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uncouth and vicious underprivileged class." Regrettting his lack of a formal education, Rosenwald's practical business sense made him a successful entrepreneur but not an elite member of society. Both Washington and Rosenwald shared a belief in education as a passport to middle class status in a white, Protestant society. More importantly, they shared a pragmatic self-interest in education as a means of securing their own private—and separate—worlds. To that end, Jewish philanthropy and black education were compatible partners.
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Congress on Racial Equality (CORE)

Growing out of the Christian Student Movement of the 1930's, CORE emerged from a pacifist religious ideology. Four of the six founding members of CORE were white (George Houser, Bernice Fisher, Homer Jack, James R. Robinson) and two were African American (James Farmer, Joe Guinn). All student members were pacifist intellectuals at the University of Chicago. Of the six founding members, four were divinity students (James Farmer, George Houser, Bernice Fisher, Homer Jack), and two (James Farmer, George Houser) were members of the Christian Pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR). The founding members of CORE were previously involved in peaceful, non-violent organizations dedicated to equality. The ideology of direct non-violent action as the foundation for racial desegregation in public accommodations was the organizing principle for CORE members until the mid 1960's, when they experienced an organizational shift.

The 1940's represented a period when the civil rights movement was in its infancy. In the 1940's, the NAACP, representing a voice for social justice, was embarking on legal battles and informational campaigns regarding the practice of segregation and discrimination (Powell 1965). During that same period, CORE worked towards the desegregation of public facilities. Throughout the 1940's, CORE established local chapters in northern and western states. In the 1950's their efforts began to concentrate on the southern and border states, with particular attention given to voter registration, bus boycotts and the Brown decision. By the mid 1960's, the organization shifted from non-violent direct action to Black power direct action, separatism, and armed self-defense.

CORE and American Universities

Since its inception, CORE drew its membership primarily from the college student population. CORE relied on student participation, mainly because these were the individuals that had the time to conduct sit-ins. Many CORE chapters were located in college towns or towns with a large college in residence (e.g., Berkeley, CA; Tallahassee, FL; Ann Arbor, MI; and Columbus, OH). More specifically, there are direct university and college linkages to the: University of Chicago, Illinois State Normal University, University of Illinois, University of Kansas, Berkeley, Roosevelt College, Penn State College, Cleveland College, Kentucky State College, University of Kentucky, Florida State University, Florida A & M University, Cincinnati Conservatory of Music, Cincinnati College of Music, Ohio Wesleyan University, and Baldwin Wallace College.

It is important to clarify that chapters were not on the college campus, but instead in the city where the colleges were located. This meant that organizations were not under the authority of the university. This is significant because the Corelator, a newspaper publication of CORE, provides evidence that some universities expelled students that were associated with CORE. There were even instances where faculty members were fired for their participation in CORE. As an example, two faculty members and twelve students were dismissed from Kentucky State College (Corelator 1960). In some instances, dismissed faculty members would assume leadership positions within CORE. Typically CORE's leaders were drawn from individuals with fiscal autonomy, such as landowners, business owners, and ministers. These individuals were more apt to participate in CORE activities without risk of being fired from a job, expelled from school or removed from the land they owned (Klugh Interview 2001).

The original founders and other members of CORE worked diligently alongside other groups that were committed to interracial collaboration. Specifically, CORE partnered with the Cincinnati Human Relations Council, the South Carolina Council on Human Relations, the Baltimore United Citizens Groups for Better Human Relations, the St. Louis Mayor's Council on Human Relations, the Evanston Interracial Council, the Miami Interracial Action Institute, the Student Community Human Relations Council of Urbana-Champaign, and the Student Community Interracial Committee of Urbana-Champaign, (Corelator 1960).

Student Community Interracial Committee (SCIC)

Formed in the spring of 1945 in Urbana-Champaign, the SCIC was responsible for the establishment of equal and fair treatment in public accommodations. They utilized the law to its fullest extent and enlisted the support of campus students, faculty and the community (Tiebout Papers 1951). Initially, the SCIC unified and fought against discrimination in local restaurants that would not serve African Americans. However, similar to CORE, the SCIC became wrought with internal strife and disbanded a few years after its inception. Before the SCIC experienced organizational strife, they began to investigate discrimination in eating establishments. The majority of eating establishments in the Urbana-Champaign area discriminated against African Americans before and after the war. Because of this, the Committee devised a plan of action for eliminating racial discrimination in restaurants and followed it closely. The Committee followed a strict set of guidelines, as they felt organization was crucial to their success. In response to cases of restaurant discrimination they:

