

The Pressures of the People

*Milton A. Galamison,
the Parents' Workshop,
and Resistance to
School Integration in
New York City, 1960-1963*

Lisa Yvette Waller

This essay explores the early efforts of the Reverend Milton A. Galamison and the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools to organize for public school integration in the 1960s. In order to appreciate fully the historical significance of the endeavors of Galamison and the workshop, it is necessary to consider trends in the literature of the civil rights movement. Among most scholars of the civil rights movement and Americans in general, the African-American liberation struggle and the resistance that it generated are understood to have been Southern phenomena. Too often, civil rights historiography focuses on the Southern movement, excluding activism in the North. This Southern orientation dominates in the production of local studies and general histories.¹ Following this pattern, John Dittmer, Charles Payne, and Stewart Burns have produced acclaimed works since 1994; each of these is a local investigation focusing on the civil rights struggle in the Deep South.² Glenn Eskew's recent work explores the intersection of local

activism in Birmingham with the national movement. Although his description of the national movement includes a Northern base of organizational power (quintessentially embodied in the NAACP), the work fails to consider Northern grassroots civil rights activism. The action of Eskew's national movement is in the South.³ The failure to pay attention to the Northern struggle results from a narrow perspective concerning the sensibility of Northern African Americans that is shared by many scholars. They argue that nonviolent direct action did not appeal to people who lived in Northern ghettos. The notion that African Americans in the inner cities rejected the tactics that proved so effective in the South goes unquestioned in large part because of historians' tendency to take up the thread of Northern protest with the advent of the rebellions in 1964.

John Salmond begins his recent work on the movement with the New Deal and *Brown*; however, he does not give great consideration to protest in the Northern arena until his dis-

cussion of the mid-1960s.⁴ In their volumes, Robert Weisbrot and Thomas Brooks follow similar trajectories, turning to Northern protest late in the movement's history.⁵ Whereas Weisbrot's belated references to the Northern struggle give the impression that the civil rights movement was a Southern phenomenon until the 1960s, Brooks explicitly accepts this chronology, stating that the civil rights struggle moved from the South to the North during this period.⁶ This progression is rearticulated by Jack Bloom in his discussion of the movement.⁷

In their recent volume, Armstead Robinson and Patricia Sullivan engage in a reevaluation of the movement's history; however, they fail to reconsider the accepted locus of the civil rights struggle. They also assume the movement to have been centered in the South. They begin:

A quarter century ago, the civil rights movement stirred the conscience of the nation while contributing to the demise of Jim Crow. In the decade following the 1954 *Brown* decision, the movement for racial equality in America gained critical momentum, *fueled by the courage, determination, and hope of countless individuals in communities throughout the South*. . . . Despite the far-reaching gains of the *southern struggle*, riots in northern urban centers made clear the extent to which racial injustice and inequality permeated the fabric of American life.⁸ (emphasis mine)

Adhering to the trend in chronology, Robinson and Sullivan's work does not address the urban North until 1965. Turning their attention to the conditions of African Americans in the ghettos, in their work of 1991, they say:

School desegregation and the right to vote had little relevance to the lives of increasing numbers of poor blacks trapped in the na-

tion's decaying inner cities. The widely hailed victories of the southern movement only increased the levels of frustration and despair in urban centers, and this despair helped to spark rioting, particularly in cities.⁹

In a discussion of 1978, preceding the one just cited above, Dorothy Newman, Nancy Amidei, and Barbara Carter address the people of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. Arguing against systematic Northern resistance to racial oppression, they say, "Theirs was not the carefully organized and skillfully articulated protest of the nonviolent movement in the South. This was spontaneous."¹⁰ These analyses posit a passive, disorganized, inarticulate African-American population in the urban North. They presume that Northern African Americans waited for the struggles of their Southern counterparts to bring them liberation. They suggest that African Americans in the urban centers of the North exploded into chaos because the Southern initiative had not changed their lives. The idea that Northern African Americans began to challenge their oppression in the mid-1960s, more than a decade after the winds of change began to transform the South, obscures significant local organizing efforts that were sustained in Northern inner-city communities over long periods of time, not only during the twentieth century but also earlier, in the 1800s.¹¹

As the Parents' Workshop activities demonstrate, the New York school integration campaign (the epitome of the civil rights movement in the city) was highly organized. It was neither chaotic nor impulsive. Well before the advent of the urban rebellions, activists employed research, rallies, and sit-outs to forward integration. Counter to the expectations created by the literature, the movement grew more organized in the mid-1960s as activists in Galamison's Parents' Workshop and other grassroots groups organized mass meetings, sit-ins, and boycotts that cap-

tered the attention of large numbers of African-American integrationists, their allies, and their adversaries in New York. In 1964, the year said to have ushered in a time of disorganized rioting in New York City, the first citywide school boycott was called by the Parents' Workshop and the Citywide Committee for Integrated Schools. The sit-out was the culmination of more than a decade of organizing and protest that was conceived and carried out by the workshop and other local groups in the city. As the New York City example shows, Northern African Americans themselves organized and demonstrated for change in their communities during the 1950s and 1960s. Their expectations were elevated by the ideology, rhetoric, and actions that surrounded these local efforts, not by the victories of the Southern struggle alone.¹²

The promise of organized African-American activism in New York City was embodied by the Parents' Workshop. Founded by Galamison in 1959, the workshop was deeply influenced by the minister, who served as the group's president and provided much of its ideological direction throughout its existence. Echoing themes that Galamison had articulated publicly for a decade, the workshop set the following objectives for itself: "to work for the integration of the schools of New York; [to work] for full and equal opportunity for learning for all the children of our city; to end all school discrimination against Negro and Puerto Rican children; and to preserve, improve and expand our free and democratic public school system."¹³ Members of the organization argued that those with children in the schools needed to take the initiative in order to overcome the resistance of school officials to integration. Workshop leaders encouraged parent members to recruit additional people with children in the schools to the organization.¹⁴ In order to do this, parents quickly became versed in the school integration issue. They gained confidence and

ability as they participated in the workshop's efforts.¹⁵ Accepting Galamison's belief that activism was central to the task ahead, members understood that they would have to organize and force change upon the system.

