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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE ATLANTA COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION

Purpose of the study.--The general purpose of this study is to describe and explain the work of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. The study will explore the reasons for the establishment of the Commission and attempt to determine if there was a need for such a commission in the city of Atlanta. The study also will attempt to learn if the Commission is a working part of the city or just a paper organization. That is to say, the study will attempt to learn if the CRC is performing the duties assigned to it by the ordinance establishing the Commission.

Specifically the study will attempt the following: 1) to discover the purpose of the Atlanta CRC, 2) to discover the composition of the CRC, 3) to discover the powers of the CRC, those in the ordinance and those that the CRC actually uses, 4) to determine the financing of the CRC, and 5) to determine if the CRC is a working commission. Also the study will attempt to determine how the Atlanta CRC compares with an ideal commission concerned with human relations.

Scope and limitations.--This study is limited by the availability of data. Due to the novelty of the program in the city of Atlanta there is a limited amount of data and statistics relating to the operation of the program. Also the study will encounter the problem of reliability, in information obtained from interviews and questionnaires.
Procedure of inquiry.--This study will be elective in its procedure of inquiry. That is, the study will not follow any one procedure in the study of the Atlanta CRC. However, the study will make use of a model in order to compare the Atlanta commission with what could be considered an effective human relations commission. The use of a model will serve several purposes; a model will eliminate subjective determination as to where the Atlanta CRC falls on a scale in comparison with an effective human relations council. A model will allow the reader to determine for himself if the Atlanta Commission is a good commission. Of course, one should bear in mind that probably no commission presently in operation satisfactorily meets all of the requirements that will be listed in the model.¹

Our model includes the following requirements: 1) A human relations council should be based on a city ordinance. Unless such a council is based on an ordinance it will find very little support in the community. By having a council based in law the council has the authority of the city behind it when it attempts to carry out its program. The ordinance will give the council some weight in the hierarchy of the city government. A council which operates without an ordinance will undoubtedly, find very little help in the city government and very little public support from groups it has to work with in solving the interracial problems of the city. A city ordinance is a clear statement by the city government that the council is operating with the

¹ See Austin Ranney and Willmore Kendall, Democracy and the American Party System (New York: Harcourt, Brace, World, Inc., 1956). Chapter II is concerned with the usefulness of models in examining the institutions of a society.
support of the city government. 2) The powers of the council should be firmly and clearly stated in the ordinance. The council should have the power to hold public hearings, have power of subpoena to issue cease and desist orders, and the authority to enforce all local ordinances relating to public accommodations and racial discrimination.

3) A council concerned with human relations must have definite goals and objectives, that is, the council must be a leader in the field of human relations. 4) The number of members of the council will vary with the size of the city. Some authorities recommend between five and fifteen members. The council membership should reflect the composition of the city. The council should show the moderate and the extremes. However, it may not be feasible to place people of the two extremes on the council. Their views on the council composition should be considered. Primarily the council will have to deal with the extremes in attempting to stop explosive situations from erupting. 5) Meetings of the council should be open unless the business is of a very sensitive nature. Meetings of the council should take place at least once a month. 6) The council should be aware of potential trouble spots through contacts with militants in these areas. If there is no communication between the council and the elements of the extremes, then such communication should be established immediately. 7) The working staff of the council should have a professional head and not a person chosen by political appointment. The director of the council should have a background in handling interracial problems. Preferably the director should be a college trained person. Additional staff persons should have experience in intergroup relations and have the ability to
communicate with all levels of the community. The size of the staff will vary with the size of the city. However an adequate staff would be one that can effectively handle the work load that the council has outlined in its objectives. 8) In operation the council should provide the following: a source of expert knowledge on matters pertaining to employment, housing, and schools. This knowledge can be gained through continuing research and studies conducted by the council. The council must make a continuing effort to publicize itself. To be sure, the bulk of the work done by the council should be of the quiet nature, but it is important that the community be aware that the council does exist, and that it is operating. This publicizing can be done through good relations with the various news media of the city. The council should also publish at least monthly a report of its activities and future plans. This report should receive very wide distribution throughout the city. Another procedure of operation for the council should be that of establishing good working relationship with the various city government departments; and see that the city is not engaging in discriminatory practices. The council should strive to fight discrimination whether it be de jure or de facto. In addition, the council should have pre-planned with the various police agencies what steps should be taken in the event of disorders. The council should have explained these plans to the local news media. Finally, the council should work for local ordinances which will effectively deal with the problems of discrimination in the city. 9) The last standard in our model is the question of finance. The council should receive funds adequate to operate and produce positive results from its programs.
and objectives. No specific amount can be named for the budget of the council but it should be noted that the council should not be punished by the withholding of funds. The council should be able to receive funds from outside sources when these funds are for the furthering of the objectives of the council.  

In order to determine the effectiveness of the CRC and the degree to which the CRC is known in the neighborhoods that it was established to specifically help, a questionnaire was constructed and the questions were asked of residents of some of the communities that are considered areas where the CRC should have its greatest impact.

The questionnaire was constructed with the purposes of determining if low-income neighborhoods were aware of the existence of the CRC, if these communities have confidence in the CRC to solve the problems of the city, and if the CRC is making an imprint on the residents of low-income neighborhoods in regards to the objectives and programs of the CRC.

The questionnaire consisted of nineteen questions. In order to select a sample group a simple random sample method was used. This study used seven geographical areas, supplied by the CRC, that the CRC considers prime areas for its work. These areas are Mechanicsville, Adair Park, Grant Park, Peoplestown, Summerhill, Pittsburgh, and Edgewood-Kirkwood. Obtained also from the Atlanta CRC was the number of

---

1 The items included in the model were taken in part from several sources, among them, A Memorandum to Municipalities: Guidelines for Municipal Human Relations Committees (August, 1965, Privately printed), The National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials; and How To Turn Talk Into Action (June, 1966, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.), U. S. Department of Justice Community Relations Service.
that the CRC has held in the designated areas during 1968 and 1969. Figures for earlier years were unavailable. In order to select test areas, the writer selected areas that received the most attention from the CRC, that is, areas where the most meetings had been held; and areas that had received no attention from the CRC in the way of meetings. Another category used was areas that are considered predominantly white and those considered predominantly black. In the latter two groups, no CRC meetings were held in 1968. In the former groups, various numbers of meetings were held in 1968. The highest number of meetings held in any area during 1968 was three, which were held in the area designated Pittsburgh.

Simple random sampling was used because it was felt that random sampling would yield the most accurate and unbiased results. The simple random method allowed each street in the areas the equal opportunity of being included in the sample.

Source of material and tools of research.—Most of the materials included in this study were obtained from the following sources: the Atlanta Community Relations Commission, The Atlanta Journal, The Atlanta Constitution, the Atlanta University Library, the Emory University Library, the Atlanta Public Library, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution reference library, and various privately printed and privately published sources.

1 Profiles prepared by the Model Cities Program were used to determine racial composition, along with profiles provided by the CRC. See appendix for geographical boundaries of each area.

2 A table of random number was obtained from M. G. Kendall and Badington Smith, Tracts for Computers, No. XXIV (Cambridge University Press, 1946).
conducted surveys. The principal tools were interviews and questionnaires.

Significance of the study.--The significance of this study is in its attempt to describe critically the effort by a large southern city to establish a permanent agency within the city government to better the conditions of the city's voiceless, these voiceless persons being predominantly black and poor. The study also outlines the work of a human relations commission and how it tries to meet the problems of interracial living.

Due to the contemporary nature of the study and in some instances the confidentiality of the information given, some quotes will not bear the name of the interviewee. These quotes and information obtained from them will be indicated by the following figure *.
CHAPTER II

ORIGIN OF THE ATLANTA COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION

Why was there a need for the CRC.--The reasons why there was a need for the establishment of a human relations commission in the city of Atlanta are as varied and complex as the problems of most cities the size of Atlanta. Similar to other cities Atlanta's population is growing. Atlanta acts as a hub for a five county area (Clayton, Cobb, DeKalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett). Within this five county area and the city of Atlanta there are over 1,272,000 people and this population is increasing. In the core city of Atlanta the population is shifting and that shift is beginning to favor the black residents of the city. In 1968 it was estimated that 45.1 per cent of the city's population was black. This increase in the black population of the city is also evidenced by the increased enrollment of blacks in the total school population. In 1968 the school population of Atlanta was approximately sixty per cent black. Evidence gives credence to the view that Atlanta is becoming a black city, but a black city which does not have blacks effectively in control of the city power either politically or economically.

Atlanta, Georgia, enjoys an image few southern cities can compete with in the area of racial harmony and good will between the black and white citizens of the city. One Atlanta mayor described the city as a

1 Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, Population and Housing 1968, a report prepared by the Metropolitan Region Planning Commission (Atlanta: 1968).
"city too busy to hate." However, there are dissenters to this view. These are the persons who deal with the social ills of the city as a part of their professional life. One group which has an intimate knowledge of the social ills of the city thinks that the national image of Atlanta should be lived, and not just espoused. This large segment of the city lives in areas of the city where the sight of rodents are commonplace and the trash and garbage are not picked up on a regular schedule, where streets go unpaved for years, where street lighting is very poor, and high unemployment is a fact of life. It is the attitude of these people that should be considered when the image of Atlanta is discussed.

In January, 1968, the Southern Regional Council conducted a study attempting to ascertain the attitudes held by black high school youths of Atlanta. Among other things the study revealed that 73 per cent of the students interviewed rated the racial climate in Atlanta as poor or fair and only 27 per cent rated it good or very good. Although this statistic alone does not prove that the racial climate in Atlanta is extremely poor it does show that among black youths of the city there is the feeling that there is room for improvement in the race relations of the city.

Conditions exist in the city of Atlanta which lead to racial antagonism; poor conditions exist in the areas of housing, both public and private; poor conditions exist in the public schools specifically

1 Southern Regional Council, Black Youth in a Southern Metropolis, Southern Regional Council (Atlanta: 1968), p. 7. This study used 688 high school students and these were selected from five predominantly black schools; Harper 121, Howard 146, Washington 150, Archer 159, and Price 112.
in the area of quality of education offered the majority of the city's black students; and poor conditions exist in the area of employment.

According to a recent study Atlanta's pattern of segregated housing has increased between 1940 and 1950 from 87.4 per cent to 91.5 per cent and to 93.6 per cent by 1960. As a result of a Negro family attempting to move into a once all white section of Atlanta, Negro realtors along with white realtors formed a gentlemen's agreement to keep blacks from migrating beyond certain bounds. However, in the early sixties Negroes decided to move beyond these bounds and moved into a section once designated off limits to blacks. Some black and white citizens of the city formed an unofficial group to keep this movement within the prescribed bounds. This effort proved futile and as a result the city erected a physical barrier (labeled the Peyton Wall by some citizens) to prevent the migration of blacks into this section of the city. The barrier was legalized by the city with the passing of a city ordinance. However, this barrier did not stand the legal suit brought against the ordinance. It was also explained by some informants that a great deal of behind the scene negotiations helped to bring the barrier down.

The nation as a whole faces a crisis in the area of education, but this problem is acute in the South, where a dual school system has been in operation since the beginning of the Second Reconstruction. Atlanta is faced with a school problem of the magnitude which will

---

require positive action and cooperation between the black and white citizens of the city. At present the Atlanta public school system is over sixty per cent black and this percentage is expanding with each school semester. The problem in the Atlanta school system is a racial problem. 1 According to a recent study conducted by a group of white Atlantans, black students in Atlanta segregated schools are so educationally deprived that when they complete high school their education is equivalent to a seventh grade education. 2 The report went on to show the inequities present in the school system. It pointed out that black students receive less in the way of physical plant and specialized instruction in reading and speech therapy. Fourth grade black students were found to be over one year behind white pupils on the same grade level. This was based on median reading scores for both groups. 3 In the area of pupil size of school 54 per cent of the black elementary pupils attended schools with more than 800 pupils. However, only 11 per cent of the pupils in white schools attended schools with more than 800 pupils. 4 On the high school level; of the eleven black high schools none had speech therapy classes. Of the five white high schools only one was without speech therapy classes. 5

1 Better Schools Atlanta, Student Achievement in Atlanta Public Schools (Atlanta: Privately printed, 1968), p. 2.
2 Ibid., p. 2.
3 Ibid., p. 3.
5 Ibid., p. 2. It should be noted that the report defines a black school as one having less than 5 per cent whites and vice-versa for white schools.
A report prepared in 1961 indicated that Atlanta was a long way from reaching equal job opportunity for its black citizens. The report pointed out that bias exists in the labor unions of the city and these unions effectively control the apprentice programs conducted in Atlanta. Not only is there bias in the private sector; there is approval of bias by the Georgia Employment Service which routinely classified job orders according to race. This was the practice until a few years ago.

The foregoing is an overall view of the racial ills of the city of Atlanta. In no way has this section gone into the problems outlined in detail. This will be done in later sections of the study. This section is intended to give the reader an introduction to some of the reasons why there appeared to be a need for a human relations commission in the city of Atlanta.

It should be noted that in spite of these problems it took great pressure from various groups in the city to force the city to finally agree to the creation of a human relations commission. The present Commission resulted from what some have called a grass roots movement. The recognized black leaders of the community did not actively participate in the initial formation of the Commission, but came in after the grass roots group had laid the groundwork.


Several persons interviewed, both black and white, stated that as long as fifteen years ago an interracial commission was suggested to then mayor, William B. Hartsfield. Hartsfield rejected the idea on the basis that he could find no whites to serve on the commission and that it would not be accepted in the white community.
Formation of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission.--The idea of a Commission on human relations for the city of Atlanta is not a new idea, but the idea did meet with rebuffs in early attempts to establish such a commission. Black leaders for a number of years had urged such a commission idea on Mayor William Hartsfield. But, Hartsfield had rejected the idea of a biracial council, presumably because he felt that no top-ranking whites of Atlanta would serve on the council.¹

Even the present mayor, Ivan Allen, Jr., was thought by some to be lukewarm to the idea of an independent human relations commission. However, it appeared that once the idea had found some acceptability in the community, the events that were occurring across the nation in the area of racial relations brought the mayor around to the view that such a commission might be feasible.²

Atlanta's Community Relations Commission had its beginning in the black ghettos of the city. The group which proposed and advanced the commission was headed by Benny T. Smith. Smith is a resident of the south side of Atlanta. It is in this area that a number of the city's black citizens and poor citizens live. Smith stated that he along with other black residents of the city felt that their needs were not being properly represented to the city. It was this group's feeling


that some system was needed whereby direct communications could be established with the city.

The techniques employed by this group to achieve its ends were in the true spirit of the democratic tradition. In 1964, 450 residents of the south side of the city marched on the Atlanta city hall in a peaceful protest. After reaching the city hall the group presented to the mayor a list of grievances. This list pointed out the city's failure to provide city services to the black ghetto areas of the city. The list also included protestation against police brutality toward residents of certain areas of the city.  

In the interim, before the human relations commission was officially formed, the members of this ghetto group played important roles in the election of many of the city's aldermen. Apparently, it was the group's belief that by offering their services, without pay, they could gain important support for future programs and proposals that ghetto residents deemed important.

Black ghetto leaders called a meeting in July of 1966. This meeting was called for the purpose of discussing problems prevailing in Atlanta. The meeting was held at the Price Community Center. The group invited many of the city aldermen to the meeting. Seven of the aldermen did respond by attending this meeting. A resolution was offered by Vice-Mayor Sam Massell to ask the city to create a human

---

1 Other informants feel that many groups were responsible for the city accepting the commission idea. However, it appears that from evidence found in many other interviews and news accounts that the group headed by Smith was the prime non-governmental group that pushed the city toward the creation of the CRC.
relations council.¹

At the August 8, 1966 Aldermanic meeting Aldermen Williamson, Cook, Cutaskis, Freeman, Leftwich, and Summers offered a resolution asking for the creation of an ad hoc committee to study the feasibility of establishing a community relations commission for the city of Atlanta.² The ad hoc committee was composed of local citizens and members of the Board of Aldermen. The Aldermen were those who were chairmen of the following city departments: parks, police, public works I and II, urban renewal, and policy and zoning.³ This ad hoc committee which was chaired by Vice-Mayor Sam Massell and Reverend Sam Williams recommended the creation of a human relations council.⁴ Less than two months later, November 7, 1966, the Atlanta Board of Aldermen unanimously adopted the ordinance creating the Atlanta Community Relations Commission.⁵

From the outset there was the feeling among black residents that the CRC was established at this time in history because of the riots.

¹ The Aldermen present were: Vice-Mayor Sam Massell, Jr., Q. V. Williamson, Richard C. Freeman, George Cutaskis, Jack Summers, Rodney Cook, and Charlie Leftwich--Correspondence from Dr. Horace E. Tate to Vice-Mayor Sam Massell, Jr. dated August 1, 1966.

² Aldermanic minutes for the city of Atlanta, August 8, 1966.


occurring across the nation. This idea was lent some credence by statements made by city officials. Vice-Mayor Massell stated that the addition of a permanent human relations commission would be an effective instrument to head off future racial disturbances in Atlanta.\(^1\) This riot prevention theme could have been the convincing selling point to the white Atlanta community; this approach may have been needed in order for the Commission to gain the wide support it would need to survive in the white power structure. Some black leaders expressed the view that this idea of doing something to prevent riots from occurring acted as a political boost for aldermen who supported the establishment of the council on these terms.*

Only two of the present CRC members believe that the Commission was created out of the fear that riots would engulf Atlanta and that one effective way to prevent this from occurring was to establish the CRC. One CRC member believes that the CRC was established to help implement the 1964 Civil Rights Act. What was needed was some agency within the city government to help implement the Act. But it should be noted that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission does not have any enforcement powers.

Groups for the formation of the CRC and those opposed.—It appears that no overt opposition was met by the creation of the CRC from what could be considered middle-of-the-road groups within the Atlanta community.\(^2\) This held true in both the black and white communities. It


\(^2\) However, as late as 1963 Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. had voiced opposition to the creation of a human relations commission on the grounds that race relations could be handled better on an informal basis. Atlanta Constitution, "Forceful Allen led—Progress Became Synonymous with City," January 6, 1969.
can only be speculated that no opposition was expressed by the majority of the white community because the thought that the creation of the Commission might prevent riots helped to create an air of hope within the city's white community.¹

On the extreme of the spectrum both in the black and white communities there was some opposition to the creation of the CRC. The opposition in the black community was minimal and only expressed itself in statements that the Commission was nothing more than another whitewash to pacify blacks and prevent riots from occurring in Atlanta.* The expression of opposition was very light; it in no way compared to the opposition expressed by the extreme of the white community.

The local Klavern of the Ku Klux Klan objected to the Commission on the grounds that the Commission membership did not include a conservative Christian.² Calvin Craig, who was the leader of the Georgia Klan during this period, stated that his followers would make use of picket lines, phone calls, and mass demonstrations to force the addition of a conservative Christian to the Commission.³ Craig further outlined his strategy by stating that his group would conduct a letter writing campaign to the members of the Commission and picket the


²A note of interest in regard to the general comments on the creation of the CRC; research of the back issues of the Atlanta Daily World, a newspaper that is edited by blacks in Atlanta did not give any editorial comment on the creation of the CRC. The issues that were viewed were November, 1966 thru April, 1967.

³Calvin Craig resigned in 1968 as the Grand Dragon of the Georgia Klan in order to run for the office of sheriff of Fulton County. The city of Atlanta lies in part in Fulton County. Craig was unsuccessful in his bid for office.
business of aldermen.\(^1\)

At the first official meeting of the CRC the Klan did establish a picket line outside of the Atlanta city hall where the Commission was holding its meeting. Further Klan harassment came in the form of a loyalty oath sent to all CRC members asking the members to sign these oaths, which stated that the members had never been members of a communist front organization or were presently members of such organizations nor were they members of the Communist Party. The members of the CRC dismissed the oath as foolishness and gave no reply to the Klan.\(^2\)

All CRC members were not subjected personally to the harassment of the Klan. Those who did receive phone calls and letters dismissed them and never gave any thought to succumbing to the demands of the Klan.\(^3\) However, it would appear from editorial comment that some city aldermen did take the threats of the Klan seriously and were having second thoughts over the creation and membership of the CRC. It was the editorial opinion of the Atlanta Constitution that the members of Aldermanic Board should stand up like men and tell the public not to heed the demands of the Klan and then proceed with the business of helping the CRC establish a working relationship with the various

---


3 Personal interviews with Mrs. Mary Stephens November 19, 1968 and with Mrs. Sara Baker December 13, 1968. Both of these CRC members received phone calls and letters from the Klan.
segments of the city. That is, the Klan should be ignored. 1 Eventually active opposition by the Klan faded as the CRC began to consolidate its position in the city.

Mandate given the Community Relations Commission.--The Atlanta Board of Aldermen gave the Atlanta Community Relations Commission a list of eleven functions and duties (see Appendix for ordinance). The functions and duties range from the vague duty of fostering better relations among the races to the more specific one of accepting funds from sources other than the city to carry out the programs of the CRC.

Very few of the city aldermen gave any public statements as to what they viewed as the mandate of the Commission. Therefore, it would appear that the aldermen agreed with the duties outlined in the ordinance. Vice-Mayor Massell did voice his opinion as to what the Commission should do and how it should carry out its duties. Massell urged the Commission to broaden its scope and attack on community problems and to move faster in the direction of solving these problems.

It was Massell's belief that the Commission should not become embroiled in the attempt to define its powers and authority. 2 Mayor Allen stated that he viewed the Commission as a sounding board. That is, the Commission should be an agency where citizens who felt that they were not fully sharing in the city services could bring their complaints. 3

---

1 Atlanta Constitution, March 17, 1967 editorial, "A Klan Inspired Campaign."


Another view was one that is difficult to document, because it was expressed covertly: some aldermen thought that the Commission should relay downward justifications and reasons why certain actions could not be taken by the city. * This last view is only brought out to point to the fact that in some instances opposition to the role of the Commission was not expressed openly but was whispered about at City Hall.  

Of great importance is how the Commission members view the mandate given them by the aldermen. Several viewpoints were expressed by CRC members as to what the mandate of the Commission is. The majority view expressed by Commission members is the one expressed by Mayor Allen, that the Commission is a sounding board. The CRC should act as a forum for citizens to bring their problems. Another view is that the CRC should be a fact finding agency, holding hearings and relaying this information to the appropriate city agency. A view expressed by one Commission member is that the CRC should strongly advocate the cause of the poor and act as their chief advocate. This view stems from the belief that it is deceptive to talk of two way communication when one segment of Atlanta simply ignores the problems of the other segment. Investigation shows that a majority of the CRC members view the Commission as primarily a sounding board. Only one CRC member, when interviewed, stated that the Commission was an action organization, although the ordinance clearly states that the Commission can investigate, discourage and seek to prevent discriminatory practices. None

---

of the Commission members viewed as their role the drawing up of proposed ordinances which would seek to prevent discrimination and segregation in the city of Atlanta.

The first executive director of the Commission believes that the CRC members are ignorant of their power and the mandate given them by the ordinance. The former director stated that Atlanta city officials do not want to admit that the city has a real problem in the area of integration and discrimination.¹ A critic of the Commission believes that the only duty of the CRC is to prevent riots. This critic sees Atlanta becoming an all black city, but a black city without blacks being able to effectively control the future of the city. It was pointed out that blacks are not truly represented on the school board nor are they adequately represented on the Board of Aldermen.²

Powers of the Commission.--In line with the model outlined in Chapter I of this study an attempt will be made to determine if the Atlanta commission measures up to the model. It is advised that a commission dealing with human relations should have the power to investigate potential or actual trouble spots and the power to summon the presence of persons to hearings. The powers of a commission will depend to a large extent on local laws relating to discrimination and segregation. When a locality has laws which ban discrimination in public accommodations, housing, and employment the commission should

¹ Personal interview with Mrs. Eliza K. Paschall, October 29, 1968.
² Personal interview with John Boone, member of the Metropolitan Atlanta Summit Leadership Conference, October 18, 1968.
be charged with the responsibility of enforcing these laws.