1. sent letters to the offending restaurant, notifying it of the knowledge of their discriminatory policy and requested that the practice be stopped, as it was a violation of the rights of man and of the law;
2. sent a delegation to restaurant managers to present arguments and listen to theirs;
3. gathered petitions and other forms of public opinion;
4. gathered affidavits for legal evidence;
5. visited the manager with the legal evidence;
6. provided evidence to the States Attorney with a request for action;
7. held conferences with all concerned, explaining the consequences of continued violations of the Illinois Civil Rights Code;
8. requested injunctions to close the restaurant because of violation of the law;
9. used a considerable legal fund to prosecute civil cases (Tiebout Papers 1945-1951).

In many instances the SCIC did not have to go beyond step seven, although they were fully prepared to seek legal recourse if necessary. In addition to their letter writing campaign, the SCIC committed finances to fighting discrimination. They regularly paid all legal fees associated with the lawsuit regarding claims of discrimination through their legal defense fund (Tiebout Papers 1945-1951).

After gaining some success with dining facilities, the SCIC shifted their efforts to the movie theaters. In their Interracial Newsletter, the committee urged African Americans to attempt to attend theaters and be seated on the main floor. In this newsletter, the SCIC asserted that the general policy of the theaters is to treat individual African Americans according to their attitude. In the case of the Rialto and Virginia theaters, African Americans who, in a non-confrontational manner, insisted upon being seated in a location of their choice were usually accommodated without any interference. The SCIC felt that the theaters "segregated[d] by conditioned responses", where a person’s attitude dictated the treatment they received (Tiebout Papers 1946). Although this was the claim made by management, there is evidence that may not have been the case. Many students believed they were being told to sit in the segregated section for no other reason than that they were African American. They claimed that they modeled perfect behavior when they purchased their tickets. There were no indicators that the students would be troublemakers that may have substantiated the claim for seating by conditioned responses.

Members of the SCIC developed a testing campaign to demonstrate the theatres commitment to mistreatment and discrimination. Several tests revealed that management arbitrarily discriminated against African American and white patrons. White students that were part of the testing campaign and asked to be seated in the "Negro" section were labeled troublemakers and asked to leave the theater (Suggs Interview 1997). African American students that were involved in the testing campaign were often told to sit in the segregated section for no other reason than that they were African American. They claimed that they modeled perfect behavior when they purchased their tickets. There were no indicators that the students would be troublemakers that may have substantiated the claim for seating by conditioned responses.

The SCIC was formed at the outset with very specific goals in mind that were written clearly in their constitution.

We, students and faculty members of the University of Illinois and citizens of Champaign and Urbana, realizing the inherent dangers of racial discrimination to our American Democracy, that it is a weapon of certain Fascist and race supremacists, to aid them in their fight against the democratic forces in the United States, do hereby establish the Constitution of the Student Community Interracial Committee to fight, by means of education and all legal forms of action, all vestiges of racial discrimination in Champaign, Urbana, and on the campus of the University of Illinois (Tiebout Papers 1945-1951).

Prior to dissolving, the SCIC moved from a plan of action to one of education. Their overarching goals were the same but they felt education was the avenue for remediying many discriminatory acts. Using these strategies, the Committee gained some success with restaurants, movie theaters and the swimming pools. They believed their purposes would be better served by continuing to break down barriers for which they had previously been successful. To that end, they implemented "workshops in public relations, human relations techniques, and Negro history" (Tiebout Papers 1951).

The tactics of addressing discrimination were taught to SCIC members that attended CORE workshops held, primarily in the summer months. Because compliance with non-discrimination laws, was not always the first response from offending facilities. In the cases where African Americans were not treated in the same manner as whites, members of the SCIC would then follow the guidelines set forth by CORE to address the issue of discrimination in an organized and non-violent manner. Students were instructed to:

1. plan a campaign of testing—CORE tactics;
2. formally contact by letter, explaining who they were, what they did, call attention to the incidents of discrimination in which they knew about, recalling dates etc... Suggest they help them change policy without injury to the business—Ask for a personal conference with the business owner;
3. visit the business owners if an invitation is not offered. They were instructed not to wait for more than 10 days to do this;
4. leaflet in front of café with printed materials geared for action;
5. picket;
6. be able to call off a campaign with dignity (Tiebout Papers).