The Parents' Workshop was a grassroots enterprise, initially housed at Siloam Presbyterian Church. The group was poorly funded, offering memberships at the rate of \$1.00 for individual "boosters" and \$10.00 for organizations like Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs), which composed a significant proportion of workshop membership.¹⁶ Regular meetings were held in Brooklyn and Manhattan.¹⁷ The Parents' Workshop also had outlets in Queens and the Bronx.¹⁸ Workshop offices were open during the summer and the school year to offer information and coordinate activities concerned with bringing integration to the city's public schools.¹⁹

Most of the Parents' Workshop leaders and members were African-American women who had children in the public schools. Of ten area chairmen in Brooklyn, nine were women.²⁰ Significant PTA and Parent Association (PA) participation insured that rank-and-file membership was primarily female as well. The workshop acknowledged its female dominance when, in an attempt to attract more attention to segregated conditions in Brooklyn, it sent form letters to ministers declaring: "We mothers, grandmothers, [and] aunts must round up our families, friends and neighbors and start *now* to rectify the ills in our community!"²¹ These women radicalized their child-rearing and other familial roles, conflating them with political protest.

The female initiative in the Parents' Workshop is not surprising; women have often taken the lead in matters related to child rearing and education. Female empowerment in the Parents' Workshop also conformed to the vitality of women's leadership that was evident within the organizations and institutions over which Galamison presided. During the

1960s, thirteen of eighteen deacons and nine of twenty-six ruling elders at Siloam Presbyterian Church were women.²² The proportion of female deacons and ruling elders had risen significantly following Galamison's

Members of the organization argued that those with children in the schools needed to take the initiative in order to overcome the resistance of school officials to integration.

installation as head minister of the church.²³ Women's participation on the elder board was particularly significant because the elders managed the church rather than engaging in the committee and

auxiliary work that churchwomen traditionally performed.²⁴ Women within the Siloam congregation must have been gratified to hear the minister declare from the pulpit: "We have no idea of what women can be because they have never been permitted to be all they can be. Man has had every opportunity to show what he really is; and he has shown what he is by the very fact that he has deprived women of the same possibility."²⁵ Although leadership among Parents' Workshop women resulted primarily from their drive and initiative, Galamison's rejection of male domination and his receptivity to women's power provided a positive environment within which women's leadership could grow.

The composition of the Parents' Workshop reflected an important tradition of African-American women's school activism in New York. This activity was widespread in the city during the 1950s. In May 1952, parents, the overwhelming majority of whom were women, organized the Committee for the Improvement of Textbooks. The committee was organized to evaluate texts used by children in the public schools. Its goal was to eliminate

books that presented negative stereotypes of African Americans and other groups.²⁶ Members also hoped to exclude from the system texts that completely ignored minority groups.²⁷ Parent Association-affiliated women who were interviewed by reporters for the *New York Amsterdam News* in the 1950s criticized parents who were not active in their PAs and PTAs.²⁸ They argued that this negligence had a negative impact on the children of the ghetto.²⁹ In March 1959, mothers at P.S. 83 in Brooklyn successfully concluded a three-year struggle to end the double session at their children's school.³⁰ This female activist tradition was pushed even further once the workshop was operative in the city.

In 1960, Milton Galamison, Annie Stein, Thelma Hamilton, and the other members of the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools set out to force the Board of Education to take specific action aimed at achieving citywide integration in the schools.³¹ Following up on parent demands, workshop leaders requested a meeting with Superintendent Theobald for April 25 at school headquarters.³² Well aware that school officials required coercion if they were to move, Galamison's group orchestrated a rally to be held at Siloam a few days before the meeting.³³ Intensifying the pressure on Theobald, the workshop arranged for people attending the rally to be given postcards demanding integration that were addressed to the superintendent. Workshop members also urged participants at the rally to attend the coming meeting with Theobald.³⁴ This gathering demonstrated the workshop's ability to mobilize significant numbers of New Yorkers around the schools issue. The rally also showed that the Parents' Workshop had allies in other organizations concerned with New York's public schools. Representing the workshop, Galamison was joined on the rally's program by officers from the Intergroup Committee on New York's Public Schools and the Urban League of Greater New York.³⁵

The April rally successfully attracted support for the workshop and attendance at the meeting with Theobald. Two hundred parents descended on 110 Livingston Street to speak with the superintendent. Galamison began with an introduction in which he cast workshop members as democrats, exercising their American right to protest.³⁶ He shared parents' chief complaint: They were upset that school policies were reducing the possibility of African-American children obtaining access to a more integrated educational environment. Galamison spoke specifically to the fact that, by the spring of 1960, only children on part-time instruction could qualify for busing to a less-crowded school.³⁷ Further, rather than being allowed to bypass closer schools in order to attend a more distant facility where their enrollment would contribute to creating an integrated environment, children were being sent to the nearest institutions that could accommodate them.³⁸ Following Galamison, several women who represented Parents' Associations and Parent-Teacher Associations in Bedford-Stuyvesant, Williamsburg, and Brownsville spoke.³⁹ These activists chastised Theobald, arguing that his timid gradualism proved that he was more concerned with placating racists than with ensuring the rights of African-American children.⁴⁰ Before leaving the meeting, workshop members demanded voluntary transfers aimed at integration without regard to utilization issues or multiple sessions, teacher equalization, and a program and timetable for desegregating the city's schools.⁴¹ These were not forthcoming.