Section 4 of the ordinance creating the Atlanta CRC does empower the Commission to investigate and hold hearings. However the CRC does not have the power to demand the presence of persons to these hearings. In short the Atlanta CRC does not have any enforcement powers. It cannot demand that a person appear before it at a specified time nor can it demand that records be produced.

At the time of this study the city of Atlanta had only one local ordinance which related to anti-discrimination. This was urged upon the city through the efforts of the CRC. The city of Atlanta passed an ordinance which required persons having contracts with the city to sign an oath attesting to their willingness not to practice discrimination in the course of their hiring while under contract to the city. The ordinance does not make it mandatory that the person contracting with the city make the same demand upon sub-contractors nor does the ordinance force an employer to hire a person who proves that he was not employed simply because of discrimination. The employer can be charged with perjury provided he has signed the sworn statement. Therefore, it would appear that the Atlanta ordinance prohibiting discrimination in hiring is weak and ineffectual.

The only true power that the CRC has is the power to bring problems to the fore and expose them to the public. CRC members have mixed opinions on the question as to whether the CRC should be given additional powers. Although the majority of the Commission voted to ask the aldermen to give the CRC the power of subpoena they are not firmly committed to the CRC having greater power. The general feeling is that
to give the CRC more power would have a negative effect in certain quarters of the city. It is thought that groups or individuals who are needed to bring about change would not cooperate if the CRC were given more power. Two of the CRC members feel that additional power might be abused by the CRC.* This question of power for the CRC emphasizes the role that the CRC should play in the community. A majority of the commissioners view the CRC as a sounding board with no power which entails enforcement.

The majority of the Board of Aldermen agree with the views of the CRC members who feel that the CRC does not need additional powers. Alderman Rodney Cook stated that the Commission had not demonstrated or documented the need for the power of subpoena.1

Composition of the Community Relations Commission.--In composition the size of a commission concerned with human relations should be adequate to properly represent the city. No definite size can be stated. The model gives no perfect size for a commission on human relations. It does state that the commission should not be so small as not to reflect the varying opinions present in the city nor should it be so large as to be unwieldy.

The ordinance creating the Atlanta CRC sets the membership at twenty and states that a person must be a bona fide resident of the city and an adult in order to be a member of the Commission. Further the ordinance provides that the mayor with the approval of the Board of Aldermen shall select the members of the Commission. In practice

---

1 Atlanta Constitution, May 25, 1968, "CRC Stands By Subpoena."
the mayor usually accepts the recommendations of the present CRC members when there are vacancies to be filled on the CRC.* The mayor has the power to select the chairman of the Commission, thus giving the mayor some influence on the course the CRC takes. All CRC members are appointed for three years the terms are staggered.1

The question of representation was put to the Commission members. All Commission members felt that the present Commission represents a good cross-section of the city. Four Commissioners stated that the first membership was not representative, but the situation has vastly improved. According to these members the black community is better represented in that there is at present on the CRC conservative blacks and impatient blacks. Present also on the Commission are members from a broader spectrum of the white community.* One Commission member was concerned with the right people being placed on the Commission. That is, this member was not concerned with whether the member was black or white, the member must have certain contacts within the community. He responded to the question of representation in this manner:

1 The original membership of the CRC was drawn from 200 names submitted to Mayor Allen by the ad hoc committee. After the Mayor made his selection the CRC was composed of 5 blacks and 15 whites. Personal interviews with Mrs. Mary Stephens, October 19, 1968 and statement issued by Eliza K. Paschal after her dismissal as director of the CRC in 1968 (Privately printed).

In March of 1967, Aldermen Richard Freeman and Hugh Pierce expressed concern over the composition of the CRC. Their concern came about after Calvin Craig, of the KKK, had voiced his objection to the makeup of the CRC. Specifically Craig wanted a good conservative Christian on the CRC. It was the contention of Aldermen Pierce and Freeman that the Commission should have all shades of opinion represented in order that the CRC could gain the confidence of the city. See Junie Hamilton, "Attorney: Relations Board Has no Membership Rules," Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 12, 1967.
We have a good cross-section on the Commission. Each one of us have certain contacts that we can communicate to the CRC and the power structure. Someone can touch the right person. We were criticized because we didn't put a Negro in as executive director. A Negro couldn't go to certain clubs and he couldn't say to the power structure, without it appearing as a threat, that certain things must be done in order for Atlanta to progress.¹

A view presented by two Commission members is the following; although people in low-income neighborhoods can present the problems, they can do virtually nothing to solve these problems. Therefore, solutions must come from people outside of the poor groups. To further clarify this view the commissioners stated that the poor cannot give jobs or even improve public housing. Help and direction must come from outside of the poor group. *This view runs counter to the view being practiced in some parts of the country and to some extent in Atlanta. That view is, that the poor must have a vital voice in the decision-making process concerning their welfare.

Interviews with various community leaders outside of the CRC membership revealed that few believed that the Commission is truly representative. One leader in the community found it very difficult to state that the Commission was truly representative, this leader felt

¹Some Black community leaders feel that a black could perform in the position of director quite adequately. If a black were the director, these blacks state, then Atlanta could truly state that it is attempting to solve the racial problems of the city. On the point as to whether the black director would be allowed into certain clubs, which practice racial exclusion, the black activists answer that the presence of the black director in these clubs would help to break down barriers of discrimination that the CRC was created to break down. In their view the question of a man being black should not be a detriment to his qualifications as director of the CRC. Further comment by these activists is that the city is becoming predominantly black and such agencies as the CRC should have black heads.
that the Commission contained far too many whites in comparison to the number of blacks on the Commission. At the time of this study there were twelve whites and eight blacks on the Commission. It was this leader's view that the whites on the Commission were supposedly of the liberal variety of whites in the city.* Another view which was expressed by a critic of the CRC is that the black members on the Commission are of the "house nigger" variety and the white members are those who represent the white establishment and want to keep things "cool." A more moderate community leader expressed an opinion on how the Commission membership should be drawn. This leader advanced the idea that the Commission members should be elected by wards, two persons from each of the eight wards of the city. In this manner the CRC would be truly representative. At present according to this leader the Board of Aldermen is quite unrepresentative because an Alderman does not have to live in the ward he represents. If there were true representation on the Board of Aldermen there would be no need for the Community Relations Commission.*

During the course of this study a review of the CRC showed that the Commission reflects to a degree various interests in the city. Present on the Commission are representatives from the white business community, the white clergy, and the white political structure. The black community is also represented in the areas of business, clergy,}

---

1"House nigger" is a term which refers to blacks who were house servants and beneficiaries of better clothing and general treatment. Therefore, many of these house servants felt themselves superior to the field hands. In some instances house servants foiled escape plans and rebellions by informing whites. See John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom* 2nd edition (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), pp. 209 and 190.
and politics. Among the Commission membership are supposedly persons who represent the poor community in the white and black sections of the city. This determination as to representing poor persons usually is made with the Commission member's residence in mind. This determination is most likely erroneous in several cases. Not represented on the CRC is the very extreme of either the black or white communities. There are black CRC members who appear to be impatient with the tactics and time consuming motions that the CRC goes through. However, these Commission members do not advocate burning down the city. The conservative white element of the city is also represented on the Commission. These white members usually act as delayers and state that the CRC needs no more power nor should it take an active role in settling certain problems faced by the city in the area of race relations. The majority of the membership of the Commission both black and white are of the moderate element. These members view the work of the Commission as vital, but state that the Commission must work within certain restricted bounds. Change has come said these members, and it will take time for more change to come. Most members realize that blacks are becoming impatient and that something more effective must be done to alleviate the racial ills of the city that lead to disturbances.¹

¹ In making a determination as to the composition of the Commission use was made of the CRC directory and the occupations of the twenty Commission members. In the area of political leanings exact definitions cannot be made of the CRC members. But from observation of CRC members in CRC meetings and in response to questions in personal interviews reasonable determination can be made as to the political leanings of CRC members. During interviews with Commission members their response to questions concerning powers of the CRC and what the role of the CRC should be helped in determining the study's view of the political coloration of the CRC members. Personal observation of CRC
In fact the Atlanta CRC can be a reflection of the mayor's idea of a human relations commission. The mayor and the Board of Aldermen elect the members of the Commission. The mayor selects the chairman of the CRC. There is a continuance of the same type of people on the CRC in that the members unofficially inform the mayor as to who could best fill vacancies that occur on the CRC. The above process assures the continuance on the Commission persons who agree to a large extent with present CRC policies.

Financing of the Community Relations Commission.--The model that this study is making use of states that the financing of a commission concerned with human relations should be adequate to carry out the programs and objectives of the Commission. Further, the model points out that the commission should not be punished by the arbitrary withholding of funds as a means of punishment. The last item in the model, regarding finance, allows the commission to accept funds from other sources to further the work of the commission.

Section 7 of the Atlanta ordinance creating the Community Relations Commission instructs the CRC to submit a budget annually to the mayor and the Board of Aldermen for their approval. This budget must be submitted by September 30th of each year. Section 8 of the ordinance gives the CRC the privilege of accepting funds from sources members at CRC meetings also aided in this determination. During CRC meetings a few members are quite vocal while others appear quite willing to allow the professional staff to direct matters. Very little debate occurs during CRC meetings. The public-at-large is usually not present, although the meetings are open to the general public. The meetings are held each fourth Friday at 2 P.M. in the city hall. It is obvious that there is some disagreement between the black CRC members and the chairman of the CRC who is also black. At various meetings there is bickering between the chairman and some black members.
other than the city for special projects, surveys, and educational programs. The Aldermen were referring to were the activities of the
first...1

The initial budget of the Atlanta CRC was $30,000 with $12,000 of this going to the first executive director as salary, leaving the CRC with an initial working budget of $18,000. The framers of the CRC had requested a budget of $40,000. It should be noted that during the initial period the CRC staff consisted of only one person, the executive director.

In its second attempt at adequate funding the CRC asked the aldermen to approve a budget of $59,300. The Atlanta Board of Aldermen only increase the CRC's budget by $5,000, giving the CRC a budget of $35,000 for 1967. There are definite reasons why the CRC was only allotted a small sum in its second year of existence. Aldermen Milton Farris and Everett Millican voiced their objection to the work of the Commission. Both Aldermen stated that while the CRC had been a useful sounding board, it (CRC) had not done much to show the citizens what the city was doing for them. Alderman Farris stated that "in order to do your job you must create confidence on both sides," and Farris went on to say that he was "not so sure you have accomplished this." Alderman Farris summed up his feelings by stating that if the CRC had done what he stated, then probably getting the budget approved would have

---


been a minor matter. 1

What the Aldermen were referring to were the activities of the first executive director of the CRC. Mrs. Eliza K. Paschal had on several occasions vigorously prosecuted, on behalf of the city's poor, demands to the various city agencies concerned with city services. Mrs. Paschal also became involved in public incidents. Specifically Mrs. Paschal's involvement in the desegregation attempts of the Wren's Nest, the home of Joel Chandler Harris, brought a great deal of attention to the CRC. These activities and others on the part of Mrs. Paschal created in the minds of some persons the idea that the CRC was established primarily to fight the battles of the blacks in the city, thus giving the impression that the CRC was another civil rights organization. Several aldermen expressed the view that the CRC had the purpose of telling people what could be done and what could not be done. Along with this was the thought that the CRC should stay out of so-called controversial matters. Mrs. Paschal had not stayed out of controversial matters. Further discussion of Mrs. Paschal and her tenure as the first executive director of the CRC will be presented later in this study.

In their 1969 attempt at securing funds to operate, the CRC found a more receptive audience among the aldermen. In the interim, from 1967 to 1968, the CRC went through a much publicized overhaul. The first director had not been rehired and in her place a new director,

---

Nat Welch, was named. This new director was one who presented a less controversial nature and appeared more acceptable to that segment of the Atlanta citizenry that wanted Mrs. Paschal relieved of her duties.

In a complete reversal of their previous positions Aldermen Farris and Millican recommended that the CRC be given an increase in their 1969 budget. During the Aldermanic Finance Committee hearings on budgets in December of 1968 Alderman Farris stated that the Commission has been raised tremendously in stature since he (Nat Welch) came, he's done a fine job. In the past the Commission has gotten in areas it shouldn't have, but it's taken on a different look than when Mrs. Paschal (first director) was there. He (Welch) is an able man and needs more money.\1

After Farris had suggested giving the CRC $45,000, Alderman Millican, another of the original critics, suggested upping the amount to $50,000.

Prior to the action of the Aldermanic Finance Committee all of the CRC members interviewed at that time expressed confidence that the Finance Committee would act favorably on the CRC's budget request of $70,000. The members gave various reasons as to why they felt that the aldermen would now act favorably toward their request. Only two commissioners at that time, December of 1968, were willing to admit that the reason the budget would be increased was because the CRC had released Mrs. Paschal and hired a less controversial figure as executive director. One of these two commissioners stated that he had been in contact with several key aldermen and pointed out to them that the CRC had removed their chief objection to the CRC and that the CRC had

---

\1\ Alex Coffin, "Aldermen OK Transit Funds, Increase CRC," Atlanta Constitution, December 20, 1968.
not far the past year been involved in matters that brought it adverse publicity.* A majority of the commissioners interviewed explained that they felt that the aldermen had not given the CRC an adequate bud-
get in the past because the aldermen did not realize that the CRC was in need of more funds. One commissioner refused to believe that Alder-
men Millican and Farris had made statements to the effect that the CRC was in matters that did not concern it or that the aldermen had with-
held funds as a means of punishing the Commission. All Commission members stated that the Commission could use more funds in order for its programs to be effective.

In comparison with cities of similar size Atlanta ranks very low on the scale of amount of money appropriated per capita for similar commissions. Atlanta, prior to the granting of the 1969 budget, was spending 15 cents per capita for its Community Relations Commission. This is in comparison to such cities as: Rochester $2.68, Denver $1.62, Minneapolis $1.13, Nashville $.34, and Kansas City $.27.1 In 1969 Atlanta is spending $.10 per capita.2

It would appear that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission in its first confrontation with the Atlanta city hall and the city power structure yielded to City Hall and the power structure. By using

---

1"Biased Firms May Lose License," Atlanta Constitution, September 28, 1969.

2This figure is based on the last population census of Atlanta. This census was conducted by the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission. The population of Atlanta as of April 1, 1968, was 506, 100 this is for the city proper. The approved budget for the CRC for 1969 is $50,000.
the power of the purse certain segments of the city were able to force the CRC to fire its first director and find one more acceptable to these segments of the city. It should be noted that Mrs. Paschal was hired over the objections of some city aldermen and city department heads. Her activities while serving as director did nothing to sway these persons to her side. Just the reverse occurred. Many city department heads expressed dismay over Mrs. Paschal's directorship. None of the CRC members stated that Mrs. Paschal's goals were wrong, only that she was unable to compromise with the city and the workings of the city. In short the majority of the commissioners wanted a director who was willing to compromise.

On the matter of finance the CRC has allowed itself to be pressured by some of the city aldermen and parts of the city power structure. This is a very dangerous precedent for it sets the stage for future pressure by the purse if the CRC again enters controversial areas pertaining to race relations in the city of Atlanta.
CHAPTER III

THE METHODS EMPLOYED BY THE ATLANTA COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION TO CARRY OUT ITS WORK

Introduction.--The chapter of the study is based on personal observation of the staff and lay commissioners of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. Two working days were spent with the staff of the Commission and many other hours dispersed throughout the course of the study. Personal interviews were held with the executive director, associate director, field representative (the former and the present representative), and the special consultant of the staff who is concerned with jobs for minority groups in the metropolitan Atlanta area.

Commission members were interviewed and also observed during Commission meetings both on the fourth Friday of each month and at Town Hall meetings convened by the Commission.

The conclusions reached in this chapter are based to a large extent on personal observations and direct comments from commissioners and staff members of the Commission.

Professional staff.--The ordinance creating the Atlanta CRC instructs the Community Relations Commission to employ an executive director. The salary of the director is fixed by the mayor and the Board of Aldermen. The ordinance enumerates the qualifications of the director: the director should be a person with training and experience in inter-group and inter-racial relations. The authority given the director is broad and vague. The director is empowered to coordinate the activities of the Commission and its staff. The director with the
approval of the mayor may employ a staff and fix their compensation within the limits of the budget. Compensation given the staff must also be approved by the city personnel board.

At its inception the Atlanta Community Relations Commission had one staff member and that was the executive director. The director had the responsibility of maintaining the activities of the Commission and coordinating its work. For approximately six months Mrs. Paschal, as the first director, was without clerical and professional staff aid. There was sporadic help, but none of this was of a long duration. The Atlanta Commission at present has a staff of six persons. Within this six are two clerical persons. The positions now filled are: executive director, associate director, field representative, special consultant,\(^1\) senior stenographer, and a senior clerk-typist. In their 1969 budget the Commission requested that several new positions be created and filled for the 1969 budget year. These new positions were assistant director and research assistant. However, the Alderman did not grant the Commission its $70,000 budget request. The Commission was granted $50,000, therefore it was the judgment of the executive director that the position of research assistant be dropped and the position of assistant director be left vacant until September, 1969, at which time the present associate director will resign.\(^2\)

\(^1\) This consultant is working on a project titled Jobs Creation--the project is concentrated in discovering the employment patterns in metropolitan Atlanta. This is a one year project funded by the Equal Employment Office Commission. The project is slated to end in September, 1969.

\(^2\) Copy of the 1969 Program Plan--Community Relations Commission, submitted to the Atlanta Board of Aldermen.
A look at the model indicates that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission does not meet the minimum requirements as to staff. It would appear that there is a need for additional field representatives, if the position of field representative is to be the "eyes and ears" of the Commission in the community. Atlanta is a city of great diversity and of great size. It will take more than one field representative to adequately keep the Commission informed of the conditions in the inner city and the problems that need immediate and long range attention.

The goals and objectives of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission, on paper, are very broad in scope. It is not possible for the present staff to carry out the broad program objectives with any great effectiveness. For instance, in order for the Community Relations Commission to carry out its black ownership program the entire staff of the Commission had to be mobilized. If the Commission had any other projects at that time they had to be held in abeyance. Consequently, the staff is only able to devote time to one major effort in any given time period. There is need in the city for a great many programs that act as stimuli to be initiated by the CRC.

The selection of staff members is left to the discretion of the executive director. Information from the present director revealed that when he selects an individual to work on the Commission staff he looks for maturity, judgment, and experience. The clerical staff is selected from a list received from the city personnel office. In

---

1 Ibid.
commenting further on the selection of the CRC staff Director Welch stated that the last three candidates for the position of field representative were interviewed by him and the chairman of the Commission.

Tools available to the professional staff.--The Atlanta Commission does not have accommodation laws to enforce. Therefore the staff must make use of persuasion. The Community Relations Commission's staff has as its primary tools grievance response meetings, contacts within the communities, contacts within local and state political structures, and contacts within the business structure of the city.

The grievance response meeting was originated by the first executive director of the Commission. From February, 1967, to August, 1967, the Community Relations Commission held a total of 29 meetings. Included in this total were 11 neighborhood meetings. One thousand persons attended these meetings. Obviously, meetings of this nature are of great value in determining the thinking of the residents of low-income and disadvantage neighborhoods. It was in these meetings that the Commission determined what short term programs were needed to gain the confidence of the residents of the neighborhoods of prime concern to the Commission. Beyond these short term programs the Commission should have been able to anticipate what the residents of these neighborhoods considered primary. A review of minutes from grievance response meetings are needed to state their grievances and discuss solutions to these problems.

1 Community Relations Commission Newsletter September, 1967, "Dilemma of the City" (Privately printed, 1967).

2 The term grievance response meeting has now been dropped by the Commission because of its negative connotation. The term most frequently used by the Commission is Town Hall meetings.
meetings shows that the Commission up to 1969 was involved in such tasks as having trash and garbage picked up, streets paved, play parks constructed and street lights erected. These were the type of activities that caused city department heads to protest against Mrs. Paschal as the executive director. This activity abated to some extent when Mrs. Paschal was released. It was continued when a new director was hired. However, it appeared that the pressure upon the City department heads was not as intense as it had been in the past. Although these services are of great importance in gaining the confidence of the residents and in demonstrating that the city is concerned and willing to give city services to low-income neighborhoods, these tasks appeared to have taken precedent over other programs which could have been put into operation to begin to meet the long range problems faced by the residents of low-income neighborhoods.

The present staff of the Commission has continued to use the grievance response meetings. The typical grievance response meeting is held at night, usually in a neighborhood church, school auditorium, community center, or some other public meeting place. The meetings are chaired by the staff of the Commission. Occasionally representatives from the various city line departments, e.g., department of sanitation, public housing, and public works are present at the meetings. At these meetings residents are asked to state their grievances and these grievances are passed to the city department involved by the Commission staff when there are no city representatives present in the meetings.

On October 15, 1968, the Commission held a meeting in an area of
The city designated as Lightening. The main concern of the residents of this area was housing and the impending relocation of some of the residents due to the proposed urban renewal programs. The Commission staff had present at the meeting representatives from the city departments of building inspector and relocation branch of the housing authority, and a representative from the Georgia State Employment Service. Each of these representatives was given an opportunity to speak and answer questions put to them by the residents present in the audience. In attendance also were the executive director and the field representative of the Commission. No Commission members were present.

It was a warm October night and the sky was clear and there was no hint of rain or impending bad weather. In spite of this the attendance at the meeting was poor. Approximately forty persons were in attendance.

The meeting had two purposes: to report to the residents of the area on action that had been taken on past grievances, and to have the city department representatives give additional information to the residents and in one instance to explain action that would be taken in the near future.

Residents at this meeting were concerned with the housing problem as it related to their personal lives. That is, one resident, the father of six children, had been unable for the past three or four years to obtain a unit in the public housing projects. This resident related that he had filed several applications and none had been acted upon favorably. The representative from the housing authority explained that there were few units in public housing available for
families the size of this resident. To this the resident responded that he knew of several of his friends who had families of similar size and they had been accommodated since his applications. In the answer to this statement the representative named the housing units with bedrooms that would accommodate a family of eight. None at that time had vacancies. It was of note to the resident that the representative did not name any of the so-called white public housing projects which had three and four bedrooms. Following the representative from the AHA was the representative from the Georgia State Employment Service. This representative explained that training programs were available to persons interested in learning a specific skill. He did not enumerate the programs. The father of the six children, who had spoken earlier, related that he had applied for a job through the state job mobile. He was instructed to go to a certain employer. Upon arrival at this employer's place of business he was informed that the job was not available. It was his opinion that he was not hired because he was black. The representative from the Georgia State Employment Service conceded that discrimination in hiring does exist in the city.

The last representative to speak was from the city building inspector's office. He reported that over 100 units in the area had been inspected and ninety-four code violations had been placed on the court docket. This cooperation on the part of the inspector office with the present staff is in contrast to the non-cooperation given the first director. In this meeting the representative was very willing to explain to residents the problems involved with code enforcement. Landlords sell their property or have titles changed to another name to avoid fines that will be levied.
Nat Welch, executive director of the Commission, open the meeting for general questions. One elderly resident rose to tell those present of the number of years he had lived in the area. Several persons from Economic Opportunity Atlanta were present and expressed distress over the confusion that surrounds relocation of persons displaced by urban renewal. Following this the meeting was adjourned.