Era of Dissolution and Reorganization

The SCIC, some University officials, and the Urbana-Champaign African American community were the backbone to the growth and development of African American students during the days of segregation. The SCIC worked long and hard until a split in 1950 due to internal strife over politics and strategies. The strife became such a problem that the organization decided it was best to dissolve the partnership before outsiders became aware of their problems and took it as sign of weakness (Tiebout Papers 1953).

Two major issues were involved in the discussion to dissolve the organization. First, there was dissention because of strategies encouraged by two factions: "radicals" and "conservatives." The radical faction of this organization demanded direct action. Their action involved testing campaigns and picketing. The "conservatives," however, opted for a more informational campaign that was based on letter writing and distributing pamphlets. The dissent between the two groups caused the conservative members to organize and call for a vote of dissolution.

Second, the membership felt that there was a lack of community support, as evidenced in the newsletter, written by Gerald Moser, co-chairman. Apparently, he was concerned with the apathy displayed by the African American community and felt the letter would motivate them. He acknowledged the community's lack of time and energy and understood they were devoted to other
areas of their lives. However, he felt it was of the utmost importance to have a
united front so he reminded community residents that the work of the Committee
was primarily for them. Furthermore, students, who would come and go once
they finished with their academic training, completed the majority of the
committee's work, but the community was there to stay and would need a strong
and steady backbone (Tiebout Papers 1946). This conference was primarily for those
in the community who were interested in the possibility of forming a
organization to eliminate discrimination and tension or to use them to advance totalitarian
ends.

This preamble marked the beginning of a new and more defined organization.

Philosophies such as Fascist, race-supremacist, and Communist fostered
the danger to our community from groups and persons motivated by totalitarian
goals. The University of Illinois students or community members, would be admitted
provided they "wholeheartedly agree to the principles of the
preamble" (Tiebout Papers 1953) that stated:

- We, students and faculty members of the University of Illinois, and
residents of Champaign County, recognize the danger to our community of
discrimination among racial, religious, ethnic, or other culturally defined groups,
and of the human tensions arising out of such differences. We further recognize
the danger to our community from groups and persons motivated by totalitarian
philosophies—such as Fascist, race-supremacist, and Communist—who foster
discrimination and tension or to use them to advance totalitarian ends.

In 1951, most of the members voted to dissolve the organization; only
seventeen of the 114 members opposed this action. It was decided that the
 treasuries would be left to five members who had proven to be worthy of
reorganizing the effort. It was then hoped that an organization would be
constructed along similar lines, but with new membership (Tiebout Papers 1951).

Within one week after the vote, the conservative element formed a new
organization, the Student Community Human Relations Council (SCHRC). The
goals of this new organization were similar to the goals of the SCIC, but now
the membership was of like disposition. The SCHRC embarked on the task of
fighting against racial discrimination in Champaign-Urbana.

**Student Community Human Relations Council**

The reorganization was successful, and the new members decided to
include a clause in the constitution that any person interested in membership,
University of Illinois students or community members, would be admitted
provided they "wholeheartedly agree to the principles of the preamble" (Tiebout
Papers 1953) that stated:

- We, students and faculty members of the University of Illinois, and
residents of Champaign County, recognize the danger to our community of
discrimination among racial, religious, ethnic, or other culturally defined groups,
and of the human tensions arising out of such differences. We further recognize
the danger to our community from groups and persons motivated by totalitarian
philosophies—such as Fascist, race-supremacist, and Communist—who foster
discrimination and tension or to use them to advance totalitarian ends.

Within one week after the vote, the conservative element formed a new
organization, the Student Community Human Relations Council (SCHRC). The
goals of this new organization were similar to the goals of the SCIC, but now
the membership was of like disposition. The SCHRC embarked on the task of
fighting against racial discrimination in Champaign-Urbana.

This organization was successful in gaining access to several areas that
had been traditionally closed to African Americans. One of the first battles for
this group was the campus area barbershops. In 1953, whites owned the campus
area barbershops, and the owners refused to cut the hair of African American
men. The YMCA took this on as a battle, but soon realized that not much had
changed, so the SCHRC stepped in. The organization felt it was appropriate for
them to be involved because they were successful at ending discrimination in the
campus area restaurants. After several months of testing barbershops and meeting
with barbershop owners and patrons, the SCHRC was successful in ending
barbershop discrimination.