Having seen the effectiveness of the school boycott during the 1958 Brooklyn Seven struggle, Galamison and the Parents' Workshop resolved to produce a massive Brooklyn protest in order to force the board to act.⁴² At rallies, the Parents' Workshop threatened to initiate its most dramatic demonstration to date—a mass "sit-out" in which at least 2,000 boycotting children and their parents would gather outside of school buildings and local

superintendents' offices until their concerns were addressed concretely.⁴³ Toward this end, the workshop organized for six months in the spring and summer of 1960. The structure of the workshop allowed them to gain a significant amount of support within the communities; although the organization was citywide, the workshop was broken down into smaller units that served individual boroughs and neighborhoods.⁴⁴ Local organization and leadership allowed grassroots activists to attract neighborhood parents and groups with great efficacy. During the 1960 campaign, area captains obtained the mailing lists of churches and other organizations from individuals in their local membership. They created distribution committees to stuff envelopes and otherwise spread the word about integration actions.⁴⁵ The Church Committee garnered the support of ministers and congregations that offered their churches to accommodate children who would sit out in September.⁴⁶ The rallies that were held during the summer of 1960 demonstrated the importance that the issue of educational equity held for African Americans in New York and made the threat of a boycott more palpable to school officials.⁴⁷ This activity sprang directly from the workshops' insistence on a program of dramatic action for integration.⁴⁸

The Parents' Workshop tactics succeeded; the boycott threat led Theobald to call a meeting with the workshop and other civil rights leaders on the day before school was scheduled to open in September. As a direct result of the political pressure applied by the Parents' Workshop, Theobald agreed to implement the Open Enrollment program, a permissive zoning initiative that was the first desegregation plan to be attempted in New York City's public schools.⁴⁹ The workshop continued with preparations for the boycott until the superintendent agreed to include elementary schools in the program.⁵⁰ With this concession won, the group called off the demonstra-

tion, but their work over the summer reaffirmed the effectiveness of organized, direct action at the grassroots level.⁵¹ Justified, Galamison later reflected in the Parents' Workshop newsletter: "New York responded only to the threats and pressures of the people. . . . There is a lesson to be learned from this. It means that the only course for the people is social action."⁵² The importance of the role of the Parents' Workshop in producing Open Enrollment cannot be overstated. Their effort belies the notion that the board voluntarily implemented the program in the absence of sustained effort on the part of African-American activists and parents.⁵³

Open Enrollment began as a pilot project in September 1960 and expanded into a full program of the public school system in September 1961.⁵⁴ The Board of Education's Central Zoning Unit selected Open Enrollment schools based on the ethnic composition of the institutions and the rate of space utilization. At the elementary and junior high school levels, "receiving" schools had 75 percent or more "other" students and were utilized below 90 percent.⁵⁵ "Sending" schools were 90 percent or more African American or Puerto Rican.⁵⁶ Participation in the program was completely optional; pupils received an application that their parents completed if they were interested in having their children transferred to one of the receiving schools on the Open Enrollment roster.⁵⁷

Ironically, though the Open Enrollment Program was the New York City school system's first major concession to school integrationists, it also embodied a major component of official resistance: the voluntarism that the board and the superintendent promoted during the school integration struggle. Although many observers thought it laughable that Southern white officials, parents, and teachers would take it upon themselves to create multiracial school environments, officials in New York adhered to voluntarism

throughout the 1950s and 1960s as a viable method of producing school integration. The belief that this approach would effectively bring racial balance to the New York City public schools further indicates that New York's school officials viewed the Northern school predicament as fundamentally different from the Southern situation. Additionally, they behaved as though Southern white people were fundamentally different from those in the North. Whereas it would take federal troops and national attention to compel Southern whites to relinquish enclaves of white privilege, school policymakers in New York relied on whites to surrender willingly to integration. New York school officials took the lead neither in developing a strong integration policy nor in compelling public schoolchildren and their parents to participate in the initiatives that were attempted.

The Parents' Workshop advanced where school officials retreated; members put a tremendous amount of time and effort into making Open Enrollment a success. They published the reading scores and locations of the receiving schools that were in the program.⁵⁸ The workshop informed the parents of potential Open Enrollment participants about transportation routes and led them on tours of receiving schools.⁵⁹ Area chairpersons served as facilitators for parents who wanted information or needed assistance in applying to the program.⁶⁰ Additionally, the workshop announced that the Jefferson Avenue Educational Center, housed in Galamison's Bedford-Stuyvesant church, would provide remediation in reading and math in order to facilitate the successful adjustment of Open Enrollment students to their new schools. The strength of the Parents' Workshop in Brooklyn led to the highest percentage of transfers occurring in that borough.⁶¹

In order to keep Open Enrollment and integration at the center of the city's concerns, Galamison repeatedly introduced the work-

shop's agenda to politicians and school officials in the city. Mayor Robert Wagner's attempt to maintain the fiction that the schools fell outside of the political arena⁶² was challenged by Galamison's demands that he demonstrate leadership on school integration. Angry that the mayor had neglected to appoint an African American to a committee that he organized to study the schools, Galamison arranged meetings with the Republican candidate for mayor, Wagner himself, and the candidates for city comptroller.⁶³ Later, when a new Board of Education was seated, Galamison wrote every member in order to acquaint them with the workshop and present them with the threat that boycotts and other actions would continue until the board extended Open Enrollment and produced a plan and a timetable for desegregation of the city's schools.⁶⁴