Reading of CRC minutes indicate that the typical grievance meeting is not attended by a large number of residents. There have been exceptions and one notable exception was the grievance meeting held in November of 1968 at the Ed Cook Elementary School. This meeting was concerned with the policies of the Atlanta Housing Authority. Approximately 200 persons black and white were in attendance.

Other than grievance response meetings the staff of the Commission depends to a large extent on gaining acceptance within the city and governmental power structure. These contacts are considered very vital by the staff of the Commission.

The present Executive Director upon assuming the position met with many of the persons considered members of the Atlanta community power structure. Following these meetings he met with the various heads of city departments. The approach was suggested by a black member of the CRC. Accompanying this suggestion was the order in which each person of the power elite should be seen. The new Director was informed to explain to these persons his views and attempt to get their support for the work of the Commission. At these meetings the new Director was instructed to let it be known that his tactics would be more acceptable than those of the first director.*
Since his first meetings with the above persons the Director has been able to gain the cooperation of many of the city's businessmen and city department heads. The rapport that the Director has established is evidenced in the cooperation he was able to gain from the Atlanta business community in carrying out the Commission's black ownership program of 1969. The Director was able to call together fifty of the city's leading white businessmen and get their acceptance and aid in the ownership program. Rapport is also evidenced between the Director and the various city department heads. News reports of mistrust of the CRC director by the city department heads no longer appear in local newspapers. All of the lay Commissioners interviewed expressed the belief that the present director has gained the confidence of city department heads. Tangible evidence of the cooperation between the department heads and the CRC can be seen in the number of reported violations of the city housing code which are placed on the court docket by the inspectors' office.

The style of the present Commission Director is that of tact and compliance with established means of resolving problems. In short the Director does not anticipate causing any major upheaval which would alienate him from the city power structure either in the governmental or non-governmental sections of the city. It appears that the Director believes the Commission to be a passive organization rather than an activator of controversial matters. In brief the style of the present

The term passive as used in this study refers to the Commission not involving itself in matters that might be considered controversial by a large segment of the Atlanta population.
director is in complete opposition to the style of the first director. It was the belief of the first director that direct action and confrontation were needed and that this type action was not out of the purview of the Commission.

The merit of the style of the present director has to be measured with the time in history it is being used and of course with its effectiveness. At this juncture in American history the quiet approach to the interracial problems of the nation has yield little fruit. Many human relations organizations have discarded the quiet approach. Their argument is that the quiet tactics were not responsible for the major gains that have been made in the field of civil rights. It has taken demonstrations and other direct action methods to accomplish the changes that have come. The quiet method gives the persons in control an opportunity to stall and delay. This stalling and delaying is partly responsible for the crisis situation that now faces American cities.

The effectiveness of the quiet method as being practiced by the Atlanta Community Relations Commission is difficult to measure. If

---

1 Organizations such as the Congress of Racial Equality and the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, which were organized primarily as non-violent groups, have of late emerged as very militant groups. These groups now speak in terms of rebellion and revolution. The phrase that has caused confusion is "black power." An attempt will not be made to explain this term but let it suffice to say that this term does not connotate the use of quiet methods to gain status for blacks. See New York Times Magazine, "The Successor to Floyd McKissick May Not Be So Reasonable," October 1, 1967, p. 32.; S. Lynd, "A Radical Speaks in Defense of S.N.C.C.," New York Times Magazine, September 10, 1967, p. 50.; Paul Good, "Odyssey of a Man," New York Times Magazine, June 25, 1967, p. 5.; and Christian Century, "CORE Leaps Without Looking," July 19, 1967.
this quiet method accomplishes major changes on the part of the Atlanta School Board to effectively integrate schools then one can say that the quiet method is effective. It was only the use of pressure and the threat of a mass boycott on the part of black students that convinced the Atlanta School Board that they would have to cease operation of double sessions, which existed primarily in the black schools of the city. Prior to the noise of October, 1967, the Atlanta Board had operated the city black schools and to a limited degree the city's white schools on double sessions for over forty years.

This quiet method has not been very successful in altering the policies of the Atlanta Housing Authority. In practice the public housing units of the city are still segregated and certain questionable tenant policies are still in force.

It is possible to say that the use of the quiet method may have contributed in extending city services to certain sections of the city that had been neglected in the past. In some areas play parks have been constructed, garbage picked up, and more street lighting added. However the city is not only responding to the quiet prodding of the Commission. It is also mindful of the warnings given in the report presented by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. These warnings reminded cities that continue to neglect to provide needed services to depressed areas of an urban area gives more militant blacks excuses for violence. The city of Atlanta is not unmindful of these warnings and also of the experiences that it had in several black neighborhoods in the summer of 1967.\(^1\)  

\(^1\) In response to the Kerner Report the City of Atlanta did several
The associate director of the Commission has developed contacts within the city's news media and within the various federal agencies that exist in Atlanta. These contacts are vital because they help to keep the Commission informed of the shifts in federal attitudes and the nuances involved in federal laws and guidelines.

Present on the Commission staff since February, 1969, is a new field representative with long experience in intergroup and interracial work. The field representative is familiar with various elected officials both on the state and local levels. His greatest contribution to the Commission is his contacts on the grass roots level of the city both in the black and white communities. Persons who consider themselves part of the grass roots groups feel at ease with the present field representative and feel that they have a sympathetic ear on the Commission staff. The usefulness of these contacts cannot be overstressed. For it is usually within the above contacts that policy determination of the Commission should be made. Elected state and local officials can help to produce the physical changes that are needed and the grass roots persons can help in determining what physical and attitudinal changes are necessary to make the city livable.

One other tool of the Atlanta Commission is the use of public appearances. The executive director and the associate director of the Commission are asked to address various civic groups. During these things: It appropriated a total of $62,000 to hire four community service officers who attended neighborhood meetings to hear complaints and attempt to have problems solved before they mounted. The city spent $90,000 for police community relations officers, and $300,000 for summer recreation programs. David Nordan, "Riot Report Hails Atlanta, Ivan Allen," The Atlanta Journal, February 27, 1969.
appearances the director or the associate director explains the plans and objectives of the Commission. This type of exchange helps to publicize the Commission to a wider audience and gain public support for the work of the Commission. These appearances also aid the Commission staff in a determination as to what the more affluent segment of the city is thinking in the area of change for the poor of the city.

Great reliance is placed on voluntary cooperation. If the Commission can gain voluntary compliance then its efforts have been successful. However, voluntary compliance is not the most potent weapon in dealing with fixed or stagnant situations. Success if it comes is a long and hard fight. Usually when success does come it is incomplete.

Without enforcement powers the staff of the Commission finds that it must depend upon sheer force of personality in most instances to sway private or public agencies to comply with laws.

An example of the weakness of voluntary compliance can be seen in the refusal of the Wren's Nest, the home of Joel Chandler Harris, to desegregate voluntarily at the urging of the Commission. Early efforts by the Commission to convince the Wren's Nest to desegregate without outside force failed. The governing board of the Nest consistently refused. They stated that the Harris will forbade the opening of the home to blacks. The Commission could not go beyond attempts at voluntary compliance because the city does not have ordinances relating to public accommodations. If the Commission attempted to make use of federal laws their applicability would have been in doubt. Also the Commission did not have a clear mandate regarding the situation at the Wren's Nest.* The city aldermen had not expressed as a body, the
Aldermanic Board's position on the matter.

Impatient blacks of the city instituted picketing of the Wren's Nest. The first director of the Commission participated in the picketing. The participation by the director in this type of direct action brought criticism from members of the Commission against the director. Angry Commission members felt that this active picketing by the director of the Commission gave the public the idea that the Commission was another civil rights group. It was felt by the majority of the Commissioners that Mrs. Paschal was creating policy without consulting the Commission. Mrs. Paschal felt that the situation at the Wren's Nest was of vital concern to the mandate of the Commission and saw no reason why the Commission should not align with groups that were protesting the racial policies of the Wren's Nest.1

The Commission, according to one commission member, was negotiating behind the scenes with officials of the Wren's Nest to admit blacks, but once Mrs. Paschal participated in the picketing the Wren officials used this as an excuse to break off negotiations. The Wren officials accused the Commission of bad faith. * It appears that there was no communication between the executive director and the commissioners. Failure had to be the only result of a split as wide as the one that existed between the first executive director and the majority of the Commission members.

In September of 1968 the Wren's Nest did finally open its doors to all. It is difficult to substantiate that quiet negotiations

---
1 Personal interview Mrs. Eliza K. Paschal, October 29, 1968.
brought about a change in the policy of the Nest. Publicly various
groups were stating that full scale picketing would take place and
were also threatening court action.\footnote{It can be safely assumed that
all of these played a role in convincing the Nest of the necessity of
desegregating the facility.} It can be safely assumed that

All efforts at voluntary compliance by non-governmental groups
have met with some frustration as experienced in the attempt at de-
segregating the Wren's Nest. In 1968 the Commission filed in the fed-
eral attorney's office a report citing a local roller rink with re-

The Commission referred the case to the federal attorney in early
1968. Now a year later the case is still pending in the federal
attorney's office. The reason cited for the delay is that further in-

\footnote{Court action might have brought results. In 1966 the United
States Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional a Georgia Law which allow-
ed persons to will property to a class of person in regards to race
(Georgia code sections 69-504 and 69-505). The specific case involved
the will of the late United States senator Augustus O. Brian of
Georgia. Brian had left instruction in his will that a certain piece
of land be used exclusively for the white race as a pleasure ground
and the grounds were not to be used by the black race. The state was
maintaining the grounds by way of maintenance. It was the opinion of
the Court that it was very doubtful if the Senator could will such to
the state on a segregated basis. Further it was doubtful if the de-

decease could will his property to the exclusive use of a class. See
\textit{Evans et. al. v. Newton et. al.} \textit{382 U. S. 296 (1966).}}

\footnote{Personal interview with Jim Lindskoog, Associate Director Atlanta
Community Relations Commission, March 6, 1969.}
director he made an investigation prior to submittal of the case to the federal attorney's office. After their receipt of the report the federal attorney's office conducted another investigation. It appears that another investigation must be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.1

An example of total failure in attempting to get voluntary compliance and change in established rules is exemplified by trailer courts operating in metropolitan Atlanta. The executive director and the associate director of the Commission have failed in several attempts to alter the policy of the trailer courts. According to the director the trailer owners have refused to change their decisions to open their facilities to blacks. Neither the 1964 nor the 1968 Civil Rights Acts are applicable in discrimination involving trailer courts. This is the thinking of the Commission.2

1 A check, by the author, on April 10, 1969 with the U. S. Attorney's office revealed that the case is still pending in Washington, D. C. Further investigation revealed that the Commission had submitted the report to the Community Relations Service in April, 1969. The CRS had investigated the matter and talked with the owners of the Uptown Skating Club, Inc. (the business in question). The CRS representative stated that he could not reveal the substance of his conversation with the management of the business, but his office did submit the case to the federal attorney's office.

2 The Commission is probably in error in regards to its thinking that the 1968 Open Housing Act may not be applicable to trailer courts. Contact, by the author, on April 10, 1969 with the Equal Opportunity Housing section of HUD revealed that a trailer court probably is obligated under the 1968 Open Housing law to open its facilities without regard to race. It was the opinion of the HUD office that trailer courts which are multi-unit are similar to apartment rentals. If the trailer camp is similar to a single dwelling home then a 1866 law can possibly be applied. According to officials what their office needs is a test case. This would probably be a worthwhile action for the CRC to consider seriously.
If voluntary compliance were effective, all of the above cases could have met with much more fruitful results. It was only through the threat of demonstrations and court action that the Wren's Nest complied and open its doors to all. In the instance of the roller rink the case is not pending in court but in the office of the federal attorney, and finally in the case of the trailer camps no action has been taken to force the camp owners to open their camps to all. The attempts were a total loss. The above examples point out graphically the need for city ordinances to plug loopholes in federal legislation relating to public accommodations. Action by local units could speed compliance and also give the Commission the legal and moral support it needs to gain compliance. The Commission as it is presently constituted and structured in law is weak without enforcement powers or the backing of strong local ordinances relating to anti-discrimination.

Overall the professional staff of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission is capable. It appears that they are limited by the conservatism present on the lay commission and the very limited budget granted by the city of Atlanta. With these two strictures the staff can only proceed very cautiously. This caution limits the ability of the Commission to enter so-called controversial areas that need attention. The one major program that the Commission has proceeded with in 1968-69 has been the black ownership program. In principle this is a very non-controversial project that does not antagonize the city power structure nor unfavorably upset the status quo. The staff has yet to enter "matters that it should not be in."

The lay Commission.--The lay segment of the Atlanta Community
Relations Commission is composed of twenty unpaid members all of whom are selected for staggered terms by the mayor with the approval of the Board of Aldermen. These commissioners serve a term of three years and are eligible to be reappointed to the Commission. The ordinance does provide for removal of a commissioner by the mayor if the member fails to attend meetings or is inattentive to duties. The chairman of the Commission is selected by the mayor. As mentioned in a previous section the powers of the Commission are very limited.

The ordinance gives the Commission only two outlets of power: persuasion and the use of public exposure to bring before the public wrong practices. After this exposure the Commission relies primarily upon public indignation to force offenders to change policies.

To bring alleged wrongs to the fore the Commission has used its power to hold hearings. At these hearings the Commission has attempted to bring out relevant facts. The Commission has labeled these city-wide public hearings Town Hall meetings.

In October, 1968, the Commission held a Town Hall meeting to give a group of concerned citizens, Better Schools Atlanta, an opportunity to tell of conditions that exist in the Atlanta public schools. The city-at-large was invited to attend by the CRC, but the attendance was light. At this particular meeting the CRC's role appeared to be one

---

1 Crowd estimates were placed at between 40 and 50 persons. Many of those present appeared to be persons from various agencies concerned with human relations. Those present were predominantly white. Seven CRC members were present and only one school board member was present (Mrs. Sara Mitchell) also present was the Atlanta School Superintendent, Dr. John Letson. This meeting was held on October 18, 1968 in the Atlanta city hall.
of a forum allowing the Better Schools Atlanta group and the Atlanta School Board to meet and air publicly the ills of the Atlanta School system. Early in 1969 the CRC once again sponsored a meeting between the Atlanta School Board and Better Schools Atlanta. At this meeting the Commission did not chair the proceedings. The School Board presented a slide presentation that indicated the progress that the Atlanta system had made under the Board. The Better Schools Atlanta group put to the School Board a list of questions they believed that the Board should answer. The Board did not answer the questions put to them by the Better Schools group. At a second meeting the Board did attempt to answer the questions raised by Better Schools Atlanta on February 11, 1969.

The use of the public hearing to bring the School Board to the public attention was difficult to arrange. On several occasions the Atlanta School Board refused to meet with the Commission.¹ This refusal by the School Board, which is an autonomous body, points out the need for the Commission to have additional power in the area of forcing individuals and agencies to appear before the public and explain practices that are under question.

All such CRC public hearings have not met with failure. Meetings with the Atlanta Housing Authority have produced some favorable results. The Atlanta Housing Authority changed the rules which prohibited an unwed mother with a child under one year of age from

¹ Alex Coffin, "Board to Answer Negro Charges," Atlanta Constitution, September 16, 1967.
obtaining a public housing unit. The AHA has also changed its policy with regard to families of prisoners being allowed into public housing.

On one other occasion the Commission was able to effect change by a private agency. The Atlanta Association of Independent Grocers were approached by residents of the city through the Commission. It is believed that the Commission was responsible for the Association's promise to regularly police its members as to service and quality of products. However, it would appear that the prime factor in moving the Association to promise better policing of its members was the threat of a boycott by residents if the Association did not promise this regular policing.*

The hit-and-miss effectiveness of the public hearing power points out the need for the Commission to have power beyond the ability to hold public hearings. Its role at Town Hall meetings has usually been passive. That is the Commission can only air problems and go no further. If the proper city agency fails to act, the hearings have not achieved this goal.

To bring before the public legitimate grievances and give the indication that relief will be had only to have no relief only adds to already present frustrations. These frustrations are the results of past futile efforts by low-income residents to confront powerful forces with their problems.

---

1 Mrs. Mary Stephens, personal interview November 19, 1968. Mrs. Stephens stated that these changes were made quietly and the AHA never acknowledge that these rules were in force or that they had been dropped.
The Commission offers still another forum for the citizens to express their grievances and for CRC commissioners to make known their views on what action and procedure the Commission should take in regards to a specific problem. The ordinance creating the Commission instructs the Commission to hold meetings at least once every month.

Regularly at two p.m. every fourth Friday the CRC convenes in the Atlanta City Hall. Usually well over half of the twenty Commissioners are present. The purpose of these meetings is to give the Commission an opportunity to decide actions that will be taken by the Commission. The meetings also act as a place for citizens to confront the Commission with their grievances.

During Commission meetings only four of the Commissioners consistently express their views while others appear quite willing to allow the professional staff to direct matters. Very little debate occurs during CRC meetings. The public-at-large is usually not present, although the meetings are open to the general public. During the course of this study, October, 1968 thru May, 1969, only one group of citizens appeared before the CRC to ask the Commission's help in solving a problem. These Friday meetings are primarily for formal

---

1 As a result of the United States Congress passing legislation in 1967 decreasing the amount of funds to states to help support the AFDC program many welfare mothers across the nation have organized themselves to protest this action by the Congress. In Atlanta welfare mothers have organized and petitioned the Georgia legislature to meet the financial gap that will develop in the summer of 1969 when the freeze of funds will go into effect. On February 28, 1969, a group of welfare mothers attended the meeting of the CRC and asked the CRC to do something in their behalf to encourage the state or Fulton County to make up the amount of funds which will be lost. In some instances the amount of money for each family will be cut in half. The Commission voted to seek repeal of the freeze legislation. If this failed the CRC voted to ask the Georgia legislature to replace the funds.
compliance with the instructions of the ordinance. However, they give
the public an opportunity to see the persons who are Commission mem-
bers. It also acts as another means for the Commission to advertise
its work to the public because the local news media is usually in
attendance.

At these Friday afternoon meetings some friction between the
blacks on the Commission is apparent. This friction is especially
visible between the more impatient black members of the Commission and
the Commission chairman who is also black. On several occasions black
Commissioners have voiced dissatisfaction with certain proposals or
lack of action on the part of the Commission. When debate does come
about the chairman appears to favor the views of the more conservative
black and white Commission members. This debate sometimes bogs down
and becomes petty bickering instead of factual discussion. In a Friday
meeting held in November there was a proposal from the CRC staff to
hold a workshop on black business at a black owned restaurant-motel
complex located on the southwest side of the city. Several of the
black members of the Commission objected to the proposal to hold the
workshop in this complex primarily because the complex is located in
the southwest section of the city and not in the southeast or the north-
west section of the city. There is a feeling among some southeast
black Atlantans that blacks in the southwest portion of the city have
a false feeling of superiority in regards to blacks in other sections
of the city.* During the above discussion the exchanges were concerned
more with personal barbs than with what appeared to be the real issue:
to work out some equitable system whereby everyone could have gained
some degree of satisfaction. The Commission chairman stopped the dis-
cussion by stating that the executive director would study the matter
and report back to the Commission on where the workshop would be held.
The workshop was held at Atlanta University and the banquet following
the workshop was held at the black-owned restaurant-motel complex
mentioned above. Both of these sites are located in the southwest
section of Atlanta.

The above illustrates the cleavage present on the Commission be-
tween some of the more impatient black members and the more conservative
black members of the Commission. At the time of this study the con-
servative black Commissioners outnumbered the more impatient blacks on
the Commission. The impatient blacks want more action by the Commis-
sion.

It would appear that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission
needs some machinery to bring its hearing-findings to some meaningful
solution. This will entail giving the Commission the power to enforce
ordinances relating to discrimination.1

Although the Commission has the power to hold public hearings it
has not used this power to explore some very pressing problems of the
poor. The CRC has not held public hearings regarding the inadequate
health facilities available to ghetto residents nor has the Commission
held hearings relating to the city of Atlanta's hiring practices. It

1The discrimination referred to is not only racial discrimination,
but also discrimination based on income. The city discriminates
against low-income neighborhoods in the area of city services. If
there is a shortage of funds to properly service the city then all
sections of the city should feel the economic lack.
is apparent that a commission with a small staff and an inadequate budget cannot perform all of the necessary tasks. This demonstrates the need for a larger staff and a much expanded budget. Without proper staffing and adequate funding the Atlanta Commission will remain little more than a token commission with regard to the pressing problems of the Atlanta poor, black and white.

Policy making machinery of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission.--The Atlanta Community Relations Commission has had a great deal of difficulty in determining who is charged with the responsibility of making policy. In its initial year of existence the Commission did not clarify who would decide policy. It was never stated whether the twenty man Commission, the executive director, or a combination of the two would decide the policy of the Commission. The ordinary assumption would be that the Commission would decide the policy.

Mrs. Eliza K. Paschal, the Commission's first director and Mr. Irving Kahler, the Commission's first chairman, were constantly at odds over who would determine the policy of the Commission. This difference as to policy initiator also extended to the other Commission members and the director. This lack of clarification helped to confuse the definition of the role the Commission should play in the community.* During its first year of existence the Commission was controlled by the executive committee which was composed of the Community

---

1 Irving Kahler was appointed as the first Chairman of the Commission. Subsequently, he resigned because he lived outside of the city of Atlanta.
Relations Commission officers. It was reported that the chairman during this first year did not conduct the Commission meetings by means of an agenda. Therefore, members were in doubt as to what business the Commission would be conducting.*

In a statement issued after her dismissal as director of the Commission, Mrs. Paschal stated that the policy of the Commission was not determined by the full Commission, but by a few members and non-members. The policy was usually made at luncheons at private clubs where blacks are not welcome. The end of the first year did not clarify where policy initiation fell. It was the feeling of some commissioners at this time that policy was being determined by a clique of conservative white and black commissioners.*

A majority of the Commission members believe that at present the CRC's policy is determined by the twenty man Commission and the staff. That is, the staff determines the needs of the city and relays these needs to the Commission. Commission members stated that no policy was determined at the open Friday meetings of the Commission.  

---

1 The executive committee at present rotates in its composition to allow all commission members an opportunity to learn fully of the Commission's work. This committee meets prior to the monthly meetings and brings suggestions to the full membership.

2 Statement of Eliza K. Paschal issued after her dismissal as executive director of the CRC (Privately printed, 1968). The uniformed commission member idea is borne out in statements by Commission members who stated that at various times during the first year they were ignorant of issues before the Commission.

3 It should be noted that these formal Friday meetings are open to the public therefore, it should appear that more debate of substance should take place. The ratifying of already decided policy is a disservice to the public.
The burden of determining policy for the Atlanta Community Relations Commission is primarily upon the executive director. Four CRC members related that they receive periodic telephone calls from either the director or other CRC members. It is during these calls that policy is discussed and opinions sounded out.* From interviews with CRC members it appears that they have confidence in the ability of the executive director to formulate and carry out policy. No CRC member interviewed could state that he or any other CRC member had a decisive voice in the formulation of the program to run a black ownership workshop.¹ Those Commissioners who answered the question as to whose idea it was to have black ownership program stated that it was the idea of the executive director. No Commissioner could state a program that came directly from the Commission members. The reason for this could be that a great amount of policy making is done by telephone. These telephone conversations are to key Commissioners. When the program is presented by the staff at the formal Friday meetings there is little left to discuss. Those few commissioners who want to argue cannot do so effectively because they usually have no specific program to offer or the votes to push their programs.

