations."[1]

The director of the Institute, Dr. Herman Long, explains that "The purposes have not changed because the nature of the situation in America remains largely

---

[1] Johnson, Race Relations in Human Relations, Summary, Second Annual Institute, p. i.

the same in spite of the great amount of change which has taken place." He states:

> Our purpose, therefore, is still that of bringing information and orientation to community leaders both in the sense of presenting organized facts and information as well as bringing before community leaders the widening range of implementing programs now at hand . . . .[1]

The announcement of the 1965 Race Relations Institute alluding to the Institute's efforts "since its beginnings" to "relate the knowledge and theoretical insights developed by the social sciences to practical problems for breaking down the barriers and removing the inequalities," re-states as the fundamental purpose of its educational program "to orient these actual and potential community leaders to the problems, processes and methods of implementing better intergroup relations."

Its Participants, Homogeneous in Age and Social Class Background

The "actual and potential community leaders" who attended the 1965 Institute included some one-hundred fifty resident members, Negro and white, from various parts of the North and South, somewhat over half from the South,[2] the largest part of these from Tennessee and other Upper South and border states, but a total of twenty-three from Deep South states and a small group from Florida.

---

[1] Long, Recorded Interview.

[2] Seventy-one or about 43% were from Northern states; eighty or about 57% were from Southern and border states.

In terms of age and socio-economic background, the Institute members were notably homogeneous being primarily, as one member expressed it, "a middle-class and middle-aged group" with teachers, churchwomen[1] and ministers, in that order, predominating but including some social workers, intergroup agency staff members and government personnel and a scattering of persons of other occupations including several students, writers and office workers.[2]

The Kinds of Learning Experiences:

Lectures, Clinics and Integrated Residential Living

As in the past, the 1965 Institute proposed to accomplish its dual purpose of sharing knowledge and training local leaders, first, by means of a series of morning and evening lectures by social scientists, agency specialists and others examining persisting social problems and describing current programs of "the Great Society" and, second, by means of afternoon clinic groups, an Employment Clinic, a Community Action Clinic and a Clinic on Church and Race, where participants could discuss problems of special concern and their experiences in dealing with them.

---

[1]Although churchwomen had been participants in all of the previous Institutes, along with teachers, ministers, social workers and others, it was only beginning in 1962 that the United Church Women as an organization arranged to have its members from various parts of the country attend the Institute in preparation for carrying out their national "Assignment:Race" program. Twenty-six women representing local councils attended the 1965 Institute.

[2]There were four persons who could be classified as skilled workers.

The Institute in 1965 continued to provide, as it had since its founding, an experience in integrated residential living on the Fisk University campus. However, statements of the administrative staff and descriptive materials make clear that by 1965 the Institute planners assumed a minimum of responsibility for the residential experience, for arranging social and other activities during the unscheduled hours.[1]

The Institute Lectures

Over the less than two weeks of the Institute, June 28-July 10, 1965, some thirty highly qualified lecturers offered their "knowledge and insights" on the problems, notably the economic problems of Negroes; on the problems and status of other minorities and on the processes and programs for change, legal, political and governmental.

Although, in earlier years, the first week of the Institute was devoted to problems and the second to programs and processes for change, these were interspersed in the 1965 Institute (due, no doubt, to problems of scheduling busy university faculty members and agency officials).

---

[1] In the announcement of the 1965 Institute, for example, the only mention made of residential aspects of the two week program was a reference to dormitory and eating facilities on the Fisk University campus with the added comment, "Enrollees will receive a guide to the campus and to the City of Nashville.. ."

Thus, the program for the first day,[1] for example, included:

Monday-June 28

10:00-12:00	INTRODUCTION AND KEYNOTE SPEECH Dr. Herman H. Long, Director
2:00-3:30	STRATEGIES OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION Dr. Daniel Katz, Conflict Resolution Center, University of Michigan
7:30 p.m.	THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN MINORITY The Honorable Edward R. Roybal, M.C. 30th District, California

In a broadly-drawn key-note address on "Human Rights and the Great Society,"[2] the Institute Director, Dr. Herman Long, set forth the major elements involved in the "racial revolution," in the "transformation of American public policy and practice," to be considered in subsequent lectures and discussions during the two-week Institute. He emphasized, "First and foremost, the consolidation of public policy which refuses to give sanction to racial distinction in law and which prohibits racial segregation and discrimination under the auspices of state or any other form of public authority." He cited, among other elements,

---

[1] "Program Schedule," 22nd Annual Institute of Race Relations.

[2] Herman H. Long, "Human Rights in the Great Society," Human Rights in the Great Society, A Summary Report of the 22nd Annual Institute of Race Relations, Fisk University (Nashville, Tenn.: Race Relations Dept., United Church of Christ, 1965), pp. 7-11.

the expanding process of desegregation; the role of the federal government and administration as "primary advocates of the new commitment to equality"; the growth of Negro political power on the national scene; the emergence of a wider range of Negro leadership and the evolvement by the civil rights movement of "a major new course of minority group strategy" based on nonviolent direct action and confrontation.

In defining these elements, he suggested the need for "actionists and social engineers" as he described Institute participants, "to make the best adaptation of knowledge and insight into the decisions of policy and practice in our local situations and special job performances."

Continuing Problems: "Economics and Race"

Among the problems examined by the several lecturers were the continuing economic problems confronting Negroes in the midst of national prosperity. Examining these problems were Dr. Vivian Henderson, Associate Director of the Institute, former Chairman of the Economics Department of Fisk University and President-elect of Clark College who spoke on "Economics and Race"; the Executive Secretary of the National Sharecroppers Fund and an economist from the U.S. Department of Labor.

In his analysis of the complex subject, "Economics and Race,"[1] Dr. Henderson raised the question, "What has been happening to Negro workers in a period of unprecedented prosperity?"

---

[1]Vivian W. Henderson, "Economics and Race," Ibid., pp. 12-17

He answered it by asserting:

> The hard reality is that Negroes as a group have not been making progress, and, in the absence of some rather drastic changes in employment and manpower utilization practices, and in the absence of large-scale expansion in jobs to absorb unemployed workers, there is a better than even chance that things could get worse for Negroes before they get better.

He discussed a number of reasons for this lack of progress including discrimination in education, employment and the apprenticable trades; the basic shift in the economy affecting sources of Negro employment, automation, and the losing competition of Negro workers with white females and within a growing labor market.

He documented the resulting condition with a number of statisitics on Negro family incomes (as compared to white) below the "poverty line." He also documented the widening economic gap, "the fact that Negroes as a group are losing ground in terms of average income."

Given the complexity of the problem, the solutions which Dr. Henderson proposed were equally complex. He urged that although better education for Negroes is important, in the face of continuing discrimination, "The fair employment provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act must be implemented vigorously, if education is going to mean anything to Negro youngsters."

At the same time he pointed out that to "crack the barriers of discrimination in employment" represented only a partial solution. "We must," he stated, "face the whole question of the changing economic environment." Here, he offered further statistics on Negro unemployment in relation to accelerated technological change. He predicted, in addition, "With the tremendous impact of technological change, the whole question of inequality in the field of economics may tend to move from race to class."

In closing, he underscored the importance of vigorous implementation of the Civil Rights Act and the poverty program policies by community groups and involvement of the poor themselves in these programs.

Dr. Henderson's presentation communicated in one and a half hours the economic problems of a decade affecting Negro employment and some projection of the far-reaching kinds of programs and social changes involved in bettering the situation.

When he completed his closely-packed presentation, there was little time for questions or clarification. However, his underlying message, the increasingly serious economic plight of Negro Americans, the widening gap between them and white Americans had clearly made a keen impression on his largely non-statistically-oriented audience. They were less clear perhaps about what needed to be done in changing the situation. A Negro minister, commenting afterwards, who described the lecture as "a high point" could only agree with Dr. Henderson, "We've got to raise the level."

Other Minorities: The Mexican-American Minority

Another set of problems examined were, as has been indicated, those of other minority groups. Although previous Institutes had devoted some time to the consideration of other groups, it was pointed out that never before had attention been given to the problems and changing status of such a variety of minority groups--Mexican, American Indian, Jewish, Puerto Rican and Carribean. In each case, the lecturer spoke with the authority of one who represented a major government or private agency working to improve the group's status and in all but one case, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, he was a prominent member of that group.

One of these lecturers was a Mexican-American leader, Congressman Edward Roybel of California, speaking on "The Mexican-American Minority."[1] Referring to Mexicans as "the oldest ethnic minority," Congressman Roybel described some of the problems of the Spanish-speaking minority numbering 750,000 in California and 7,500,000 in the United States. He described his own efforts and those of Saul Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation to encourage the "sleeping giant," the Mexican-American in California, to become interested in civic affairs, to register and vote and exercise the full rights of citizenship.

He emphasized the importance of the minorities, notably Mexican and Negro, working together politically. He told of some of the problems encountered in bringing them together in his Congressional District. He mentioned, for example, that the federal poverty funds had been held up in Los Angeles when Mexicans and Negroes each formulated separate programs. "In California," he stated, the minorities together "could elect a governor or at least hold the balance of power."

The question and answer period was far-flung with some West Coast Institute members raising questions about California politics and about Saul Alinsky (who was unknown to a good many) and others asking the Congressman's views on Viet Nam and Red China. Still others among Negro Institute members expressed interest in learning about the problems of other minorities. A Mississippi teacher commented later, "So often we get all bogged down in what's bugging us." A minister from Florida not only indicated interest in and sympathy for "other ethnic groups more distressed than Negroes" but stated that he had gotten the idea "of trying to communicate with Cubans in my area."

---

[1] Edward R. Roybal, "The Mexican-American Minority," Ibid., pp. 107--111

Processes and Programs for Change: "Strategies of Conflict Resolution

Well over half of the lecturers during the two weeks of the Institute presented programs or analyzed processes of and resources for change. Among these were social scientists, lawyers for the civil rights movement and organizations and officials from various departments and agencies of the Federal Government with responsibilities for implementing recently enacted legislation and policies for equal rights and opportunities.

The first of these lecturers following the opening session of the Institute was a closely-reasoned, research-oriented analysis on "Strategies of Conflict Resolution"[1] by Dr. Daniel Katz of the University of Michigan, Conflict Resolution Center. Dr. Katz presented his audience, made up primarily of churchwomen, ministers and public school teachers, with five theoretical strategies for conflict resolution: 1) power mobilization; 2) propoganda and persuasion; 3) utilization of the existing structure; 4) search for moral consensus and 5) conflict denial.

In defining these strategies, in turn, he illustrated them, drawing upon a variety of sources including the literature of social science research, foreign policy, labor-managment history, campus protests and the civil rights movement.

In evaluating the several strategies, the weaknesses and potential of each in various situations, Dr. Katz suggested that some combination of these was generally most effective "in real life."

During the brief period after the lecture, audience members, while attempting to assimilate the theoretical models and diverse applications of those

---

[1] Daniel Katz, "Strategies of Conflict Resolution," Ibid., pp. 53-57.

models, were free to ask questions of Dr. Katz. Under the circumstances, only a small number of questions were raised and some of these were too personal or too specialized to be dealt with in the time available. Among the side comments noted by this participant-observer was a suggestion made by a research-oriented intergroup agency staff person, "Let's have a discussion to talk about the . . . session and a remark by a churchwoman who complained, "I'm tired of sitting. I want some practical answers."

The Legal Processes and Civil Rights

Among the several civil rights lawyers who spoke was Attorney Jack Greenberg, Director-Counsel, N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, whose subject was "New Developments in the Legal Struggle for Civil Rights."[1] Attorney Greenberg outlined, in terms of historical-legal events, the efforts to attack the "separate but equal doctrine" over several decades culminating in the 1954 Supreme Court decision, Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. The Court, he stated, not only ruled on school segregation but "proclaimed for America once again the ideals of the Declaration of Independence . . . ."

Outlining the major direct action efforts for full civil rights since that date--the sit-ins, the freedom rides, and the Birmingham and Selma demonstrations, he asserted that the reaction underlying them "would not have occurred without the Supreme Court decision of 1954" and, in turn, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the pending 1965 Act would not have occurred without the demonstrations.

---

[1] Jack Greenberg, "New Developments in the Legal Struggle for Civil Rights," Ibid., pp. 35-40.

Turning to the legal problems of enforcing the new Civil Rights Legislation, he examined in some detail, the several provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the government's efforts to enforce them and the ways in which individuals and groups, especially in the South, have sought to evade the law. He considered especially the uses and misuses of the "federal cut-off provision" which states that "if a school, a hospital, or any other institution receives federal funds, it cannot segregate on the basis of race." He described some of the efforts of his legal staff in pressing the Federal Government to enforce such provisions.

"All of this," he concluded, "means a bigger job for government, but it also means a bigger job for the cooperating lawyers of the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense Fund as well." He emphasized the heavy burden placed on a relatively small number of Southern Negro lawyers such as two other lawyers who addressed the Institute, Attorney Avon Williams of Nashville and Attorney Peter Hall of Birmingham. "If there would be no Civil Rights Act of 1964 without demonstrations," he stated, "there also would have been no demonstrations without the civil rights lawyers. People cannot demonstrate if they are in jail," he explained, and "they also cannot demonstrate unless they have confidence that if they are acting within their rights, lawyers are going to protect them."

There were a number of questions raised after Attorney Greenberg's lecture by Institute members seeking legal information and clarification relevant to situations in their various communities. A man from Raleigh, North Carolina wanted more details on the legal problems involved in desegregating a hospital ward. Someone from Nashville wanted to know what action could be taken with regard to a "club" which claims to admit persons on a membership basis, but only turns away Negro patrons. A question was asked as to

the relative merits of "freedom of choice" versus the neighborhood school in achieving local school desegregation. The subject of discrimination in the sale of housing was broached, of realtors being unwilling to show Negroes houses in certain sections. Here, Greenberg dealt with the problem briefly and added, "If you want to file suit in your community, get in touch with us."[1]

The Federal Government and the Conciliation of Crises

Among the federal government representatives who addressed the Institute to outline and describe the programs of their agencies was James Laue, staff member of the Community Relations Service, Department of Commerce. In dealing with the subject, "Social Conflict, Social Change and the Community Relations Service,"[2] Mr. Laue indicated that the major functions of the Community Relations Service, as established under the 1964 Civil Rights Act are: "To assist communities in the conciliation of disagreements arising from discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which may impair the rights of persons under the law or which may affect interstate commerce. A more general function," he added, "is to help create a national climate of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Although he spoke briefly on the preventive and public relations services of the CRS, Mr. Laue placed primary emphasis on its role in the conciliation of

---

[1] As noted in the Clinic on Church and Race discussion, at least one person responded to this offer of assistance.

[2] James H. Laue, "Social Conflict, Social Change and the Community Relations Service," Human Rights and the Great Society, pp. 58-63.

community crises. A crisis, he observed, either actual or potential, makes conciliation possible "mainly because people usually will not move until the status quo becomes so unbearably uncomfortable that they have to." Before 1960, he observed, there was a need for some way to create crises; since that time, direct action by the civil rights groups has brought these crises about.

In examining the process of change-through-crisis, he suggested that there are seven steps involved which he referred to as the "seven C's": Challenge, Conflict, Crisis, Confrontation, Communication, Compromise and Change. This last condition he defined as "the achievement by protesters of at least some of the goals set forth in the challenge."

Returning, in closing, to the positive relationship of crisis to the work of his agency, Laue stated, "The great paradox we work under in the CRS is that we know that the quickest way to get folks to do right . . . is to have a good crisis now and then--but at the same time we cannot advocate crisis."

In the question period, an Institute member from Selma commented on the process as he had observed it is Selma. "We have gotten communication," but, he emphasized, "not much results." Laue admitted, "I forgot to tell you that the process often breaks down."

Someone raised the question of the agency's responsibility for monitoring slanted and censored news broadcasting in states such as Mississippi. Laue replied that his agency had only the power of persuasion. When it was suggested that its research staff might gather data on the problem, he explained, "There are only three of us in the Research Department."

A member of a Southern intergroup agency asked how the Community Relations Service related its services to state and local agencies. Laue indicated that CRS tried, whenever possible, to work through these agencies, "to move back to

the local level."

A white Mississippian urged that the federal government "has to help us, force us" to conciliate crises. Laue stressed the importance of local leadership in maintaining communication between Negro groups and the white community, to "warn them of crises" and the "need for conciliating."

Since the Community Relations Service, as a year old agency working behind the scenes, was new to many Institute members, specific questions were relatively few. However, persons representing various communities and groups indicated an interest in learning about it as a potential resource.

In his overview at the end of the Institute, Dr. Lewis Jones, sociologist and staff member in large part responsible for defining the theme, "Human Rights in the Great Society," and for selecting a number of the lecturers and lecture topics, skillfully related the various parts to the whole and the Institute, historically, to previous Institutes. Indicating that over the years there had been a basic shift in American race relations "from custom to power," he summarized the kinds of power, the programs and processes for change as they had been described and analyzed by the various lecturers in the course of the Institute.

The Clinic Groups

In contrast to the morning lecture sessions, where Institute members listened to two lectures and asked questions of the lecturers, the afternoon clinics on Employment, on Church and Race and on Community Action were relatively informal discussion sessions which, according to a pre-Institute statement "give attention to special problem areas and the experiences of

the Institute participants." What was discussed within these clinic groups was, to varying degrees, decided by participants but the three broad problem areas had been defined by the staff some ten years previously. They represent, the Institute director indicated, "lasting categories of interest." He observed that the community category "is probably too broad but," he explained, "we have not yet found a better substitute."[1]

Each of the clinic groups was headed by a "clinic leader," an Institute staff member who was assigned according to his special knowledge and interest and functioned as he saw fit--as a teacher-leader, a facilitator of group discussion and decision-making, a resource person sharing his expertise or some combination of these. The two clinics described, based on taped sessions, were selected because they varied most in terms of the roles of the clinic leaders and, therefore, the roles of participants.