Overall the SCHRC was successful in its efforts to end discrimination in
the, Urbana-Champaign area. The SCHRC was a vital instrument in changing the
face of race relations on the campus and in the twin cities. The organization was
part of a legacy that gave African Americans opportunities to begin to shed their
ascribed second-class citizenship in Champaign County.

**Reflections on University of Illinois**

The strange career of Jim Crow may have impacted students' lives, but it
did not stop them. The isolation that existed for African American students was
incomprehensible. Each year during the postwar years (1945-1955), an average
of 140 African American students, less than 1% of the total student population,
encountered Jim Crow laws of the North. In that period, attending school without
the negative influences was difficult, but the addition of racism and discrimination
made obtaining an education much more challenging. This leads one to wonder
whether graduation rates would have increased in the absence of those challenges.
Despite these unpleasant instances, African American students were able to
matriculate, persevere and achieve under segregation.

One of the most puzzling aspects of this research is the notion of loyalty.
The majority of the individuals interviewed were very candid in their discussions
and vivid in their recollections, but despite the obvious denial of equality these
students were still loyal to the University, evidenced by their membership in the
Alumni Association and their frequent returns to Urbana-Champaign for
university-sponsored events. To a lesser extent, other students have placed the
University years behind them and did not care to revisit the memories. This
dichotomy leads one to wonder about the source of university loyalty. It is clear
that the loyalty was either blind or grew in the face of adversity. Adversity has
been known to bring people together, so the idea of succeeding in an institution
such as the University of Illinois may be enough to foster a sense loyalty.

African American students at the University of Illinois experienced
varying forms of discrimination. As their enrollment trends increased, so did the
discriminatory acts they faced. These students attended school under very
antagonistic conditions: they had to find a place to eat and live miles from
campus; they were not allowed to sit in adequate seats in theaters; they could not
get haircuts from neighboring barbers. These various acts of discrimination had a
negative impact on the educational and social environment of these students;
however, a great number of them accomplished their educational and social
justice goals. Lessons in the fundamentals of surviving the intricacies of racism and discrimination (e.g., interracial cooperatives, social isolation, increased campus-community hostility) were learned. Despite those lessons, many students left with what most would consider an excellent education and perhaps an even better experience in surviving the realities of a racialized society.
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The American Schools Respond to World War II: A Survey of the American School Board Journal Articles from January 1942 – December 1945

With the attack on Pearl Harbor, America abruptly entered World War II. Since at least September 1939, the beginning of the war in Europe, America’s school leaders had focused on the impact the war and more particularly how America’s possible entry into the war might affect their educational mission. This study explores the thoughts and concerns of America’s school leaders after Pearl Harbor as reflected in articles published in the American School Board Journal (ASBJ), January 1942 – December 1945. Forty-eight issues, including approximately 750 articles, were published during that period. The vast majority of those articles referred to the war. Clearly, war dominated the issues that faced American educators during this period. Those concerns reasonably may be classified into three main categories:

1) Curriculum readjustment as the school responded to the needs created by the war situation. Modifications were made to many existing subjects in the regular curriculum even as new curriculum elements were invented and inserted into the programs of studies.

2) The effect of the war and its concomitant restrictions and demands upon the material production of the nation created shortages in school supplies and building materials for the nation’s schools during this wartime period.

3) Teacher shortages were endemic throughout the war. Teachers, both men and women, often took jobs in the military services or the war production industry. One of the ways in which schools responded was to remove the “marriage bar” and hire married female teachers. (Note that the schools were not particularly accustomed to addressing this problem, having just emerged from the depression in which the schools, which provided a source of constant employment, could choose teachers from a large pool of applicants.)

Thus, in addressing all of the challenges posed by the war, in all of the categories recited above, a consistent concern voiced by America’s school leaders was the assertion of America’s need to not let the war significantly impinge upon the vital mission of education. At the same time, those leaders echoed the intense patriotism evoked by society during this period and, in their writings, continuously tied their suggestions to patriotic themes and values. These two threads, support for the war coupled with a concern for the possible deleterious effects of the war on schools, were woven through all of the writings by these leaders on all three of the categories addressed below.

Wartime Curriculum Adjustment

As patriotic fervor swept the country after Pearl Harbor, the public schools were best positioned to educate and provide specialized training to the population,