At present a large amount of the policy of the Commission is decided by the executive director, the Commission chairman and a few key Commission members. There appears to be little participation by a

---

¹ This program was the CRC's first major effort in 1969. It called together representatives from various companies and had present potential black owners. At one point the executive director called this project the one which would make the reputation of the Commission. Over 200 persons attended this project. Further consideration is given to this project in Chapter V.
majority of the Commission members. This is borne out in the admission of Commissioners that no policy of positive action had been determined by the individual Commissioners. The Commission is not taking full advantage of the diversity of the Commission members backgrounds when it relies on the advice of a few members.

During personal interviews with Commission members it was evident that some hold very progressive ideas and proposals, but feel that their proposals would be unworkable. They feel in this manner because of such practical considerations as a limited budget and a feeling that they must keep members of the Atlanta Board of Aldermen from becoming disenchanted with the Commission.

Represented on the Commission is a person from the poor white community, but the CRC has not taken any concerted actions in the poor white areas of the city. There is need for CRC assistance in these areas. The problems in the city's white ghettos are as pressing as those in the black ghettos of the city. The black representatives on the Commission from the low-income black areas have not been able to push the Commission in the direction of stimulating programs designed to help female heads of households who need nurseries for their children during the day when the mothers work.

The Commission has not turned policy in the direction of the few vocal blacks on the CRC who call for a much closer look at the Atlanta

---

1 In a speech on March 12, 1969 at the Atlanta Hungry Club Commission director Welch stated that the CRC plans to go into poor white areas of the city. This statement was recorded by the author. However, in a personal interview with the author on March 24, 1969 Mr. Welch stated that no definite plans had been formalized to go into white areas because they had received no invitation from these areas.
housing problem. These same vocal members have voiced concern over the lack of policy on the part of the Commission to learn the causes of school truancy which is high in the low-income neighborhoods of Atlanta.

Perhaps the CRC Commissioners in their expressed confidence in the executive director have failed to realize that the aspirations and experiences of the director and other similarly motivated Commission members is oriented toward the American white middle class ideas of needs and success. This orientation cannot be labeled as wrong, but it does limit their view of the needs of city's poor and black citizens. To interpret the need for better stores in a community as a need for a black ownership program is not necessarily the proper interpretation. The residents of these black areas could have simply been asking for larger chain stores to operate in their communities. Policy must be shared in order for the Commission to fulfill its broad mandate of bettering the communications between all segments of the city.
We support integration as the priority education strategy: It is essential to the future of American education.¹

Public school integration and faculty integration.--In 1954 the United States Supreme Court struck down legal segregation in the United States. Specifically the Court ruled that separate schools for blacks and whites were inherently unequal, and therefore, unconstitutional. The Court in its 1955 decision stated that schools should be desegregated with "all deliberate speed." This was a fatal phrase for it allowed school systems across the South to delay and invent devious schemes to circumvent the Court's decision.

The school decision is in the middle of its second decade and recent reports from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates that schools, especially southern schools, are still segregated. In the fifteen years since the Court's ruling only 24.4 per cent of the black school age children in the South are attending integrated schools.² The figure is even smaller for the number of whites attending predominantly black schools.

¹ National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March, 1968.
Amount of integration in Atlanta schools.--Only 4.6 per cent of the students in Atlanta's elementary schools are in integrated school situations. Only 7.6 per cent of the city's high school students are in integrated schools.¹ In terms of actual numbers as given in an untitled report issued by the Atlanta School Board only 293 black students attend predominantly white schools and 22 white students attend predominantly black schools.² In terms of numbers Atlanta has fifty-five all black elementary schools, twenty-three all white elementary schools, twenty-three schools with token student integration, and nineteen elementary schools that have 5 per cent of the student body of the race opposite that of the majority of the student body. On the high school level there are ten all black schools, one all white school, six schools with token integration, and nine integrated schools.³

It would appear from the above figures that fifteen years after the legal decision to end segregation the Atlanta school system has failed to comply and continues to effectively segregate black and white students. A total of 92.3 per cent of black elementary pupils

¹ Student Achievement in Atlanta Public Schools, Better Schools Atlanta (Privately printed, Atlanta: 1968), p. 6. It should be recalled that for the purpose of its study BSA defined an integrated school as one with at least 5 per cent of the student of the race opposite the majority of the student body.


³ Student Achievement in Atlanta Public Schools, Op. cit., p. 5.
are in all black schools.\textsuperscript{1}

Faculty integration.--The picture of faculty integration is as bleak and dismal as that of student integration in the Atlanta public schools. In the city's elementary schools 97 per cent of the schools have three teachers or less of the opposite race from the majority of the school's student body.\textsuperscript{2} In the city high schools the picture is not much better: 85 per cent of Atlanta's high schools have four teachers or less of the opposite race than that of the majority of the student body.\textsuperscript{3} Overall, 97 per cent of Atlanta's black teachers teach in black schools.\textsuperscript{4}

Broken down further only 1.3 per cent of Atlanta's black teachers teach in integrated schools, and 1.6 per cent teach in white schools. The above is for elementary schools. Black teachers in Atlanta's white schools constitute a negligible 0.5 per cent. Those in integrated high schools constitute 2.0 per cent.\textsuperscript{5}

Compared with the small amount of student integration in the Atlanta public schools the amount of teacher integration is very insignificant. Overall, in the elementary schools of the city the amount

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., p. 3.
\item Ibid., p. 3.
\item Ibid., p. 3.
\item Ibid., p. 3.
\item Ibid., p. 12.
\end{enumerate}
of student integration is 22.8 per cent. Only 5.7 per cent of the elementary school faculty is integrated.\(^1\) The percentage is even lower on the high school level. The total integration of blacks into white high schools is 13.3 per cent as compared to 2.9 per cent for black faculty integration in the city's high schools.\(^2\)

There is a gross imbalance of blacks into white schools and whites into black schools. This imbalance holds true on both the student and faculty levels. Integration is a one-way street in Atlanta with blacks students and teachers going to white schools with very little reciprocal action on the part of whites to black schools.

Physical plant, student population, school sites, and pupils per class room.---One of the gravest problems faced by black schools has been overcrowding and inadequate facilities, especially in the way of school plant and materials.

No white elementary school in Atlanta has a student population over 900 students. However, fourteen black elementary schools have student populations over 900. In terms of percentages 54 per cent of the city black elementary schools have student populations of over 800, while the city's white elementary schools have only 11 per cent of its schools with student populations of over 800 students.\(^3\)

Even more glaring is the matter of acreage per school sites for

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 12.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 12.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 16.
black and white schools. Based on four acres per 1,000 students 31 per cent of the black elementary schools have less than four acres per 1,000 students. In the white elementary schools 11 per cent of the white elementary schools have less than four acres per 1,000 students.1

Coupled with the above is the number of pupils per classroom. In their 1968 study Better Schools Atlanta discovered that 65 per cent of the city's black first graders attended classes of twenty-nine students or more. In comparison 34 per cent of the white first graders attend first grade classes of twenty-nine or more. Coupled with this is the pupil-teacher ratio in the city's elementary schools. In black elementary schools 44 per cent of the schools had a pupil-teacher ratio of 29.1 per cent or above. In the city's white elementary schools 14 per cent of the schools had a pupil-teacher ratio of 29.1 per cent or above.2

In the area of value of furniture and equipment per pupil the inequity is very visible. In 1967-68 school year 84 per cent of the black schools received less than $100 per pupil in regards to value of furniture and equipment. Only 33 per cent of the city's white elementary schools received less than $100 per pupil in the value of furniture and equipment per pupil. The median number of books per pupil in Atlanta's black elementary schools was ten books per pupil. White elementary schools received a median of sixteen books per

1 Ibid., p. 16

2 Ibid., p. 18.
The report issued by Better Schools Atlanta pointed out that as of June, 1967, 100 per cent of Atlanta's black high schools were without speech therapy programs. In contrast only 20 per cent of white high schools were without speech therapy programs.\(^2\) In the elementary schools 21.2 per cent of the black elementary schools were without speech therapy programs and 4.6 per cent of the white elementary schools were without such a program.\(^3\)

Student achievement.--The result of inadequate facilities and unmanageable class sizes comes to the surface when the median reading levels for black and white pupils is compared. Black students in the city's fourth grades are over one year behind white students in the same grade. The median reading level for black fourth graders is 2.7. The median for white fourth graders is 3.7. As black students move from the fourth grade to the eighth grade their median reading level advances 1.1 grade. That is, the median black eighth grader in the Atlanta public schools only reads on grade level 3.8. White students on the same grade level have a median reading score of 9.2.\(^4\)

In response to the inequities present in the Atlanta school

---

1. Ibid., p. 22.
2. Ibid., p. 23. In terms of number: 1 white high school is without a speech therapy program, 11 black high schools are without speech programs.
3. Ibid., p. 23.
4. Ibid., p. 28.
system several civic-minded groups have attempted to publicize needed changes. Prominent among these groups is Better Schools Atlanta (BSA). This group is composed primarily of white Atlantans. In its report issued in the summer of 1968 the group stated that it had two purposes: '(1) to impress upon the Atlanta School Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools our awareness of the size and precise nature of the educational crisis in Atlanta and (2) to inform Atlanta citizens of the dimensions of this crisis so that they will provide the economic support and the climate necessary to assure good schools.'

On October 17, 1968, Better Schools Atlanta made public the results of its study. The findings are stated above. At an October 17, 1968 Town Hall meeting Superintendent John Letson was present to argue the case for the Atlanta School Board. In reply to the charges made by BSA Superintendent Letson stated that the Atlanta public schools, especially black schools, had received more in the way of funds in the last few years vis-a-vis the city's white schools. Letson also stated that the reason for the great difference in reading levels was due to cultural deprivation of black children.

An editorial comment in the Atlanta Journal stated that the school system must take some responsibility for the low reading levels of blacks and not offer the excuse that the home is responsible.

---

1 Ibid., p. 1
2 Statement made by Superintendent John Letson on October 17, 1968, at the Town Hall meeting, recorded by the author, sponsored by the Community Relations Commission.
Criticism from the community is not limited to white groups. The Vine City Foundation, a self-help program located in one of Atlanta's most publicized low-income neighborhoods, criticized middle class blacks for failing to offer leadership in helping to change the School Board policy. This group believes that middle class black educators, ministers, and other leaders are afraid to speak out and are oriented toward white middle class status. According to the Foundation middle class blacks will have to help. One black group, the Metropolitan Atlanta Summit Grassroots Council, has called for the resignation of School Superintendent John Letson.

As early as August, 1967, the Community Relation Commission was concerned with the ills of the Atlanta school system. The first Commission director compiled a report describing the conditions of the Atlanta public schools. This report was initialed by the director. However, the report received very little support from Commission members and no support in the governmental structure of the city.* Basically the report, drawn by Mrs. Paschal, emphasized the need for more integration on the pupil and faculty levels in the school system.

Further investigation by Mrs. Paschal revealed that the five high

---


2 Statement made by John Boone on October 17, 1968 at the Town Hall meeting sponsored by the CRC. Boone is an official of the MASLC. Recorded by the author.

3 In 1967, blacks of Atlanta became incensed over the overcrowded conditions, double sessions, pupil assignment plan, and faculty and administrative matters. It was learned that only black high schools were experiencing double sessions.
schools in the city on double session were black schools and no white schools were involved. This figure meant that 50 per cent of the black high school population was receiving half-a-day's education.\footnote{"Five High Schools on 2-Session Day," The Atlanta Journal, August 28, 1967. Also Speech by Eliza K. Paschal at the Hungry Club, November 1, 1967.}

It was Mrs. Paschal, as director of the CRC, who pointed out the vagueness and evasiveness present in the city's freedom-of-choice plan.

Upon the above findings of the director and the impending school crisis that developed in 1967 the CRC asked the Atlanta School Board to meet with the Commission. The purpose of the meeting as explained by the Commission was to discuss the urgent problems of the city's schools. The Commission's request of a meeting was not responded to by the School Board. The Commission in September sent telegrams to each Board member and the school superintendent. These telegrams were sent after the Board had failed to respond to the first request for a meeting with the Commission. These telegrams proved futile.\footnote{"Board Told Grievance on School," The Atlanta Constitution, September 15, 1967.}

In answer to the request of the CRC for a meeting the School Board responded by way of the newspapers. The Board stated that it did not have time to meet with the Commission. Further, the School Board commented that the Board did not need the Commission to solve the pressing problems facing the schools at this time. The School Board Chairman, Ed Cook, referred to the efforts of the Commission as

outside interference. Recent efforts by the Commission to alter School Board policies have centered on serving as a forum for such groups as BSA to expose conditions in the Atlanta school systems. In October of 1968 the Commission sponsored a meeting wherein the BSA group presented the report mentioned above. In spite of the abundance of evidence presented at this meeting by BSA the school Superintendent was able to effectively control the meeting and avoid answering direct questions put to him by the audience and BSA.

In commenting on the BSA report the CRC stated that built into the pattern of inadequacy is the serious problem of racial discrimination. This discrimination has prevented black students in the city from fulfilling their potential. This deprivation, according to the CRC's statement, is based entirely on color.

The CRC has consistently attempted to put pressure on the Atlanta School Board to integrate the schools thoroughly on the student, faculty, and administrative levels. Nat Welch, present CRC director, has stated that the Atlanta School System only has token integration and is "footdragging" on integrating local schools. Welch stated that latest CRC figures show that only thirteen of Atlanta's 120 elementary schools have more than 10 per cent integration. Other CRC figures indicate that only six of Atlanta's twenty-six high schools have more

---


than 10 per cent integration. Director Welch states that CRC studies indicate that six schools were constructed recently and all have been placed in the heart of white or black residential sections. That is, no schools were placed so as to be accessible to black and white students.

To further augment its file of school difficulties in Atlanta the CRC voted to interview persons in and outside of Atlanta. The purpose of these studies will be to find innovative suggestions for improving the quality of education in Atlanta. Methods would also be solicited to effectively accomplish desegregation of Atlanta schools.

In a speech given on March 12, 1969, Welch called for a need to change the policies of the Atlanta School Board. In the same speech he advocated a well organized voter registration drive to get these changes. During the speech Welch cited figures that showed only 62.8 per cent of the eligible blacks in Atlanta are registered to vote. It should be noted that although Welch called for a change in policy he never stated that the present school board should be ousted. However, on the same occasion the chairman of the Commission did call for some drastic changes on the School Board.

All Commission members are not as adamant about changing the Atlanta School Board composition. Three of the white Commissioners

---


2 CRC meeting, February 28, 1969.

3 Speech at the Hungry Club by Nat Welch on March 12, 1969. Recorded by the author.
interviewed stated that the Atlanta School Board may have done a good job up to this point. These three members believe that the possibility exists that all of the inequalities reported by various sources may not be entirely credible.*

The views of these three Commission members are shared by the Atlanta School Board and the Superintendent of Schools. On every occasion that Superintendent Letson has had an opportunity to talk to the school problem he has stated that cultural deprivation and poor stimulation at home has caused blacks to fall behind whites in the local schools. To counteract criticism of inadequate school plants for blacks the Superintendent points to the large amount of funds that have been expended recently on black schools. Critics of the system state that the Superintendent fails to mention the reason for these large outlays of funds in black schools. The reasons is that black schools have been neglected in the past and more funds are needed to bring the black schools to a point where the city's white schools are at present. More funds are needed to close the chasm between the black and white schools.

One form of segregation has helped to perpetuate another form of segregation. Segregation in the housing patterns of the city has helped to reinforce segregation in the school system. The Atlanta School Board through the school superintendent states that the Atlanta system is based on a freedom-of-choice plan.² That is, any student is
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1 Statement by Superintendent John Letson at the October 17, 1968 Town Hall meeting. Recorded by the author.

2 The freedom-of-choice plan has been ruled illegal when it fails
eligible to attend any school of his choice.\(^1\) In reality the student is not free to attend any school because of the transportation and the hostile attitude a black student can expect to receive in attending a white school. A further problem that attends the freedom-of-choice plan is that it places on the parents the burden of initiating integration. Reports show that the freedom-of-choice plan procedure is vague and evasive.\(^2\)

The report compiled by Better Schools Atlanta indicated that faculty integration in Atlanta public schools as of the summer 1968 was 5.7 per cent on the elementary level and 2.9 per cent in the city's high schools. Figures of the CRC indicate that eight of the city's elementary schools have more than 10 per cent faculty integration and four of the high schools have 10 per cent faculty integration. In to sufficiently integrate the schools of a city. The United States Supreme Court in its decision of 1968 in the case of Green et. al. v. County School Board of New Kent County et. al. 391 U.S. 430 (1968) ruled that the burden is on a school board to provide a plan that promises realistically to work now (emphasis the Court's). The Court further stated that, "Where a freedom-of-choice plan offers real promise of achieving a unitary, non-racial system there might be no objection... but where there are reasonably available other ways powers as zoning, promising speedier and more effective conversion to a unitary school system, freedom-of-choice is not acceptable... has operated simply to burden students and their parents with a responsibility which Brown II (Brown v. Board of Education, 394 U.S. 294 (1955) placed squarely on the School Board." See also Bowman v. County School Board, 382 F 2d 333 C. CA. 4th Cir. 1967 concurring opinion, "Freedom-of-choice is not a sacred taskman it is only a means to a constitutionally required end--the abolition of segregation and its effects.... but if it fails to undo segregation, other means must be used to achieve this end." see also Bradley v. School Board 382 U.S. 103 and Raney v. Board of Education 391 U. S. 443.

\(^1\)"Two Atlantans, The Atlanta Journal, 1968.

answer to the charges of lack of faculty integration the Atlanta Schools Superintendent states that a poll conducted by his office showed white teachers as a whole are less willing to teach in black schools, than are black teachers in white schools. Critics of the School Board call such a poll illegal in the face of decisions by the Supreme Court which ruled that faculties as well as student bodies must integrate. One very important admission that the Superintendent and the School Board make when such statements are made by the Superintendent is that the School Board is hiring teachers for black schools who are not qualified to teach in all the schools of the city. In effect the dual system still exists in the city when the School Board refuses to assign teachers to a school regardless of their color.

All of the response of the School Board to criticism leveled at it has not been well reasoned type as displayed by Superintendent Letson at public meetings. In January of 1969 the detective squad assigned to the School Board, on the orders of A. C. Latimer, attorney for the Board, ordered the investigation of certain persons who had signed a petition protesting some of the inequities present in the Atlanta system. School detectives questioned the employers and other sources about "30 or 40" persons who had signed the petition. One of the persons investigated was Robert Truve, president of Better Schools Atlanta. According to Mr. Truve he would have probably lost his job if his employer had been unaware of his activities in the protest.

---

1 Statement by Superintendent John Letson at October 14, 1968, Town Hall meeting sponsored by the CRC. Recorded by the author.
against the Atlanta School Board. It would appear that the School Board is not above using intimidation to silence its critics.

The preponderance of evidence shows that there is a great disparity between the black and white schools of the city with black schools receiving less in the way of quality education. Reports show that integration in Atlanta is at a minimum. In terms of figures integration in Atlanta is 12.2 per cent. Atlanta's School Board uses the argument of cultural deprivation to answer charges that blacks are as much as four reading grades levels behind whites. Never does the School Board mention the great deprivations, in the way of school material and plant, that have contributed to this chasm between black and white students in the city. In the face of court decisions that have ruled freedom-of-choice plans illegal when they fail to accomplish the desired end of abolition of segregated schools the Atlanta Board continues to rely on this system.

It appears that Atlanta like many other large cities has the problem of resolving its dual housing pattern along with its dual school pattern. That is, the segregated housing situation has helped to reinforce the dual school system that now exist. This is not to say that the school systems would have been unitary if the housing situation were more fluid. The only point intended here is that housing has helped to make the school problem even more complex.

The possible solutions until some form of stabilization occurs


2 Stabilization refers to blacks being able to move into previously all white neighborhoods and white not fleeing.
In housing is to bus children from overcrowded situations to less densely populated schools, the possibility exists that the School Board could consider decentralization of the schools. This would in effect give neighborhoods more control and possibly help to upgrade the quality of schools in ghetto areas of the city. This suggestion is offered because Atlanta has a school population of over sixty percent black. Talk of true integration may be unfeasible if the present rate of black student population continues. Another suggestion is the use of zones which would help to place students in schools near their homes especially when these schools could accommodate students from black and white residential areas. In short, the prime responsibility for desegregation of the schools is on the School Board. The Atlanta Board is legally obligated to present a plan that will truly dispense with a dual system.

In 1969 the Atlanta Community Relations Commission Chairman, Rev. Sam Williams, suggested that it was possibly time for the present Atlanta School Board to be unseated. However, the Commission has yet to mount what could be called a substained and concerted effort to unseat the Board nor has it presented a plan to integrate the schools of Atlanta or to upgrade the quality of education offered in the schools. The Commission does not have the manpower or the expertise to conduct what could be considered a comprehensive study. This only points out the need for the Commission to have an expanded budget to hire expert consultants or to expand the present staff to include a position for an individual with expertise in the use of statistics and research. The CRC has yet to alarm the public of the crisis that exists in the
educational system of Atlanta. This alarm has been left to private
groups such as Better Schools Atlanta. It is possible that the CRC
could hold neighborhood meetings specifically for the purpose of talks
on schools. As mentioned above three of the present CRC commissioners
are unwilling to admit that the Atlanta School System is in trouble
and needs to make some radical changes. One of these three commis-
sioners stated that perhaps the blame should be placed on black teach-
ers, the majority of whom he believed unqualified to teach.* The Com-
mission has not mounted an effort to unite a significant part of the
white community to push for better schools for all students in the city.

The city of Atlanta like sitting across the nation followed the
federal pattern in its efforts at segregation in the field of public
housing. Following World War II, the Federal government established
the Federal Housing Authority which was created to extend loans for
low-cost private housing. However, the FHA did not practice equality
in the administration of funds. In accordance, the FHA advised against
loaning money to Negroes who wanted to move into previously white
areas. The federal government was supporting segregation. It was the
policy of the FHA to set a maximum on the amount of money a Negro
could borrow from the FHA. This rule applied regardless of the income
of the black applicant. 3

1 Alex CoeEA, "Retiring Allen Tells City Today." The Atlanta Com-
mittee, January 6, 1968.

2 Earl R. Taylor and Alan F. Taylor, Negroes in Cities: Residen-
tial Segregation and Metropolitan Change (Chicago: Aldine Publishing

3 "Only a Beginning—But a Significant One," Metropolitan Atlanta
Negroes have got to learn to respect the traditional rights of segregation. Ivan Allen, Jr., July 11, 1953.

Housing in Atlanta: public and private.--The above statement was made by Mayor Allen prior to his assuming the office of mayor, and since his assumption the mayor of Atlanta has modified his views on the traditional system of segregation. However, the white majority of Atlanta has not altered, greatly, its view in regards to segregated housing in the city of Atlanta. Recent reports have indicated that Atlanta's housing pattern is more segregated than it was eighteen years ago.

The city of Atlanta like cities across the nation followed the federal pattern in its efforts at segregation in the field of public housing. Following World War II the federal government established the Federal Housing Authority which was created to extend loans for low-cost private housing. However, the FHA did not practice equality in its administration of funds. In memoranda the FHA advised against loaning money to Negroes who wanted to move into previously white areas. The federal government was supporting segregation. It was the policy of the FHA to set a maximum on the amount of money a Negro could borrow from the FHA. This rule applied regardless of the income of the black applicant.