The third clinic, on Community Action, headed by sociologist Dr. Joseph Taylor was a group with a wide range of interests and some thirty participants from thirteen states. They remained together as a group throughout their nine afternoon sessions and attempted by means of total group discussion, presentations by outside resource persons and presentations by group members to consider, to some degree, a great many community problems including: housing, education, the urbanization process, general problems of the "inner city," identifying and using community resources, strategies of effecting change, problems of migrant peoples and the administration of justice.

---

[1] Dr. Herman Long, Recorded Interview.

The Employment Clinic

The Employment Clinic, renamed by the Clinic leader, Dr. Vivian Henderson, the Equal Opportunity Clinic, was made up of some twenty-five persons, primarily teachers, churchwomen and staff members of intergroup agencies, more than half of whom were from the North.

In deciding what should be the major subjects for discussion, Dr. Henderson gave individuals a brief opportunity to indicate their areas of interest as they introduced themselves at the first meeting of the group. Of those who ventured to comment, several indicated an interest in the Federal Poverty Program. He then passed out a mimeographed list of recommended topics which had been discussed by the Employment Clinic in previous years to which he had added several additional topics, some eighteen in all. After a few reactions to the list ranging from a person who underscored the idea of discussing vocational training to a person suggesting that the group concern itself with "basic causes" of the economic problems to someone urging, "We need to dream a little bit, more than these questions permit us to do," Dr. Henderson brought the group back to the subject of the War on Poverty. He emphasized, "It opens up whole new areas" and "supports the idea of examining new approaches." The first meeting of the Clinic ended with the decision to focus on this program.[1]

In discussing the Poverty Program with his Clinic group, Dr. Henderson used as his "text," various sections of the law establishing the Office of Economic Opportunity and special materials which he had obtained as a consultant to that agency. One afternoon meeting,[2] for example, was devoted to

---

[1] Participant-observer notes on session, June 29, 1965

[2] Material based on tape recording of session, July 6, 1965.

a discussion of the section of the law describing the Community Action Program with Dr. Henderson reading excerpts, analyzing and interpreting them and raising questions. Considerable time was spent examining the meaning and implications of the phrase "maximum feasible participation of the poor." The group was asked, "What do you do to involve the poor?" Someone replied, "See what they want." Dr. Henderson agreed that this was "a step," but went on to emphasize the importance of involving the poor in the actual programs.

Someone else asked, "How do you create an atmosphere so that the underprivileged are not made to feel constantly inferior?" Dr. Henderson commented on the importance of the question and invited others to respond. There was some discussion of groups in which the poor are already participating, talking among themselves. There was discussion, pro and con, about the advisibility of working through political channels to reach people. A churchwoman from San Francisco said that there was no one from the grass roots level at City Hall in her city. An Urban League staff member from the East told about a recent election by the poor to select a Poverty Board in Philadelphia.

Dr. Henderson told of the skepticism of staff members of one Community Action Program he had observed who insisted when told to involve the poor, "They are not going to be comfortable!" He indicated that it was not the staff's business to make such a judgment. Pointing out that natural leadership is generally present, he described as an example an able leader and organizer whom he had encountered recently in a Nashville public housing project. He suggested that the problem was not finding such leadership but getting the mayor or other officials to agree that the poor should be involved. Others gave examples of this problem.

Someone asked whether the Community Action Program was completely unrelated to agencies already serving the poor. Dr. Henderson replied with a lengthy explanation of the philosophy behind the program. "One of the purposes of this program," he indicated, "is to do what these agencies have not done!" He gave an example of a multi-problem family, who under the new program would be helped by a multiple attack on their problems rather than by piecemeal services.

The problem of a curriculum for training teachers working with the poor was raised by a clinic member. After several comments by interested persons, Dr. Henderson brought the group back to his reading from the "text" about the several programs and several services of the Community Action Program, including Consumer Education, the Neighborhood Legal Service, etc. He observed that the poor often develop their own services where none exist. As an example, he told of a blind Negro in Nashville who had organized other blind Negroes. Someone suggested that the blind leader be invited to attend a Clinic session. Dr. Henderson indicated that he would try to get him to come "if I can get him an honorarium." He stressed the importance of paying such persons for their services just as other speakers and consultants receive pay.

Questions were raised by a Negro woman from Mississippi about the Poverty Program in Carthage, Mississippi where Dr. Henderson had served as a consultant. He went into some detail in describing the situation which he found there. White leaders had been praised for "involving Negroes," he reported, but actual policy was being made by an Urban Renewal Commission--"all white, all from power structure."

Someone from California asked for specific information about securing a poverty program to assist migrant workers. Dr. Henderson, commenting on the

importance of the problem, suggested some possible sponsoring groups for such a program.

A second Southern Clinic member wanted to know how to write a proposal. Dr. Henderson, after outlining the kinds of questions to be answered, indicated where and how detailed information could be obtained.

Reactions to the Employment Clinic on the part of Southern Negro and white participants differed widely. An intergroup agency representative complained that the group was not organized for a discussion. "We're in a little bit of a teacher-pupil relationship," he explained, and observed, "We have no particular esprit de corps. There hasn't been enough to get us a little freer." Thus, he concluded, from his point of view, "It hasn't been of too much value."[1]

Conversely, the Negro teacher and community leader from Mississippi found the Clinic to be the most significant aspect of the Institute. She had been eager to learn more about the Poverty Program and how to develop and secure funds for a local program. "I really received the information that I needed and wanted," she stated.[2]

Church and Race Clinic

The Clinic on Church and Race with Rev. L. Alexander Harper of the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ as its leader, had a membership, initially, of forty Negro and white ministers and

---

[1] Interview with John Spence, July 7, 1965.

[2] Interview with Mrs. Della Davidson, July 9, 1965.

lay persons from the North and South, twenty-six of whom were members of the United Church Women.

Describing his plans as Clinic leader, Harper explained, "Taking all known factors into account (including the heavy lecture schedule), I deliberately left our agenda flexible, but prepared for and encouraged, work on the achievement of inclusiveness in church life, in housing and in public school . . . ."[1]

After the first week in which Clinic members, one by one, told something about themselves and their "greatest concern in church and race," and heard presentations by two visiting resource persons, they elected to divide into three small groups to discuss different kinds of problems: 1) Inclusive Churches; 2) Inclusive Housing and 3) Meeting Community Crises. No instructions were given the small groups except that they select a discussion leader and reporter with the leader's role being "to enable people to be heard and to keep them on the task." The task, it was agreed, was to come up with as many ideas as possible regarding the role of the church in coping with the several problems.

The first session of the "Inclusive Housing" group will serve to illustrate something of the process and content of these discussions.[2] Nine persons, including Negro and white representatives of churches from the East, the Far West, the Midwest and the South agreed to be in the group. The person asked to be discussion leader was a Southern white churchwoman who expressed some

---

[1] L. Alexander Harper, "Staff Report and Critical Evaluation of Design and Process," 1965 Race Relations Institute, p. 8.

[2] Material based on tape recording of session, July 5, 1965.

anxiety about her role and about how the group should proceed.

In response to the query, "What should we do?," one of the Californian participants volunteered to describe their recent unsuccessful experience in attempting to defeat an anti-fair housing proposition in that State. She described the efforts of various groups and individuals to rally support for existing fair housing legislation and the more effective and organized efforts of opposition groups, led by the realtors. "After we got through," she indicated, "we found that we had a good group here in the community, a very representative group, and though towards the end we knew we were going to lose, we decided we should keep this group going afterwards . . ." She explained that in spite of these intentions, they ceased to function or to meet after their defeat. "I would like to know," she asked, "a good way to go about re-activating this group . . ."

In the discussion which followed, she was asked to tell more about the make-up of her group, and, in the process, identified a number of small and larger segments who had backed fair housing including a few realtors, some Negro ministers and members of her own church. As she talked, she became more hopeful about the resources, more convinced about what she could do. After some minutes, she announced, "What I think I will do is go back and call these people that started this group and tell them I have been here and ask them if they would like to meet with me and a few others to talk this over informally. And then perhaps go from that to getting many leaders in the community. Of course, we have a lot of Mexican-American people who feel . . . discrimination."

A woman from Wichita, Kansas, told of Negro families in her community who were unable to move out of the ghetto into other parts of the city and suburbs. She stated that the problem lay with a realtors' group which was committed to keeping Negroes segregated. No one commented. The discussion leader, apparently unhappy with the lack of an "answer," indicated that she had come "to my first Institute on a national level" assuming that she would have her housing segregation and other problems solved. "And after I have been here a week," she stated, "I realize that if Fisk knew this they wouldn't be keeping it a secret and they would run to Washington and we would have all our problems solved." She concluded sadly, "So, we are not going to settle anything and apparently we are just supposed to talk this thing out the best way we can."

The woman from Wichita who had raised the realtor problem asserted, "But we can find some new ways of trying!" After further discussion of realtors' practices, she reported that along with another woman from Wichita, she had talked with Attorney Greenberg of the N.A.A.C.P. following his lecture and he had offered to advise them on how to proceed in legally challenging the discriminatory realtors' practices. She expressed the hope that they could secure assistance locally from a Negro lawyer. "We are going back and talk with him," she stated. "As long as we have the Civil Rights Act and we have the kind of help we can get from Mr. Greenberg, I think Mr. Lewis, the man in Wichita, would open this thing up . . . . We are going to try to get him to do this . . ."

Other kinds of housing problems were raised. A churchwoman from Tucson, Arizona reported that the University of Arizona listed housing without regard to whether it was discriminatory. She described efforts, working through State officials, to secure a change in policy. Someone from Boston indicated that

everything was "open" there including churches and schools, except housing. He observed that the desegregation of housing "was where we should have begun."

A Negro lay leader from San Francisco suggested that the group should concentrate on the role of the churches in breaking down housing segregation. "What can the churches do and what should they do to try to get a first entry?," he asked. He went on to describe the role of the Episcopal Church and others "across denominational lines" in the San Francisco area. "Most churches, I have found, especially in our area, own apartment houses. This is a great source of income . . . . The Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church in San Francisco have apartment houses and they have gone ahead and seen to it that Negroes get into these apartments." He reported, also, that the churches had been sending out letters to other apartment owners. "There is a union-like among apartment owners," he explained. Other positive efforts by church groups to open existing housing and to build new open housing were described. Considerable interest was expressed in these efforts by church representatives from other areas and a number of questions were asked.

The discussion moved to the problems faced by Negroes in obtaining loans for purchasing housing. Here again, Californians were able to provide the most forward-looking solution to the problem. Someone told of the establishment of credit unions by various groups, "for automobile financing, for housing financing . . . Teachers have their own credit unions. The N.A.A.C.P. has a credit union. Our church has its own credit union--just for that." The machinery for setting-up such credit unions was outlined briefly and interested clinic members were referred for specific information to a national credit union organization.

The initial small group session on "Inclusive Housing" which its discussion leader had predicted was "not going to settle anything" ended with several persons formulating plans as a result of what they had learned and the contacts which they had made.

In general, participants in the Church and Race Clinic emphasized that what they valued most in their group discussions was the opportunity to exchange personal experiences and ideas which they might apply in their own church and community situations.[1] Among these, for example, was a Negro minister from Florida who indicated that his church had tried and failed in the past to develop a church loan program. Following the discussion of credit unions, he stated:

> I thought we would try it again and go at it in a different way . . . When you hear how other people have gone about it, it may give you the courage to try it again . . . . It's good to hear what other people are doing, how they go about it.[2]

Others mentioned getting information about how to involve Negroes and whites in joint church and civic activities, how to change housing patterns through the effort of church organizations and ideas on the interchange of church members.

Along with these action-oriented ideas was an increased understanding through informal discussion of one another's viewpoints and problems. One

---

[1] "Brief Evaluations of the 1965 Fisk Race Relations Institute Church-and-Race Clinic by Members," p. 4.

[2] Interview with Rev. Benjamin Lane, July 8, 1965.

Negro minister, for example, explained that talking with white ministers helped him to understand the pressures on them. "I am more sympathetic to their problems now," he commented.

The Interracial Church Visitations

The greatest insight for white members into the problems of Negroes, however, occurred when the Clinic sponsored Sunday interracial visitations to known conservative white churches of Nashville and were ousted from one of them. "This experience," the Clinic report noted afterwards, "provided the most vivid and immediate data possible for reflections on the need and painful problems of inclusive church fellowship."

In discussing the experience in the Clinic on the following day, white members of the group expressed shame, outrage and shock at the treatment which Negroes, especially, had received. They were shocked and outraged at being put out of the church by officials who told themumbashedly, "We are a segregated church. Negroes are not welcome"; at being under the surveillance of police cars called by the church and of being told, when the group gathered for prayer on the church steps, "Get off this property and don't come back."[2]

One Southern white churchwoman, in describing the shock of being told by church leaders, "Get out," and "hold your church services in the street," said, "I grew up. . . . I figured out a lot more than I had before." And

---

[1]Interview with Rev. A.M. Scott, July 8, 1965.

[2]Participant-observer notes on session, July 5, 1965.

thinking of Negro churchwomen in her own community, she commented, "They've never told us things like this."[1]

In contrast to ousted white church members, a Negro churchwoman stated quietly, "I didn't feel badly. I felt sorry for him (the church official). He already looked like death. Tears came to my eyes thinking how ignorant he was."[2]

Another Negro churchwoman stated, "I walked out of the church with no feeling of bitterness at all, but with a great deal of love and compassion in my heart. There were those who were as grieved as we were."

And a third Negro member of the clinic observed, "This helps us to share with others. Many of us, especially those of us from the Deep South, have been shut out from many things."

Following the group evaluation of the experience, two questions were raised, "What kinds of changes is this going to make in our own communities?" and, "How do we carry this message back?" One of the Southern white laymen urged the need "in our own communities, now, to get something going."

There was little time within the hour and a half clinic session for the group to explore and define what should be done "to get something going." A California churchwoman announced the intention of relating the "experience of being shut-out to my all white church." And other clinic members, from their comments, were beginning to take a second look at their "all white churches."[3]

---

[1] Interview with Mrs. Francis Boughton, July 5, 1965.

[2] Notes on session, July 5, 1965.

[3] Ibid.

The Residential Experience: Limitations in the Setting and the Resources of Institute Members

The residential setting for the twenty-second Race Relations Institute was, as in other years, the Fisk University campus located in one of the old Negro neighborhoods of Nashville, Tennessee. For various reasons, internal and external, the Institute was probably less of an intimate, self-contained community than in many previous years.

The University itself was host to several simultaneous groups of resident students including a teachers' workshop on school integration, a group of science teachers brought together for a special program sponsored by the National Science Foundation and its regular summer school students. These groups lived in the same dormitories and shared the same cafeteria and other facilities of the university. Thus, as one of the Institute members commented after he told of eating with a group whom he thought were Institute members and finding out they were science teachers, "The mixture of other groups on campus probably diluted the experience some."

The 1964 Civil Rights Act which served to open up places of public accomodation throughout the South also affected the communal life of the Institute. It meant that Nashville was open to those groups or individuals who chose to spend their free hours away from the "Institute community." The minority of younger members of the Institute and some of the older members with cars tended most frequently to go off on their own. In contrast, some of the older Negro participants in the Institute from communities further South rarely left the campus and immediate neighborhood.

Then, too, partially because public accomodations were open, there were fewer Institute-planned activities outside formal sessions and therefore fewer

occasions which brought the whole group together informally. Director Herman Long pointed out that in earlier years, in the face of public and police hostility toward the interracial body, the planning of activities "was absolutely necessary as there was no social outlet in the community." But, "Now," he explained, "there are avenues of social outlet and exploration."[1]

As a result, there were only two all Institute social occasions, a Sunday afternoon trip and a final evening reception for the speaker and members of the Institute and staff.

This left members, staff and speakers on their own in facilitating whatever kinds of interaction occurred. There were, of course, many unscheduled hours at mealtimes and after sessions in the afternoon and evening. Living in the dormitories together and eating meals in the university cafeteria offered the two most frequent opportunities for informal discussion and social interaction.

Here again, the unplannedness of living arrangements presented some problems. No special efforts were made to see that Negro and white Institute members roomed together, most of the staff feeling that such arrangements would be contrived or artificial. Thus, by simply assigning people as they arrived, Negroes were generally housed with Negroes and whites with whites, perpetuating, in effect, the segregated patterns in which people had been living (and travelling) in their several communities and parts of the country. The resulting "segregation" tended to be not only racial but often geographic and occupational with, for example, two Negro ministers from the same community

---

[1] Dr. Long indicated, in addition, that the staff preferred that social gatherings be organized at the initiative of participants because "We do not want the program to be over-structured." (Recorded response to interview questions, August, 1965.)

in Florida assigned as roommates. One of these men in discussing the living experience on the campus complained, "This bothered me a little. We were integrated and we weren't integrated. I don't see any Negro and white roommates." The other admitted that he had been "looking for" a white roommate.[1]

Another Southern Negro participant wondered, at first, if housing Negroes together and whites together was a policy. When it was explained that participants were simply housed as they arrived, she stated, "That could be handled better. . . . It affected who I got to know."[2]

The fact that men and women were housed in various men's and women's dormitories rather than in some common facility had its affect generally, on whom people got to know. The dormitories were equipped with lounges which could serve, presumably, as common meeting places but they tended to be either busy thoroughfares or, as in the case of a large lounge in the women's dormitory, closed for use except on special occasions.

In the men's and women's dormitories, Institute members tended to get to know their roommates and perhaps others on their floor. Some small groups developed; for example, a group of women who enjoyed taking early morning walks "discovered each other." Some occasions, such as a birthday, brought a group of women together for a spontaneous dormitory party in one of the rooms. But many were not involved in such groups or occasions.