The aggressive activism of workshop members caused New Yorkers to view the organization as a central source of information and advocacy regarding the Board of Education's Open Enrollment program and the school system's integration policy. The organization's status as the primary organization to help communities grapple with Open Enrollment is reflected in the numerous requests for speakers and information that local people directed to the organization. Leaders in Parents' Associations repeatedly contacted the workshop, requesting individuals who could inform local parents about the program.⁶⁵ Once the Board of Education approved the fourth and fifth grades at P.S. 289 for participation in Open Enrollment, the chairman of the school's education commit-

tee asked that the Parents' Workshop supply a member who could discuss implementation of the program at this grade level.⁶⁶ The chairman of the Community School Action Committee for Districts 43 and 44 in Brooklyn expressed a desire to meet with Galamison and the workshop to discuss the schools issue.⁶⁷ Presidents of the Parents' Associations of many city schools requested that workshop representatives attend meetings designed to stimulate parents and assist them in helping their children with schoolwork.⁶⁸ When members of the Fort Greene Houses Tenants' Association decided to fight for better education

Whereas it would take federal troops and national attention to compel Southern whites to relinquish enclaves of white privilege, school policymakers in New York relied on whites to surrender willingly to integration.

in their neighborhood schools, they asked that the workshop provide them with information on zoning, comparative class size, racial demographics, and teacher experience.⁶⁹ Association member Clara Krell said, "We know from observation and

experience that things should be different, [but] we do not have the figures to back us up, and we are sure that in any discussion we would present our arguments more strongly if we had statistics."⁷⁰ This was exactly the type of function that the workshop was intended to perform; statistician Annie Stein and others could supply data to support the empirical knowledge of neighborhood residents, information that school officials rarely respected. More than a year after her initial request, Krell had become secretary of the Tenants' Association and continued to rely on the workshop for speakers and information regarding the schools.⁷¹

Despite the efforts of the Parents' Workshop, there was only limited participation in the Open Enrollment program. During the pilot year, fewer than 3 percent of the pupils

who received applications actually transferred to receiving schools.⁷² The rate of involvement did not improve significantly for the duration of the program.⁷³ Ultimately, Open Enrollment failed appreciably to improve racial balance in the city's schools because school officials undermined the plan and because African Americans were ambivalent about the program.

The lack of enthusiasm with which many school officials approached Open Enrollment as a remedy for segregation was initially evident in their hesitancy to have the public view desegregation as the program's primary emphasis. Frequently, school officials stressed that Open Enrollment was meant to manage more effectively discrepancies in school utilization.⁷⁴ Evidence indicates that the sentiment of school personnel ultimately led them to sabotage the program. Many parents reported that they did not receive detailed information on eligibility and participation in the program.⁷⁵ One reason for this was the fear, held by several principals in the ghetto, that a "brain drain" would occur in their institutions if the brightest students with the most capable parents availed themselves of the transfer program and moved to schools outside of the area.⁷⁶ Some understood this response as a reasonable desire to retain model students in the ghetto, where they could inspire other children.⁷⁷ Others believed that this reaction reflected a cynical fear that children from the ghetto might leave their neighborhood schools and perform better at receiving schools in white areas. This improvement would reflect badly on ghetto school personnel, demonstrating that the educational problems in the inner city were not due to deficiencies among the pupils but to neglect by teachers and principals.⁷⁸ Further, skeptics felt that the brain-drain argument proved that employees in ghetto schools believed that there were only a few bright children among their students.⁷⁹ Responding to various con-

cerns, principals often circulated Open Enrollment transfer information at times calculated to produce a low response. At other times, school personnel failed to distribute material at all.⁸⁰ Even when school employees issued transfer request forms in a timely fashion, the turnaround time for receipt by school principals could be quite short.⁸¹ Sabotage was not alone in undercutting participation; the relatively low number of receiving schools at the junior high school level meant that many families wanting to transfer under the Open Enrollment program were denied their requests.⁸²

The Parents' Workshop attempted to remedy many of the problems that families experienced as they tried to participate in the program. When significant numbers of parents attended a workshop meeting and reported that their applications for admittance to Open Enrollment junior high schools were denied, the Parents' Workshop investigated the amount of space available in participating junior high schools.⁸³ The workshop eventually suggested that the designated racial percentages of receiving schools be altered, allowing more institutions to participate; however, members could not fully develop a plan because the Board of Education refused to provide the workshop with space utilization and racial composition data.⁸⁴ In the face of official opposition, the Parents' Workshop held an overnight sit-in at 110 Livingston Street and won placement in integrated schools for those children who participated in the demonstration.⁸⁵

The Parents' Workshop engaged in a hard sell in order to overcome not only the resistance of school officials but also the ambivalence of African-American and Puerto Rican parents. Members organized rallies at which Galamison discussed reasons that African Americans and Puerto Ricans should transfer out of their neighborhood schools.⁸⁶ In public gatherings and literature, the workshop un-

failingly presented the minister's views on the benefits of integration. The group argued that children who transferred would develop improved self-esteem.⁸⁷ They would be better prepared for job training and college, and they would be less fearful of competition with individuals from different backgrounds.⁸⁸ Fact sheets on Open Enrollment in the primary grades warned: "THIS IS IMPORTANT! Most of the damage suffered by our children because of separate and unequal schools occurs in the elementary grades . . . compare the reading levels of the sending and receiving schools, and you will see the advantage of transferring your child."⁸⁹ Workshop literature also appealed to social justice and race pride, equating participation in the transfer program with action aimed at dismantling the edifice of segregation and discrimination in the South.⁹⁰ Finally, the group argued that Open Enrollment would teach children of all races to work together without any false sense of inferiority or superiority.⁹¹