1 Alex Coffin, "Retiring Allen Tells City Today," The Atlanta Constitution, January 6, 1969.


Following the federal government, Atlanta adopted three broad basic policies in the field of housing: 1) those concerned with getting rid of slums and replacing them with low cost housing for the poor, 2) those concerned with getting rid of slums and replacing them with other improvements, and 3) those directed toward keeping black and white homes as far apart as possible. It appears that the last policy always took precedence over the others. ¹ Use was made of physical barriers such as expressways, industrial complexes, and zoning laws. Land would be zoned industrial to keep it from being put to use as multipurpose family buildings. ²

As of April, 1967, the population of the city of Atlanta (excluding the surrounding counties) was 513,000. Of this figure 44.8 percent was black. In spite of this fact blacks of Atlanta occupied less than one third of the land area. ³

Robert A. Thompson, an official of the Federal Housing and Urban Affairs Department, has stated that in order for any type of stabilization to occur in the area of housing in Atlanta housing opportunities all over the city must be opened to Negroes. ⁴ In effect the HUD

---

¹ Ibid., p. 12.

² Samuel L. Adams, Atlanta Housing Study, Southern Regional Council (Privately printed, 1967).

³ See appendix for map of Negro concentration in Atlanta. Population statistics were obtained from Population and Housing 1967, Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission.

official stated what many have known, that whites fleeing further into the suburbs have helped create the conditions that exist in the field of housing. The exodus of whites give opportunity for realtors to move into an area and exploit the racial fears that are present on the part of whites. Eventually the area receives less in the way of public services and the homes become multi-family units with absentee landlords. Thus the creation of a slum.

The discrimination against blacks in housing prevents black access to non-white areas and this creates what the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders labels a "back pressure" in the black ghettos. In effect housing in the black ghetto areas is at a premium and landlords can capitalize on this shortage of housing. The landlord can break up apartments for denser occupancy. The rents can be increased and the maintenance on the housing left undone. In fact this situation creates a housing market which is not free, and thus the black tenants have no bargaining position.¹ This condition does not exist in white Atlanta. The abundance of housing for white Atlantans can be seen in the classified ads of the two largest local newspapers.

In 1968 there were approximately thirty slum landlords in Atlanta. Figures also reveal that some 50,000 people live in what have been termed slums. Of this number three out of four of the slum dwellers are black. The housing picture for the poor and black is even more dismal than that presented above. There are also between 17,000 and 19,000 substandard houses and between 1,000 and 1,200 are added to

¹ National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March, 1968.
this category each year. Under these conditions it is difficult for low-income persons to obtain decent housing.

Private ownership of a home is a dream of American families. The ownership of a home gives status to the family and helps the occupants feel as if they have a permanency in the neighborhood and are a worthwhile part of the community. However, this dream has not been easily obtainable for blacks. With the federal government leading the way, blacks were denied adequate funds to obtain housing, and thus in the long view the federal government along with local authorities, both public and private, have helped create the serious housing condition that exist among blacks.

Census figures available for 1960 showed that in the city of Atlanta there were 124,768 owner occupied homes among whites. The same statistics indicate that non-whites occupied only 14,000 owner occupied units in the city.

Presently in the Atlanta metropolitan area there are nine groups which have the common goal of attempting to stabilize housing in Atlanta. These groups were formed in response to the flight of whites into other areas as soon as a black moves into the neighborhood. To date few of these groups have met with any great degree of success.

One such group is the South West Atlantans for Progress (SWAP). This group has attempted to stabilize the southwest sections of Atlanta called West End and Cascade Heights. Recently, blacks started to move
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2 United States Census of Housing 1960 Atlanta, Georgia, Area Part 2, 1959.
into the area and the inevitable exodus of whites began. In its attempts to stabilize the neighborhood the SWAP group attempted to get the Atlanta Board of Aldermen to pass an ordinance that would prohibit the displaying of "For Sale" signs in the city residential sections. The group felt that this tactic would lessen the pressure on residents to sell and discourage potential black buyers from swarming into the neighborhood. The Board of Aldermen did not pass the proposed ordinance and SWAP met with the first of its frustrated attempts to meet the problem of white exodus. During a meeting of the Atlanta CRC a representative of the SWAP group informed the commission that SWAP had not had a constructive meeting. A CRC commission member, at the same meeting, informed the other commissioners that he had personal knowledge that the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce had sent letters to persons who indicated that they were moving to Atlanta. These letters advised the potential residents against moving into integrated areas.¹

In Chapter II mention was made of the infamous Peyton Wall which was erected in an attempt to keep blacks within certain bounds of the city. It was this type of action and thinking which helped to create the crowded and deplorable conditions endured by blacks in Atlanta.

The factors which have contributed to the segregated housing pattern in Atlanta can be summed up in the following: The city plans street closures and thoroughfares that do not facilitate easy travel between black and white residential areas; The placement of such public facilities as cemeteries, public housing projects and open green areas where they will prohibit any over spill of blacks into white areas;

¹ Community Relation Commission meeting minutes, September 27, 1968.
and in earlier times certain whites made use of violence and intimidation. Finally, differential zoning and application of land clearance and condemnation regulations combined to make black areas less desirable.  

It would appear that the only immediate solution to the problem of housing in the black ghetto areas would be public housing. However public housing and urban renewal have not done what they were designed in principle to accomplish. Instead of placing low-income residents into decent housing urban renewal has served to displace more people than it has accommodated. The city of Atlanta falls into the category of cities that has not adequately housed its poor citizens.

Approximately 32,000 people live in Atlanta's public housing projects. As of 1968 Atlanta had built sixteen public housing projects and of this number four were built for whites. Exact statistics are not known but the Atlanta Housing Authority estimates that three fourths of the public housing tenants are black.  

Atlanta was one of the first cities in the nation to take advantage of the federal laws of 1949 that were designed to help localities build public housing. In fact the first two public housing projects built in Atlanta were numbers one and two on the federal drawing board. These projects were Techwood and University Homes. Although they were the first on the federal docket the Atlanta projects were a full seven years going up after the land had been cleared. As would be expected the former

---


residents had widely dispersed over the city.\(^1\) This dispersal created crowded conditions in other parts of the city's already crowded ghetto areas. In the ten year period 1956-1966 Atlanta provided only 2,000 low-cost housing units. It must be noted that during this period public housing was coming under attack from such groups as realtors and builders who were protesting that public housing was not economical and in some quarters that it was unconstitutional and not the duty of the federal, state, or local government.\(^2\) In 1967, 21,000 units of housing were demolished in Atlanta. These units housed a total of 67,000 persons. These people were moved from their homes to make way for government improvements such as expressways and urban renewal.

The leading evictor in Atlanta has been expressways. As of 1968 expressway construction in Atlanta had removed 23,000 residents from their homes. Urban renewal in Atlanta had demolished 3,800 units of housing and displaced some 17,000 persons. During this period Atlanta has only replaced 5,000 units of housing for low-income occupancy.\(^3\)

It should be noted that in 1967 of the 67,000 persons displaced through urban renewal and other governmental projects, 80 per cent of the displacees were black and three out of four were renters. Over half of these persons were below the poverty level and over three
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fourths earned less than $5,000 per year.  

In recent years the city of Atlanta has taken a slightly different posture on the issue of public housing. Mayor Allen has launched a campaign to provide 9,800 public housing units by the end of 1968 and 7,000 more very soon afterward. At the end of 1968 Allen did not have his 9,800 new units of public housing. The stumbling block has been the location of public housing projects. No Atlanta community with any degree of affluency wants public housing located in its neighborhood. All attempts by the Atlanta mayor to have areas of the city zoned for public housing have met with opposition except in those quarters of the city where the residents are too uninformed or are unaware of their power to petition the city not to rezone their area.

In February of 1969, the Board of Aldermen were considering rezoning an area of Atlanta in the southwest. There was protest over this rezoning which would have allowed the building of public housing. The Board voted the rezoning down and the area, at least for the present, is safe from public housing. This particular move was very political in that 1969 is an election year and several members of the Board are seeking the position of mayor. It would have been politically unwise to vote for the rezoning in an area where the voters are literate and vocal.


The response of the city government as a whole has been half-hearted and bogged down in the politics of the city. In the instance of rezoning an area for public housing the Board of Aldermen have been very responsive to the wishes of the residents of the area which would be affected little heed is made of the great need for public housing. The problem of location of public housing is a very difficult one especially when the Board of Aldermen will not take definitive positions on the matter.

Similar to the groups formed to ease integration in private housing, groups have been formed by tenants to protest policies of the Atlanta Housing Authority. One such group is TUFT (Tenants United For Fairness) which has gained publicity.

In response to the housing problem in Atlanta the Community Relations Commission has held meetings with the Atlanta Housing Authority and the Tenants of various public housing projects. At times these meetings have been fruitful but all too often they have simply been futile. The representative sent by the AHA would simply justify the policies of the AHA with no indication that these policies would be changed or modified.\(^1\) Information made available for this study secured from the CRC indicates that at grievance response meetings the AHA would simply state to the tenants the policy of the AHA and in effect tell the tenants that they would have to live with the problems because of federal policy. In the information made available it appears that the tenants in fact have no appeal from eviction or raises

During a meeting held September 5, 1968 in the Fort Street Methodist Church representatives of the AHA were present and the AHA presented materials to the residents that indicated which areas would be removed, and that the removal would occur in the early part of October, 1968. It appeared that the representatives of the AHA were not questioned further in regard to where the displaced residents would go. These questions were not raised by the tenants nor were they raised by the members of the CRC present. In October of 1968 the CRC held another meeting with the AHA in the Perry Homes section of the city. Although the minutes of this meeting made available for this report did not show it, there was a heated discussion on the matter of certain policies pursued by the AHA. The policies in question were those concerned with the raising of rent when a child leaves high school and finds a job, but goes to college in the fall and the rent is not readjusted down as quickly as it was adjusted up.* What appeared to be a fruitful meeting was held in the area designated Lightening on October 15, 1968. At this meeting representatives from the city housing code inspection office and a representative of AHA relocation office were present. The representatives of the inspectors' office informed the forty-five persons present that their office had made cases against ninety-four landlords in the area for code violations. At this meeting the residents were primarily concerned with relocation of persons displaced through code enforcement by the city and displacement by urban renewal.

---

1 CRC minutes Grievance Response meeting, September 5, 1968, and CRC Grievance Response meeting, October 3, 1969.
The question posed by those in attendance was what assistance could displaced persons expect from the city. The representative from the relocation office explained that nothing could be done for persons unless they moved into a public housing project. It was then pointed out by some residents that, they had applied for public housing as long as three years ago, but had received only negative responses from the AHA.

What the residents were saying is borne out in statistics that indicate that more units are demolished than are replaced by the city for urban renewal or other governmental projects. When the units are removed there are no places for the displacees to go. Few can pay the excessive rent demanded in other areas, and of course the segregated housing pattern of Atlanta prohibits these residents from seeking low-cost housing outside of the black ghetto. Those who desire to purchase a home are restricted because they find it impossible to secure loans.

Recently the Federal government initiated a program designed to help people in low-income brackets to buy homes. A female resident at the Lightening meeting had received some information concerning this program from someone in the AHA. When she presented this information to the representative from the relocation office he failed to explain the program fully to the resident. He simply stated that the AHA was not selling homes. A more helpful approach would have been for the relocation officer to explain the program to the resident and not

---

1 The writer was present at this meeting of the CRC. This personal observation left the writer with the impression that there is very little constructive communication between the residents and the AHA. The representative sent by the AHA relocation office to this meeting appeared uncooperative and not to sympathetic to the problems faced by persons forced to relocate.
The Atlanta CRC has made some gains with the AHA. The Commission was able to have the AHA change its policies in regards to the admittance of unwed mothers into the public housing and the rule which excluded families of persons in jail from securing units in public housing.

However, the CRC has not had similar success in the area of full integration of public housing and its efforts in the area of the rent adjustment has met with disappointment. It appears that many tenants in public housing direct their strongest protest against what appears to be the arbitrary manner in which public housing is administered. One item under protest is the immediate raising of rent when a child goes to work and the slowness with which the rent is reduced when the child returns to school or leaves the home. Tenants complain also about the eviction by the AHA without notice of why they are being evicted. In these areas the CRC has met with no success, and their projected plans for 1969 do not indicate that the CRC intends to handle these problems in the immediate future. It appears that the Commission should launch a concerted program to attack these problems, since in the Atlanta area public housing appears to be the only immediate solution to the severe housing problem faced by low-income residents of the city.

In their program outlined for 1969 the CRC has indicated that it will compile a report on segregation in Atlanta public housing projects.

1 Personal interview Mrs. Mary Stephens, Community Relations Commission member, November 19, 1968.
However, a member of the Commission feels that the Commission is already in possession of enough facts to move on to some constructive action in the field of Atlanta public housing.*

Concerning private housing in the Atlanta area, the Commission states that it will continue to participate as a member of the Atlanta Fair Housing Association. The CRC has stated that it will hold meetings in such areas of the city as Buckhead, Ansley Park, and Morning-side. All of these areas are predominantly white. The latter section at present is facing the problem of whites fleeing the area because blacks are beginning to move into the area. The CRC proposes to discuss the 1968 Open Housing law and what Atlantans can do on their own initiative to change segregated housing patterns.1

The above proposal seems futile in light of the fact that the white persons who live in all these areas with the exception of Ansley Park, left the city proper to escape the city's black population.

Housing is the key to the pattern of racial discrimination that exists in the city of Atlanta. The city along with the help of the federal government has encouraged and helped to perpetuate segregation in the housing pattern. In the past few years the federal policy toward racially mixed neighborhoods has changed. This change came with the passing of the 1968 Open Housing Law, and with the policy of the Defense Department when Secretary Robert McNamara issued an order that Army personnel could not rent from persons denying accommodations to blacks.

---

1 Community Relations Commission--1969, Program Plan, pp. 2-3.
In the area of public housing Atlanta faces the problem of dissenting residents who do not want public housing placed in their sections of the city. Private housing patterns are determined by realtors who refuse to sell or rent to blacks who want to move into predominantly white areas of the city.

The sentiment of the CRC appears to be indecisive and mixed on the matter of housing. Although the CRC does state in its program for 1969 that it is for dispersal of public housing in all quadrants of the city it has not pursued this policy with any great vigor. The CRC's strongest protest has been to the AHA which is readily available for grievances. However, the CRC has not really put forth a concerted program to integrate the public projects nor has it launched a program to get a wider segment of the city involved in the problems faced by public housing tenants. Finally, the Commission has not pushed for a city ordinance calling for non-discrimination in the sale and rental of houses and apartments.
Pervasive unemployment and underemployment are the most persistent and serious grievance in minority areas. They are inextricably linked to the problem of civil disorders.\footnote{National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, March, 1968.}

The employment problem in Atlanta.--Atlanta, Georgia, probably has the largest concentration of black millionaires of any other American city.\footnote{Margaret Shannon, "Wealthy Atlanta Negroes... How they Did It," The Atlanta Journal and Constitution Magazine, March 9, 1969.} In spite of this seeming affluence in the black community, thousands of blacks in the city complain that they cannot earn enough money to live on. They live a hand to mouth existence. Some blacks state that the longer they work the longer they cannot live on their salaries. That is, their income do not increase to meet their needs.

A great many blacks are unemployed, underemployed, or unemployable. In the city the vast number of working blacks dominate the jobs, i.e., domestics and common laborers. Statistics available from 1960 indicate that blacks in Atlanta comprise only 20 per cent of those employed in private industry. Blacks are under-represented in every category except service work. These are the low paying service jobs which in all likelihood will disappear within the next few decades. An indicator of this is that the demand for such labor has dropped 13 per cent in the last ten years, but the demand for white collar workers has increased over 40 per cent.\footnote{"Two Atlantas," The Atlanta Journal, 1968.}

In 1960, seven out of ten black male workers were engaged in work
as operatives. These categories were truck drivers, in service occupations, or laborers. The black working female force in 1960 fared no better. Fully 80 per cent of Atlanta's black working females were employed as maids or operatives, e.g., laundry help and hospital custodial jobs.¹ Progress in the hiring of blacks in Atlanta in meaningful jobs has been very recent. It was only in 1962 that the first black firemen were hired by the City.²

The overall growth of non-farm wage and salary workers increased greatly in Atlanta between 1962 and 1967. Non-farm employment rose by 34 per cent.³ However, blacks were still concentrated in service type employment.⁴ Blacks in white collar jobs in Atlanta are a rarity. A survey conducted by the United States Equal Opportunity Employment Commission indicated that only 4.5 per cent of the black working male force hold white collar jobs. This figure broken down into several categories pointed out that .5 per cent of blacks were to be found on the managerial level. Further statistics showed that .3 per cent of Atlanta's black male workers are classified as professionals. Another .2 per cent are classified as technical, .8 per cent are classified as


sales workers, and 2.6 per cent are classified as office and clerical workers.\(^1\)

This same report from the EEOC indicated that 14.4 per cent of the black working women of the city were found in white collar jobs. Only .4 per cent are at the managerial level and 9.4 per cent are office and clerical workers.\(^2\)

Overall, of all male laborers in Atlanta 54.3 per cent are black. In the service occupations blacks constitute 49.4 per cent of the total workforce.

The City of Atlanta's hiring record of blacks has improved but it still leaves much to be desired. A majority of the blacks hired recently by the City are in menial jobs. There are few blacks in supervisory positions. Approximately 39 per cent of the employees of Atlanta's City Hall are black. Of this percentage 17 per cent are above the classification of laborer. None of the City's twenty department heads is black. No assistant department head is black.\(^3\) There is little likelihood that blacks will occupy these positions in the near future. Tradition and established patterns of procedure will deny a black a position as a department head or assistant. In the City of Atlanta the traditional procedure is to re-elect department heads until they retire. When retirement does occur the next person

---

\(^1\) Ibid.

\(^2\) Ibid.

\(^3\) Alex Coffin, "City Employs Many Negroes," The Atlanta Constitution, March, 1969.
in line is elected to the position. No blacks are at present next in line. Drastic changes of procedure will be needed to remedy the lack of blacks in top positions in the Atlanta City Hall.

In 1950 the median income of black Atlantans was $2,036 per year. Ten years later the average pay for white Atlantans was $3,400, but for black Atlantans the average was $2,500. Over a span of a decade the median income for blacks, in a city whose population is becoming increasingly black, rose only $464. This reflects the low paying jobs occupied by blacks in the city.

The pay categories dominated by blacks in Atlanta have not kept pace with the rising cost of living. The wages of janitors, porters, and cleaners between 1955 and 1965 rose by $.47 per hour. In 1955 the wage scale for the above categories was $1.06 per hour. By 1965 it had risen to $1.53 per hour. Laborers and material handlers experienced a wage increase of $.73 per hour in the decade between 1955 and 1965. In 1955 their hourly wage was $1.15. By 1965 it had risen to $1.87 per hour.

Although there have been increases in the hourly wages these increases have been insufficient to meet the cost of living that Atlanta has experienced. Blacks have been unable to gain major breakthroughs

---


3 "Atlanta Ten Years of Growth," U. S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, Atlanta, Georgia, p. 6. This report did not categorized by the race the occupational area, however, other evidence indicates that blacks in Atlanta dominate the job categories named.
in job categories that would help to raise the economic level of blacks in the city. That is, the base from which the pay of blacks is raised is low, therefore even a 50 per cent increase over a ten year period is not sufficient to bring the scale to a level that will allow many blacks to leave the ranks of poverty.

Atlanta's white employers like those across the nation have placed immense obstacles in the path of blacks in the area of obtaining fruitful and satisfying employment. Specifically, the tests used to judge an applicant for a job are, in many instances, geared to the white middle class and are not realistic. That is, the test are usually irrelevant to the job to be performed. These tests are aimed at the applicant's interest in music, art, travel, and in general the applicant's adaptability to the white community. Very few blacks have the educational experience and background to compete equally with whites on these tests.

A study conducted by The Atlanta Journal listed seven job obstacles to employment of blacks: (1) applicant must be a high school graduate, (2) applicant must be able to pass certain aptitude and intelligence tests, (3) applicant must be over 21, (4) applicant must be under 50, (5) applicant must be a male, (6) applicant must be white, and (7) applicant must not be physically handicapped.

---

1 Personal interview with Charles Williams consultant on Jobs Creation Project for the CRC sponsored by the EEOC, November 4, 1968.


3 Ibid.
At its inception Atlanta's CRC did not mount an impressive attack on the problem of employment for the disadvantage. Its work was limited primarily to presenting the problem to the general public in sporadic fashion. In September of 1968 the Commission received a financial grant from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to study the employment patterns in Atlanta. Specifically, this project will "take a hard look at the minority hiring procedure of twenty-five employers in Atlanta. This will be an attempt to create jobs and give minority groups a fair shake. It will look at the test procedure to see if they are validated, the interviewing procedure, and also the job description to see if it relates."\(^1\)

The project will concern itself with private employers. City hiring procedure will not be evaluated under this program.\(^2\) Nor will the project concern itself with the discriminatory practices of labor unions in the city of Atlanta. These two areas need immediate attention. The City must act as a model if it truly believes in the principles it charged the CRC with the responsibility of fostering. As reported above the City does hire a large number of blacks but the majority are in menial classification and the prospects of blacks advancing to positions of leadership in the near future are not very bright. It would appear that an outside agency must concern itself

---


\(^2\) On March 12, 1969, during a Hungry Club address Nat Welch, executive director of the CRC, stated that the Commission will independently look into the hiring practices of the city government. This was the first public statement by the CRC of plans to investigate the policies of the City as they relate to hiring.
with the hiring policies of the city and present a plan that will significantly alter the current trend of excluding blacks from the supervisory jobs in the Atlanta City Hall.

As to what the Commission staff considers an integrated work force, the director of the EEOC project explained that there "is no such thing as an integrated work force, e.g., 75 per cent black doesn't mean integration when that 75 per cent are in menial tasks. Integration must be from top to bottom."

The goal of the CRC's Job Creation project is to have fifteen of the twenty-five employers sign what the Commission has labeled "affirmative action" agreements. Beyond this the CRC can only depend on the employers being faithful to their commitment. Of course, there are federal laws that can be appealed to, but they are involved and represent a great deal of delay. There is no immediate relief for the person who can prove that he was not hired because of his color, age, or sex.

At the time of the conclusions of the research for this study the largest concentrated effort by the Commission with regard to employment and income for blacks was a Workshop on Black Business Opportunities. This program parallels the thinking of the Nixon Administration which calls for blacks to have a "piece of the action." The stated purpose of this workshop, which was held on February 20, 1969, was to "involve Atlanta Negroes who are interested in becoming owner-managers of


2 Ibid.
business in Atlanta. We hope that this combined community effort will offer a quantum jump to Atlanta black business entrepreneurs and strengthen ongoing efforts of the Atlanta Business League's Project Outreach.1

The types of business present in the workshop were of the service variety, i.e., service stations, fast foods outlets, and ice cream concessions. Several of the black participants in the workshop criticized the types of business represented. It was their view that blacks had too long been barbers, beauticians and service station owners. It was their suggestion that blacks should attempt to get into the manufacturing end of business. In short these blacks called for the CRC to sponsor workshops on helping blacks to become producers of goods as well as services.2

Present at this workshop were representatives from six Atlanta banks. The bankers explained the banks' position on extending loans to blacks for the purpose of starting business. These bankers stated that banks in general had now reversed their previous position on extending loans to blacks for the purpose of opening business and are now more receptive to blacks who want money for such purposes. The Small Business Administration representative expressed the same

---


2 These views were recorded during the workshop session held at Atlanta University. This particular session was concerned with the success stories of other blacks, and also at the session held to hear the views of Atlanta bankers and the SBA. It is of note that the one black bank in Atlanta was not on the panel of bankers.
One of the most enlightening sessions of the workshop was the panel discussions between interested blacks and franchise companies. Of particular interest was the panel discussion between blacks and auto dealers. It was very obvious that the auto representatives did not come to offer any dealership to any interested blacks. The auto representatives pointed out that the cost of a dealership was in excess of $450,000. One black from North Georgia questioned this figure. He pointed to Chrysler dealerships in his area which were no more than service stations and their investment did not represent the amount of money mentioned by the auto representatives.