And, in the case of many of the men, who were housed in a non-air-conditioned unit, even small group interaction was infrequent. When asked about their informal discussions, one of the men replied, "Frankly, we in

---

[1] Interview with Rev. A.M. Scott, July 8, 1965.

[2] Interview with Mrs. Lethia Daniels, July 8, 1965.

the men's dorm couldn't stay around. . . . It was too hot." He indicated, that they did have "two or three bull sessions, in spite of this."[1]

Whatever the physical and other limitations which tended to separate people or at least to make interaction more difficult, large and small groups of Institute members did plan and participate in some occasions which were significant in their residential experience. One of these was ine interracial church visitation project sponsored by the Clinic on Church and Race but involving a number of other Institute members, some forty in all, one fourth of these Negroes. The visitation experience at four of the white churches was a positive if self-conscious one. For the group of seventeen Negro and white Institute members who visited the First Southern Methodist Church, whose membership was outspokenly segregationist, the experience was a moving and revealing one for some, a shocking and upsetting one for others, but an experience which stimulated a good deal of honest discussion and critical social and self-appraisal among participants.

Another occasion was an Indonesian dinner planned by a small group of Institute members but open to some fifty, as many as could be accomodated at the apartment of a staff member where it was held. The creator of the dinner was a young Indonesian-born student minister from the Midwest, assisted by a number of Institute members. The evening's menu included Southeast Asian food and music, exotic and unfamiliar to both Northern and Southern Negro and white Americans, but enthusiastically shared by all. On this occasion, although there was almost no singing during the Institute, the group ended by singing some of the songs of the Freedom Movement, most of them new to Northern and many Southern members.

---

[1]Interview with Rev. Donald Witzl, July 8, 1965.

Evaluation of the Institute by Staff and Participants

Staff Evaluations: Participants' Reports and Informal Observation

No systematic effort was made by the staff of the 1965 Institute to evaluate the effects or effectiveness of the educational program. Director, Dr. Herman Long, indicated that no systematic ways of evaluating the Institute had been devised by the staff either in the early years or subsequently. "We never have had evaluative questionnaires or similar instruments," he explained, "simply because we have realized their limitations." Instead, the staff, in assessing the impact of the Institute, has relied largely upon reports of activities in the form of letters sent back by participants. "We encouraged that they send to us any indication of programs which they learned about at the Institute which they attempted to apply . . . in their local communities." He cited several kinds of programs which had grown out of the efforts of returned Institute members including early mayor's committees on race and human relations, police-community relations programs and the civil rights program of the United Packinghouse Workers Union "stimulated in good part" by the Institute.[1]

He pointed out, in addition, that the formal papers submitted for credit by some Institute members represented another type of evaluative report.

Staff members, of course, did engage in informal kinds of evaluation during the Institute. Leaders of two of the clinics, when asked how they went about the process of evaluation, emphasized participation and the quality of group reports as indices.

---

[1]Long, Recorded response to interview questions.

The leader of the Community Action Clinic, Dr. Joseph Taylor explained:

> I think the results--quantity and quality of participation. How much do I get everyone involved? . . . I like to get everyone talking, even if I get them angry--see if they are using what they have learned from the morning sessions.[1]

There was, at the end of the first week of the Institute, a "Review of the Week: by a panel of staff members. Two of the four staff panelists, rather than making an evaluation, analyzed the histcrically changing focus and content of the Institute. A third panelist suggested two areas of need which had emerged in the first week's discussion in his clinic. The fourth panel member observed, "I get the feeling we shouldn't be here at all," indicating that it would be interesting to "hear from those who have participated over the years."[2]

After the panel, someone asked for a summary of the highlights of the several clinic groups. Again, these were given by the staff member panelists.

One other staff evaluation was forthcoming. A visiting staff member, expressing regret that no evaluative report had been requested, decided to submit his own report, as well as involving members of his clinic in evaluating their experiences. However, since this report was submitted in mimeo-

---

[1]Interview with Joseph Taylor, July 10, 1965.

[2]During a brief question-and-answer period, several Nashville residents who had attended a number of past Institutes were invited to comment. A retired railroad engineer paid tribute to the Institute for the ideas which he had acquired which he stated, "I've retained and passed on as best I could." He added, "I've been very fortunate to have my family come over to my side. I don't know whether it's the Institute, books I've read or the church."

graphed form sometime after the Institute, there was no opportunity for more than an exchange of staff letters "answering" its contents.[1]

Southern Participant Expectations and Evaluations

The twenty Southern Negro and white participants interviewed at the beginning of the Institute, most of whom were interviewed after the Institute,[2] included teachers, and other school personnel, churchwomen, ministers, intergroup agency staff members, a welfare administrator and a university student, with the teachers, churchwomen and ministers in numbers essentially proportionate to their numbers in the Institute. Those interviewed were also largely representative in terms of geographic distribution with six coming from Tennessee and the border states of Kentucky and Maryland and the others coming from Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina and Florida.

---

[1]The report of L. Alexander Harper included "Highlights" related to the "two weeks of interracial living," to "informal values" of "interracial friendship and conversation "in his clinic and to the lectures" viewed as a whole, the wide scope of problems dealt with." It also discussed some so-called "Critical Questions," matters ranging from the need for assigning interracial roommates and for "more informal exchanges; to the need for re-examining the lecture format and for periodic research on the Institute (Harper, "Staff Report and Critical Evaluation of Design and Process").

[2]Fifteen of the twenty persons interviewed at the beginning of the Institute were available for interview afterwards.

Their Expectations and Objectives

One half of the group, when interviewed at the beginning of the Institute, were very vague or general in their response to the question, "What do you expect (or hope) to get out of this Race Relations Institute?" Those who were vague in what they hoped to gain included, for example, a Negro teacher from Memphis, Tennessee who replied simply, "Information on attitudes." This same teacher when asked why she had chosen to participate in the clinic on "Church and Race" said merely, "I wanted to see what was going to be said."[1] Another Negro teacher from Raleigh, North Carolina who had been sent to the Institute by a church board scholarship was even more cautious in her expectations. "I have come with an open mind, trying to learn the fuctions of this Institute."[2] Still another kind of vagueness was represented by the response of a deeply religious Negro churchwoman, founder of a mission nursery in Gainesville, Florida, who defined as her objective, "A better understanding of the plans of God" for "working together for one common goal."[3]

Among those seeking general knowledge was a white minister from the Northern Kentucky Commission on Religion and Human Rights who stated that he hoped to obtain "broader knowledge of problems and possible solutions";[4]

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Estalyn Ross, July 1, 1965.

[2]Interview with Mrs. Lethia Daniels, June 30, 1965.

[3]Interview with Mrs. Damon Dell, July 1, 1965.

[4]Interview with Rev. Donald Witzl, June 29, 1965.

a young white NAIRO intern with the South Carolina Council on Human Relations, who hoped to acquire "primarily background and current trends";[1] and a Negro churchwoman and former home economics teacher from Baton Rouge, Louisiana who indicated, "I expect a wealth of information and a depth of study that will enable me to share with others in the struggle for 'Human Rights in a Great Society'."[2]

The other half of the Southern Negro and white participants interviewed indicated that they hoped to get help in solving their community or other problems, although these problems were often not very clearly defined. Thus, a Negro teacher and community leader from Oxford, Mississippi stated that she hoped to gain "something that will help me help my people in Oxford and Mississippi." When asked about the problems in her community, she emphasized the problem of "getting others in leadership positions involved in community improvement."[3] It was only after the Institute had been underway for several days that she defined a specific goal growing out of discussions in her clinic group: to obtain more information on the Federal Poverty Program for Oxford.[4]

A Negro minister from Winter Park, Florida, member of a bi-racial council there indicated, "I hope to get answers to existing problems in our community." Asked about the nature of the problems, he spoke at some length about housing and school segregation, lack of decent jobs and poverty among his parishoners. Asked what he had been doing about the several problems, he replied, "I am working with the few (existing) organizations in our community."[5]

---

[1] Interview with Brad Posten, June 28, 1965.

[2] Written response to pre-Institute interview questions, Mrs. Josephine Hagen.

[3] Written response to pre-Institute interview questions, Mrs. Della Davidson.

[4] Interview with Mrs. Della Davidson, July 3, 1965.

[5] Interview with Rev. A.M. Scott, June 29, 1965.

A troubled white churchwoman, chairman of Social Action in her local church in Miami Beach and of the State "Assignment: Race" program of the United Church Women of Florida said eagerly, "I hope to be made aware of methods in which we might implement integration in our community and in our church." She added, "We do not have one Negro in residence on Miami Beach and do not have a Negro in our church."[1] She expressed great unhappiness about her sense of isolation and her lack of any real communication with members of Negro churches or the Negro community.

Another white churchwoman from Jackson, Mississippi, replied when asked what she expected to get from the Institute, "understanding in depth of where we are at today in race and human relations--information, inspiration, education as to what next step to take." In regard to community problems, she stressed the need to enlist "more participants in active work for better human relations in my state and community." She, herself, she indicated, as a State and local leader, had been helping to re-build local United Church Woman's Councils in Mississippi on an integrated basis and had been "working for legislation to correct wrongs." She spoke of the difficulties in attempting to build integrated councils in the midst of the massive civil rights demonstrations in the State "because of the strain, tension and conflict . . ." She expressed her determination "to find new approaches to people," but she added, "You get tired . . . I thought I would get perspective coming here . . . being here with people from all over the nation." She concluded, "I came to learn, completely open to suggestion and correction."[2]

---

[1] Interview with Mrs. Francis Boughton, July 1, 1965.

[2] Interview with Mrs. Jane Schutt, June 30, 1965.

A few persons interviewed seemed to have specific goals.[1] One of these, a Northern-born and educated white minister representing a Negro church in Raleigh, North Carolina, active in the N.A.A.C.P., "the movement" and the Ministerial Alliance there, responded when asked what he hoped to gain from the Institute, "practical steps for obtaining true integration of churches, schools and residential housing and employment in Raleigh." He also spoke of wanting to learn "how to organize a continuing lobby to press for legislative goals."[2]

Another person who, along with other intergroup agency participants had goals which were rather clearly defined was on the staff of a regional office of the United States Commission on Civil Rights in Memphis. His objectives, he stated, were, "First, an acquaintance with activists in my region; then, a great familiarity with the history and personalities of the civil rights movement."[3]

Unshared Criticisms and Suggestions during the Institute

Participants interviewed during the Institute offered a number of evaluative comments, but there was no channel and no specified occasion when these

---

[1]One group of Institute members with a specific, task-oriented objective who might be mentioned were those persons, primarily teachers, who were seeking academic credit for their participation together with a paper.

[2]Interview with Rev. Frank Hutchison, June 30, 1965.

[3]Interview with John Spence, June 29, 1965.

comments were invited by the staff. Some persons had suggestions to make for modifying and, they believed, improving the daily agenda. One man, for example, who complained about the heavy morning lecture schedule, suggested that one lecture and the afternoon clinic session be held in the morning with the second lecture in the afternoon.[1] Others complained, when interviewed, that their clinic group was dominated by a few persons or that the group was too large for full and free discussion. One such person after summarizing her complaints went on to make a number of suggestions as to what could be done to improve the clinic:

> I think if we were in smaller groups it would help. . . . I think they could tape the sessions and listen to them. . . . It would be interesting if we had some case studies.

When asked by the interviewer if she had expressed her ideas to her clinic group, she replied, "I haven't had a chance to speak much at all. . . . You see, we really haven't had time."[2]

Evaluation Through Role-Playing.

At the final meeting of the Clinic on Church and Race, the Clinic leader suggested that the group, as a kind of evaluation of the Institute experience, role-play how they would explain the value of the Institute to someone in their church or community.[3]

---

[1]Interview with P.L. Lindsey.

[2]Interview with Mrs. Lethia Daniels, c. July 2.

[3]Material taken from tape recording of session, July 8, 1965.

In the first situation portrayed, a Southern white minister (played by a Southern white minister) was questioned closely by a member of his board who was skeptical about the Institute. After some minutes of defensive dialogue, the minister concluded:

> I am not sure I know what I've gotten out of it. It may take some living and doing for some weeks, or perhaps even years to come. I do think I have gotten an insight into the problem and the nature of it, and into possible ways of how to work. . . . I would hesitate to put my finger on any one thing as an exceptional or unique value. I would not want to exclude any part of the experience.

In a second role-playing, a Southern Negro churchwoman (played by a Southern Negro churchwoman) attempted to interpret her experience at the Institute to a member of the Women's Board. She had similar difficulties in stating in any specific terms what she had gained. She began:

> It is something you have to see for yourself. It was a great enrichment. There are things I will never be able to tell you, but there are things that I feel are workable among us. . . . I think there are things we have to give and take, and they have to learn to give and take with us.

When asked what things she referred to, she replied, "We feel that we are 'right' in our own little world; that we are 'right' and they are 'wrong'. We feel that we are just fighting for ourselves . . . We should be fighting for all men."

In discussing the two role-playing situations, the Clinic leader observed, "It is interesting that nobody mentioned lectures and nobody mentioned anything they have read. . . . It was more of a pouring into the vitality of the person resources for future involvement in crisis. . . ."

The Southern white minister who had participated in the role-playing agreed. "It takes awhile for you to integrate what you get in your brain into your acting, living way. . ." He continued, "When you live this out, then, all

of a sudden, you will pluck from this intellectual context and put it into the dynamics of life."

The session ended with apparent agreement as to the difficulties in making any immediate evaluation or stating, "This is what I find useful."

Post-Institute Interviews: What Participants Valued

In interviewing Southern participants at the end of the Institute, a special effort was made to encourage respondents to indicate, "What part or parts of the Institute, if any, were of special interest or value to you?" Although their answers are difficult to categorize, some one-third found participation in the clinic of special value; two-thirds indicated that the lecturers were of notable interest or value and all but one person emphasized the significance of various aspects of the residential experience.

Most of those who cited their clinic participation as being a significant part of the Institute tended to be persons who gained specific information or ideas to take back to their communities. For example, an Oxford, Mississippi community leader, as has been indicated, emphasized the special importance to her of the Equal Opportunity Clinic because she received from Dr. Henderson "the information that I needed and wanted on the President's Poverty Program."[1] A Negro teacher from a segregated school in Memphis was able to obtain, in the Clinic on Community Organization, some practical information on successful school desegregation methods used elsewhere.[2] Some Southern Institute members

---

[1] Interview with Mrs. Della Davidson, July 9, 1965.

[2] Interview with Mrs. E. Ross, July 8, 1965.

in the Clinic on Church and Race, as has been indicated, received ideas from California participants in the clinic on the role of churches in establishing credit unions and opening up housing on an unsegregated basis. Several churchwomen mentioned program ideas which they had obtained from their United Church Women's Clinic on "Assignment: Race."

In contrast, a number of persons who stated that the lectures were a particularly important part of the total Institute tended to endorse them generally. These persons, it might be noted, were very often the ones who came to the Institute with a vague or general sort of objective. Thus, a white minister who approached the Institute seeking "broader knowledge" said of the lectures, "I got a good, broad exposure to the problems of the transition period from the people that favor integration." He added, "as good general knowledge as you can get in two weeks."[1] A Negro college administrator who sought a "broader knowledge of race relations" expressed his appreciation of "the many invited speakers and viewpoints."[2] A Negro churchwoman who stated that she had come "with an open mind" said at the end of the Institute, "The speakers opened my eyes to actual facts."[3]

A few lecturers were singled out as having specific usefulness by persons coming to the Institute with rather definite objectives. A white minister of a Negro church, for example, who had expressed the desire to learn more about

---

[1]Interview with Rev. Donald Witzl, July 8, 1965.

[2]Interview with P.L. Lindsey, July 9, 1965.

[3]Interview with Mrs. Lethia Daneils, July 8, 1965.

political action, indicated that political scientist Dr. Samuel Cook in his lecture on "The Political Shaping of Racial Change" had given him some helpful ideas.[1]

A white churchwoman from Mississippi who was "trying to find imaginative, new approaches," spoke with enthusiam about the practical ideas which she had obtained from one of the civil rights attorneys who recommended the use of observers in protest situations. This in turn, she explained, had suggested to her a new observer role for churchwomen.[2]

Not surprisingly, Southern Negro and white participants in emphasizing the importance of the residential experience frequently spoke of the various opportunities for honest communication. As one Negro churchwoman from Florida observed, "People are freer here. We talked together. They talked about our group. We talked about theirs. All of us have our shortcomings."[3]

Another woman, a Tennessee teacher from a segregated school, emphasized that living together "breaks down the rigidity of formality." She explained, "When I meet you in the bathroom at the end of a long day, you don't care who I am." This same woman who had stated cautiously at the offset that she was seeking "information on attitudes" commented enthusiastically after the Institute, "It's a new experience in a completely integrated society!"[4]

---

[1] Interview with Rev. Frank Hutchison.

[2] Interview with Mrs. Jane Schutt, July 8, 1965.

[3] Interview with Mrs. Damon Dell, July 8, 1965.

[4] Interview with Mrs. E. Ross, July 8, 1965.

The only two members of the one hundred and fifty member Institute who were from Mississippi, a white churchwoman from Jackson and a Negro teacher and community leader from Oxford, came to know one another at the Institute. Each mentioned meeting the other as an important event in their total experience. The white churchwoman said of the meeting, "We made a friendship that I am sure will continue. We've made plans together. I've made plans to include her in the United Church Women."[1] The Negro Mississippian, more cautious but hopeful observed, "It's the strangest thing that I had to come to the Institute to meet one of my own state-mates. I believe she's sincere."[2] Both of these Mississippi women were mindful of the rare opportunity afforded them for integrated living at Fisk. When asked how she would answer people who might say that nothing is accomplished or learned at such Institutes, the Negro Mississippian replied, "First thing I would try to explain the relationship that actually existed. A lot of people can't see us together--a lot of whites. I would try to explain the values gained."