While the workshop pressured the board to include more schools on the Open Enrollment roster, many African-American parents demonstrated their impatience with the program. Parents complained that Open Enrollment put the burden for integrating the schools on children of color, and they insisted that whites ought to share in the effort to create a more just society.⁹² Both Puerto Rican and African-American parents were hesitant to send their children far from home to attend school. Parents also worried that their children would be the victims of mistreatment in hostile receiving schools.⁹³ Their concern was not misplaced. The Parents' Workshop received several complaints of children being segregated by classroom in integrated Open Enrollment schools.⁹⁴ One observer in the Bronx described how Open Enrollment worked in a neighborhood elementary school. Approximately thirty children arrived at the school by bus. School em-

ployees did not allow the Open Enrollment students to enter the school yard with the other students. Instead, they entered the school through a side door and remained in their classroom all day. These Open Enrollment students even had lunch and recess in their classroom.⁹⁵ White parents whose children attended a receiving school in Flatbush complained to Galamison that Open Enrollment transfer students were being segregated in the cafeteria.⁹⁶ Unconvincingly, the principal explained that the children were contained in their section of the lunchroom because they were served hot soup that they might spill on other students if they had access to the entire space.⁹⁷

Ironically, the fact that poor educational conditions in the ghetto were so widespread informed the decisions of some parents to keep their children in inner-city schools, forgoing participation in the Open Enrollment program. These parents saw educational neglect in the ghetto as a community problem. From the perspective of many parents, Open Enrollment provided individual children with the possibility of breaking free from the constraints of the ghetto and having an improved chance at success, but the benefits of participation in the program were not to be shared by those who remained in the community. According to this understanding, neighborhood schools were not improved through the Open Enrollment initiative. Indeed, voluntary transfer plans were not designed to integrate or otherwise benefit ghetto schools.⁹⁸ Community-focused parents believed that reliance on the program failed to serve the collective. Instead, Open Enrollment drew attention away from the poor-quality schools that continued to miseducate children who remained in the ghettos.⁹⁹ Writing in the Parents' Workshop newsletter, African-American parent Barbara Bonhomme stated this position definitively. She began with a discussion of the positive educational experiences that her son

and daughter had after they transferred to an integrated school. She continued:

Individual triumphs are not enough, however. We must remember that the Negro people can only truly rise, (and our own children with them), when *all* children are taught equally. Open enrollment is a tiny wedge of freedom, pushed into a school system which degrades and oppresses non-white people.¹⁰⁰

Bonhomme was cognizant of Open Enrollment's limitations; nevertheless, she and the Parents' Workshop saw the program as an important step toward integration. They hoped that mixed schooling would ultimately ensure that all children were taught equally. Skeptical parents rejected the idea that the solution to inequality in education was to be found in leaving the neighborhood to pursue integrated instruction. One parent complained that transfer programs improperly suggested to children "that to receive anything good, they must leave the Negro neighborhoods."¹⁰¹ Activist Olivia Taylor rejected integrated public education because she did not feel that it provided a proper context for the development of a positive African-American image for her daughter.¹⁰² Reflecting on the Open Enrollment initiative, parent, teacher, and activist Gwen Tim-

mons argued that she and other African Americans were "brainwashed" into believing that white people had the best of everything and that children from the ghetto would improve simply by gaining access to white schools. She evoked Washingtonian ideology when considering the program's shortcomings, declaring, "I believe in working on putting down your bucket where you are and making the people

accountable for teaching your children teach them where they are."¹⁰³

During the early 1960s, professor of social work and school activist Preston Wilcox prepared a report on an East Harlem-Yorkville transfer program in which he, too, argued that initiatives that drew African-American children from local classrooms stigmatized African-American schools and damaged the community by siphoning off the strongest students and their parents.¹⁰⁴ For Wilcox and the parents whose ideas he shared, the solution to the schools problem involved improving local schools, even if they remained segregated.¹⁰⁵ Those who declared their preference to stay in neighborhood schools and to demand remedial programs and extra services reflected concern not only for their children but also for the schools in their communities.¹⁰⁶ Galamison persisted in his antagonism toward parents who subordinated integration to equalization. Believing that they had been hoodwinked into accepting continued segregation, he argued adamantly against their position.¹⁰⁷ Galamison certainly had to

Galamison's hostility notwithstanding, many community-focused African Americans continued to forward alternative visions of equal education for ghetto children.

justify integration to white racists and African-American nationalists;¹⁰⁸ however, the Open Enrollment debate illustrates the extent to which the minister and the workshop also had to defend their integrationist program to

ordinary African Americans who did not promote a nationalist agenda.

Galamison's hostility notwithstanding, many community-focused African Americans continued to forward alternative visions of equal education for ghetto children. Their rejection of the transfer program indicates that locally based remedies for unequal education did not result simply from frustration with

persistent segregation. Rather, they sprang in large part from a community-centered oppositional thought that informed African-American demands for power well in advance of the 1966 Intermediate School 201 incident, the harbinger of Black Power politics in the New York City public schools crisis.

By 1963, when Open Enrollment was replaced by the Free Choice Transfer Plan, many parents and civil rights leaders had turned away from voluntary transfer initiatives as solutions to the problem of segregation in the schools.¹⁰⁹ Increasingly, they began to demand school reorganization, pairings, and other nonvoluntary plans that would compel white students and their families to take on the burden of integrating the system.¹¹⁰ The rejection of voluntary transfers also resulted from the board's unwillingness to fortify Open Enrollment with more far-reaching initiatives. When the Parents' Workshop won Open Enrollment as a concession from the Board of Education, they viewed it as the beginning of what should have become an effective, citywide drive in the direction of integration.¹¹¹ Toward this end, Galamison and the Parents' Workshop consistently demanded a plan for citywide integration that included a schedule for its completion.¹¹² They were repeatedly denied. In the face of Open Enrollment's failure to engender further initiatives toward integration and given the minimal numbers of children, relative to those enrolled in the system, who actually transferred, the program was ultimately considered a failure.¹¹³ Following the pattern of permissive transfer schemes in general,¹¹⁴ Open Enrollment in New York City caused no significant long-term desegregation.¹¹⁵ Aware of this failure, Galamison and the Parents' Workshop were left to organize a citywide coalition and a series of major school boycotts designed to intensify the pressure toward achieving integration throughout New York City.