At this point blacks began to ask the dealer representatives what were the possibilities of blacks opening dealerships in the Atlanta area. The representatives responded that at present there were no openings in the area for new dealerships. The representatives pointed out that the quota of dealers for this area had been reached and that the companies had a backlog of potential dealers. In short, the auto representatives said there were no openings and there would be no openings. Blacks responded that the auto companies would have to break precedent and establish black dealerships. That is, blacks were saying that in spite of surveys which indicated that no more dealerships were needed in the metropolitan area and that the companies have long waiting lists they simply must forget these factors and establish black dealerships.

Informants stated that the prime reason that the banks had changed their policies was that the money had been deposited in the banks by the federal government, therefore the banks ran very small risk because the money is not theirs. In addition the Small Business Administration is now offering to underwrite a larger portion of loans to blacks.
dealerships. At this point one auto representative adjourned the meet-
ing by stating that all should go to lunch.

Comments from Commissioners relating to the workshop ranged from
the vague to definite as to what the workshop would accomplish. One
Commissioner when queried on the workshop prior to the workshop being
held was unaware of the project. This Commissioner was an exception.
All other Commissioners when asked to comment on the workshop appeared
aware of the purpose of the project. The majority of the Commissioners
readily admitted that the workshop would only help a few blacks. But,
they countered that what blacks needed first was black capitalism in

their communities. One black Commissioner felt that the project
would not be a great success, but that it will give a few blacks an
opportunity that they would not ordinarily have. He believes that the
CRC should have programs that will help a larger segment of the black
population.

For the untrained, unmotivated, and unemployed black man in
Atlanta the employment situation is bleak. In 1960 blacks constituted
35 per cent of the Atlanta work force, but they constituted 45 per cent
of the unemployed. In order to fully understand the employment

1 When confronted with the question of whether blacks would be
able to locate businesses in areas other than black communities most
CRC members felt that it was not the job of the CRC to try and in-
fluence bankers to loan money to blacks who wanted to locate in areas
other than black ones. One Commissioner answered the question in this
manner: "You blacks can't have it both ways. Some blacks are calling
for separatism and the others are calling for integration." This CRC
members is not alone in his confusion as to what the majority of blacks
in Atlanta want. Most of the other white CRC members share his confu-
sion.

2 Only a Beginning. ... Op. cit., p. 17.
situation in Atlanta one must look at the attitudes of the principals. It would appear that young black Atlantans do not view a job as a moral obligation as the Protestant ethic instructs white America to view continual gainful employment. A job may appear to some young blacks as one means of obtaining money. There are other ways of obtaining money; working is just one.

An attitude exists in the white community of Atlanta that persons with no skills or little skill should not be paid in accordance with the prevailing living standards, but with what the employers view the job as being worth. One wealthy white woman commented: "I would not pay my black yardman $80.00 per week because he isn't worth it." It would appear that Atlantans must come to the realization that people will have to be paid what it costs them to live no matter what they are worth.

The Commission should concentrate its efforts, not on programs that will benefit only a few blacks, but on programs designed to help the mass of blacks in Atlanta in the area of employment. The CRC should initiate programs that will stimulate projects that will have meaningful employment waiting when persons complete training programs. The CRC should spotlight the discrimination in apprentice programs as they are currently operating in Atlanta. Most importantly, the CRC should develop imaginative ideas on how to stimulate black and white youths to seek and keep gainful employment. That is, the CRC should come forth with a program that will stimulate motivation. This is of course not an easy task, but the CRC was not created to tackle easy

---

Talk of black capitalism is futile in the face of the overwhelming number of blacks who cannot avail themselves of these programs because they do not have the motivation to approach the operation of a business. Capitalism has not helped the country solve its massive problems of poverty, and it is not logical to conclude that to promote programs that will put a limited number of blacks into business which will employ only a few persons will help blacks to overcome the problems of poverty and under motivation.
Naming a new director for the Commission.--In January, 1967 the Atlanta Community Relations Commission, the mayor of the city, and the Atlanta Board of Aldermen selected Mrs. Eliza K. Paschal as the first executive director of the newly created Community Relations Commission. It was a strange selection based on the criticism Mrs. Paschal received from the Commission and the members of the Board of Aldermen during her tenure as director of the Commission. Not only was she criticized by her employers, she was also severely criticized by most of the City department heads with whom she came in contact. A great deal of confusion surrounds the selection and eventual dismissal of Mrs. Paschal as the director of the Commission. The evidence as to why Mrs. Paschal was not rehired and why she engendered the great degree of dislike is fragmentary. Informants were reluctant to give specific reasons as to why Mrs. Paschal was dismissed. Members of the Commission were equally reluctant to give reasons. Some admitted that they were not aware of the reasons. Others guessed as to why her tenure was so short. One Commissioner stated that it was not important to talk of the dismissal of Mrs. Paschal and refused to discuss the subject. It appears that a good deal of the controversy surrounding the dismissal of Mrs. Paschal was done behind closed doors and only a few persons were ever privy to the exact reasons why the Commission would not rehire her. There were whispered rumors that impugned the integrity of Mrs. Paschal. These only served to confuse the issue in the minds of the public and some Commission members.

Within the white community of the city there existed a distrust of Mrs. Paschal because of her past activities in civil rights
controversies. One Commissioner stated that Mrs. Paschal could never have gained acceptance by the Commission or the city government.

There was too much antagonism already built up against her before she assumed the directorship of the Commission.* That is, Mrs. Paschal would have faced opposition even if she had taken a less controversial position on issues. This study will not concentrate in depth on the accomplishments of the CRC while Mrs. Paschal served as director. Mention of accomplishments of the CRC during this period will only be brought into the discussion as they specifically relate to the controversy surrounding the dismissal of Mrs. Paschal as director of the Commission.¹

Mrs. Paschal's interest in human relations extend to her student days at Agnes Scott College. As a representative to a student meeting of the YMCA-YWCA in 1937, mention was made of Mrs. Paschal's activities by the local Atlanta press. The Georgian, a Hearst newspaper, operating out of Atlanta during 1937 gave a front page spread to the meeting and commented on the activities of a black haired student from Morehouse College and the blond student from Agnes Scott College.² For a time Mrs. Paschal served as president of the League of Women Voters of

---

¹ It appears that many of the Commissioners and City governmental officials objected to Mrs. Paschal's techniques and methods of accomplishing her goals. Specifically, Mrs. Paschal believed in the direct approach. When conferring with city officials concerning needed services she was not willing to accept excuses or delays. Mrs. Paschal believed that the Commission belonged on the front lines of civil rights activities not in the background as some Commissioner felt. She was not oppose to walking on picket lines and using other direct methods to resolve problems.

² Statement made at the Hungry Club by Eliza K. Paschal, November 1, 1967. (Privately printed, Atlanta, 1967).
Georgia, and for six years she served as executive director of the Council on Human Relations of Greater Atlanta. As director of this organization Mrs. Paschal was very active in the demonstrations of the early sixties that lead to the breakdown of discrimination practiced by Atlanta businessmen in the area of public accommodations. Mrs. Paschal was well known to the city power structure and her activities had been well publicized before she assumed the directorship of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. Mrs. Paschal was well versed in the tactics of action programs and she was aware of the stalling tactics employed by others to resist change. It is conceivable that Mrs. Paschal had a broader knowledge of the racial ills and poverty of the city than many of the Commission members.

Over seventeen other applicants Mrs. Paschal was selected director of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. This selection came in 1967. Her selection was approved by the mayor and the Atlanta Board of Aldermen. However, informants stated that Mrs. Paschal was only hired because she was being pushed by the black community of the city. 

1 It should be noted that although Atlanta has a national reputation for harmony between the races it was not until the 1960's that blacks, in Atlanta, were able to avail themselves of the majority of the public accommodations of the city. It was not until continuous demonstrations that blacks were hired and upgraded in the large department stores of the city. The facade of harmony was caused by the white view that a few blacks represented the views of the entire black community. Mrs. Paschal in her tenure as director of the CHRGA participated in efforts to desegregate public accommodations in Atlanta. These activities brought her into the spotlight and in some instances the object of resentment. See "Project and Progress," a report issued by the Greater Atlanta Human Relations Council (Privately printed, Atlanta: March, 1964).

In the view of one Commissioner it was a compromise situation. The City had to show that it was sincerely willing to make the Commission workable. It was also pointed out that the idea for the Commission had germinated in the black community and the City had its back to the wall and had no choice but to select Mrs. Paschal as the first director. One white Commission member, who appeared sympathetic to the black view, stated that he received calls from the black community to vote for Mrs. Paschal as director of the Commission.* In contrast one white Commissioner stated that the majority of the Commission members did not want Mrs. Paschal as director, but felt that they had no choice in the matter.*

With this mixture of feeling present on the Commission it was inevitable that friction would come to the fore in the relations between the director and a majority of the members of the Commission. It was also inevitable that the friction would extend to involve the members of the departments of the city government.

Friction came first from the Board of Aldermen. It was the view of some Aldermen that Mrs. Paschal would represent only the liberal white view and the militant black view in the city. That is, the aldermen feared that more moderate views would not be heeded by the Commission director. Vice-Mayor Sam Massell was the lone Alderman to state that Mrs. Paschal was doing a credible job.  

---

1 Alex Coffin, "Controversy is Mumbled Again," The Atlanta Constitution, April 24, 1967.

2 Ibid. Also Personal interview with Vice-Mayor Sam Massell, March 27, 1969.
Views from the CRC membership as to whether Mrs. Paschal was competent in carrying out her duties ranged from the non-committal to the answer of "no." All the Commission members who answered that Mrs. Paschal was not competent prefaced their remarks with the general statement that Mrs. Paschal is a very "nice" lady. However, she was one who did not understand the workings of a Commission like the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. In general most felt that Mrs. Paschal's inability to compromise was what limited her effectiveness as director of the Commission.

In commenting on Mrs. Paschal's competence one Commissioner, who voted to retain her, felt that Mrs. Paschal had feeling and devotion for the job. Not only these intangibles, but she had the confidence of the poor black and white residents of the city. Another Commissioner who voted for Mrs. Paschal stated that the proof that Mrs. Paschal was doing a good job was the amount of irritation she caused among certain aldermen and city department heads, and conservative members of the Commission.*

Those who voted for the release of Mrs. Paschal based their vote on what the above Commissioner felt was Mrs. Paschal's strength. That is Mrs. Paschal's antagonism of many of the city department heads and her antagonism of people in the city's power structure. Those who believed that Mrs. Paschal was not suitable for the position stated that she was too much of a "purist" in that she was unwilling to compromise. Mrs. Paschal also refused to accept the reasons given by city department heads as to why certain needed services could not be rendered to deprived neighborhoods. One Commissioner who deals with employment in
his professional life stated that Mrs. Paschal could not get "the time of day" from private employers in the city. Other CRC members who voted against Mrs. Paschal's retention gave as reasons that she made the Commission a controversial issue. It was their belief that she had brought the wrong type of publicity to the Commission. What these CRC members said in sum was that Mrs. Paschal was not acceptable to the white power structure of the city and therefore was unacceptable to the majority of the Commission members.

There are those CRC members who have adopted a middle-of-the-road attitude toward Mrs. Paschal. It is their belief that too much was made of the Paschal controversy. They further believe that Mrs. Paschal would have worked out as director if they had had an opportunity to work with Mrs. Paschal and make her aware of the difference in working as an arm of the city government and working for a private agency. One middle-of-the-roader stated that he could have pointed these differences out to Mrs. Paschal and in time he is certain that harmony would have come about, and the entire episode could have been avoided.

The opinion of black Atlanta leaders, non Commission members, was unanimous in their support of Mrs. Paschal as director of the Commission. One black leader stated that she was moving to eradicate discrimination in the city. It was his view that she was doing this too fast for some of the city fathers. 1

In answer to charges that she was uncompromising Mrs. Paschal stated that her record on civil rights was known prior to her being

---

1 Personal interview with John Boone an official of Metropolitan Atlanta Summit Leadership Congress, October 18, 1969.
hired as director of the Commission. In further defense Mrs. Paschal stated that "to survive at the expense of effectiveness would be a betrayal of the trust placed in the Commission."\(^1\)

The events that led to the dismissal\(^2\) of Mrs. Paschal are sketchy and clouded by inconsistency in reports of the episode. Only a few CRC members were able to state that they were aware that the CRC was considering action not to rehire Mrs. Paschal as director. No black member of the Commission, other than the present chairman, was able to state that he was aware of the plan to remove Mrs. Paschal.

As related by Mrs. Paschal she was approached on January 14, 1968, by a member of the Commission's executive committee. This member informed her that she spoke for the Commission chairman, Irving Kahler. It had been told to this member and Mr. Kahler that Mrs. Paschal had been offered another job. It was the feeling of this member and Mr. Kahler that Mrs. Paschal should resign the directorship of the CRC and accept the other position. During this encounter Mrs. Paschal inquired if this meant that she would not be reappointed, and the member of the executive committee informed Mrs. Paschal that this was true. According to Mrs. Paschal's informant "they" had decided not to reappoint her as director.\(^3\) In further conversation Mrs. Paschal was told that the

\(^1\) Alex Coffin, "Director Defends Relations Activity," The Atlanta Constitution, November 2, 1967.

\(^2\) A majority of the Commission members prefer to use the term not reappointed as opposed to dismissal or fired. It is their view that Mrs. Paschal was simply not reinstated. Her contract was only for a year with no option for rehiring.

\(^3\) Written statement of Eliza K. Paschal after her dismissal as Executive Director of the CRC (Privately printed, Atlanta: 1968).
reason for the decision was that "everybody" was afraid of her. She was told that she had made to many people "mad" and it was the considered opinion of some CRC members that she could best serve outside of City Hall.1

Investigation indicates that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission never gave Mrs. Paschal a public reason or a specific charge as to why she was not reappointed. In an editorial comment The Atlanta Voice stated that

"The decision not to rehire Mrs. Paschal appears to have been made by the executive committee rather than the CRC as a whole... To maintain public confidence the charges against Mrs. Paschal should be documented.2"

The conspiracy alluded to by the editorial comment of The Atlanta Voice can be documented by the statements made by members of the Commission when asked why Mrs. Paschal was not reappointed, and the specific reasons as to why she was not rehired. A majority of the Commissioners stated that they were never told the reasons for Mrs. Paschal's dismissal. One black CRC member related that he was totally unaware that Mrs. Paschal's job as director was in jeopardy.* This CRC member expressed the view of a majority of the black members when he stated that he felt that he should have resigned at that period because "I felt I was just warming a seat."

One white female Commission member felt that in order to learn the true reasons why Mrs. Paschal was dismissed one would have to ask the first chairman, Irving Kahler. She felt the

---

1 Ibid.

entire episode resolved into a personal vendetta against Mrs. Paschal.*

There was a rumor that Mrs. Paschal had not handled the funds of the Commission properly. It was this charge which led some to comment that Mrs. Paschal should have resigned quietly and not bring the public's attention to her dismissal. Newspaper stories intimated that the Commission was doing Mrs. Paschal a service by not making the charge against her public. On the contrary, Mrs. Paschal felt that the Commission was doing her a disservice by not publically stating the charges.¹

Only one Commissioner commented on the rumor. In his comment this Commissioner stated that if there were some question relating to the handling of the funds it should have been directed to other persons. According to this Commissioner Mrs. Paschal never handled the CRC-s funds. All of the funds were handled by the city comptroller and the executive committee of the Commission. In short, it was the opinion of this member that the rumor of misuse of funds was a facade used to confuse the issue.*

When word leaked that Mrs. Paschal would not be retained as director of the Commission, black leaders and groups rallied to implore the Commission not to dismiss Mrs. Paschal. Groups such as the NAACP, Metropolitan Atlanta Grassroots Council, Atl Citizens Registration Committee, Operation Breadbasket, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Fulton County Democratic Club, and the Atlanta Committee for Cooperative Action, all of these predominantly black organizations, ¹

supported the retention of Mrs. Paschal as director of the Commission.\(^1\)

Individual black leaders also lent their support to Mrs. Paschal. Representative Julian Bond and State Senator Leroy Johnson spoke out against the Commission's anticipated action of dismissing the director. In spite of this united front presented by the black community the CRC persisted with its plan to relieve Mrs. Paschal of her position.\(^2\)

Blacks considered this action by the Commission as another defeat for the black community. The black community in 1967 had failed in efforts to have blacks placed on the State Highway Board, to have a black named as director of the Atlanta poverty program, in the refusal of the School Board to fill vacancies with choices of the black community, and in the defeat of the attempt to have more blacks named to the Model Cities Program. The refusal of the CRC to retain Mrs. Paschal was viewed as another defeat for the black community.\(^3\)

In January of 1968 the Atlanta Community Relations Commission voted not to reappoint its first director. The final vote was ten for dismissal and five for retention. All of the Commissioners who voted for dismissal were white. Only one white Commissioner, Mrs. Mary Stephens, voted to retain Mrs. Paschal. The Reverend Sam Williams, who was presiding at the meeting, did not vote, therefore he did not take a public stand on the issue. The black members voiced distress

---

over the dismissal decision. They pointed out that the decision not to retain Mrs. Paschal was never discussed in a prior meeting.

Following the release of Mrs. Paschal the Commission appointed a committee of five Commissioners to select a new director. The committee was composed of the following members: Mrs. Mary Stephens, Clarence Ezzard, Jack Sells, Dr. Robert E. Lee, and the chairman of this committee, T. M. Alexander, Sr. ¹

Throughout the summer of 1968 the committee screened applications for the directorship. In June of 1968, the committee narrowed its choice to three candidates. One of the three candidates was the Reverend John B. Morris, Rev. Morris withdrew his name from consideration because he felt that the Commission had made its decision before he was allowed to speak on his qualifications. Rev. Morris intimated that the final list of three names was merely a formality.² During the meeting to consider the final selection the Rev. Joseph Boone, an official of the Metropolitan Atlanta Summit Leadership Congress, asked the Commission to reverse its action of hiring Nat Welch and declare the directorship open. Rev. Boone stated that the Commission had ignored qualified black candidates for the position. All of the final three applicants were white. In spite of Rev. Boone's protestations and the intimation by Rev. Morris that the final selection was preplanned, the Commission selected Nat Welch as the second director of the

---


Atlanta Community Relations Commission.

In the aftermath of the firing of Mrs. Paschal and the hiring of Mr. Welch the comments of the local white newspapers was one of predicted failure for the Commission. In an editorial The Atlanta Journal stated that the Commission in its vote to release Mrs. Paschal was along racial lines, and for a Commission charged with the responsibility to promote harmony between the races to split on a crucial question, was a tragedy.1

The comment from The Atlanta Voice, a black paper in the city, was that the community would lose faith in the Commission.2 Evidence available gives credence to the idea that Mrs. Paschal was fired for a mixture of reasons. However, there appear to be two overriding reasons. One was Mrs. Paschal's failure to await direction from a Commission that was too timid to take affirmative actions when needed. The second reason appeared to have been the Commission's fear that to continue Mrs. Paschal in office would have greatly damaged the Commission's opportunity to gain more funds from the City.

One black Commissioner stated that during a CRC meeting the Commissioners were told that their appropriations were in jeopardy if they failed to relieve Mrs. Paschal as director. It was Alderman Everett Millican who made the statement to the Commission that 'Mrs. Paschal will have to go.'*

When asked why she was dismissed from the directorship Mrs.

---

Paschal answered that she was never given a specific reason as to why she was dismissed. She related that she was told that she was making people "mad." It was Mrs. Paschal's belief that Mayor Allen and the Board of Aldermen never truly wanted the CRC to have a real voice or power in the community. Therefore they never gave it the support it needed to obtain cooperation from City department heads. The mayor and the Board, in Mrs. Paschal's view, failed to state clearly what they expected from the Commission. After her dismissal from the Commission directorship Mrs. Paschal accepted the chairmanship of the Metropolitan Atlanta Summit Leadership Congress. Later in February, 1969 Mrs. Paschal resigned this post, "to take a long-needed vacation."

If any conclusion can be drawn from the Commission's handling of the dismissal of its first director it is that a commission charged with the duty to ease racial tensions should have a clear and definite plan as to procedure and there should be, exclusive of the ordinance, public statements by the city government as to their support of the Commission and what they truly expect from the Commission. Another conclusion is that a commission should not start with a compromise. That is, if the Commission truly did not want its first director from the outset then such should have been stated. It was not in the interest of the community to hire a director and fire this director after one year of service, and fail to tell the public the specific reasons.

1 Personal interview with Eliza K. Paschal, October 29, 1968.

for the dismissal. The Commission was on very weak ground when it attempted to make it appear that Mrs. Paschal had committed some indiscretion. This tactic does not build good will. No public commission should hold executive sessions on a subject which has become confused in the public mind. To dispel public doubt the sessions should be open. All questions should be answered fully and documented. The effectiveness of a human relations commission is dependent upon public confidence. Confidence is not gained when decisions are made in secret and by a few members of the commission.

If there were legitimate charges against Mrs. Paschal they should have been spelled out and never couched in rumor. If there were a clash of personality between the director and the Commission members then the director should have never been hired. The confidence that the Commission lost during the Paschal episode will not return quickly. During a swearing-in-ceremony of a new Commission member, in March, 1969 Mayor Allen expressed very well what the Commission experienced during the Paschal's episode. In Allen's words the Commission started on troubled waters and for a while fell by the wayside.¹

¹ This statement was recorded on March 28, 1969 in the Mayor's office. The statement was made during the swearing-in of Mike Cheetam as a member of the Commission.
CHAPTER V

THE ATLANTA COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION'S RESPONSE TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSE TO THE COMMISSION

Any public agency charged with the responsibility of promoting racial harmony must find acceptability in the community. There must be in the community a felt need for the existence of such a public body. Such a public body must be known widely in the community. A public body such as the Atlanta Community Relations Commission should make every effort to make its work and duties known to the widest audience. There should be no restriction on the type of audiences that are made aware of the work and duties of the Commission.

Specific questions were asked of members of the Commission relating to whether the Commission was finding acceptance in the black and white communities. The same questions were also asked of persons active in local civil rights efforts. Inquiry was also made of the Atlanta Mayor, Vice-Mayor and a member of the Atlanta Board of Aldermen.

Only one Commissioner stated that the community lacked confidence in the Commission. It was this Commissioner's view that the Commission had lost the confidence of the community due to the handling of the dismissal of Mrs. Paschal as executive director. The community was left with the impression that the Commission was holding Mrs. Paschal back from dealing with the social ills of the city.*

A black community leader agreed with the above assessment of the
issue. It was his belief that the debacle of the Paschal affair had turned the community, particularly the black community, away from the Commission as an agency committed to altering the present trends in housing, education, and employment. This black leader described the mood of the black community as believing that the white man is attempting to "put the black man in a trick." Blacks in the city fear the "hidden agenda" that the Commission once practiced.\(^1\)

One Commission member gauged the confidence of the public in the Commission by stating that people still attended grievance response meetings. It should be noted that the Commission did not have available figures relating to the number of persons who had attended grievance response meetings. During the course of the research for this study the Commission held three community meetings. The average attendance at two of these meetings was forty persons. However, over 200 persons attended a meeting sponsored by the Commission where the topic was the policies of the Atlanta Housing Authority and representatives from the housing authority were present.\(^2\) Overall, the attendance at Commission sponsored community meetings has been sparse.

A Commissioner who voted against Mrs. Paschal's retention stated that he would not gauge public confidence. But, it was his view that

---

\(^1\) The term hidden agenda is applied to the practice of the first chairman of the CRC not to announce in advance what business the CRC would be considering. Since the beginning of the chairmanship of Rev. Williams each Commission member and persons present are made aware of the Commission business by means of a printed agenda distributed to all present. The Commission director makes available prior to the meetings staff suggestions and recommendations.