Probably the most dramatic example of the way in which Southern participants were "freed" by the residential situation was a Southern white churchwoman from Florida who described the integrated living on the campus as "the most earthshaking experience I've ever had!" (This same woman, in a pre-Institute interview, complained of being isolated and having no real communication with Negroes in her community). She admitted that she had been so uncomfortable in her first days of living on a largely Negro campus that "I just panicked." She told of having called her husband on four different evenings to tell him that

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Jane Schutt, July 8, 1965.

[2]Interview with Mrs. Della Davidson, July 9, 1965.

she was coming home and, each time, he insisted that she "stick it out." Asked how, when she changed, she replied, "It was eating with them that made me feel so free. . . .What tore me up was that I could have been a hypocrite for so long." She described her overwhelming realization as she and several other Negro and white Institute members were eating together,"'My God,' I thought, They are just like I am!" Before participating in the Institute, she explained, "I always felt that they were people to be helped instead of people to be lived with."[1]

Even some of those who most readily pointed out inadequacies in the residential setting and arrangements, the de facto segregation of roommates, the lack of free time activities, felt that the residential experience was an important part of the Institute. A Negro teacher and churchwoman from North Carolina said of the experience of "eating together, walking together, sharing ideas," after expressing her criticisms of "separate white roommates," "If this was absent, I would have felt an emptiness in a sense."[2]

Post-Institute Interviews: Participant Dissatisfactions; Recommendations for Change

The responses of Southern Institute members asked in a Post-Institute interview, "What part or parts of the Institute were of little or no value?" and in a follow-up questionnaire,[3] "What would you say should be changed?"

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Frances Boughton, July 8, 1965.

[2]Interview with Mrs. Lethia Daniels, July 8, 1965.

[3]The Follow-up Questionnaire was sent to all Southern participants in the Institute in May, 1966. Twenty persons responded.

suggest several areas of recurrent dissatisfaction. These related to the kinds of participants in the Institute, the kinds of formal learning experiences offered and the uses of the residential situation.

A number of persons raised questions regarding the membership of the Institute. It was pointed out that most of the group was "middle-class and middle-aged," that it included few, if any, of those actively involved in the civil rights movement, with the exception of speakers. In addition, a member of the Clinic on Equal Opportunity, noting that there were no "leaders or potential leaders" from among the poor, suggested, "I think that they should include some of the people we're talking about."[1] (The Clinic subsequently adopted this suggestion as one of the recommendations in its Institute report).

Others expressed anxiety, when asked about their back-home plans, about being the only representatives in the Institute from their particular church or community. Some of this problem would seem to be reflected in the role-playing situations described earlier--the Institute member in these situations seemed defensive and unsure in even talking about what he had learned.[2] A Negro teacher who returned to a Tennessee community where schools remain segregated wrote back strongly recommending that efforts be made to recruit groups of teachers and administrators from school systems such as hers![3]

Another area of suggestions and criticisms coming from participants in the 1965 Institute related to the frequently mentioned need for more emphasis, in small group sessions, on acquiring techniques for community action and on developing practical plans for implementing the kinds of strategies and programs

---

[1] Interview with Mrs. Della Davidson, July 8, 1965.

[2] See "Evaluation through Role-Playing."

[3] Unsigned Follow-up Questionnaire, May 10, 1966.

outlined by the several lecturers. A Baltimore intergroup relations official, for example, stated, "I had hoped to get some practical suggestion for working in a changing neighborhood and working in human rights in a large city." He expressed disappointment regarding the structured presentations in the Clinic on Community Organization and the unwieldy size of the group, pointing out that there should have been "more opportunity to discuss in small groups."[1]

Others made similar kinds of recommendations. A Tennessee teacher suggested "smaller working groups with more clearly defined goals" and expressed the desire for gaining "techniques for improving community relationships."[2] A social worker urged "more discussion in smaller groups, based on areas of special interest" and indicated as one of her areas "better ways of motivating and increasing the interest of parents in their children's education."[3] A member of a counseling guidance staff from Virginia wanted more opportunity to hear from participants "and less from the experts."[4]

And even among those who felt that the lectures were the most valuable part of the Institute, there were recommendations that they be fewer in number and shorter with more opportunity to discuss them.

Various suggestions were made as to how the residential experience might be improved, beginning with the allocation of rooms on an integrated basis. As

---

[1] Interview with Daniel Haldeman, July 8, 1965.

[2] Unsigned follow-up questionnaire, May 5, 1966.

[3] Follow-up questionnaire from Lyvonne Gray, June 21, 1966.

[4] Follow-up questionnaire from J.W. Woodruff, May 16, 1966.

one Negro member whose roommate was a Negro expressed it, "I think as it was a Race Relations Institute the housing pattern should be changed."[1] The need for the planning of more free-time activities was pointed out. The person most critical of residential aspects of the Institute, who indicated that it had made no difference for him in what he learned or whom he got to know was among those who recommended:

> I think there might have been a little more compression of academic time and a little more organized free time. . . . I'd like someone to pull together small groups with a little staff help.[2]

Effects of the Institute: What Institute Members Said They Would Do and Did

During the end-of-the Institute interviews, the group of twenty participants were asked what plans they had made, if any, to work on local problems when they returned home. More than half defined certain plans or goals which they hoped to achieve. In the follow-up questionnaire, ten months later, all Southern participants in the Institute were asked, "What, if anything, have you done as a result of being in the Institute?" Among those originally interviewed who responded to the follow-up interview, there seems to be little indication of any follow through on projected plans.

A young intergroup agency intern from South Carolina, for example, said, when interviewed, that he planned to encourage the integration of churches and to involve especially college-age students in an exchange-of-members program.

---

[1]Follow-up questionnaire from Rev. A.M. Scott, May 9, 1966.

[2]Interview with John Spence, July 7, 1965.

When asked in a follow-up questionnaire, "What, if anything, have you done as a result of being in the Institute?" he replied, "Well, I ha-en't been back to church."[1]

A white Mississippian described to this interviewer plans for a program to train members of local United Church Women's Councils to serve as observers in racial crises and to involve them in local voter education efforts; in response to the questionnaire she gave no indication that she had acted on either of these plans.

A Negro minister from Florida who described post-Institute plans to set up an integrated ministerial committee on housing to assist Negro families in obtaining homes outside of slum areas and who also indicated that he planned to contact Cuban leaders in his area and invite them to participate in local church and community activities made no mention of either of these plans ten months later.

Instead, most persons responded primarily in terms of talking to others. A Negro teacher stated, for example, "I related my experiences and growth to others of both the Negro and Caucasian races . . ."[2] and a white teacher indicated, "I have used the materials in speeches."[3]

Some indicated that they had sought to influence others in their school, church or community. A white teacher in Virginia, for example, who stated that he had become "more sensitive to injustices in my own school" told of his efforts to influence his fellow teachers' attitudes towards their Negro students and to

---

[1]Response to follow-up questionnaire from Brad Posten, May 18, 1966.

[2]Unsigned response to follow-up questionnaire, May 10, 1966.

[3]Response to questionnaire, James H. Bryant, May 20, 1966.

intercede for the students on occasion.[1] A Negro minister in Florida reported, "I have organized . . . study groups on bi-racial bases to bring about a better relationship."[2]

A white Tennessee teacher reported, "I am teaching an all Negro adult education class. The experience that I had talking and working with everyone down in Fisk has helped me."[3]

But, in fact, no one of the participants who responded to the questionnaire reported any active involvement in solving community problems during the many months which had elapsed since the Institute.

Critique of the Institute as a Leadership Training Model

The crucial test of any educational model would seem to be: were its stated objectives achieved by the kinds of learning experiences offered? In examining the follow-up data obtained from twenty Southern respondents some ten months after the Institute, there is evidence that the sharing of "the accumulated wisdom and experience" objective was achieved, that these participants not only acquired some new knowledge and insights but shared them with school and community groups. There is little evidence, however, regarding the achievement of the Institute's other major objective: the training of leadership "for dealing intelligently with problems of group relations." According to their own reports, not one of the respondents was assuming any new, active role in dealing with local problems.

---

[1] Response to questionnaire, Kenneth L. Eshleman, May 7, 1966.

[2] Response to questionnaire, Rev. A.M. Scott, May 9, 1966.

[3] Response to questionnaire, Paul Haney, May 5, 1966.

One might well question the representativeness of the sample of Institute participants who responded to the follow-up questionnaire. However, since the questionnaire which asked, "What, if anything, have you done as a result of being in the Institute?," was sent to all Southern participants in the 1965 Institute, the sample is a self-selected one. And, it would seem to the writer that those responding could be expected to include persons who were "doing something" and were not displeased to so report.

It would seem fruitful, therefore, to ask why the apparent dearth of Institute participants who put their knowledge of race relations problems to some direct use. Analysis of the data presented suggests several kinds of reasons.

To begin with, as some Institute members pointed out, various action-oriented segments of community which might have added to the discussions not only vigor and compelling reality, but a pressure to focus on "freedom now" and steps to achieve it in the several communities were notably absent. Pre-Institute interviews not only revealed a relatively homogeneous group of middle-class teachers, churchwomen and ministers but revealed, too, a frequent lack of any clearly defined social-educational objectives or aspirations in coming to the Institute. Apparently the Institute staff, although it invited the participation of all, made no special effort to involve a more dynamic variety of groups and points of view. Even in small numbers, it would seem, such participants might have served to stimulate and challenge others to think in terms of programs of community action.

At the same time, those participating in the Institute who articulated plans to undertake some sort of action project when they returned home would, past research indicates, have been far more likely to do so if several persons had come together from a given organization and community and returned to

reinforce one another.

Turning to the kinds of learning experiences offered, it is clear that the lectures by highly regarded authorities from the social sciences, government and private agencies and organizations were the key element in the Institute curriculum with the largest amount of time, four to six hours each day, devoted to them. The general high caliber and significance of these lectures, published each year by the Race Relations Department and circulated among social scientists and intergroup relations practitioners, cannot be questioned.

What might well be questioned, however, was the great number of lectures, thirty in less than two weeks, and the way in which those lectures were organized. Social scientist staff members who planned the Institute could quite readily, by reason of training, experience and close acquaintanceship with the specific subjects, relate the parts to an intellectual whole and the whole to the changing society.

However, for most non-professionals attending the Institute, listening to the lecturers one-by-one as they followed in rapid succession, in no apparent sequence, the multiple task of understanding the sometimes abstract parts; of relating the several parts to a complex whole, and, in turn, to their own "local situations and special job performances" was a difficult and demanding one.

It would seem to this student of adult education that one significant lecture presentation each morning followed by an opportunity in small group sessions to examine its meaning and implications for local communities would greatly enhance the possibility of relevant ideas being accepted and put to some use. In the case of academic subject matter presupposing considerable background

such as Dr. Katz's lecture on "Strategies of Conflict Resolution" or Dr. Henderson's on "Economics and Race" or in the case of a subject with special relevance to a group of participants such as some of the lectures on legal and political processes, it would seem that additional small group sessions should be held. It would also seem that lectures on related kinds of problems should be grouped together so that they could be discussed together for more efficient and effective learning.

The clinics, too, should be re-examined in terms of whether they actually fulfilled the function for which they were established. (Only one third of those interviewed, it should be recalled, indicated that their clinic participation had been of special interest or value). The "informal clinics," according to the 1965 announcement, "give attention to special problem areas and the experiences of the Institute participants." In actual fact, the size of the clinic groups was such that informal interaction and exchange of experiences was difficult.

One of the clinics, the Clinic on Church and Race, during the second week, divided into several small groups around problems of special concern. Out of this, during the several hours, came some new insights into local problems and some sharing of resources and approaches used successfully in other communities and parts of the country. There was not time, however, to formulate and discuss, in any systematic way, back-home plans.

The other two clinics met in full group sessions which were necessarily more structured, less responsive to the needs and interests of individuals. In one group, the clinic leader set the priorities, defined the course of the discussion and served as the expert. In the other, several clinic members served, in turn, as the experts and made presentations to the group. Thus, for most

Institute members there was no opportunity for intensive small group sessions where they could clarify their problems, obtain the help and resources of the group and make plans for using those resources.

In terms of the informal learning experiences within the framework of the residential situation, it seems clear that the staff did little to enrich or facilitate these experiences. It also seems clear, in view of the fact that Southern Institute members emphasized again and again the learnings which resulted from coming to know one another across racial lines, that the opportunity for honest communication and social interaction made possible by the two weeks of residential living is still a relatively rare one in the "Great Society." Obviously in adapting or modifying this curriculum model the residential aspects need to be re-examined with a view to experimenting with and exploring new ways of facilitating that communication and interaction. The kinds of informal learning experiences provided, it should be pointed out, need not be limited to social occasions on the campus. It might also be pointed out that if several Negro and white Institute members were recruited from the same community, they might well develop specific plans for working together on their return.

Finally, it would seem, that the educational program would be greatly enhanced by some sort of evaluative procedure, however informal, both during and after the Institute whereby Institute members would be invited to offer their suggestions and criticisms, Out of such recommendations by participants in the 1965 Institute, could have come immediate improvements, for example, in the daily format and in the organization of the clinic groups and uses of time within those groups. Plans might also have been made for additional small group sessions and for more creative uses of the residential situation. If adult members of a Race Relations Institute are expected to return to their communities and assume responsible leadership, it seems appropriate that they relate to the Institute as adults.

PART III

A WORKSHOP FOR VOLUNTEER TEACHERS IN THE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION PROGRAM OF THE

SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, 1965

The Citizenship Education Program of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference might be more meaningfully called the Full Citizenship Education Program. Using volunteer teachers who must themselves learn more about their government, the workings of politics and basic literacy education skills, the program seeks to help Negro adults with little or no education to read and write, to register and vote, to have an effective voice in community affairs--to achieve the rights of full citizenship.

The educational program was not developed by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, in fact, it came into being before the SCLC,[1] but the purposes of the program and those of the Southwide organization of Negro ministers and lay leaders headed by Dr. Martin Luther King were, in large part, the same.

---

[1]The initial meeting of what later came to be called the Southern Christian Leadership Conference took place in Atlanta, January 10-11, 1957. (L.D., Reddick, "The History of SCLC," The SCLC Story (Atlanta, Ga.:The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 1964), p. 12). The Citizenship School Program was developed by the Highlander Folk School as part of an experimental project for leadership training in rural Southern communities under a grant from the Emil Schwarzhaupt Foundation, beginning in 1953. The first Citizenship School was initiated in 1956.

For along with its most widely-known purpose, "to stimulate nonviolent direct mass action to remove the barriers of segregation and discrimination," the organization pledged itself specifically "to achieve full citizenship rights," "to secure the right and unhampered use of the ballot," and "to reduce the cultural lag."[1]

In reviewing, in 1965, the brief but significant eight year history of the organization with its dramatic achievements through nonviolent action, one of the SCLC's leaders, Reverend Andrew Young, emphasized that these achievements were but first steps. The most difficult goals, including adequate education and political effectiveness, he pointed out are yet to be obtained. In his words:

> We have blindly treaded in faith through the injustices of our society, seeking hot dogs when we needed jobs, standing in at movies when we needed education, arguing over bus rides when we needed houses and staging boycotts for jobs which would soon be non-existent when we needed political rights to shape and structure our own destiny.[2]

Background and Development of the Citizenship Education Program

The Development of the Program: From a Johns Island Bus to Southwide Community Classes

The Citizenship School idea which furnished the basis for the Conference's educational program in communities across the South began on Johns Island, one

---

[1] One of the official "Aims and Purposes of the SCLC" is "To reduce the cultural lag through the Citizenship Training Program" (The SCLC Story, p. 14).

[2] Rev. Andrew Young, "An Experiment in Power," Keynote Address, Ninth Annual Convention, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Birmingham, Alabama, August 11, 1965.

of the depressed, rural Sea Islands near Charleston, South Carolina. It began with a self-educated Negro civic leader, Esau Jenkins, who initiated a kind of Citizenship School for workers riding on his bus between Johns Island and the mainland of Charleston. One of his passengers had asked him to help her learn to read and write so that she could get a voter registration certificate and become "a first-class citizen." Mr. Jenkins not only responded to her request, but secured and circulated copies of the South Carolina Constitution and voting law among all of his non-voting passengers. Each day, he drilled them, reading aloud those portions of the Constitution which they would need to know. As a persistent and strong-minded leader, Mr. Jenkins managed to help and inspire a few of his passengers to memorize whole sections of the Constitution sufficiently well to obtain their voting certificates. As an educator, however, he largely failed, for the fortunate few who registered were still unable to read. And most people were neither able to register nor to read, nor even, many of them, to write their names. The need for basic adult education was obvious. Motivation was high. But the principal of the local, when approached, was fearful. He was afraid, it was clear, of white reaction to classes for Negro adults who were trying to learn to read and write so that they could register and vote.

It was at this point, in the fall of 1956, that Esau Jenkins turned to the Highlander Folk School for help in establishing the first Citizenship School, as it was called, on Johns Island. The independent and integrated adult education center had been engaged in developing civil rights and community leadership training programs since 1953 when it held the first residential workshop on

---

[1] For a first-hand account of the development of the first Citizenship School on Johns Island and the role of Esau Jenkins, see the autobiography of Highlander staff member and former Sea Island public school teacher, Mrs. Septima Clark, Echo in My Soul (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1962), pp. 35-55.

school desegregation in the South.[1] Esau Jenkins had participated in several of these workshops, beginning in 1954 and had encouraged other adult leaders and young adults to participate.

On returning from this initial experience in integrated living and learning, he wrote back enthusiastically to the Highlander staff of the first integrated church fellowship held at their church center on Johns Island. He described with some wonder "white young men and women from Charleston singing, studying, playing and sitting together with colored young men and women of which three of my daughters were a part."[2]

More significant for the development of the Citizenship School, he announced his intention to "run as a candidate for office as School Trustee . . . on Johns Island." And he added, "please you and everyone at the School pray for me. If I lost, (sic) we will try it again."[3] Mr. Jenkins did lose, but he made a major contribution to the self-perception of his Negro neighbors on the traditionally white-dominated island. For the first time since Reconstruction days, the name of a Negro appeared on the ballot--a Negro leader whom people knew and respected was running for office. Only a small number were registered and able to vote in what had always been "a white man's election." From this election, however, the vote took on new meaning and value--to Esau Jenkins, to his bus passengers and to others on the Island.