Notes

1. Notable exceptions include Alan Anderson and George Pickering's work on the Chicago public school integration struggle of the 1950s and 1960s; James Farmer's discussion of integrationist nonviolent direct action campaigns in Chicago, New York, and other northern cities in the 1940s; and Clayborne Carson's exploration of the challenges that confronted Northern SNCC chapters in the 1960s. See Alan B. Anderson and George W. Pickering, *Confronting the Color Line: The Broken Promise of the Civil Rights Movement in Chicago* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986); James Farmer, *Lay Bare the Heart: An Autobiography of the Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Arbor House, 1985); Clayborne Carson, *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981). Just as I prepared "Holding Back the Dawn" for submission in its final form, Clarence Taylor's work *Knocking at Our Own Door* was released. Earlier, Taylor produced a study of African-American churches in Brooklyn and, during the research phase, became interested in Galamison. It is gratifying to know that I am not alone in my assessment that Galamison is an important figure in the civil rights struggle. Although the sources led us in similar directions, we have pursued different avenues of inquiry. I am particularly interested in exploring the legacy of African-American school protest and placing the New York City school integration movement into the context of African Americans' debates over separate and integrated education. This forces the historian to reckon with Galamison's failure to address adequately and responsibly the best means of bringing the benefits of equal education to the masses of children in the ghetto. I also find that the emergence of the movement is illuminated by an in-depth exploration of school conditions and the politics surrounding the "discovery" of inequality in the system. See Clarence Taylor, *Knocking at Our Own Door: Milton A. Galamison and the Struggle to Integrate New York City Schools* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

2. Stewart Burns, ed., *Daybreak of Freedom: The Montgomery Bus Boycott* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); John Dittmer, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); Charles M. Payne, *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

3. Glenn T. Eskew, *But for Birmingham: The Local and National Movements in the Civil Rights Struggle* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), pp. 14-52.

4. Salmond does not turn to the North until his final chapter, which is tellingly entitled "The End of the Movement." See John A. Salmond, "My Mind Set on Freedom": *A History of the Civil Rights Movement, 1954-1968* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1997).

5. Robert Weisbrot, *Freedom Bound: A History of America's Civil Rights Movement* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1990), pp. 238–242, and Thomas R. Brooks, *Walls Come Tumbling Down: A History of the Civil Rights Movement, 1940–1970* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), pp. 232–233. Weisbrot and Brooks look at school activism in New York City, but in the isolated context of the 1960s. Weisbrot considers the Ocean Hill–Brownsville affair of 1967–1968 and the subsequent United Federation of Teachers strike. Brooks discusses the school boycott of 1964.

6. Brooks, *Walls Come Tumbling Down*, p. 192.

7. Jack M. Bloom, *Class, Race, and the Civil Rights Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), pp. 1, 186.

8. Armstead L. Robinson and Patricia Sullivan, "Re-assessing the History of the Civil Rights Movement," in Armstead L. Robinson and Patricia Sullivan, eds., *New Directions in Civil Rights Studies* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1991), p. 1.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

10. Dorothy K. Newman et al., *Protest, Politics, and Prosperity: Black Americans and White Institutions, 1940–1975* (New York: Pantheon, 1978), p. 21.

11. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick point to a tradition of nonviolent direct action protest aimed at segregated schools in the North during these periods. See August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, "The Origins of Nonviolent Direct Action in Afro-American Protest: A Note on Historical Discontinuities," in August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, eds., *Along the Color Line: Explorations in the Black Experience* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), pp. 359–362, 378–379.

12. The resistance that suffused the ranks of high-level school officials, local school personnel, and various communities constricted and ultimately suffocated the school integration movement in New York City. The disappointment of this initiative provided a direct rationale for the level of African-American frustration and despair that was manifest in the urban rebellions of the 1960s.

13. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Constitution of the Parents' Workshop for Equality in N.Y.C. Schools," November 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW. Members of the Parents' Workshop were agitated by the persistent retardation, low standardized test scores, undertrained teachers, and decaying physical plants that plagued the children of New York's ghettos.

14. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet on the Open Enrollment Schools—1961," Galamison Papers, SHSW.

15. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, February 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW; Dorothy Lane to Area Captains, August 25, 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

16. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, September 1962, Annie Stein Papers, PEA; *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, March 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW. Fiscal troubles were constant for the workshop; however, Galamison insisted that members not become overly concerned with funding and membership, issues that came to dominate his time at the helm of the Brooklyn NAACP.

17. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, November 1962, Annie Stein Papers, PEA; *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, December 1961, Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

18. Milton A. Galamison, "An Analysis of the Board of Education Open Enrollment Policy," September [1960], Galamison Papers, SC.

19. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, October 1962; *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, June 1963. In addition to addressing integration, the Parents' Workshop also provided parents with information on other educational matters, such as the differences between the types of diplomas offered by the high schools.

20. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Questions and Answers on the Junior High Open Enrollment," Galamison Papers, SHSW, p. 2.

21. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, form letter, May 11, 1963, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

22. Siloam Presbyterian Church Bulletin, January 19, 1966, Galamison Papers, SC.

23. Siloam Presbyterian Church Bulletin, January 19, 1966, Galamison Papers, SC; Siloam Presbyterian Church Bulletin, June 19, 1949, Galamison Papers, SC.