\(^2\) These figures were obtained from personal observation of the meetings.
if confidence had been lost it was because of Mrs. Paschal's refusal to resign quietly. He concluded that the overall community both black and white had confidence in the Commission. Only those on the fringe express loss of confidence in the Commission. *

It was the opinion of Mrs. Paschal that the community would not regain confidence in the Commission until the Board of Aldermen decided what they want the Commission to do. Until that time the community would always lack confidence in the Commission. In sum, Mrs. Paschal appeared to have been saying that the Commissioners and the executive director are confused as to their powers and limitations. Therefore, they will not make any meaningful decisions until clarification comes from the city government.

During this study the question was asked of black Commissioners if they felt that the black community was aware of the work of the Commission. All black Commissioners who answered this question stated that the black community was not aware of the work of the Commission. Two black Commissioners felt that some black grassroots leaders were aware of the work of the Commission.

One black Commissioner stated that there is a tendency in low-income neighborhoods not to subscribe to local newspapers. It was his estimate that less than 20 per cent of the residents of Perry Homes were regular subscribers to newspapers. In commenting on radio publicity this Commissioner believed that radio announcements just bypassed people. It was his opinion that the Commission should do more in the

---

1 Personal interview with Mrs. Eliza K. Paschal, October 29, 1969.
field of communications with low-income neighborhoods. ¹

The above question was asked of the white Commissioners in relation to whether the Commission was known in the white community. Only one white Commissioner expressed the belief that the Commission was known widely in the white community and that the white community has confidence in the Commission.

However, the majority of the white Commission members, who answered, stated that the white community was not aware of the Commission and few whites knew of its duties. One white Commissioner expressed the view that it was unnecessary to educate the white community about the Commission. It was his opinion that little could be gained by such an education.* What this Commissioner fails to realize is that it is this ignorance of blacks and whites of each other that has caused America to become a nation of two societies. His view is not representative of the majority of the white Commission members.

Response from two white Commissioners was that there possibly existed a need for the Commission to initiate a program in the white community. The program would acquaint white with the Commission and the work of the Commission. The white community according to one Commissioner is not sensitive to or aware of the total problem unless through some militant act by blacks. A Commissioner stated that he would not be surprise if the white community is unaware of the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. This Commissioner stated that a number of affluent whites were unaware that the United Nations exists. The

solution says this Commissioner is to let white affluents see and talk
with black affluents. By this method barriers can be broken down, and
whites and blacks can see beyond stereotypes.

On the question of whether the Commission is known in the black
and white communities the Commissioners seem aware that the Commission
is not known, and some proposed programs to make the Commission known
in the community.

City officials are not unanimous in their views as to how the
Commission is being accepted in the community. Alderman E. Gregory
Griggs expressed the view that the Commission probably was not well
known in either the black or white communities. The Alderman stated
that he had received no inquiries from his constituents in the city's
First Ward in regards to the Commission.\(^1\) It is of note that the
city's First Ward lies in the heart of the areas that the Commission
has directed most of its attention during its existence. Paralleling
the view of Alderman Griggs is that of Vice-Mayor Sam Massell who also
believes that the Commission is not well known in the city's white com-
munity. It was the Vice-Mayor's belief that people are seldom aware
of governmental bodies unless these bodies have a direct bearing on
their lives.\(^2\)

The most optimistic view of the CRC's success in the community was
expressed by Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. The Mayor stated that,

There seems to be an increasing interest and support of

\(^1\) Personal interview with Alderman E. Gregory Griggs, February 27,
1969.

\(^2\) Personal interview with Vice-Mayor Sam Massell, March 27, 1969.
the CRC from the affluent white community. Many people throughout Atlanta are finding the Commission to be a valuable agent in bringing about social change and equal opportunity for all citizens through peaceful and responsible means.¹

The community learns of the governmental agencies or the militant acts of blacks by means of the local newspapers, radio, and television coverage. In the past year the Atlanta Community Relations Commission has received very cooperative support from the local news media. Newspaper editorial tell of virtues of the Commission and praised it for its Black Ownership Project, and in general laud the activities of the Commission. This favorable editorial comment is from the black and white papers of the city. Local radio stations give publicity to the activities of the CRC. In particular one local black station gives out periodic comments on the Commission. Jim Lindskoog, associate director of the Commission, is given air-time on a regular basis by the local all talk station in the city. All three television stations give editorial time to the Commission. This support was evident during the Commission's attempt to have its requested budget approved for 1969.

In spite of the Mayor's statement and efforts by the local news media the Atlanta Community Relations Commission is in need of methods of publicizing itself to the community-at-large. The most obvious method for the Commission to use in publicizing itself is through a periodic newsletter. This newsletter should be circulated throughout the city, especially in depressed areas. Neighborhood Economic Opportunity Atlanta Offices and neighborhood stores could serve as

¹ Communications from Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. dated April 2, 1969.
distribution points. The value of a newsletter which is written in a manner that all can understand would be a aid in assisting the Commission in promoting its programs. At present the Commission has no plans to publish such a periodic newsletter. 1

In March, 1969, the Commission released a year-end report. The report was well-prepared, but it was aimed primarily at the business and political community of the city. Distribution was limited to the power structure, both business and political. As valuable as these contacts are there is a need for information of the Commission's work to reach the ordinary citizen both in the city's affluent areas and the economically depressed areas. One can understand why the Commission has not received the support it needs in the community. The success of the Commission is dependent upon the Commission communicating with all segments of the city.

In order to evaluate the opinions of the citizens that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission was created primarily to help, a random sample survey was conducted. The questionnaire was aimed at attempting to learn the attitudes of black and white residents toward the Commission. 2

---

1 Personal interview with Nat Welch, Executive Director of CRC, March 28, 1969.

2 The areas used for this survey were Pittsburgh, Summerhill, and Grant Park. During the course of the survey more blacks were interviewed primarily because they were more cooperative. A total of 100 persons were questioned, but only 90 questionnaires were valid. Those not used were voided because of one the following reasons: The questionee was intoxicated, or appeared to be below intelligence. In the survey of the questionnaires used 70 blacks were questioned and 20 whites.
TABLE 1

HAVE YOU EVER HEARD OF THE ATLANTA COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Number</td>
<td>Per Number</td>
<td>Per Number</td>
<td>Per Number</td>
<td>Per Number</td>
<td>Per Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was learned from this survey that 23 per cent of the persons questioned were aware of the existence of the Commission (see Table 1). As mentioned above a majority of the Commissioners are aware that the Commission is not well known in the community. It would appear that there is a definite need for the Commission to take positive steps in the direction of publicizing itself to the community.

In regards to the means by which the 23 per cent learned of the Commission: 30 per cent learned of the Commission by means of a friend, 20 per cent reported that they learned of the Commission by means of radio, and another 20 per cent reported that they learned of the Commission by means of a community organization. None of those questioned reported that they had learned of the Commission by means of the local newspaper. (see Table 2). This statistic supports Commissioner Dobbs contention that less than 20 per cent of persons in low-income neighborhoods subscribe to newspapers.

Ironically 60.5 per cent of those questioned felt that there were no problems in their neighborhood. (see Table 4). The fifth question of the questionnaire inquired of the residents if they felt the Commission could solve problems faced by the community. It is significant
TABLE 2
HOW DID YOU LEARN OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Informed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that 83 per cent had no opinion on the question. (see Table 5). Interpretation of this leads to the conclusion that the Commission cannot be effective when a substantial number of residents are in doubt as to whether the Commission can be an effective force in solving community problems.

TABLE 3
WHAT IS THE JOB OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not know</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe, evaluate, motivate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#All of the persons who answered question number one were not aware of the job of the Community Relations Commission.
Table 4

WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE PROBLEMS IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Delinquents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash pickup by landlords and city</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 indicates that 91 per cent of those questioned were unaware of whether the Commission had made any efforts to solve the problems of the city. A related question is question eight (see Table 8) which asked residents what problems they considered most important: 17 per cent felt that lack of recreational facilities was the most important problem, another 17 per cent felt that inadequate housing was the most pressing problem, 13 per cent were of the opinion that the
### TABLE 5

**DO YOU THINK THE COMMISSION CAN HELP SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Without Help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6

**HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the help of the Community</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems are too Broad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

**HAS THE COMMISSION DONE ANYTHING TO SOLVE THESE PROBLEMS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

OF THE PROBLEMS, YOU MENTIONED, WHICH IS MOST IMPORTANT?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Pickup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Signs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Chain Stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages will not be exact because some respondents considered two or more problems as most important.

lack of chain stores in the communities was the most important problem
due to better conditions in depressed areas of the city. Without

If the Commission has made any improvements for the residents of
low-income neighborhoods very few are aware of these improvements.

Table 9 indicates that 97 per cent of those persons questioned were
unaware of any activity in their community by the Commission.

The results shown in Table 9 indicates that the Commission is in
need of some means to involve the residents of the communities in their
TABLE 9
WHAT HAS THE COMMISSION DONE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD THAT YOU PERSONALLY KNOW ABOUT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Trash Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put Up Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10
DO YOU HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT THE COMMISSION CAN HELP THE COMMUNITY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the course of the sample it was evident that residents
DO YOU BELIEVE RACE RELATIONS IN ATLANTA ARE VERY GOOD, GOOD, FAIR, POOR, OR VERY POOR?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were unaware of the duties and responsibilities of a human relations commission. After explanation of a human relations commission and a brief history of the Atlanta Commission few respondents could give any definite views regarding such a commission.

In regards to the nature of race relations in Atlanta 52 per cent of the respondents felt that race relations were fair in the city. On the other extreme is the 1 per cent that felt that race relations in the city were very poor. It is significant that 20 per cent expressed the view that they did not know the nature of race relations in the city. (see Table 11).

It would appear that the Commission has a good base from which to work if it attempts to coordinate some interracial activities in the depressed areas of the city.

Outstanding personalities in some instances may help to bolster
TABLE 12

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING NAMES DO YOU RECOGNIZE: NAT WELCH, FRANK HORTON, REV. SAM WILLIAMS, JIM LINDSKOOG, BENNY T. SMITH, SAM MASSELL, AND ELIZA PASCHAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nat Welch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Horton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Sam Williams</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Lindskoog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny T. Smith</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Massell</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Paschal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The image of public organization. With this in mind a question was asked of the residents regarding their recognition of names of persons associated with the Commission. Rev. Sam Williams, present chairman of the Commission, was recognized by 20 per cent of the respondents. When questioned in what connection most answered it was through Rev. Williams' duties as minister and not his connection with the Commission. Benny T. Smith, field representative for the Commission, was recognized by 13 per cent of the respondents. Recognition of Smith came as a result of his political activities in the city. The first director of the Commission, Mrs. Eliza K. Paschal, was recognized by 11 per cent of the respondents. Mrs. Paschal's recognition came as a result of her activities in the 1960 efforts to fight segregation in the city (See Table 12).
TABLE 13

DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE COMMISSION CONSIDERS WHAT THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMUNITY WANT IN DECIDING WHAT TO DO IN A NEIGHBORHOOD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 14

DO YOU THINK THAT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION SHOWS THAT THE CITY WANTS TO HELP PEOPLE IN LOW-INCOME GROUPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although two Commission representatives were recognized by a significant number of persons it is evident that their representatives were not recognized because of their association with the Commission. Of note is that 27 per cent of the respondents did not recognize any of the names.

In response to questions thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen respondents appeared to indicate that a very small percentage are aware of the
techniques that Commission states that it uses in determining what the needs of the community are (see Table 13). Significantly 91 per cent did not know if the establishment of the Commission indicated that the city of Atlanta wants to help the residents of low-income neighborhoods (see Table 14). In the area of attendance of CRC meetings 85 per cent of the persons who stated that they were aware of the Commission's existence stated that they had not attended any of the CRC meetings (see Table 15).

TABLE 15

HAVE YOU ATTENDED ANY MEETINGS HELD BY THE COMMISSION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 16

AT THIS MEETING WAS ANY PROGRESS MADE TOWARD THE SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS RAISED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Atlanta Community Relations Commission has not gotten its message across to the neighborhoods it has most concerned itself with
TABLE 17

HAVE YOU EVER WORKED ON A COMMUNITY PROJECT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 18

WHAT COULD THE COMMISSION DO THAT IT IS NOT PRESENTLY DOING?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get Landlords to Fix-up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Chain Stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the last three years.

Table 16 indicates that of the 14 per cent of the persons who had attended meetings held by the CRC 67 per cent felt that no progress was made toward solution of the problems discussed in the meeting.

It should be explained that the CRC has a policy of holding one meeting to determine grievances, and a meeting in the same area thirty days later to report the results of action taken on the grievances.
In some instances the persons who reported no progress could have failed to attend the second meeting wherein progress was reported.

Question eighteen asked residents what the Commission could do that it is not presently doing. Once again respondents failed to give definite opinions (see Table 18). Of the respondents who answered the question 94 per cent did not know what the Commission could do that it is not presently doing.

Question eighteen was not asked of the respondents until after the history and duties of the Commission had been explained to the respondents. Of those who expressed a view, 2 per cent felt that the CRC should have landlords fix-up homes, and another 2 per cent felt that the neighborhoods were in need of chain stores.

Question nineteen asked the respondents how long had they lived in this community. The average length of residency for the respondents in this survey was 13.5 years.

Overall, it would appear that the Atlanta Community Relations Commission is not known in the community and it has not taken positive steps to make itself known. Residents of low-income neighborhoods are unaware of the job of the Commission. Few have any views relating to how the problems of the community can be solved by the Commission.
It is appropriate at this point to review the model which was drawn in the first chapter of this study. The purpose of the model was to compare the Atlanta Community Relations Commission with what could be considered an effective human relations commission.

The Atlanta Commission meets the first requirement of the model in that the Commission was established by a city ordinance. Thus the Commission is recognized by the City. However, evidence found during this study revealed that although the Commission was created by the Atlanta Board of Aldermen it was not fully supported by City officials. It was City officials who spoke in opposition to the work of the Commission during the early months of the Commission's existence. In addition to official lack of support, although unsupported, there is the belief that many Aldermen would have voted against the creation of the Commission had they not been forced into acceptance because of the tremendous pressure exerted by the blacks of the city. Another prime reason for the unanimous vote for the Commission was the view in certain sections of the city that it would prevent riots from occurring in Atlanta. Clearly the Atlanta Community Relations Commission is not operating with the full moral support of the City.

The second requirement of the model is that the commission have sufficient power to carry out its duties. The Atlanta Commission does not have the power to subpoena or to issue cease and desist orders,
nor does it have the power to enforce local ordinances relating to public accommodations and racial discrimination. The latter power cannot be given because the City does not have laws relating to the above areas. Efforts by the Commission to gain the power of subpoena have been denied by the Board of Aldermen on the grounds that the Commission has failed to demonstrate a need for such a power. Many of the Commissioners have mixed feelings over the question of whether the Commission should have more effective powers. It is their view that more power might be abused or it might bring negative attitudes to the fore against the Commission. That is, the Commission might lose the good will of an important segment of the city's population.

In meeting the third requirement the Commission does have a plan for attacking the problems it considers important. However, the Commission has yet to provide the leadership it should in the city in the areas of education, employment, and housing. The fight of the Commission against the Atlanta School Board has not produced from the Commission a plan that can be presented to the Board and to the public to effectively integrate the city schools; or a plan that will completely eliminate the city's dual school system. The workshops or jobs sponsored by the Commission was without a doubt a very worthwhile project, but it did not touch the mass of unemployed, underemployed, or never employed in the city. The project was designed to help a few and this is what it accomplished. In the area of housing the Commission has not yet faced the Atlanta Housing Authority on the question of significant integration of public housing. In defense of the Commission it can be pointed out that the Commission has indirectly forced the AHA to alter
many of its tenant policies. Due to its inability to communicate with the more affluent whites of the city the Commission has been unable to help dispel doubts held by these persons concerning blacks moving into all white sections. According to their 1969 program prospectus the Commission does anticipate going into these affluent white areas. 1

The composition of any commission is difficult to gauge. The Atlanta Commission probably meets the requirement of a broad representation on the Commission. There are persons from all major segments of the diverse Atlanta population.

Requirement number five calls for the meetings of the Commission to be open. The Atlanta Community Relations Commission holds regular meetings the fourth Friday of each month and the meetings are open to the public. However, it should be noted that a great amount of the decision-making of the Commission takes place away from these Friday meetings. The Commission like similar bodies has a tendency to feel that business that might cause disturbances among the members should be handled away from the formal sessions.

On the staff of the Atlanta Commission is a field representative who has many contacts within the city of Atlanta. However, his contacts do not extend to the very extreme groups of the city. It is

1 Atlanta like many other cities is experiencing blacks moving into previously all white neighborhoods. Following the first black moving into a neighborhood is the local real estate dealers who wage a campaign of subtle intimidation against the remaining white residents of the community. There is constant contact by realtors to force whites to sell. Many whites panic, and admit they are afraid if they do not sell they will be the last white on their street. See Sam Hopkins, "White Residents Rap Real Estate 'Scare,'" Atlanta Constitution, April 12, 1969.
important that such contacts be made by the Commission. Requirement number six calls for such contacts to be made in order that the Commission can be aware of potential trouble spots and have communications to alleviate the trouble.

Requirement number seven states that the staff of the Commission should be headed by a college trained professional with experience in intergroup problems. The Atlanta Commission does have a director who is college trained and does have experience in intergroup relations. It appears that all of the present staff members have had experience and work with intergroup problems. This excludes the secretarial staff. However, the Atlanta Commission's staff is not adequate to handle the work load that the Commission has outlined for it to carry out. The Commission at present has one field representative. Without additional field representatives the Commission cannot keep abreast of the needs of the community. There is need for the Commission to have on its staff a research person who can keep the files of the Commission current on the trends in human relations.

The model concerns itself, in requirement number eight, with the operation of a commission. The Atlanta Commission does not come up to the standards set by this requirement. The Commission is not a source for information on such pertinent topics as schools, housing, and employment. It should be noted that the Commission does have in its possession studies conducted by other agencies. Probably the Commission can provide some information on employment in the city due to a project it is now conducting. In the area of publicizing itself the Commission falls woefully short. The Commission is best known in the
business sector of the city. However, it is not known to the sections of the city which it was created to help. The Commission does not publish a periodic newsletter. Therefore, many residents of the city are unaware that the Commission exists. The Commission since the addition of a new director does have good working relations with various City departments.

The Commission does have in operation, when needed, a rumor control center. This center is to be activated, and manned by professionals, in the event of major disturbances. Through this method the Commission hopes to dispel rumors that circulate during times of stress.

Another operational procedure should be continuing effort by the commission to work for local ordinances that will effectively deal with problems of discrimination in the city. This the Atlanta Commission has not done and does not propose to do.

The last requirement in the model is that the Commission be properly financed, in order that it can effectively carry out its programs. The Atlanta Commission is not adequately financed. The approved budget for 1969 was $50,000. This averages less than ten cents per capita for the city of Atlanta. Further, the Commission was warned by a few members of the Atlanta Board of Aldermen that funds would be cut if the Commission failed to follow their suggestion. That suggestion was that the Commission fire its first director. The Commission dismissed the first director, and thus allowed itself to be ruled by an outside force.

At the outset it was mentioned that probably no commission in operation meets all of the requirements outlined in the model. The
Atlanta Commission does meet some of the requirements, but it should be borne in mind that operation is more vital than form. Although the Atlanta Commission meets many of the requirements the way in which the Commission carries out its objectives is very important. The attitudes of the Commissioners should be considered when evaluating the Atlanta Commission. For it is these attitudes which will control the direction that the Commission takes on many issues. For instance few Commissioners are firmly committed to giving the Commission power to enforce ordinances or pushing for the enactment of ordinances relating to discrimination.

An agency which is charged with the responsibility of changing established patterns is a weak organization when it has no enforcement powers. It has been found that no appreciable gains have been achieved in bettering race relations by conciliation groups which do not also have ultimate powers. This statement can be applied to the Atlanta Community Relations Commission. The Commission has not and cannot bring about any meaningful changes until it has the enforcement powers necessary to force change in many instances.

From 1960 to 1969, all meaningful gains in desegregation in Atlanta have come through militant acts. The acts of demonstrations and the use of federal laws have brought about the changes that the city has experienced in the last decade to remove racial barriers.¹ ²

² Protest and Progress a report issued by The Greater Atlanta Human Relations Council, March 27, 1964 (Privately printed, Atlanta: 1964).
There must be countless outside forces in operation if an agency with no power, such as the Atlanta Commission, is to be fruitful in its efforts. When the Atlanta Commission was created the country and Atlanta was experiencing great stress and pressure for racial changes. The threat of riots was very real in every major American city. In response to demands for change the United States Congress passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The passage of this act initiated vigorous efforts by the federal government to bring about an end to discrimination. Without such forces in operation it is doubtful if the Atlanta Community Relations Commission would have come into existence.

The philosophy of the Atlanta Commission is to go slowly proceeding only when the way is very clear. The history of desegregation in the city of Atlanta indicates that quiet actions will not bring about needed changes. A measurable gains have come through militancy. It is not recommended that the Atlanta Commission become a civil rights organization but, it is suggested that the Commission should take positive steps in the direction of alleviating discrimination that is still practiced in the city. It should make known to the public this discrimination. It is also suggested that the Commission submit to the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen proposed ordinances that would put the city on record against discrimination in the sale and rental of houses. Further, it is within the present power of the Commission to expose the discrimination practiced by local labor unions. The Commission should become vocal on the issue of granting the Commission the power to deal with persons who failed to appear before the Commission. All of these activities would make the Commission a leader in the city.
in the area of human rights.

There is a preponderance of thought on the Commission that to give the Commission enforcement power or the power of subpoena would only serve to engender a negative response from certain powerful segments of the city. It is the opinion of these Commissioners that the Commission will lose the good will of this segment of the city. There is a fallacy in this line of thought. The good will these commissioners speak of is the paternalist attitude of some white Atlantans and the indifference of others. These commissioners fail to realize that if all the Atlanta Community Relations Commission was created to do was to expose problems then there was no need for its creation. There are many private groups within the city which are concerned with exposure. What is needed is an agency that will have the power to bring about change.

It would appear that the Atlanta Commission will be a very weak commission until there is a realization by the Atlanta Board of Aldermen that the Commission cannot be effective unless it has a budget commensurate with its duties. The Commission will be weak until it is given the power to effectively bring about equal opportunity for all. The Commission will be weak until it makes its works known to a wider audience. Finally, the Commission will be weak until the members press for such objectives as local ordinances relating to non-discriminatory selling and rental of housing, and a stronger law relating to non-discriminatory hiring.

The future of the Commission is not bright because the times are calling for new tactics and innovations to deal with the problems of
urban America. A Commission that believes that the slow way is the
best way will not be able to offer the leadership necessary in a chang-
ing time. If the Atlanta Community Relations Commission wants to be-
come a force in the city it must take bold and decisive steps that will
show the community that it is a leader in the area of speaking and act-
ing for the deprived, exploited, and depressed of the city.
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Dear Mr. Massell:

On July 21, 1966, a meeting of community leaders was held at the Price High School Community Center that had as its major objective that of discussing problems that are prevailing in the City of Atlanta. Another major objective of this meeting was to determine if problems prevalent in the Atlanta community could be resolved without unnecessary hardships being placed on citizens of this community.

After a lengthy discussion of prevailing problems and subsequent suggestions for solutions to the problems, the group assembled decided that a resolution would be passed which would request the Mayor and Aldermanic Board to establish a human relations office with direct responsibilities to aid in resolving problems that are prevailing in our city.