---

[1]See Part I of this study for the history and development of the first school desegregation workshops in the South by the Highlander Folk School.

[2]Letter from Esau Jenkins, Johns Island, South Carolina to Myles Horton, September 20, 1954.

[3]Ibid.

The first Highlander-developed Citizenship School[1] was held in the rear of the little co-operative store which members of the Johns Island Progressive Club, a local Negro civic group, had acquired, paying for it month by month. The first volunteer teacher was a Negro beautician and active N.A.A.C.P. member from Charleston, Mrs. Bernice Robinson, who, while attending a Highlander residential workshop with Esau Jenkins and Mrs. Septima Clark, had learned of and become concerned about health and other community problems on the near-by Sea Island. Although she insisted that she "couldn't teach because she never taught before," Mrs. Robinson agreed, at the urging of Mrs. Clark, a Charleston school teacher who had taught Johns Island children and had recently joined the Highlander staff, to "give . . . some time and do whatever she could."

---

[1]Before undertaking this program, a great many field trips had been made by the Highlander Folk School staff to Johns Island and the other Sea Islands to meet with community leaders and to observe first-hand their problems, "Index of Developments on Johns Island," Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tenn., July 22, 1955, (in the files of the School).

Out of these field trips, leadership conferences and meetings were held both in Charleston and on Johns Island. One of those, for example, was an all day community meeting devoted to discussing such questions as "Why should Negroes be organized?" A report of the meeting indicates, "There was a packed and attentive house" (Highlander Folk School, 23rd Annual Report (October, 1954-Sept. 30, 1955).

The more interested and promising participants in these civic meetings and conferences were encouraged to attend week-long residential workshops on community leadership held at the Highlander Folk School and on Johns Island. Out of these workshops in 1955 and 1956 came plans for a Housing Committee, voter registration drives and a co-operative store.

By 1956, the director of the Highlander Folk School, Myles Horton, could report a number of constructive developments, "All of these developments," he observed, "are much slower than I had hoped they would be, but people are doing things themselves and there is a new spirit of co-operation on the Island." He added, however, "Illiteracy is still a big problem . . ."(letter from Myles Horton to Carl Tjerandsen, Schwarzhaupt Foundation, March 1, 1956).

The curriculum for this first Citizenship School class came almost entirely from its fourteen eager adult students. When asked by Mrs. Robinson, at the first meeting, what it was they wanted to learn, they readily responded: "how to write their name, how to read the words of the South Carolina election laws . . . how to spell some of those words," as well as their meanings. And they wanted to know, too, "how to fill in blanks when they were ordering out of a catalog . . . how to fill in a money order . . ."[1]

Along with this curriculum related to the several civic and personal needs of the students, Mrs. Robinson agreed to work with a group of high school girls who wanted to learn to sew. The combined curriculum as it emerged is best described by the teacher herself:

> The school which we planned for three months is in progress and the people have shown great interest. They are so anxious to learn. I have fourteen adults, four men and ten women, and there are thirteen high school girls enrolled to learn sewing. There are three adults that have had to start from scratch because they could not read or write. I start out with having them spell their names. About eight of them can read a little, but very poorly. So far, I have been using that part of the South Carolina Constitution that they must know in order to register. From that, I take words that they find hard to pronounce and drill them in spelling and pronunciation and also the meaning of the words so they will know what they are saying. We have to give them some arithmetic. The men are particularly interested in figures. I have never before in my life seen such anxious people. They really want to learn and are so proud of the little gains they have made so far. When I get to the club each night, half of them are already there and have their homework ready for me to see. I tacked up the Declaration of Human Rights on the wall and told them that I wanted each of them to be able to read and understnad the entire thing before the end of the school.[2]

---

[1]Tape recorded interview with Mrs. Septima Clark on how the Citizenship School began, January 7, 1960, pp. 3-4 (in the files of the Highlander Folk School).

[2]Letter from Bernice Robinson to Septima Clark, January 20, 1957.

The struggles of these unschooled adults in the first Citizenship School to learn to pronounce the new and difficult words and understand their meanings aided by a teacher who had never taught is recorded on tapes and in the Highlander Folk School reports to the Schwarzhaupt Foundation as well as in the teacher's notes and letters. Not only did a number of students manage to master the words, but as the educational supervisor, Mrs. Clark noted, "In two months' time, surprising to say, there were some who were ready to register."[1]

Expansion of the Citizenship School Program

Interest in the Citizenship School grew not only on Johns Island but on adjacent South Carolina Sea Islands, Wadmalow, Edisto, Daufuskie and St. Helena. On Johns Island, the enthusiastic new "first class citizens" were the most convincing interpreters of the program to their neighbors. Elsewhere, the story of the Johns Island schools was told by Mrs. Clark, Highlander field staff member, who made visits to the several islands, sometimes for several days or a week, to meet and talk with interested leaders and civic groups about their problems and the program as related to those problems.

Whether the island was a large one, such as St. Helena with a population of some 3,300 (3,000 of these Negroes) or a small one such as Daufuskie with a total population of 141 (133 of these Negroes) the pattern of involvement in the Citizenship School Program was essentially the same. A community group or groups would express an interest in having a school in their area. A leader or several leaders were invited to a workshop at the Highlander Folk School to learn more about the idea, as well as about other activities including registration and

---

[1]Tape recorded interview with Mrs. Septima Clark on Citizenship School beginning, p. 4.

voting and community organization. They, in turn, returned home to organize a school under the guidance of and continuing supervision of the Highlander field staff which included the first Citizenship School teacher, Mrs. Bernice Robinson.

Adult students on these islands were often day laborers from large plantations who worked long hours and came many miles to their unaccustomed new schools for citizenship. Field reports describe both the arduous process of instruction, beginning with many who had never learned to hold a pencil, and the sense of wonder and accomplishment on the part of volunteer teachers and students when "from their eyes you can see the gleam of light when they can write their names."[1]

According to the month by month records of these teachers, not only did large numbers of their students qualify as voters, but they formed voter organizations to urge their neighbors to qualify and met monthly, even when work on the plantation interrupted their classes, to discuss civic issues. These meetings, too, are recorded--in painstaking, pencil-written minutes, set down very often in the awkward hand and language of a new first-class citizen.[2]

A Highlander Folk School annual report summarizes this expansion, "1958 - 1959 saw four new Citizenship Schools opened in the Sea Islands and brought requests for three more in near-by communities." The report also describes the expanding curriculum with its immediate practical purpose continuing to be "to enable students to pass the South Carolina literacy test for voter registration,"

---

[1]Taped interview with Mrs. Septima Clark, p. 6.

[2]The files of the Highlander Folk School contain month by month reports of the volunteer teachers on the several Sea Islands as well as minutes of civic meetings as written by recent students in Citizenship School classes.

but also including "an all-around education in community development and better living." Subjects within this broad curriculum for "better living" included "Social Security, co-operatives, income tax, understanding of tax supported resources such as water testing for wells" and training in filling out mail-order and money order forms which was included in the first student-defined curriculum.[1]

A progress report on the Citizenship School program in September, 1960, indicates that the adult school program on Johns Island had been so effective in its preparation of new voters that there was, according to local leaders, "no need for another school here."[2] This did not mean that the Sea Islands' citizenship education program ended. Schools were continued on other islands and, at the same time, the Johns Island experience and its leaders and teachers represented an important educational resource, as well as an inspiration, to other groups desiring to organize schools in their communities.

In expanding the Citizenship School program beyond the Sea Island in 1959-1960, the Highlander extension staff, which was already working with a number of former students in communities over the South made a systematic effort to describe the successful program and to offer them assistance in initiating their own shcools.

During this period, too, the director of the Highlander Folk School sent out a memorandum inviting other groups in the South to make use of the program.

---

[1] Highlander Folk School, Highlander Reports 27th Annual Report (October 1, 1958-September 30, 1959), p. 3.

[2] Septima Clark, "Recent Developments in 'The Citizenship School Ides'," September 25, 1960 (in the files of the School), p. 3.

It stated in part:

> Highlander's educational resources are available for the use of any agency or organization which shares its view about the need for Citizenship Schools . . . it is prepared to receive supervisors and teachers sent by any one of these agencies, and to hold workshops in which these people will be trained for organizing and conducting Citizenship Schools in their local communites.[1]

As a result of these efforts, always in the context of a rapidly expanding civil rights movement, the Citizenship School Program spread to communities in Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee and other parts of South Carolina. And with this expansion, beginning in 1959, the Highlander Folk School developed a residential program for training groups of volunteer teachers and supervisors to replace its individualized training and supervision in the field.[2]

It is the curriculum for these residential workshops and the accompanying materials for use by volunteer teachers which became, in 1961, the Citizenship Education Program of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. It is this curriculum for training Citizenship School teachers, with subsequent modifications by the SCLC which is the subject of the present study.

---

[1] An announcement for an early "Workshop on Training Leaders for Citizenship Schools" states, "This workshop has been planned to train local leaders for assuming responsibilities for Citizenship Schools in their communities." It indicated that the"consultants" will be "leaders from Citizenship Schools in other parts of the South" who"will tell how they got started and how they are running their program." (Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tenn., January 19-21, 1960). (Mimeographed.)

[2] The organizations sending students to the Highlander Folk School workshops for leaders of Citizenship Schools during this period included: the Southeast Georgia Crusade for Voters; the Chatham County Crusade for Voters of Savannah, Ga.; the Madison County Civic League of Huntsville, Ala.; the Citizens Committee of Charleston County, S.C. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (Highlander Folk School, "The Citizenship Program Continues to Expand," Highlander Reports, 29th Annual Report (October 1, 1960-Sept. 30, 1961), p. 2.

Transfer of the Citizenship School Program to the SCLC

The initial relationship of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to the Citizenship School Program, beginning in 1960,[1] was as a co-operating organization which agreed to send persons recruited by its affiliates to the Highlander Folk School to be trained as volunteer teachers and supervisors.

When it became apparent in 1961 that the Highlander Folk School, as an integrated center actively engaged in Southwide programs of civil rights education, would be closed by the Tennessee Courts and its educational programs terminated, arrangements were made to place the Citizenship Program under the sponsorship of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference with funds for the program to be administered by the Board of Home Missions of the Congregational Church. Under this new sponsorship, the program was to be directed by Rev. Andrew Young along with an educational staff consisting of Mrs. Septima Clark, on leave from the Highlander Folk School as Director of Workshops, and Mrs. Dorothy Cotton of the SCLC as Educational Consultant.

The first Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop under the SCLC staff was held in July, 1961, at the Dorchester Center, McIntosh, Georgia.[2]

---

[1] At an SCLC meeting in Shreveport, Louisiana in October, 1960, it was decided that the invitation to co-operate in the program be accepted in view of the need for "the training of new leadership in the South to implement the program of the SCLC" (Memo to SCLC Affiliates from Southern Christian Leadership Conference National Office, n.d.).

[2] The participants in this first SCLC workshop came from Louisiana, Georgia and South Carolina. They included retired and unemployed persons, housewives, farmers, a union member, an undertaker's helper, a dress maker, a building contractor and a minister. According to a workshop report, the volunteers stated that the training did for them what they hoped the Citizenship School would do for their students: "It defined the individual's responsibility for first-class citizenship" and gave them "the courage to assume this responsibility and to work actively in community development."

From 1961 to 1965, some 1600 volunteer teachers were trained in residential workshops. These teachers, in turn, taught more than 25,000 adult students and out of their efforts and those of their students, "They were responsible for the enrollment of more than 50,000 registered voters."[1]

A Curriculum for Volunteer Teachers of Citizenship Schools

Purpose: To Develop Beauticians, Tradesmen, Farmers and Seamstresses into Teachers

The purpose of the Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop of the SCLC, as its name clearly indicates, is to train volunteer teachers who will return to their communities to organize and teach Citizenship School classes, to help their neighbors read, write, vote and become fully participating citizens.

This purpose has special significance because the workshop specifically undertakes to develop as teachers groups of people not generally thought of in this role. Civic organizations are asked to send "persons with practical skills who could be taught to teach" including "beauticians, tradesmen, farmers, seamstresses" and also retired persons and young people. The only qualifications laid down within these broad categories are that they be willing to teach a class and that they be "persons who read well aloud and who write legibly on the blackboard."[2]

In electing to train these kinds of non-professionals as Citizenship School Teachers, the curriculum planners based their decision both on the positive

---

[1] Mrs. Septima Clark, Report to the Highlander Center Board of Directors Meeting, Knoxville, Tenn., May 14, 1965.

[2] "Application for Teacher Training," Citizenship Education Program, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

results achieved by the pilot Sea Island program with the same kinds of grass roots teachers and on the negative results of publicly-supported institutions with professional teachers which had failed to reach these same groups of people in the islands.

Underlying the thinking and planning was the assumption that the civil rights movement which was changing the social pattern and expectations of a whole generation of Negroes (and whites) in communities across the South would motivate many who had never taught or led to become teachers and leaders just as it would motivate many more who had never conceived of themselves as citizens to read and write and qualify as voters. This belief that in a period of social crisis adults are not only challenged to learn faster, but can be taught to assume new leadership roles and develop other leaders had been a central one in the curriculum thinking and planning of the Highlander Folk School in its more than twenty-five year history of relating educational programs to Southern social crises and movements.

The "round-the-clock" Curriculum

The six day residential training curriculum as developed by the Highlander Folk School was an intensive, round-the-clock experience. Beginning on Sunday evening and lasting until Friday evening, it was planned to encourage maximum participation on the part of the 20-25 volunteer teachers and supervisors in attendance.

Following an orientation evening where each participant introduced himself and told something about his community, there was a day of demonstration classes in the teaching of reading and writing where participants were asked to observe

criticize and act as teachers using as texts such materials as sample voter registration tests. Daily sessions thereafter took participants, step by step, through the process of preparing for their own schools: arranging a meeting place and scheduling the classes in relation to employment, transportation and other local factors; planning the week-by-week program beginning with the first meeting and culminating with closing exercises, always taking into consideration the instructional level of the particular students; recruiting students utilizing a variety of approaches; and relating the Citizenship School program to on-going community education and action activities. [1]

At each step, the students were asked to participate in the process, through demonstration classes, role-playing and small group sessions where they formulated their own plans and educational programs. To climax this experience, each student was asked, on the final day, to present his plans to the total group. A note regarding the curriculum-thinking underlying this learning activity indicates that it "gives the student the experience of 'talking out' some of his ideas," affords him "the benefit of the group's reaction" and "produces in the student the feeling of having made a commitment."[2]

Along with these structured learning activities, there were evening programs including speakers, group singing and films, offered both for themselves and to demonstrate activities which, it was hoped, would be included in the local Citizenship Schools. The singing, with a professional song leader, included Negro folk and religious songs which it was suggested their students would enjoy singing and, at the same time, increase their reading vocabularies.

---

[1] See Appendix for the curriculum outline, Training Leaders for Citizenship Schools, Highlander Folk School, Monteagle, Tenn., n.d. (Mimeographed.)

[2] Ibid., p. 10

There were also opportunities, daily, during a so-called "voluntary skill period" for individuals and groups to learn to use tape recorders, record players, film and slide projectors.[1]

The "round'the-clock," residential aspects of the workshop were always emphasized by those who conceptualized it. The informal discussions, the recreation, the "living together in the community" were all viewed as integral parts of the total educational experience. Out of the informal social interaction, the "over-the-dishpan talks with people from other communities who are facing the same problems," it was pointed out, participants can "not only become leaders themselves, but they are in a position to develop other leaders."[2]

SCLC Curriculum Changes: More Content, Less Participation

In interviewing the Citizenship Education Program staff, there were considerable differences in opinion as to the significance of changes in the curriculum which have occured under the new organizational sponsorship and direction.

---

[1]The original methods and materials for the training of Citizenship School teachers were developed, in large part, out of an analysis by supervising staff and others of the Highlander Folk School staff of what was being taught and how by volunteer teachers in the first Johns Island classes. Through observation and analysis of these classes, it was possible to identify the recurrent needs of Negro adult students seeking to vote and achieve "first-class citizenship." It was also possible to identify, among the teaching methods and materials as evolved and adapted by the unorthodox teachers, those methods and materials which "worked," which proved effective in preparing students to register and vote and assume the other responsibilities required of them as adult family and community members.

[2]Myles Horton, Reply to Questions posed by Dean Charles Gomillion, Tuskegee Institute, regarding the Highlander Folk School's contribution to civic democracy in the South, 1959.

One staff member, who felt that the content and process have remained essentially the same, indicated, "We have added with the times." She explained that information on new Federal programs, such as the Poverty Program, and on new legislation such as the Voting Rights Act, have been included. She indicated, too, that some new subject-matter has been included as new student needs have been suggested, for example, the need for consumer education and the need to know how to read and evaluate a newspaper.[1]

Another staff member, citing the same kinds of curriculum changes together with methodological changes in the teaching of reading, felt that the curriculum was "altogether different."[2]

Actually, in examining the two curricula, there have been some twelve hours of subject-matter added, but the basic design remains essentially the same. The SCLC curriculum, like the original Highlander Folk School curriculum, continues to prepare participants, step-by-step, to organize and teach Citizenship School classes in their local communities.

It is in the area of small group and individual teaching-learning activities that the curriculum has been greatly altered. In the August, 1965 workshop, there were no opportunities for individual and small group planning in relation to their back-home situations or for instruction in the use of audio-visual aides. This change in the curriculum came about, apparently, as an accomodation to the fact of the doubling of workshop participants, from 20-25 to 40-50, and the shortening of the training period which now begins on Monday evening and ends on Friday evening.