24. Mrs. Gwendolyn Timmons, interview by the author, Brooklyn, N.Y., November 3, 1997.

25. Milton A. Galamison, "Are You Fit to Be Tied?" sermon delivered at Siloam Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, N.Y., January 29, 1956, Galamison Papers, SC; Milton A. Galamison, "Doing What Becomes You," sermon delivered at Siloam Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, N.Y., October 22, 1950, Galamison Papers, SC; Milton A. Galamison, "This Also Is a Son," sermon delivered at Siloam Presbyterian Church in Brooklyn, N.Y., April 24, 1955, Galamison Papers, SC. Galamison was not a fully realized feminist; he articulated the suspect ideas that women were sharp-tongued and that they were "adorners" rather than "producers." This notwithstanding, his public statements in favor of women's empowerment predominated. Galamison's apprehension of the politics of women's oppression was exceptional in its day.

Galamison, the Parents' Workshop, and Resisting School Integration

26. "Textbooks Purging—To Exclude Insults—Backed by Parents," *New York Amsterdam News*, March 14, 1953, p. 15.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

28. C. Gerald Frazer, "Many Feel Dissatisfied with Schools," *New York Amsterdam News*, October 31, 1953, p. 34.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 34.

30. "Double Sessions Battle Won by Moms at PS 83," *New York Amsterdam News*, March 28, 1959, p. 20.

31. Galamison, "Promises, Promises." Chap. 3 of unpublished manuscript entitled "Period of the Pendulum," 1970, Galamison Papers, SC, NYPL, p. 12. Stein and Cumberbatch had advised Galamison to continue his leadership role at the NAACP; however, in the wake of continued subversion at the Brooklyn branch, they shortly joined him at the Parents' Workshop.

32. Milton A. Galamison to PTA presidents, April 16, 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

33. Galamison to PTA presidents, April 16, 1960.

34. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally for Equality," Galamison Papers, SHSW, pp. 1-2; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally for Equality in New York City Schools," Galamison Papers, SHSW.

35. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally for Equality in New York City Schools."

36. Milton A. Galamison, "Introductory Remarks: Conference with the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. J. J. Theobald," April 25, 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

37. *Ibid.*

38. *Ibid.*

39. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, press release, April 25, 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

40. *Ibid.*

41. Galamison, "Introductory Remarks."

42. Clarence Taylor speculates that in proposing a boycott, Galamison and the Parents' Workshop were influenced by the Harlem Nine demonstration. Certainly, the workshop was aware of the Harlem protest; however, attention must be given to the Brooklyn Seven boycott. Galamison's direct involvement in this demonstration and its culmination in relatively immediate concessions established the central precedent for the workshop's activities at this time. On the precedent for the 1960 boycott threat, see Clarence Taylor, *Knocking at Our Own Door*, p. 102.

43. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," pp. 12-13; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, press release, June 8, 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW. The protesters signed a pledge that they would participate in the sit-out.

44. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Constitution of the Parents' Workshop for Equality in N.Y.C. Schools," pp. 1-2. Carolyn Eisenberg

underestimates the local, working-class component of the workshop because she groups it with other citywide organizations, which she argues tended to be made up of middle-class individuals. The workshop was actually a confederation of local, grassroots organizing units. See Carolyn Woods Eisenberg, "The Parents' Movement at I.S. 201: From Integration to Black Power, 1958-1966: A Case Study of Developing Ideology," Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1971, pp. 38-39.

45. Lane to Area Captains, August 25, 1960.

46. Milton A. Galamison to Samuel R. Johnson Jr., August 29, 1960, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

47. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, press release, June 8, 1960; Dorothy Lane to Area Captains, August 25, 1960; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Spot Announcement," Galamison Papers, SHSW.

48. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, press release, June 8, 1960.

49. Bert E. Swanson, *The Struggle for Equality: School Integration Controversy in New York City* (New York: Hobbs, Dorman and Company, 1966), p. 18; David Rogers, *110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City School System* (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 17, 243, 397; Eleanor Bernert Sheldon and Raymond A. Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City: A Fact Book* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965), p. 76; Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 13.

50. Irving Goldaber, "The Treatment by the New York City Board of Education of Problems Affecting the Negro," Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1964, p. 190.

51. Activists became increasingly convinced that studies and presentations alone would never produce integration.

52. Milton A. Galamison, "Has the Supreme Court Decision Failed?" *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, September 1962, Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

53. Arguing "New York is after all not Little Rock," Midge Decter completely eclipses the protest that produced Open Enrollment, erroneously attributing the program's genesis to the board's own commitment to integration. See Midge Decter, "The Negro and the New York Schools," *Commentary* 38 (3) (1964):26.

54. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, pp. 77-78. In 1963, school officials ended Open Enrollment and replaced it with a program called the Free Choice Transfer Plan. Some observers view the Free Choice Transfer Plan as an extension of its predecessor. Thus, they date the end of Open Enrollment in 1967. For this discussion, Open Enrollment and Free Choice Transfer are distinct.

55. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 77. "Other" was the designation given to white students. In part, utilization figures were used to

avoid overcrowding receiving schools. Over time, the utilization figure for some receiving schools was raised to 95 percent.

56. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 77. Technically, schools with 90 percent or more "other" students were eligible to be both receiving and sending schools. In fact, nonwhite children were those who made up the overwhelming bulk of the transfer pool.

57. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 78.

58. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet on the Brooklyn Junior High Schools—Open Enrollment Program," February 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet on the Open Enrollment Schools—1961," Galamison Papers, SHSW; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #5: The Open Enrollment Policy—December 1961," December 4, 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW; Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 14.

59. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Questions and Answers on the Junior High Open Enrollment," Galamison Papers, SHSW; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 24.

60. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, December 1963.

61. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, February 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 24.

62. Rosemary Clemens, "New York City Mayors as Policy Makers in Education," Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1973, pp. 3, 89, 204–207. Clemens argues that Wagner's political savvy, reflected in his refusal to engage school policy overtly, allowed him to acquire "tremendous, unharnessed political influence" and provide educational "leadership." Clemens can come to this conclusion because she fails to consider the school integration issue. Regarding this matter, Wagner's silence was disturbing to African-American and Puerto Rican activists. The mayor offered no leadership at all, and if he did possess unharnessed political influence, he refrained from employing it overtly or covertly in the interest of integration.

63. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, press release, August 11, 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

64. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, October 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

65. Elizabeth Hill to [Thelma] Hamilton, December 5, 1962, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

66. Esther Linder to Thelma Hamilton, December 30, 1962, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

67. Evelyn Millman to Milton Galamison, October 4, 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

68. Shirley Cohen to the Parents' Workshop, February 18, 1962, Galamison Papers, SHSW; Percy Jenkins to Milton Galamison, March 20, 1963, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

69. Krell to Graves, December 7, 1961.

70. *Ibid.*

71. Krell to the Parents' Workshop, January 7, 1963, Galamison Papers, SHSW.

72. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 78.

73. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 15; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 305; Stein, "Strategies for Failure," *Harvard Educational Review* 41 (2):164. By 1962, approximately 9,000 children had transferred. This was less than 3 percent of eligible children.

74. Swanson, *The Struggle for Equality*, p. 19; Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 13.

75. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 14; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, pp. 24, 306–307.

76. Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 309.

77. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 14.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

79. Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 309.

80. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 14; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, pp. 307, 310.

81. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Questions and Answers on the Junior High Open Enrollment." During the pilot stage, parents had only fourteen calendar days to receive the form, decide to participate, choose a school, and return the application.

82. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 78.

83. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, April 1961, Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

84. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, May 1962, Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

85. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, October 1962, Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

86. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally on Open Enrollment," Galamison Papers, SHSW.

87. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #5"; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally on Open Enrollment"; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Questions and Answers on the Junior High Open Enrollment"; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #3: Open Enrollment in Queens County—January 1961," Galamison Papers, SHSW.

88. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #5"; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #3."

89. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #3."

90. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Questions and Answers on the Junior High Open Enrollment"; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally on Open Enrollment."

91. Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Rally on Open Enrollment"; Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools, "Fact Sheet #5."

92. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 15; Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 82; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 307. Galamison complained regularly that the board insisted on its exclusive right to make educational policy, while when it came to integration, the board left the initiative to parents.

93. Mrs. Gwendolyn Timmons, interview; *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, February 1961.

94. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, n.d., Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

95. Louis Kushnik, "Race, Class and Power: The New York Decentralization Controversy," *Journal of American Studies* (Great Britain) 3 (2) (1969):204-205.

96. Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 16.

97. *Ibid.*

98. The shortcomings of Open Enrollment were not lost on Galamison and the workshop. In the October 1961 newsletter, complaints about the one-sidedness of the program and its inability to integrate ghetto schools were shared. Nevertheless, Galamison was convinced that Open Enrollment was the appropriate beginning for the New York City school system. See *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, October 1961.

99. Fred Powledge, "Nonwhite Pupils Shun School Plan," *New York Times*, January 29, 1964, p. 19.

100. Barbara Bonhomme, "Experience in an Integrated School," *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, n.d., Annie Stein Papers, PEA.

101. Powledge, "Nonwhite Pupils Shun School Plan," p. 19.

102. Daniel Hiram Perlstein, "The 1968 New York City School Crisis: Teacher Politics, Racial Politics and the Decline of Liberalism," Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1994, p. 283.

103. Mrs. Gwendolyn Timmons, interview.

104. Eisenberg, "The Parents' Movement at I.S. 201," p. 119. Wilcox prepared the report for the New York City Commission on Human Rights in 1961.

105. Bonhomme, "Experience in an Integrated School"; Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 17; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 99; Powledge, "Nonwhite Pupils Shun School Plan," p. 19. Earlier in the decade, the *New York Amsterdam News* interviewed

African-American mothers about conditions in Harlem's schools. Mrs. Wilhelmina Lewis argued, "It's better to build up the community than to run out of it." See Frazer, "Many Feel Dissatisfied with Schools," p. 15.

106. Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 99; Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 17. Rogers maintains that the board deliberately reinforced the neighborhood school preference among African Americans and Puerto Ricans by providing more special services in sending schools than receiving schools. For more on the discrepancies between sending and receiving schools, see Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, pp. 92-94.

107. It was as though Galamison realized that African-American ambivalence toward Open Enrollment foreshadowed the decline of the school integration movement and his vision. With the coming of the community control movement, Galamison had great difficulty adjusting to the shifting demands of African-American activists.

108. Taylor, *Knocking at Our Own Door*, p. 119.

109. Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 25.

110. Sheldon and Glazier, *Pupils and Schools in New York City*, p. 82; Milton A. Galamison, "Pulling Out the Rug," *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, n.d., Annie Stein Papers, PEA; Galamison, "Promises, Promises," p. 15; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 307.

111. *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, October 1961, Galamison Papers, SHSW; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 24.

112. Parents' Workshop for Equality to Bernard E. Donovan, *News from the Parents' Workshop for Equality in New York City Schools*, n.d., Annie Stein Papers, PEA; Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, p. 24.

113. Perlstein, "The 1968 New York City School Crisis," p. 272. Perlstein finds that fewer than 20,000 students participated in Open Enrollment and Free Choice Transfer, combined. These programs spanned seven years.

114. George Richard Meadows, "Open Enrollment and Fiscal Incentives," in Florence Hamlish Levinsohn and Benjamin Drake Wright, eds., *School Desegregation: Shadow and Substance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), p. 143.

115. A study by the Center for Urban Education found that the Open Enrollment program had done little to change the educational achievement of participating pupils. The work stated, "In terms of the objectively measurable criteria, the open enrollment children gained nothing that those who remained in the sending schools did not." The most telling measure, reading achievement, was roughly equal for students in the program and those who remained in segregated schools. See Center for Urban Education, "Evaluations by Center for Urban Education of Special Board of Education Programs," 1966, Rose Shapiro Papers, MML.