It is the sincere desire of many citizens in the Atlanta area that such a director and such an office be commissioned as early as possible so that this office can begin work on preventing burdensome problems from occurring. I am therefore sending this letter at this time to remind you to bring this matter before the Aldermanic Board.
This letter comes from me simply because Mr. Bennie Smith, who called the meeting, asked me to serve as chairman of the group.

You are aware of the significance of the meeting because you were present. I wish to thank you for your cooperation and for your efforts in seeing that this request gets to the Aldermanic Board.

On the enclosed sheet will be found a copy of the resolution. Names of the persons who attended the meeting and who voted for the resolution are stipulated at the end of the resolution.

With kindest personal and professional regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

II. E. Tate
Executive Secretary

Het:dc

Enclosure
RESOLVED, that a full-time director with a staff be established in the City of Atlanta with full responsibilities to establish and maintain rapport in the human relations area for citizens of Atlanta and for the Atlanta community. The undersigned group urges the passage of the necessary city legislation to implement the human relations office with the necessary responsibilities and authority to completely implement the objectives of such an office.

Mr. Bennie T. Smith,
Dr. H. E. Tate, Presiding Officer
Vice Mayor Sam Massell, Jr.
Alderman Q. V. Williams
Alderman Richard C. Freeman
Alderman George Cotsakes
Alderman Jack Summers
Alderman Rodney Cook
Alderman Charlie Leftwich
State Representative A. D. Grier, Jr.
Chief Herbert Jenkins
Helen Howard
Edward Moody
Rev. W. A. Hines
James Howard
Elmore Keith
LeRoy Aldridge
Pauline Kindell
Mrs. Martha Weems
Rev. H. F. Green
Mrs. Sarah F. Baker
Theodore Ward
Sen Horace T. Ward
J. H. Calhoun
Capt. M. C. Redding
Clinton Chafin
G. A. Heard
James E. Dean

Rep. Charlie L. Carnes
Rep. Tom Dillan
Dr. C. Clayton Powell
Mrs. Dorothy Bolden
Rev. C. 'D. Colbert
Rev. E. J. Jones
Dr. Gerald Reed
William Merritt
John Hood
Joel M. McGuire
Rosa L. Burney
Membership of the Ad Hoc Committee selected by the Atlanta Board of Aldermen to study the feasibility of establishing a human relations council for the City of Atlanta - 1966

1. Vice-Mayor Sam Massell
2. Alderman Rodney Cook
3. Alderman Milton Farris
4. Alderman John M. Flanigen
5. Alderman Richard C. Freeman
6. Alderman Jack Summers
7. Alderman Charles Leftwich
8. Alderman Everett Millican
9. Charles Hart
10. Eliza K. Paschal
11. L. D. Simon
12. Benny T. Smith
13. Dorthy B. Thompson
14. Rev. Sam Williams

The members of this ad hoc committee were selected by the Atlanta Board of Aldermen after their receipt of the petition from residents present in the August meeting held at the Price High School Community Center. All of the lay representatives of this ad hoc are committee members now presently serving on the Commission or in the case of Mrs. Paschal did serve (Mrs. Dorthy B. Thompson has not served on the Commission in any capacity).
OFFICE OF CLERK OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN
CITY OF ATLANTA, GEORGIA

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CHARTER

BY: SAM MASSELL, JR., CHAIRMAN ALDERMANIC HUMAN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF ATLANTA TO CREATE A COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE CITY OF ATLANTA, GEORGIA, PROVIDE FOR MEMBERSHIP, DEFINE THE PURPOSES AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION AND OBJECTIVES SOUGHT TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, PROVIDE FOR THE ORGANIZATION AND OPERATIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

BE AND IT IS HEREBY ENACTED BY THE MAYOR AND BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF ATLANTA AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. There is hereby created a Community Relations Commission for the City of Atlanta, Georgia, to be known as the Community Relations Commission. The Commission shall be composed of twenty members, serving without compensation, all bonafide adult residents and representatives of all segments of the City of Atlanta, Georgia, to be appointed by the Mayor with approval of the Board of Aldermen, one of whom shall be designated by the Mayor as its chairman at the organizational meeting and at each annual meeting thereafter. Seven members of said Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Of the twenty members first appointed, six shall be appointed for one year, seven for two years and seven for three years; thereafter all appointments to the Commission shall be for a term of three years. Any member may be removed by the Mayor for failure to attend meetings or inattention to duties. In the event of death, resignation or removal of any member, his successor shall be appointed by the Mayor to serve for the unexpired period of the time for which such member has
been appointed provided, however, that all members shall continue in office until their successors shall have been appointed.

SECTION 2. The Commission, at its organizational meeting and each annual meeting thereafter, shall elect from its membership a vice-chairman; a second vice-chairman; and a secretary. The chairman, vice-chairman, second vice-chairman, and secretary shall have and perform such duties as are commonly associated with their respective titles. The officers of the Commission shall be and constitute the executive committee of the Commission which shall exercise such powers of the Commission between its regular meetings as may be authorized by the Commission. The Commission shall be further authorized to appoint and fix the membership of such number of standing and temporary committees as it may find expedient for the performance of its duties.

SECTION 3. The Community Relations Commission shall meet at least once each month at such time and place as shall be fixed by the Commission by its standing rules. Special meetings shall be called by the chairman, or in his absence by the ranking vice-chairman, or on the written request of any two members of the executive committee, or upon the written request of a majority (ten members) of said Commission. All such requests shall state the purpose or purposes for which such special meeting is to be called, and shall be filed with the secretary at least twenty-four hours before the time of the special meeting so-called and authorized. Such request and call for a special meeting shall be read at the meeting and entered in the minutes, and no business shall be transacted except that stated in the request for such special meeting. The Commission shall prepare its own agenda for all meetings and establish its own rules of order or adopt Robert's Rule
of Order for the conduct of their meetings.

SECTION 4. The functions, duties and powers of the Commission shall be:

(a) To foster mutual understanding, tolerance, and respect among all economic, social, religious, and ethnic groups in the City.

(b) To help make it possible for each citizen, regardless of race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry, to develop his talents and abilities without limitation.

(c) To aid in permitting the City of Atlanta to benefit from the fullest realization of its human resources.

(d) To investigate, discourage and seek to prevent discriminatory practices against any individual because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry.

(e) To attempt to act as conciliator in controversies involving human relations.

(f) To cooperate with the Federal, State, and City agencies in developing harmonious human relations.

(g) To cooperate in the development of educational programs dedicated to the improvement of human relations with, and to enlist the support of, civic leaders, civic, religious, veterans, labor, industrial, commercial and eleemosynary groups; and private agencies engaged in the inculcation of ideals of tolerance, mutual respect and understanding.

(h) To make studies, and to have studies made, in the field of human relations, and to prepare and disseminate reports of such studies.
(i) To recommend to the Mayor and Board of Aldermen such ordinances as will aid in carrying out the purposes of this ordinance.

(j) To submit an annual report to the Mayor and Board of Aldermen.

(k) To accept grants and donations on behalf of the City from foundations and others for the purpose of carrying out the above listed functions, subject to the approval of the Mayor and Board of Aldermen.

SECTION 5. Pursuant to the named functions and duties of the Community Relations Commission, it is empowered to hold hearings and take the testimony of any person under oath. The Commission, after the completion of any hearing, shall make a report in writing to the Mayor setting forth the facts found by it and its recommendations. At any hearing before the Commission a witness shall have the right to be advised by Counsel present during such hearings.

SECTION 6. The Commission shall, with the approval of the Mayor and Board of Aldermen, employ an executive director, and the Mayor and Board of Aldermen shall fix his compensation. The executive director shall be a person with training and experience in inter-group and interracial relations. The executive director shall coordinate the activities of the Commission and its staff. He may, with the Mayor's approval and within the limits of the budget of the Commission, employ such staff as he needs, and the executive director shall fix the compensation of such staff, subject to the approval of the Personnel Board of the City.

SECTION 7. The Commission shall prepare annually a budget for
the ensuing fiscal year, and shall submit such budget to the Mayor and Board of Aldermen for their approval. Except for the initial year, the Commission shall prepare and submit each budget no later than September 30 of each year. All Budgetary expenditures shall be authorized by the Commission.

SECTION 8. In the event that private funds are made available for special projects, surveys, and educational programs, the Mayor is authorized, upon recommendation of the Commission, to enter into such contract or contracts with private individuals, associations, or groups desiring to promote the purpose of said Commission by furnishing funds for said purposes.

SECTION 9. The services of all other departments of the City of Atlanta shall be made available to the Commission upon its request for such services subject to the ability and capacity of said Department to render same. Information in the possession of any department, board, or agency of the City of Atlanta shall be furnished to the Commission upon its request, and to the extent permitted by law, subject to the ability and capacity of the department to furnish it. Upon the refusal by any director or head of any department, board, or agency of the City to furnish any information which has been requested by the Commission, the matter shall be referred to the Mayor who shall determine whether such information shall be furnished to the Commission, and the decision of the Mayor shall be final.

SECTION 10. The Mayor is authorized to allocate adequate office space and to provide the necessary facilities in the City Hall for said Commission if the office space and facilities are available. If office space and facilities are not available in the City Hall, then
the Mayor is authorized to secure adequate office space and to provide
the necessary facilities as convenient to the City Hall as possible.

SECTION 11. If any section of this ordinance be held to be un-
constitutional or otherwise invalid by any Court of competent jurisdic-
tion, then such section shall be considered separately and apart from
the remaining provision of this ordinance, said section to be com-
pletely separable from the remaining provisions of this ordinance and
the remaining provisions of this ordinance shall remain in full force
and effect.

SECTION 12. The provisions of this ordinance shall be included
and incorporated in the Charter and Related Laws of the City of Atlanta,
as an addition thereto.

SECTION 13. That a copy of this proposed amendment to the Charter
and Related Laws of the City of Atlanta shall be filed in the Office
of the Clerk of the Mayor and Board of Aldermen and in the Office of
the Clerk of the Superior Court of Fulton County and that the "Notice
of Proposed Amendment to the Charter and Related Laws of the City of
Atlanta," attached hereto, marked "Exhibit A" and made a part of this
ordinance, be published once a week for three weeks in a newspaper of
general circulation in the City of Atlanta or the official organ of
Fulton County and that a copy of said advertisement be attached to
this ordinance prior to its final adoption by the Mayor and Board of
Aldermen.

SECTION 14. That all ordinances and parts of ordinances in con-
flict herewith are hereby repealed.

ADOPTED by Board of Aldermen November 7, 1966
APPROVED November 8, 1966
**SELECTED DATA ON THE ATLANTA COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission Members</th>
<th>Term of Office</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Sam Williams</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Minister, teacher</td>
<td>Rev. Williams became chairman of the CRC after Irving Kahler resigned as chairman. Rev. Williams has long been a critic of the Atlanta School Board and its policy of delay. He is a very capable chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. M. Alexander, Sr.</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>Mr. Alexander has long been active in civic work in Atlanta. His contacts within the city power structure are varied and many.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Byron Attridge</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Mr. Attridge's interest in the disadvantage lies in his position as general counsel for the Atlanta Housing Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sara Baker</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Nursery Owner</td>
<td>Mrs. Baker operates a nursery in one of the city's deprived areas thus helping to supervise minors while their mothers work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Helen Bullard</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Owns a consultant Firm</td>
<td>Miss Bullard worked many years as the secretary to long time Atlanta Mayor Wm. B. Hartsfield. Her contacts are extensive in the city government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. J. Butler</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Labor Specialist</td>
<td>Specialist in labor, presently involved in an OFO project to involve minorities in apprentice programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Members</td>
<td>Term of Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Cheetham</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Owner Advertising Firm in Atlanta</td>
<td>Mr. Cheetham is author of several articles on public relations. Also he has unsuccessfully offered for political office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert E. Lee</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Dr. Lee's area of interest is Negro education. She is founder of the SCALE (Citizens for Negro Education and Liberation) group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Dean</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Georgia State Representative</td>
<td>Mr. Dean is one of the youngest legislators in the Georgia Assembly. He is also one of the eleven black legislators in Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Fred Patterson</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Civil Worker</td>
<td>Mrs. Patterson is the founder of the Women Voters of Georgia. She is known for her feminist work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dobbs</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Director Wesley Community Center</td>
<td>Mr. Dobbs has long experience in the problems of deprived neighborhoods. He has organized neighborhood groups to sway the city to positive action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Salla</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
<td>Mr. Salla is a Republican in a Democratic city. He is the director of several social service organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence G. Ezzard</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Georgia State Representative</td>
<td>Mr. Ezzard represents a predominantly black section of the city. His constituents are among the city's poorest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shields</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Television Executive</td>
<td>Mr. Shields is the executive producer for television station WAGA-TV. In 1966, Mr. Shields founded the WAGA-TV in the WAGA-TV studio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. L. Gellerstedt, Jr.</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Mr. Gellerstedt chaired the business group in Atlanta that found jobs for hard core unemployed during the summer of 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. D. Simon</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Pitney-Bowes Employee</td>
<td>Mr. Simon represents the people Mr. Simon represents are in one of the city's worst areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hart</td>
<td>November, 1970</td>
<td>Federal Employee</td>
<td>Mr. Hart has long been active in community affairs. He participated in the citizen group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Members</td>
<td>Term of Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary Stephens</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>that petition the city for the establishment of the CRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert E. Lee</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Dr. Lee's special interest is in the area of education. He has pushed for the CRC to come out for strong reforms in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John R. Taylor</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Fred Patterson</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Civic Worker</td>
<td>Mrs. Patterson is involved with such groups as the U.N. and the League of Women Voters and the Christian Council. Her involvement is not new in civic work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Jacob Rothschild</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Rabbi</td>
<td>The Rabbi has used his Temple to foster racial understanding. The Rabbi has on several occasions been called in by Mayor Allen to give advice on social matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Sells</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Manufacturer Representative</td>
<td>Mr. Sells is a Republican in a Democratic state. He has offered for political office and has won and loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Shields</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Television Executive</td>
<td>Mr. Shields worked as an on-camera newscaster for television station WAGA-TV. In 1968 Mr. Shields became an executive in the WAGA organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. D. Simon</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Pitney-Bowes Employee</td>
<td>In his neighborhood Mr. Simon is referred to as Mr. Civic Worker. The people Mr. Simon represent are in one of the city's worst slum areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Members</td>
<td>Term of Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary Stephens</td>
<td>November, 1971</td>
<td>Involved in Economic Opportunity Atlanta</td>
<td>Mrs. Stephens lives in a white area of the city that is economically deprived. Mrs. Stephens special interest is the policies of the Atlanta Housing Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John R. Taylor</td>
<td>November, 1969</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Dr. Taylor's special area of interest is education. He chairs the CRC's education committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speaking Engagements of Nat Welch Executive Director of the
Atlanta Community Relations Commission-1968-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Congregationalist Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Methodist Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside Methodist Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Congregation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Church West End, Concerned Citizens Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Congregationalist Church</td>
<td>January 8, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Street Methodist</td>
<td>January 15, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briarcliff Methodist</td>
<td>February 2, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Lecturer U. of Ga. Police Academy</td>
<td>February 13, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>February 24, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungry Club</td>
<td>March 12, 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint James Methodist Church</td>
<td>March 16, 1969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Commission staff was unable to give dates for the speaking engagements of 1968.
Areas presently concentrated in by the Atlanta Community Relations Commission

Mechanicsville (Area I)

Number of streets: Approximately 24
Racial pattern: Black
Number of CRC meeting held in 1968-1969: 1 (held in 1968)
Zoning: Residential
Political representation: 1st Ward of the City, Aldermen Robert S. Dennis and E. Gregory Griggs

Geographic Boundaries: South and West by the Southern Railroad; North by Whitehall Street and Memorial Drive; East by Capital Avenue.

Grant Park (Area II)

Number of streets: Approximately 21
Racial pattern: White 7,354, Black 81
Number of CRC meetings held in 1968-1969: 1 (held in 1969)
Zoning: Residential, industrial, and recreational
Political representation: 1st Ward of the City, Aldermen Robert S. Dennis and E. Gregory Griggs

Geographic Boundaries: North by the East Expressway; East and South by West Point Railroad; West by Kelly Ave., Primrose Ave., and Hill Street.

Pittsburgh (Area III)

Number of streets: Approximately
Racial pattern: Blacks 8,350 Whites 50
Number of CRC meetings held in 1968-1969: 3 (all in 1968)
Zoning: Residential, commercial (widespread)
Political representation: 1st Ward of the City, Alderman Robert S. Dennis and 4th Ward Aldermen Hugh Pierce
Geographic boundaries: North and East by Southern Railroad; South by University Ave.; West by Stewart Ave. to Northside Drive.

Peoplestown (Area IV)

Number of streets: Approximately 21
Racial pattern: Black 4,678, White 923
Number of CRC Meetings held in 1968-1969: 0
Zoning: Residential, commercial, heavy industry
Political representation: 1st Ward of the City, Aldermen Robert S. Dennis and E. Gregory Griggs

Geographical boundaries: North by Atlanta Ave. to Hill Street; South by Atlanta West Point Railroad; East by Hill Street; West by Capitol Ave. (from Southern Railroad to Atlanta Ave.)

Adair Park (Area V)

Number of streets: Approximately 19
Racial pattern: White
Number of CRC meetings held in 1968-1969: 0
Zoning: Residential, commercial
Political representation: 1st Ward of the City, Aldermen Robert S. Dennis and E. Gregory Griggs

Geographic boundaries: North by West Expressway; South by University Ave.; East by Stewart Ave.; West by Lee Street.

Summehill (Area VI)

Number of streets: Approximately 16
Racial pattern: Transitional predominantly black
Number of CRC meetings held in 1968-1969: 1 (held in 1968)
Zoning: Private residential, apartments, or commercial

Political representation: 1st Ward of the City, Aldermen Robert S. Dennis and E. Gregory Griggs

Geographical boundaries: North by Hunter Street to Central Ave.; South by Atlanta Ave.; East by Hill Street to Hunter Street; West by Capitol Ave. to Capital Homes.

Edgewood (Area VII)

Number of streets: Approximately 37

Racial pattern: Transitional area, in the last three years the black population of the area has more than double.

Number of CRC meetings held in 1968-1969: 2 (all in 1968)

Zoning: Residential and some heavy industry

Political representation: 2nd Ward of the City, Aldermen E. A. Gilliam and John M. Flanigen

Geographical boundaries: North by DeKalb Ave. beginning at LaFrance St.; South by Boulevard; East by Wyman and Rogers St.; West by Whiteford to DeKalb Ave.

Attached is a copy of the Ordinance establishing the Commission which outlines the duties and responsibilities.

It was created primarily to work in solving the problems of Atlanta's disadvantaged citizens, both white and black.

By fulfilling its responsibilities as outlined in the Ordinance, and by providing Atlanta citizens with factual information concerning racial issues and working to eliminate some of the existing misconceptions and myths.

The CRC is one of many organizations working to end the barriers on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin.
April 2, 1969

Mr. William H. Boone, Jr.
3775 Gordon Road, Apt D-5
Atlanta, Georgia 30331

Dear Mr. Boone:

In reply to your questionnaire regarding the Community Relations Commission, I hope the following information will assist in your studies at Atlanta University:

1. What factors caused the city to create the CRC. . . . ?

   This was a decision made by the Board of Aldermen to provide a coordinating agency to work with various community problems.

2. What do you view as the job of the CRC. . . . ?

   Attached is a copy of the Ordinance establishing the Commission which outlines the duties and responsibilities.

3. Was the CRC created primarily to work in black neighborhoods. . . ?

   It was created primarily to work in solving the problems of Atlanta's disadvantaged citizens, both white and black.

4. How can the CRC best serve the people of Atlanta?

   By fulfilling its responsibilities as outlined in the Ordinance, and by providing Atlanta citizens with factual information concerning racial issues and working to eliminate some of the existing misconceptions and myths.

5. Should it take an active role in changing racial patterns . . . ?

   The CRC is one of many organizations working to end the ghetto on the basis of race, creed, color or national origin.
Nat Welch........Personal Data

BUSINESS BACKGROUND

1963-present. Federal Representative to the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board. Appointed by the late President John F. Kennedy. Appointment re-affirmed by President Johnson.


1953-60 Vice president, sales, Orradio Industries Inc., Opelika, Alabama, manufacturer of magnetic tape.


EXPERIENCE IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Appointed by President Johnson to the National Citizens Committee for Community Relations, 1964 to present. Appointed to NCC Business and Advisory Committee (a task force on minority group employment problems), 1967-present.


Advisory Committee, Playgrounds for Young America Inc., 1964-present. Founded by the late Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to build playgrounds in ghettos.

Member of Governor's Committee for Investigation of Voter Registration of Veterans, 1950.

Temporary chairman, Atlanta Metropolitan Committee for Equal Opportunity in Housing.

COMMUNITY SERVICE, ATLANTA, GA.

Member, Atlanta Federal Executive Board, 1965-present. Chairman of Housing Sub-Committee of Critical Urban Affairs Committee, 1967-present.

Section Chairman, United Appeal drive, 1967.


PERSONAL

6. Do you believe the CRC can be the prime agent in getting the School Board to fully integrate the Atlanta public schools?

The CRC can be a prime agent in pointing out any existing inequities within the School system, and offer recommendations to alleviate these inequities.

7. Can CRC do anything to speed integration of neighborhoods. . . ?

The CRC can make certain that all complaints concerning discrimination in housing are thoroughly investigated. The Commission can also work with existing neighborhood fair housing groups in stimulating initiative.

8. At present, the CRC has no powers outside of holding hearings and investigation should the CRC be given additional powers?

The CRC has not submitted any formal resolutions requesting additional powers, and has been able to work quite effectively without them. If some should be requested, this decision would have to be made by the Board of Aldermen.

9. Atlanta is very heterogeneous in its makeup. How do you make the CRC membership reflect the diverse segments. . . ?

By appointing citizens representative of all segments of Atlanta.

10. What do you consider when you select a CRC member. . . ?

Citizens who have the qualifications to maintain the very excellently balanced commission, and who have the talents and motivation to carry out the duties of the Commission.

11. Why did the Finance Committee give the CRC a sizable increase in its budget this year. . . ?

As the Commission developed its responsibilities, additional financial needs emerged, and the Finance Committee and the Board of Aldermen apparently felt additional funds were justified, and, therefore, approved them.

12. As late as 1961, it was reported that you did not favor an official human relations council. . . why did you change your view in 1966?

The answer to Question No. 1 also answers this question.
Mr. William H. Boone, Jr.

13. How do you feel the CRC is being accepted in the affluent white community?

There seems to be an increasing interest and support of the CRC from the affluent white community. Many people throughout Atlanta are finding the Commission to be a valuable agent in bringing about social change and equal opportunity for all citizens through peaceful and responsible means. Hopefully, this increasing interest will lead to the involvement of more Atlanta citizens in the efforts of the CRC.

14. What were your feelings toward Mrs. Paschall as director of the CRC?

Based on the unanimous recommendation of the Commission members, I appointed Mrs. Paschall as its director, as I felt the Commission deserved my full support.

Sincerely yours,

Ivan Allen, Jr.
Mayor
## COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ACTUAL 1968</th>
<th>PROPOSED 1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$26,827</td>
<td>$43,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, Life Benefits</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Expenses for Staff</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Distance</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Equipment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Subscriptions</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop on Black Business Opportunities</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Donations</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,621</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anticipated Income**

- **Cash on hand, January 1, 1969** $2,126
- **City of Atlanta** 50,000
- **Mills B. Lane** 500
- **From EOA Contract for Secretarial Time** 1,500

**Total** $54,126