---

[1] Interview with Bernice Robinson, November 8, 1965.

[2] Interview with Mrs. Septima Clark, November 9, 1965.

Notably, when asked to comment on curriculum changes, staff members made no mention of what would seem a basic change in the day-by-day workshop process.

In terms of the residential aspects of the workshop curriculum, essentially the same amount of time is set aside for informal recreation and social interaction. In addition to the daily meal-time and the between and after-session hours, one afternoon during the four afternoon workshop is devoted to a staff-student trip and outing.

In interviewing the staff, they emphasized the need for a residential setting which is comfortable and informal and takes participants away from the distractions of the city as well as from their family and community responsibilities. They were clearly aware that, for many, the total experience is a vastly new one--both the workshop itself, participating in the training and preparing to become Citizenship School teachers and being away from home, meeting people from other communities and parts of the South and exchanging ideas and experiences with them. In arranging for the housing of students, it was indicated, a conscious effort is made to facilitate this exchange by placing people from different communities and parts of the South together.

Description and Analysis of the August, 1965 Teacher Training Workshop

Some Factors Affecting the Workshop

In describing and analyzing the Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop which took place August 23-27, 1965, it is necessary to be aware of certain factors outside of the curriculum which inevitably affected it.

The Voting Rights Act: Registration Without Education

To begin with, the passage into law, just before the workshop, of the 1965 Voting Rights Act[1] eliminated not only the literacy requirement for voting in the several Southern states, but also eliminated the major reason for the rapid growth of the Citizenship School Program, in contrast to traditional literacy programs. Over an eight year period, tensand hundreds and finally thousands of illiterate Negro adults were drawn into Citizenship School classes. They were willing to face up to their inadequacies, to go through the belated process of learning to form letters and read and write words, to cope with complex sentences, ideas and processes—not for a diploma or a certificate, but to become registered voters! Now, they could register without being able to read or write.

At the opening of the August workshop, Mrs. Clark spoke with enthusiasm about the great changes occurring in the South and the challenges and opportunities presented for "concerned people." Turning to the recent legislative enactment, she indicated, "We want to read and write for many reason . . . (but) we don't need to write to register and vote." What she did not indicate to the volunteer teachers was that the training staff was deeply concerned about the implications of the new Voting Act for the very future of the Citizenship School Program.[2]

---

[1]The Voting Rights Act was signed by the President of the United States on August 6, 1965.

[2]Notes as participant-observer of the first session, August 23, 1965.

Participants in the Workshop: Illiterate to College Graduate; Retired Person to High School Student

The thirty-five Negro and white participants in the workshop represented a far wider range of ages and educational backgrounds than any proverbial one-room school, and a far greater range than originally intended by curriculum designers and the SCLC Citizenship Education Program staff. The staff explained that as the program and their responsibilities had grown, the job of recruiting trainees had been turned over, increasingly, to the far-flung field staff of the SCLC and, in 1965, to the college student SCOPE workers, the Summer Community Organization and Political Education volunteers. Many of these had little understanding of the program for which they were recruiting.[1]

Thus, in interviewing and attempting to gather written data from twenty-six[2] of the forty participants in the August workshop, two persons were found to be functionally illiterate; one, a young man from a small Alabama town who had been an elementary school drop-out; the other, an older woman, also from a small Alabama town, who indicated that she had been to school for one year. The latter said wishfully, pointing to a newspaper that she would "like to pick up that paper and read." At the upper end of the educational range were white and Negro college graduates, who themselves represented a range from white graduates of Northern Universities to Negro graduates of unaccredited colleges.

In age, the group ranged from retired persons in their late sixties to youth in their teens (some still in high school, some recent graduates, some drop-outs). In between, there were men and women, primarily the latter, ages

---

[1] Interview with staff member Bernice Robinson, November 8, 1965.

[2] Data on educational backgrounds, community and civil rights activities and participants objectives in coming to the workshop gathered primarily in interviews, except for some high school and college-trained Negro and white participants who were given questionnaires.

twenty-five to fifty-five. Their educational backgrounds ranged from high school, trade school or beauty culture school to six or seven years of elementary school, again varying considerably in quality, depending upon when and where the education occurred.

The Setting as a Segregating Influence

The setting itself, Dorchester Center, a half-century old Negro community center and one time church-related Negro boarding school located in rural Georgia, appeared, on first impression, to be a serene, comfortable white pillared-edifice surrounded by green lawns. Within, however, the building was poorly laid out and more poorly managed so that the staff of the Citizenship Education Program, shortly after the August workshop, decided to look for other quarters for their program. The only large common room was in constant use for meals, for evening sessions and for recreation. And because the center of recreational activity was a loud juke box with rock and roll records, those who wanted to relax, to talk in small groups, or to read had to retire to the upstairs dormitory rooms which were small, hot and crowded with beds and people's belongings.

In the evening after sessions when it was too noisey and too warm to retire, the adults and some of the younger people stood or sat around the edges of the common room watching the group which was dancing. A few of the staff and others who had access to cars left to find a quieter place. Inevitably, the effect was, during the informal evening hours, to segregate people by age and by privileged status.

One of the older women who complained about the young people, their music, their noise, their talk insisted that there was only one solution, "There should be two workshops, one for the old and one for the young!"

Positive Factors: Student Motivation to Help "My People," the Movement and Myself

Yet, if the students were widely diverse in age, in education and experience, they had in common a commitment to the civil rights movement, to the ideal of "freedom" and "first-class citizenship" and a desire to help others as well as themselves to achieve that status. Over and over again, in workshop interviews, both youth and adults, when asked what they hoped to get out of the workshop explained, as did a sixty year old cafeteria worker, "I came to this workshop because I wanted to help my people . . ."[1]

Some saw the job as encompassing large segments of their community. An Alabama farmer lamented that there were many young people as well as adults who "have never started." He was, however, undeterred by the size of the problem, "I came for the educational experience--their methods for getting it over to the people,"[2] he emphasized.

Some had suffered economic and other reprisals for their participation in the movement, but this had not lessened their determination to learn and to help. One middle-aged woman, mother of four children, prominent in the Selma movement, suddenly lost her job as cook when her employer complained that she had "slowed down with all that marchin'." Unemployed and worried about her children, she had, nonetheless come to the teacher training workshop. "The main reason I came," she explained, "is in order to help the people and also help myself."[3]

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Bertha M. Durant, August 26, 1965.

[2]Interview with Collins Harris, August 24, 1965.

[3]Interview with Mrs. Ella Mae Moton, August 24, 1965.

A nineteen year old Alabama youth who had been helping the SCOPE workers to organize a Negro Voters League and to push for higher wages in a Deep South area where "some janitors and maids make about twenty cents," had not only been threatened by the white community, but beaten by his father. He expressed the hope that he would be able to teach a Citizenship School although, he admitted, "In a way, I don't want to go back."[1]

A mother of eight from a small Alabama town indicated that her husband was afraid that he would lose his job because she was attending the workshop. She commented quietly, "I had to do some tall talkin' to come."[2]

Some of the workshop trainees were painfully aware of their inadequacies and feared that they might not qualify as teachers. One woman who had already been trying to help individuals in her community read and write asked the interviewer whether she would be prevented from teaching a Citizenship School class because she had studied only six years in a rural school.

A tall young grade school drop-out who couldn't spell the name of the town where he grew up and who began working at the age of nine "selling coal and putting gas in cars" spoke with enthusiam of the Citizenship School Program. In spite of the fact he was unable to teach, he indicated that he would try to help someone else teach. He observed, hopefully, "It helped the people . . . if everybody do that, the world, young folks, old folks. Then everybody will have more learning. It could be a great world!"[3]

---

[1]Interview with John Reynolds, August 24, 1965.

[2]Interview with Mrs. Starkes, August 25, 1965.

[3]Interview with John Henry Fitts, August 25, 1965.

Many among the younger participants were concerned about the apparent apathy and lack of understanding of the movement which they observed on the part of adults. A June high school graduate from New Orleans stated firmly, "I am determined to become a key instrument in my community." Of the adult community, he observed, "The people are satisfied much too easily."[1]

A young woman who had completed four years in a Southern Negro college told of going door-to-door in her community and speaking to civic and church groups to try to get people to register. Describing the fear, the feeling of infericrity on the part of many, she stated, "I hope to get ideas in general to help me make the approach . . . to help some want to become first-class citizens . . ."[2]

A recent high school graduate from a small South Carolina town wrote, "In my community we need more person (sic) to register . . . I plan to learn a lot wherein when I go home, I can teach people how important citizenship is."[3]

Some of the students as well as adults saw the workshop as an opportunity to help the movement and also to learn something about teaching and working with groups. A slight, thoughtful student who had been a Negro "test case" when he entered Louisiana State University, stressed that he was seeking to "acquire skills for teaching others." He expressed the hope that perhaps he could "find out suggestions on how to bring out the best in people myself, how to share information, discuss the problems we have at home, share ways of problem-solving."[4]

---

[1]Interview with John Wright, August 25, 1965.

[2]Interview with Mattie McCants, August 26, 1965.

[3]Interview with Robert Jackson, August 27, 1965.

[4]Response to Questionnaire, Clarice Collins, August 24, 1965.

A recent high school graduate from a small half Negro--half white town in Alabama told about talking with other students who were trying to teach people to read and write. "I would like to go back and learn (sic) the people more than the people there are teaching, then try to get them to understand what's happening in the movement." She continued, "I would like to know all about the School--what kind of materials, films, all that I can tell them." When asked if she was employed, she replied, "No work but civil rights."[1]

Another young woman, bright, articulate, mother of two, who had left school at fourteen to get married and whose marriage had "broken-up" because her husband opposed her activities in the movement, stated that she had come to the workshop "to get more knowledge, experience, know-how" so that she could organize and teach a class. "You'd be surprised at how many people don't know anything about the Constitution, the beginning of the Negro in America," she exclaimed.[2]

All of the five white participants in the Citizenship School workshop were college graduates from the North and West who had come South to volunteer their services and learn more about the movement. Four had recently joined the American Friends Service Committee--VISA program. One, a young California clergyman, wanted to find a useful role, to give expression to his religious convictions through working in the South and in the movement. All expressed an interest in learning about the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Citizenship School Program but, above all, they wanted to get to know and understand the Negroes who had come to the workshop, their ideas, their hopes, their problems.

---

[1] Interview with Carolyn McMurray, August 24, 1965.

[2] Interview with Mrs. Imogene Thomas, August 23, 1965.

The Workshop Staff: Volunteer Teachers and Members of the Movement

The several members of the workshop staff, out of their own experiences and commitment, were closely related to the movement and to the other workshop participants. Along with being adult educators, they were involved in the movement as staff members of Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and, long before, as Negroes living in Southern communities. Two staff members, Mrs. Bernice Robinson and Ben Mack had themselves been Citizenship School teachers; Mrs. Robinson, as has been indicated, in the first School established in the Sea Islands in 1956. All of the staff had taken the risks and paid the price for their activities in the movement. Mrs. Septima Clark had been fired from her public school teaching job of more than thirty years in Charleston, South Carolina for her involvement in civil rights and had thereafter joined the Highlander Folk School staff and helped develop the Citizenship School Program. Another staff member, an Atlanta University-trained social worker; Annell Ponder, was a veteran of the Albany, Georgia movement where she and others had become "legendary" for their prolonged and courageous non-violent struggle in the face of jailings and beatings from the white community and fear on the part of many in the Negro community.

Staff and students, in many ways, already "knew one another." They could move on, therefore, rapidly to the business of the workshop.

Orientation Session: Getting Acquainted with One Another and with Their New Roles as Teachers

Significantly, the workshop was opened with the singing of freedom songs, led at first by a staff member, but very rapidly taken over by group members who improvised verses growing out of their local movement experience. The powerful

unifying effect of the group singing could be felt immediately--even by the tentative white participant-observers. One of these recalled the first night's singing:

> B.J. started it off with "Paul and Silas Bound in Jail" in his strong, slow and swinging voice, clapping heavily and moving around the circle . . . the fire spread so quickly my fingers tingled and I suddenly had more air to sing with. The room became the world and the singing was not just from the lips and lungs; it was a full expression of being.[1]

What followed the singing were relatively formal introductory statements by staff about the hours and house rules of the residential center and about the workshop purpose and daily schedule, but the effect of the singing was to relate everyone, unite everyone in the impelling, pervasive music of the movement.

During this very first session, participants were asked to begin thinking of themselves in their new and unaccustomed roles as teachers. Early in the session, as some forty-five staff and participants sat together in a circle, each was asked to "introduce your neighbor on the right." This, for many, was an uncomfortable process. It required not only rapidly acquiring (and remembering) the name and background information about a new person, but being able to repeat this information before a whole group of new people. The process was made more formidable for some because of the person whom they had to introduce. A shy, young Negro high school drop-out from a small town in Alabama, for example, had to interview and introduce a poised and assured young white woman with a Northern urban university background. Almost immediately, however, the staff reminded students in the workshop that one reason for taking time for these introductions was so that they, as teachers, would be thinking about

---

[1] Personal notes on the Workshop, Lucy Massie, n.d.

some method to introduce their students to one another on the first meeting of their Citizenship School class. On frequent subsequent occasions, workshop members were moved beyond their own limited stage of development by being put in the role of teachers gaining new skills or knowledge in order to help others.

Motivating the Group: "Do You Know Some People Who Can't Read or Write?"[1]
(Second day)

At the beginning of the second session, the morning after participants had arrived from their communities in various parts of the South, staff member Dorothy Cotton involved the group very personally in the subject of the workshop by asking, "Do you know some people who can't read or write?" Their own stories brought forth by this question spelled out more compellingly than any motivating speech or sermon why they were needed as volunteer teachers.

Someone told of an older woman in her community who was "afraid to carry her grandbaby to the doctor . . . because he would ask her to write her name."

Another told of teaching an old man of seventy-eight who "didn't know what his check said" to "write his name and scribble a little."

Others told of efforts made by both young and older people to hide their ignorance. "They even carry fountain pens and pencils," one man observed of some of his illiterate neighbors in a rural county.

As they brought out examples, one of the workshop participants admitted, "I would like to know more about reading and writing myself." Another woman commented, "I don't have much education, but I do have a will to help . . ."

---

[1]Description of session based on notes as participant-observer, August 24, 1965.

One of the high school age students indicated that his own father was unable to read or write but added, "He's a very hard person to get over to . . ."

A woman who described her town as "a hard place" reported that by going door-to-door she had found "twenty-four people who want to learn." Indicating that most members of the movement in her community had recently been jailed, she assured the group, "I'm gonna do the best I can in my spare time!"

A SCOPE field worker estimated that in the Alabama county in which he was working, "about fifty per cent can't read or write," and added that he had been unable to find a single "settled" person to come to the workshop.

There was a heated discussion of the reasons why so many Negroes are illiterate. One of the high school participants suggested that "most of them are old" and were unable, many years ago, "to get the proper training." A middle-aged woman differed strongly. She pointed out that as late as 1949, people working on large plantations had little opportunity to go to school. "When they started planting, gathering cotton, they had to stay in the fields!"

A man of fifty who had managed to obtain both high school and vocational education over a period of years insisted, "We got this way because we were downright stupid, lazy and afraid!" And he cited with pride his own hard-won accomplishments, "I couldn't go more than two or three months out of the year, but I went!"

A college-educated young man differed strongly, "I think one of the reasons it's this way is because we're black!" He pointed to the unqualified teachers in many Negro schools. "Sometimes when we finish high school, we're doing what we call reading. . . . We don't read now. We call words!"

Another young man, a student, added, "The person who brought the Negro over had a purpose. Once he could read and write, they wouldn't have been able to work him for nothing."

The session ended to be followed by a demonstration class on teaching people how to write their names. For almost one-half hour, some of the would-be teachers discussed the meaning of the word "signature" and whether a name which was printed could be considered a signature.

A laborious exercise followed with two participants demonstrating how to write their names on the blackboard by picking out the proper capital and small letters from an alphabet chart as they would ask their students to do. Again, the two struggled while others waited and watched. In general, the group seemed to view the lengthy process with understanding, perhaps, growing out of their analysis of the underlying reasons for the inadequacies of their neighbors, their families and, in some cases, themselves.

Reading Demonstration: From Sounds to Words to "Why Vote?"[1]
(Third day)

In demonstrating the teaching of reading, the staff member leading the discussion was Mrs. Bernice Robinson, the high school-educated former beautician and seamstress from Charleston who served as the first volunteer teacher with the Citizenship School Program.

Beginning with the sound chart and asking the class to repeat the sounds, Mrs. Robinson apoligized for the elementary level, "Remember, you are going to have more trouble with your classes. I am working with 'graduate students' here!" As the class practiced repeating the several sounds, however, it was clear that a number of them, as in the case of the teaching of reading, needed help in pronunciation while others seemed good-naturedly amused by the process.

[1]Description of session based on tape recording and notes as participant-observer, August 25, 1965.

After some minutes of demonstrating sounds and relating the process to her own experience as a Citizenship School teacher, Mrs. Robinson moved the group to a more advanced level in the teaching of reading. She pointed out that in their Citizenship School classes, they would find such materials as government pamphlets on Medicare and Social Security useful "texts" because they contained material needed by their adult students. To demonstrate how a Medicare pamphlet might be used, she asked the group to "Find a word beginning with the letter 'p'." Again, the exercise was both a learning experience for some and a demonstration of the teaching process to others. Someone picked out the word "popularly" but thought the word was "popularity." Someone else clarified the meaning of the two words. The word "program" was identified. Here, a lengthy discussion followed when Mrs. Robinson asked, "What do we mean by the word program?"

One person stated, "A program is to build on, a foundation."

Another suggested, "A program is something for everyone to follow."

A third person, a college graduate, suggested that to be meaningful the word should be used in some context, in relation to something specific. Mrs. Robinson responded by returning to the Medicare pamphlet and asking, "What does the word 'program' mean here?"

Further discussion followed with some of the younger and better-educated students attempting to short-cut the discussion by interrupting the lengthy explanations of other group members. "Give the person who thinks a little slower a chance to answer," she reminded them.

In closing the first half of the session, Mrs. Robinson reviewed the process which the group had just experienced of moving from the teaching of sounds, to words, to considering words in a context.

Moving on to what she described as an "intermediate reading lesson," and emphasizing that they should find materials of interest to their students, she demonstrated with an illustrated pamphlet which had been issued to the trainees entitled, "Why Vote?" As various class members volunteered to read the pamphlet, paragraph by paragraph, they frequently had difficulty with pronunciation as well as with the meanings of words. When someone confused the word "ally" with "alley" she commented, "Every workshop we get these words confused!"

In coming upon the word "political machine," there was a considerable discussion of how political machines are created and operate. After asking the group to tell about political machines which they had seen in action or heard about, Mrs. Robinson drew a diagram of State government on the blackboard and pointed out the kinds of patronage and consequent control exercised by a governor. "Two hundred thousand votes might be controlled indirectly through these State jobs," she observed. Turning from the general problem of controlled votes to Negro voting power and the potential voting power of students in Citizenship School classes, she exclaimed, "This is why it is so important that we get over to our people that they should vote! We don't owe anything to that governor! We can break any machine if we get people registered to vote!"

The reading of the pamphlet continued. Other pronunciations, word meanings, and political concepts were discussed. At one level, time was devoted to discussing the political concept of a pressure group. At another, some readers had considerable difficulty in pronouncing the words "register" and "registration" which they pronounced "redister" and "regis-ter-ation." One middle-aged woman who had difficulty with the word "registration" said anxiously, "My tongue is tied. Will that be all right for teaching?" She was reassured that she had been able to say it correctly "when you took your time."

Discussion of the content of the pamphlet moved on to the subject of studying issues before voting. This raised a troubling question in the mind of one workshop member, "What should be done if the papers don't give fair coverage to civil rights issues?" Here, a number of suggestions were made by both staff and participants. The idea of a boycott of the newspaper was suggested. A civil rights paper, The Southern Courier was cited as an example of a paper available by subscription with good coverage of civil rights issues in the South. One of the staff members suggested that Negroes might put out a local mimeographed paper of their own.

As the group completed reading the pamphlet aloud, some readers, including a recent high school graduate, had difficulty with the material. Mrs. Robinson closed the session with a strong statement on the importance of reading for "first-class citizenship" (addressed apparently both to volunteer teachers and their students).

Film and Discussion Session: Brief, Poor Film; Long, Animated Discussion[1]

(Fourth evening)

One one of the last evenings of the workshop, a brief educational film, "Good Government is Your Business," was shown. Following the film, the group, divided by the staff into four small groups to facilitate discussion, evaluated it at length in terms of its merits and uses for Citizenship School classes.

The film was an old, cheaply-made one with a didactic plot: a "good" young man decides to run for office against a "bad," perennial machine candidate. His family and friends urge him not to try. The machine threatens him. He persists

[1]Description of session based on notes as participant-observer, August 26, 1965.

and, with a single campaign message, "Get out and vote," arouses a previously apathetic public and wins the election.

In spite of the simplicity of the film, and the fact that all the characters were white and middle-class, the response to it was almost entirely enthusiastic. There was rapt attention on the part of most viewers. The discussion which followed involved both students and adults of various backgrounds and educational levels. The only dissenters and question-raisers were to be found among several of the Northern white participants who questioned the feasibility of one man defeating a political machine or rallying public support without any apparent issues.

The reports back from the small groups included inspired statements by various spokesmen such as "One man <u>can</u> change a community if you are enthusiastic!," and "You have to vote at the local level--everything you do is regulated by politics!" And, "In order to do anything, you must have faith!" The reports were not only well received, but at least one of them was greeted with applause.

The film, whatever its quality, had not only come at a point in the workshop where it was relevant, but at a point in the lives of Negroes in the South where it was highly relevant!

Final Day of the Workshop: The Unanswered Questions[1]

(Fifth day)

On the last morning of the workshop, there was a detailed explanation and demonstration of record-keeping by Mrs. Septima Clark with each workshop participant asked to fill out his own sample record sheet.

---

[1]Description of session based on tape recording and notes as participant-observer, August 27, 1965.

As she explained carefully how to make out a roll, how to figure average monthly attendance, etc., various class members began to raise unrelated questions which were obviously of concern to them as they looked toward the end of the workshop and returning to their communities.

One of the eager volunteer teachers asked about the feasibility of teaching more than one class. The answer was brief. He could teach two classes, four nights per week, if there was sufficient demand.

An older woman asked the group and Mrs. Clark for help on several problems including how to get people to attend church, how to get people to attend Citizenship School classes and what to do about people who use profanity. Mrs. Clark, desiring to get back to the subject of record-keeping assured her, "We'll get you some help."

A young woman was worried about the way in which the discussion of civil rights had been surpressed in her small Georgia community. She indicated that both the Negro and white ministers "had agreed not to mention civil rights in church."

This comment initiated others about how to deal with "Uncle Toms." One man passed along a slogan he had heard, "Don't fight him and don't feed him!"

Another student, looking ahead to starting his Citizenship School class asked, "Is harvesting a bad time for a class?"

After some attempt to deal as briefly as possible with the several questions, Mrs. Clark returned to the subject as defined, asking the group to take out their sample expense vouchers. She demonstrated how the voucher would look, putting the sample items in the several columns, "blackboard $5.00, fourteen pencils at two for five cents . . ."

As Mrs. Clark demonstrated how to total the voucher, someone broke in urgently, "In my town, people are registering. I want to know about voting." She, along with several others, had talked throughout the week about the problem of how to help people eligible to register under the new Voting Act, but unable to read, to cope with the ballot. Mrs. Clark gave a brief explanation and promised to discuss the matter"another time." But other questions and expressions of concern and anxiety followed. "People want us to prove ourselves . . .," one young woman began.

Record-keeping had been demonstrated in spite of the interruptions, but many questions clearly remained unanswered in these final hours of the workshop.

Final Session: The Volunteer Teachers as Transformers of Society[1]

The final session of Friday evening was a banquet honoring the new group of volunteer teachers who had come, five days earlier, as a retired beautician, domestic workers, an undertaker's helper, high school students, an unemployed cook, an independent small farmer, an owner of a boarding house for elderly people, a minister's wife, college students, mothers and grandmothers.

Every aspect of the occasion was planned to mark the transformation. Cotton dresses were replaced by Sunday attire. The farmer who had lounged comfortably in his overalls throughout the week was wearing a dark suit and addressing the group as "Speaker for the Men." The mother of four, who had been troubled for several months by events of the Selma march which had taken her job and put her son in the courts, stood before the festively-decorated tables as "Speaker for the Women." "This seems to be a place that we don't want to leave," she observed. "God be with us as we continue our fight to make this a free world."

[1]Description of session based on notes as participant-observer, August 27, 1965.

Ben Mack, on behalf of the staff, spoke with humility of their efforts, "Perhaps you have not gotten all that you had hoped. . . . We hope some of the things will be of great service to you when you go back to your communities. We hope that you will do as we have tried to do."

Through a so-called "skit," in several acts and covering one hundred years, a group of younger members of the workshop, Negro and white, dramatized the transformation of "Uncle Tom" in the cotton fields to "Mr. Tom" as a freedom fighter.

To climax the transformation, the chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, John Lewis, spoke to the new teacher-leaders. "The Citizenship School teachers," he stated, "represent the new people of the South, not the 'new Negro,' . . . people who have been on the outside for a long time." He traced the early struggles of "poor people," the recent civil rights struggles beginning with the sit-ins and, "Now," he emphasized, "the right to vote!" Stressing again the larger nature of the struggle, he predicted, "We're going to transform the South . . . the whole South." In achieving this transformation, "the Beloved Community," he turned to the assembled group, "If any real changes are to take place in our society . . . we must do something ourselves! The people! You must bring them about!"

The banquet session closed with "the people"--staff, speaker, volunteer teachers--joining hands to sing "We Shall Overcome."

The Residential Experience Examined

In spite of the inadequate physical setting, the residential experience provided a number of opportunities, planned and spontaneous, for informal educational and social activities which were significant in themselves as well

as affecting the kinds and quality of communication which occurred within the formal workshop sessions.

One of these activities was group singing of the songs of the civil rights movement. Every morning, afternoon and evening before a new session began, someone would start a song, sometimes a staff member, sometimes a group member, young or old. Someone would sing, "Everybody Loves Freedom . . ." Someone else would add the verse, "Alabama Loves Freedom . . ." Other verses would be added, Tennessee, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, South Carolina, until all of the states represented were included. The effect, as on the first meeting, was to include and relate everyone across boundries of age, education, experience and race. Along with the effect on group morale and the enjoyment, simply, of singing together was its value as a learning activity. Everyone was learning new songs which they could take back to their several communities and Citizenship School classes.

Probably the most important among the informal learning activities were the frequent opportunities for discussion at meal times, while washing up afterwards, in the dormitory rooms or sitting under a tree after a session. In intimate groups of two or three or four or five (sometimes including a staff member), participants were free to raise questions about things they didn't understand, to talk about back-home problems or to share their personal hopes and plans.

Out of such discussions, some got specific help from their fellow participants--a woman who was seeking suggestions, for example, about how to gather community support for a youth center said enthusiastically, "Donald gave me some very sharp points to get this center built!"[1]

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Rebecca Ware, August 27, 1965.

Others were strengthened in their determination to continue the struggle. "We never really know how bad it is until you hear others talk about it," a small town Alabama woman observed.[1]

Many expressed their pleasure at coming to know one another. "Here you have a chance to eat, live and work with people. Other places you just work and march together," explained one seasoned young civil rights worker.[2]

Some youth and adults mentioned getting to know one another. A high school aged youth said simply, "I got closer to older people than before."[3]

Others spoke in more general terms about the experience of being together at Dorchester. "It's as great to me as anywhere I have ever been or heard of," an older man stated who had made it a point to talk with most of the youth and adult members of the workshop as well as the staff.[4]

An afternoon bus trip and beach outing for students and staff on one of the last afternoons of the workshop provided a leisurely opportunity for this kind of interaction. At the same time, it provided an opportunity, the first for many Negroes in the group, to visit a beach, to walk along the sand and feel the waves. Most of the younger members of the group and some, even among the older women, not only watched but waded into the water. One of the older women, when asked what stood out for her in the workshop, replied readily, "All of my classes and the afternoon we all went swimming."[5]

---

[1] Interview with Mrs. Ella Mae Moton, August 27, 1965.

[2] Interview with Donald Doss, August 27, 1965.

[3] Interview with Robert Jackson, August 27, 1965.

[4] Interview with Collins Harris, August 27, 1965.

[5] Written response to interview questions, Mrs. Lizzie Mae Willis, n.d.

The beach trip was also the first and only opportunity when the group, together, encountered "the outside world." Others on the customarily "Negro beach" expressed curiosity about the integrated group. In reply, if they showed any interest, questioners were told not only about the group but about the Citizenship School program. A sense of pride in and identification with the workshop group, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the program were clearly in evidence.

Reactions to the Workshop: "I have been inspired enough to put it before the people."

The immediate effect of the workshop was to give many a feeling of confidence, of readiness to return to their communities and organize a Citizenship School class.

A widow and retired beautician who had more formal education than many of the older participants, but who had lacked confidence in herself, stated, "I see a better future for us . . . I have been inspired enough to put it before my people . . . my value of being here was more to put in action what I knew."[1]

An Alabama farmer who had come to learn "their methods for getting it over to the people" talked, after the workshop, of how he planned to teach. "The tactics are different," he explained. "By using some of these I have learned here, I can get to them more softly." He added, "As our instructors did."[2]

One of the women who had sought advice on how to instruct illiterate voters, registered under the Voting Rights Act, to use the ballot, indicated at the close of the workshop that she was still not sure how to proceed. However, of her

---

[1] Interview with Mrs. Essie Bizzell, August 27, 1965.

[2] Interview with Collins Harris, August 27, 1965.

general reaction to the five-day training, she stated affirmatively, "It gave me confidence to address myself to the students."[1]

Some of the workshop members had already begun thinking through the details of getting their classes underway. "I'm going to try to get my class to meet before the Civic Club," one of the women said when asked if she had any plans as she returned home.[2]

A South Carolina high school graduate replied with regard to his plans that he was starting his Citizenship School class on September 9. Another recent high school graduate indicated that he had already begun recruiting for his class before he came to the workshop.[3]

Some were looking ahead to assuming additional community responsibilities and to making other changes in the community. One woman, apparently inspired by her own adult education experience, looked beyond the Citizenship School classes to having "an adult school in our community."[4] Another woman saw the Citizenship School as the first step to "wake up a lot of people" in working toward "a better gover'ment."[5]

A college student from New Orleans indicated that he planned "to go into an area that rejects civil rights." He continued, "I will canvass the area, establish local people to work with, and pursue my convictions to the fullest."[6]

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Roberta Starkes, August 27, 1965.

[2]Interview with Mrs. Rebecca Ware, August 27, 1965.

[3]Interview with Robert Jackson, August 27, 1965.

[4]Interview with Mrs. Essie Bizzell, August 27, 1965.

[5]Interview with Mrs. Rebecca Ware, August 27, 1965.

[6]Written response to interview questions, August 27, 1965.

There were others, of course, who did not have clearly thought out plans when the workshop ended. The woman who was wishing that she could "take up that paper and read" said of her plans, "I will be doin' some kind of work in the movement." And of her experience at Dorchester, "There was gratitude in me just to sit and learn."[1]

Follow-up Data: What Participants Did When They Returned Home

According to available records, nine of those attending the August, 1965 workshop were teaching Citizenship School classes as of September, 1965. There may have been others but these persons had filed reports and requested materials from the Citizenship Education Program staff. This meant that at least one third of those eligible to teach had recruited students and organized a class within one month after participating in the volunteer teacher training workshop!

Along with their requests, some of these new teachers included enthusiastic accounts of their experience. One of the high school-age teachers wrote:

> I have set-up my classes here in Macon and Gray, Georgia . . . We have something like a mass meeting to draw people to our classes and we have found this to be a very good way to get the adult interest in knowing more about affairs going on in Macon. . . .[2]

Others came more directly to the point. "The class is great," one young woman stated. "I want you to send me the blackboard, chalk, writings (sic) pad and the pencils because we are boycott(ing) the town here." She added that all fourteen members of her class had registered, along with some four hundred others.[3]

---

[1]Interview with Mrs. Lizzieren Moore, August 27, 1965.

[2]Letter from Elijah Jones to SCLC office, October 4, 1965.

[3]Letter from Sadie Phifer to SCLC office, n.d.

Another brief letter was from an older woman teaching a class of fourteen, ages thirty-seven to seventy-six:

> This is my first month teaching this Citizenship School class. It have be (sic) a great experience for me. I hope I can be of some help to those who have become Registered Voters hear (sic) in Selma and Dallas County.[1]

Unfortunately, data regarding classes taught or other activities of the August, 1965 Workshop members have not been available since these Autumn, 1965 reports.

Field Trip to One Community

In December, 1965, this writer made a visit to Selma, Alabama to gather follow-up data on workshop participants living in that area. Along with learning that four persons from the Selma area had taught a Citizenship School class, the interviewer learned of many other activities in which the several participants had become involved.

One of the women who had intended to teach a class, had instead, been taking adult evening classes herself.[2] She explained that in her efforts to obtain employment she had failed a "job test." Although she was unsure whether the failure was hers or a punative action on the part of an anti-civil rights employer, she had found the classes rewarding. She emphasized that the workshop had helped her. "They asked some of the same questions!," she commented. Along with continuing her own education, this participant indicated that she had been active in the local voter registration campaign. She estimated that she had "influenced" some seventy-five to one hundred persons to vote since the

---

[1] Letter from Mrs. Lizzie Mae Willis to SCLC office, n.d.

[2] Field interview with Mrs. Ella Mae Moton, Selma, Alabama, December 2, 1965

Federal Registrar had come to Selma in August. During the interview, a neighbor who was unable to read came to ask her help in deciphering a letter she had received regarding registration.

Unfortunately, systematic data is lacking on the community activities of workshop participants who, for whatever reasons, did not teach a Citizenship School class. It may be that a good many of them, like the unemployed head of her family interviewed, are assuming community responsibility in other ways and continuing their education.

One of the workshop participants interviewed, a woman in her sixties who does house work by the day, had just finished teaching her first three month Citizenship School.[1] It was clear that along with helping her students, at various levels, to gain rudimentary reading and writing skills, to become acquainted with the Bill of Rights, to discuss the pamphlet "Why Vote?" and to acquire other skills and information related to full citizenship, that she had encouraged their fuller participation in community affairs. Each student, she reported, had been responsible during the three-month class for encouraging ten neighbors to become registered voters. At the same time, they had all, teachers and students, participated in weekly political meetings in their ward and in recent bi-weekly meetings to discuss plans and make recommendations regarding the Poverty Program in that area. Judging by the Citizenship Education Reports of the SCLC for previous years[2] this community participation by volunteer teachers and their Citizenship School students was quite typical.

---

[1]Field Interview with Mrs. Lizzie Mae Willis, Selma, Alabama, December 3, 1965.

[2]See Appendix

Follow-up Questionnaire Data

Efforts to obtain additional follow-up data by means of a questionnaire mailed in May, 1966 to August, 1965 workshop participants were not very successful. Only seven persons responded. Three of these were among the group which had already reported that they were teaching Citizenship School classes beginning in September, 1965. Two others replied to only a few of the questions.

The sixth person, an older woman from a small town in Alabama, wrote, "Busy working and have not started class yet." She indicated, however, that she had been working with "the Civic Clubs in every possible way."[1]

A seventh respondent, a farmer from a small, primarily Negro community in Alabama, made no mention of Citizenship School classes but said of the workshop, "Everything proved to be helpful to me in my fight in Civil Rights in the State of Alabama" and he reported of that fight, "I have been successful in leading my community in a protest against the laws and the educational system."[2]

The Workshop for Citizenship School Teachers as a Model: "The educational process has begun long before"

In explaining why the workshop for the training of volunteer Citizenship School teachers "works," how seamstresses and farmers from rural Georgia or Alabama could become teacher-leaders in five days, one of those who developed the program stated, "The educational process has started long before they come and continues long after they leave."[3]

---

[1]Reply to follow-up questionnaire from Mrs. Bulah Lowery, June 5, 1965.

[2]Reply to follow-up questionnaire from Collins Harris, June 5, 1965.

[3]"An Interview with Myles Horton," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVLL (May, 1966), p.492.

In viewing the workshop as a model for training leaders, therefore, it should be thought of in relation to a three step process:

(1) Participants come to the workshop with considerable first-hand knowledge of civil rights and community problems and a deep desire to solve them. Thus, as has been indicated, the participants in the Citizenship Education Program Teacher Training Workshop held at Dorchester Center, McIntosh, Georgia, in August, 1965, although varying widely in age, experience, occupational and educational backgrounds, approached the workshop deeply committed to the civil rights movement and to helping their neighbors achieve full citizenship.

(2) They participate in a residential adult education program which serves to reinforce their commitment and identification with the Southwide movement, gives them some new skills and knowledge and, most important, a new community role and a new belief in what they can do. The knowledge and skills offered in the workshop described were clearly only a small part of what most volunteer teachers would need to fill in the inadequacies in their own educational backgrounds as well as to help their neighbors. But they were helped, from the first session, to view themselves in their new roles as Citizenship School teacher-leaders. And, in their five days together of sharing plans and problems and singing freedom songs, they were strengthened, too, in their sense of being part of a larger movement for full citizenship in the South.

(3) <u>They returned home in their new roles with a broader goal for themselves and their communities</u>. They returned to their communities, as one woman expressed it, "loaded with plans."[1] And many found, as she did, that they had little trouble gathering a class because her neighbors were "in favor of me coming to Dorchester to get some information for them."[2]

The teaching of classes, however, was only one of their activities, as is indicated by the farmer who reported a successful protest in his segregated Alabama community "against the laws and the educational system," by the unemployed cook who indicated that she had "influenced" at least seventy-five neighbors to vote or by the domestic worker who, with her class, was actively involved in local politics and poverty program planning.

---

[1] Letter from Mrs. Lizzie Mae Willis, May 6, 1966.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the several kinds of data presented, two of the three residential adult education programs, the Highlander Folk School Workshop on School Desegregation and the Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, would seem to be useful models for organizations and institutions seeking to develop effective, democratic local leadership so greatly needed in community and civil rights groups of the South.

In coming to this conclusion, three factors related to the design and process of these workshops appear to be of fundamental significance and, it might be added, of significance in the development of other leadership training models:

(1) The residential setting in both instances, but especially in the case of the Highlander Folk School Workshop on School Desegregation, was a planned educative environment where there could be free and creative interaction among Negro and white, college-educated and self-educated, young adult and older adult, student, staff and resource person. The group, in each case, was small enough, the atmosphere informal enough, the opportunities for discussion and social interaction varied enough and the physical location far enough away from the distractions and demands of every day living to make possible an intensive and rich social-educational experience.

(2) The adult students, whatever their ages, came to the workshops as responsible and active members of their several communities and organizations, committed to assuming new or more effective social roles,

(3) The educational program was problem-oriented with adult students encouraged to make maximum use of the resources of the residential setting and the social knowledge of their fellow adult students and staff in preparing to cope with problems of achieving school desegregation or of helping their neighbors become "first-class citizens."

SUMMARY

Title: AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED PROGRAMS FOR THE TRAINING OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS IN THE SOUTH

Investigator: Aimee I. Horton

Institution: Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee

Project Number: S-291

Duration: June, 1965 to June, 1966

BACKGROUND

Recent Supreme Court decisions, beginning with the 1954 decision outlawing the "separate but equal" doctrine in race relations, the non-violent actions of Negroes including student sit-ins and protest marches in Alabama and Mississippi, and the strong affirmation of those actions by the Federal Government in the form of major civil rights legislation and changes in public policy, have contributed greatly toward setting aside the segregated system in the South and the "Uncle Tom" leadership which served it. What remains to be accomplished, however, in every Southern community, is to develop new kinds of independent, democratic Negro leadership, able to mobilize local Negro support in changing the persisting segregated patterns and discriminatory practices. At the same time, they must be able to participate effectively with responsible white community leadership in the solution of common problems of community living. What the basically changed social situation in the South requires is educational programming to develop new kinds of local leadership--both among Negroes and their white counterparts.

In accomplishing this far-reaching task, existing adult education programs for the training of civil rights and community leaders should provide models which can be adapted by institutions and organizations seeking to help meet the widespread need. However, there is little in the recent research literature of adult education on the training of community leaders. And, in the case of the present study which examines three different potential models of racially-integrated residential adult education programs for the training of local leadership, only one relevant study has been identified. The present study, therefore, should contribute to the literature of residential adult education and community leadership training as well as to the immediate practical need for adaptable educational models.

OBJECTIVES

This study is concerned with examining three examples of racially integrated residential adult education programs for the training of civil rights and community leaders in the South. These programs differ in their sponsorship, clientele and educational objectives and in the kinds of learning experiences, including residential learning experiences, offered for achieving these objectives. The purpose of the study is to examine each as a potential model, in whole or in part, for other institutions and organizations in the South concerned with developing leadership training programs.

The study of each program will be confined to describing and analyzing: 1) objectives as defined by staff and participants; 2) examples of the learning experiences utilized to obtain these objectives, including residential learning experiences; 3) evaluation of the program by students and staff; and 4) apparent effect and effectiveness of the Institute as viewed by participants.

The first of these programs to be examined is a 1955 Workshop on School Desegregation, one of a series of workshops developed, beginning in 1953, by the Highlander Folk School, an independent residential adult education center located in rural Tennessee. The second program is the 1965 Annual Institute of Race Relations, founded in 1942 by the Race Relations Department of the American Missionary Association and located on the campus of Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee. The third example to be examined is a 1965 Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop sponsored by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a religiously-oriented civil rights organization headed by Dr. Martin Luther King and held at a church-supported center in rural Georgia.

In the first program to be examined, participants were Southern Negro and white leaders of a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, all actively working on problems of desegregation in their several communities. In the second, participants were largely middle-class Negro and white teachers, ministers, churchwomen and others from communities of the North and South. Participants in the third of the three programs included a small number of concerned whites, but were largely working-class Negroes, young adults and adults, from Deep South communities with a desire to help their neighbors achieve "first-class citizenship."

The curriculum for the Desegregation Workshop was problem-centered, moving from problem definition to a consideration of resources to the development of specific plans for community action. The Institute curriculum was, in large part, academic with emphasis on lectures by specialists to give participants a broad orientation to race relations problems and programs for change. The Workshop for Citizenship School Teachers took participants step-by-step through the process of preparing them for their new community roles as teacher-leaders.

In each case, the experience in integrated residential living was considered by curriculum planners to be of some importance, but the several settings and efforts to plan activities related to that experience varied considerably.

PROCEDURE

The data on which the description and analysis of each of the three programs is based have been gathered in somewhat different ways.

The data on the Highlander Folk School Workshops on School Desegregation, 1953-1957, have been gathered in the following ways: a) minutes and other staff records of planning sessions; b) tape recordings and written records of workshop sessions; c) reports and other materials resulting from workshops; d) correspondence between staff and participants before and after the workshops; e) follow-up questionnaires to workshop participants as administered both by the Highlander Folk School staff and, recently, by the present writer.

Data on the Race Relations Institute and, specifically, on the 1965 Institute have been gathered from the following sources and by the following means: a) reports of past Institutes; b) pre-and post-Institute interviews or questionnaires administered to twenty Southern participants; c) attendance at the two-week residential Institute as a participant-observer of formal sessions and the informal residential activities; d) interviews with Institute staff members; e) follow-up questionnaires to all Southern participants in the Institute.

Finally, data on the Southern Christian Leadership Conference Citizenship Education Program and, specifically, on the 1965 Teacher Training Workshop have been gathered from: a) staff reports and tape recordings of planning and evaluation sessions during the development of the Citizenship School Program; b) pre- and post-interviews or questionnaires administered to twenty-five young adult and adult participants in the workshop; c) attendance at the five-day residential workshop as a participant-observer of formal sessions and informal residential

activities; d) interviews with the 1965 workshop staff and with those responsible for developing the Citizenship Education Program; e) follow-up interviews with participants in the Selma, Alabama area three months after the workshop; f) follow-up questionnaire to all forty participants in the workshop.

RESULTS

The results of this study cannot be readily summarized since they are in the form of a description and analysis of each of the three potential models for developing civil rights and community leadership and an evaluation of each by participants in terms of what they valued and what action they reported taking as a result of the educational experience.

The Highlander Folk School Workshop on School Desegregation, 1955

The Highlander Folk School Workshops on School Desegregation, 1953-1957, were developed specifically to prepare Negro and white local leaders to take effective action in facilitating the process of school desegregation in their several communities and thus carry out the 1954 Supreme Court decision, pending at the time of the first workshop.

In examining the records of this series of one-week and month-long Workshops, there is a functional relationship between the outcomes of one workshop and the planning and agenda of the next. Thus, selected participants in the 1953 and 1954 workshops assisted in planning the 1955 workshop as well as recruiting participants. Guidelines for desegregation and other materials produced and tested by participants in previous workshops were resources for the 1955 workshop.

Members of earlier workshops who returned home to assume significant leadership roles in their communities became resource persons for that workshop.

In the course of the workshop, each local leader-participant described his community and its problems and patterns of segregation as he perceived them. The group, in turn, attempted to identify and analyze the common or underlying problems of the several communities. Finally, divided into working groups and assisted by staff and resource persons, they developed practical plans for action when they returned home.

The forty some Negro and white local leaders attending the workshop represented a variety of Southern community backgrounds from urban communities of the upper South to the rural Sea Islands of South Carolina. They had many opportunities to come to know and learn from one another within the informal, rural setting of the Highlander Folk School where the staff made maximum effort, through planned recreational, educational and work activities, to facilitate significant interaction.

In evaluating the workshop experience, Southern Negro and white participants, whatever their social, educational and community backgrounds, emphasized the importance to them of various aspects of living and learning together in a "desegregated" residential community. They spoke of the democratic, tension-free atmosphere where they could live in friendship and work co-operatively on the solving of their several problems of desegregation.

Participants developed specific but flexible plans for action when they returned home, including A Guide to Community Action for Public School Integration which was widely distributed and used. A number of them, correspondence and reports of field visits as well as questionnaires indicate, managed to assist the school desegregation process in their several communities as well as to take part in voter education programs and other activities. A few, notably Mrs. Rosa Parks,

assumed dramatic leadership roles—Mrs. Parks as the leader of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, often described as the first major act in the Southwide civil rights movement.

The Institute on Race Relations Fisk University, 1965

The 1965 Race Relations Institute, like the First Annual Race Relations Institute in 1942, was concerned, as its founder, Dr. Charles S. Johnson had stated, with making available the "accumulated wisdom and experience" and with developing "leadership for dealing intelligently with problems of group relations." Southern Negro and white participants who were interviewed at the beginning of the Institute, however, whether teachers, ministers or churchwomen, were often vague or general in their reasons for attending.

The central element in the curriculum of the two-week Institute, "Human Rights in the Great Society," was, as in previous Institutes, a series of morning and evening lectures, some thirty in all. These dealt with economic and other problems confronting Negroes; the problems of other minorities and the political and legal processes and governmental and private programs for change. The lectures were presented by social scientists, government specialists and spokesmen for civil rights organizations and minority group agencies, all authoratative in their knowledge, experience or both.

The Institute curriculum also included afternoon clinic groups. Clinics on Church and Race, on Employment and on Community Action, where members could discuss problems of special concern. Two of these three clinics, however, were too large to allow for individual presentation of problems and in none of the groups was there time to consider step-by-step solutions. . . .

As in previous years, the Institute continued to provide an experience in integrated residential living on the Fisk University campus. However, for various reasons related to a changed and more open social situation in the surrounding community and to staff convictions regarding the Institute program, little responsibility was assumed by the staff for planning social and other activities to bring Institute members together in informal interaction. No special arrangements were made, in fact, even to house the one hundred fifty Negro and white participants from the North and South on a planned, integrated basis within the men's and women's dormitories. Thus, most Negroes roomed with Negroes and whites with whites.

In interviews with a representative group of Southern participants at the end of the Institute, respondents were asked, "What part or parts of the Institute, if any, were of special interest or value to you?" Some one third found participation in their clinic group of special value; two thirds indicated that the lectures were of notable interest and all but one person emphasized the significance of various aspects of the residential experience. Those who cited especially their clinic participation tended to be persons who gained specific ideas to take back to their communities. In contrast, those who commented about the lectures tended to endorse them generally. Even those who were extremely critical about the inadequacies of the residential setting and arrangements emphasized the importance of "eating together, walking together, sharing ideas."

There is evidence in the responses to follow-up questionnaires ten months after the Institute that participants had obtained some new knowledge and insights which they shared with school, church and community groups. There is evidence that a smaller number gained useful, sharable information in the clinics on Employment, Church and Race and Community Action. However, there is little evidence in the responses on follow-up questionnaires that Institute participants were assuming any new and active roles in dealing with local community problems.

The Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 1965

The purpose of the 1965 Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop was, specifically, to train and inspire volunteer teachers to return to their communities and organize Citizenship School classes to assist their neighbors in learning to read, write, vote and become participating citizens. The volunteers, seamstresses, beauticians, domestic workers, as well as students and retired teachers, were widely varied in their ages and educational backgrounds, but all eager to assume a new and useful role in the civil rights movement by helping others achieve "first-class citizenship."

Initial sessions in the five-day workshop included discussion of the urgent need of many Southern Negroes (including some of the workshop participants) to gain basic skills and civic knowledge. This was followed by a number of demonstration and practice sessions in reading, writing and simple arithmetic, using as "texts" money orders, checks, pamphlets on new government programs and information on politics and voting as well as simple articles on Negro history.

The residential experience was an integral part of the total experience with many having their first opportunity to meet people and learn about problems in other parts of the South, as well as singing Freedom Songs together, planning together and making a trip to an ocean beach as an integrated group.

Interviews and observation of sessions indicated that the desire to be a teacher-leader, to help "the movement" and "my people," transcended the inadequacies both of the program and of participants' backgrounds. (Many had less than a high school background and some less than an elementary school education). This motivation also caused people to be almost totally enthusiastic and uncritical of

the workshop as an educational opportunity. A Negro farmer from Alabama stated, for example, "It's as great to me as anywhere I ever heard of." A retired beautician said after the workshop, "I see a better future for us . . . I have been inspired enough to put it before my people . . ."

One month after the workshop, one third of those eligible to teach Citizenship School classes (excluding white participants who came to learn about the program and those Negro participants who were functionally illiterate) had recruited and organized schools and had their evening classes underway. Some of the others, whose job or other problems prevented them from teaching a class, reported being active in voter registration, local politics and other community activities.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the several kinds of data presented, two of the three residential adult education programs, the Highlander Folk School Workshop on School Desegregation and the Citizenship School Teacher Training Workshop of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, would seem to be useful models for organizations and institutions seeking to develop effective, democratic local leadership so greatly needed in community and civil rights groups of the South.

In coming to this conclusion, three factors related to the design and process of these workshops appear to be of fundamental significance and, it might be added, of significance in the development of other leadership training models:

(1) <u>The residential setting</u> in both instances, but especially in the case of the Highlander Folk School Workshop on School Desegregation, was a planned educative environment where there could be free and creative interaction among Negro and white, college-educated and self-educated,

young adult and older adult, student, staff and resource person. The group, in each case, was small enough, the atmosphere informal enough, the opportunities for discussion and social interaction varied enough and the physical location far enough away from the distractions and demands of every day living to make possible an intensive and rich social-educational experience.

(2) The adult students, whatever their ages, came to the workshops as responsible and active members of their several communities and organizations, committed to assuming new or more effective social roles.

(3) The educational program was problem-oriented with adult students encouraged to make maximum use of the resources of the residential setting and the social knowledge and experience of their fellow adult students and staff in preparing to cope with problems of achieving school desegregation or of helping their neighbors become "first-class citizens."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

There are only six references listed in the report other than the numerous records, published and unpublished, related to the three programs which are the subject of the present study.

PUBLICATIONS

As yet, no publications have resulted from this project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

Books

Black, Algernon. The Young Citizens. New York: Frederick Ungar Comapny, 1962.

Clark, Septima. Echo in My Soul. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1962.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemna. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.

Johnson, Charles and Associates. To Stem This Tide. Chicago: The Pilgrim Press, 1943.

Thompson, Daniel. The Negro Leadership Class. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1963.

Articles and Reports

Horton, Myles. "An Interview with Myles Horton," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (May, 1966), 490-97.

Human Rights in the Great Society, A Summary Report of the 22nd Annual Institute of Race Relations, Fisk University. Nashville, Tennessee: Race Relations Department, United Church of Christ, 1965.

Pitkin, Royce. The Residential Adult School in American Adult Education. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1956.

Reddick, L.D. "The History of the SCLC," The SCLC Story. Atlanta, Georgia: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 1964.

---

[1]The numerous unpublished materials in the body of the research report are located in the files of the Highlander Folk School, Knoxville, Tennessee; the files of the Race Relations Institute, Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee, and the files of the Citizenship Education Program, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Atlanta, Georgia.