

Pam
69-318

1959

MIAMI

INTERRACIAL

ACTION

INSTITUTE

Summary and Evaluation

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
OF WISCONSIN
816 State Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

CORE - Congress of Racial Equality
38 Park Row, New York 38, New York

Price: Ten Cents

C R E D I T S

The Summary of the Institute was written by Mrs. Susan Bodan of Brooklyn, New York, a full-time participant at the Miami Institute. She based her Summary in part on a shorter write-up by Gordon R. Carey.

The Evaluation was written by CORE's Executive Secretary, James R. Robinson, with help from Mrs. Bodan, Gordon Carey and Marvin Rich. It is largely dependent upon the written evaluations done by Institute participants.

SUMMARY OF ACTION AT THE INSTITUTE

by Susan Bodan

After a day and a half of orientation and discussion, the Institute began tests of various lunch counters in stores in the shopping district of Miami. All our tests confirmed the fact that Negroes were not being served on the same basis as whites. In some places Negroes were served if they would stand somewhere in the rear; in others there were separate "stand-up" counters; in most Negroes were not served at all.

In testing theatres, in the few that we were able to test, again it was confirmed that Negroes were not admitted. In the one instance where a Negro entered with a white, it was merely by oversight, though we noticed in that instance that most of the people in the theatre paid no attention at all to the presence of a Negro among them.

Teams of mixed Institute members also went out to see how desegregation in public transportation was working out. In some cases it was found that Negroes still went to the back of the bus and would even stand when there were vacant seats in the front. By and large, however, younger Negroes sat wherever there was a seat. Jitney drivers did seem to discriminate against Negroes waiting on street corners.

After several days of testing the Institute took as its major project a sit-in at the lunch counter of the Byrons-Jackson's department store. Gordon R. Carey, one of the Institute's directors, assumed major direction of this project. This is a small store, and it was thought this might prove an advantage. However, a disadvantage was that the counter was in the hands of a concessionaire, so that full responsibility for policy could be evaded by both the concessionaire and the store management.

The Institute, with the cooperation of Miami CORE, held sit-in demonstrations at this counter for five days. The demonstrations lasted from two to six hours. On several occasions the management closed down the counter either partially or fully because of our sit-ins. It is interesting to note that the counter was closed although we seldom took up even half of the seats. Because of the way we grouped ourselves along the counter, it was difficult for the countermen to determine whether customers who sat down to be served were CORE people or not; so they served no one. However, many people who sat down to be served were naturally just customers, and this gave the CORE people a chance to talk to the customers, explaining what we were doing and getting their reactions. It can be objectively stated that most of the people we spoke with were sympathetic to our protest.

As to the countermen, while at first they were more neutral than hostile to us, as the lunch counter was closed down daily and finally was closed down completely for an indefinite period, they blamed us and became unfriendly. The first day of the sit-in the CORE people were instructed to leave sizeable tips to show sympathy for the countermen. However, the next day the aggregate of the tips was returned in an envelope, obviously at the management's instruction. Interesting to note is that just before the counter was closed down for good, the leaders of the CORE group, negotiating with a representative of management or of the concessionaire, offered to suspend the sit-in if one cup of coffee were served to one Negro sitting at the counter. This simple request was refused, the main argument of this man being: "Why do you pick on us? After all, we're just little fellows."

The Byrons-Jackson's counter having closed down, we moved our demonstrations to Grant's five-and-dime store where Miami CORE had had previous sit-ins and

where there had been prior negotiation with management. These sit-ins were eminently successful, since we were joined by volunteers recruited at the mass meeting. Here too, day after day, parts of the counter were closed and finally all service had to be suspended. The manager of the counter was particularly vigilant to see that no fraternization occurred between counter-girls and CORE people. He even tried to provoke one of our women by using unseemly language to her.

Three days before the Institute closed, the manager of the Byrons-Jackson counter called us to ask for a negotiation session that day. As a result of the talks, management agreed to serve Negroes on a trial basis beginning the following Monday - the day after the Institute closed. Some Institute members felt that since the Institute was to be disbanded the day before, management was just stalling and would renege on its agreement. However, most Institute members left on Sunday happy in the belief that they had accomplished the opening of the first downtown lunch counter to Negroes. On Monday a test team went to the Bryons-Jackson counter. Service was refused.

This refusal launched local Miami CORE on a week of sit-ins at the counter. As many as eighty persons participated on a single day. After the group sat six days, management closed the counter down permanently. They actually removed the fixtures and went out of business rather than serve Negroes. As the chairman of Miami CORE expressed it, "Well, at least we're all equal now; now nobody eats."

While the sit-ins were in progress, other projects were also being carried out by the Institute. Aside from testing movies and transportation, as mentioned above, we engaged in considerable voter registration work under James T. McCain's direction. Even though not much time was allotted to registration, results of door-to-door canvassing showed that Negroes in Miami can be persuaded to register and vote -- to exercise the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.

In addition to two smaller open meetings, one mass meeting was planned and carried out under Rev. T. W. Foster, one of the Institute's directors. About six hundred people gathered. Rev. Shuttlesworth of Birmingham, Alabama, was the feature speaker.

In connection with running the Institute, there were several standing committees. The program committee functioned temporarily, and a strategy committee continued throughout the duration of the Institute.

And not to make Jack a dull boy, Mr. and Mrs. Milton Zoloth of Miami CORE entertained Institute members, and several other socials were held.

December, 1959

-- Susan Bodan

EVALUATION OF MIAMI ACTION INSTITUTE

Concept and Aims of the Institute

The Miami Action Institute had two main aims. One of these was training a number of people from various parts of the country in the use of peaceful direct action as a weapon to advance integration. The second was to speed up the attack on segregation in Miami already begun by CORE.

As we said in our announcement, it was the purpose of the Congress of Racial Equality, (CORE) in planning the Institute to point up the great need for training and for action on a community level. We hoped that Institute participants would learn by doing and that the discussions based on actual successes and failures experienced in action would give clarity to the concept of nonviolence which otherwise often remains vague.

Miami was chosen as the site of the Institute for several reasons. First, we already had a CORE group which was working to end segregation at lunch counters and in other public accommodations. Secondly, Miami is a far south city with some of the racial problems of the deep South, yet with a large population of northerners. This meant that varied action projects could be carried out with some popular support and that we would be able to give Institute members experience useful in border and northern states as well as the deep South. Furthermore, we were interested in a city where we could have an interracial living arrangement, and Miami could provide such an arrangement with comfortable surroundings.

With this description of the aims we had in view let us proceed to the details of planning for the work-shop and the actual way the Institute worked out. We hope in this way to be able to spot weaknesses, so that next year we can avoid at least some of them.

At the same time we do realize that each Institute will have its weaknesses and that each year we will make mistakes.

Preparatory Work

Miami CORE was organized in the late winter of 1959, during a field trip made by James T. McCain and Gordon R. Carey. The local contacts in the Miami area did a particularly good job of collecting people who could be interested in taking action for integration. After the CORE field secretaries had left and the Miami group was in operation, the National office was kept constantly informed of the details of the problems met. This was essential to us in order to be able to plan for the Institute. When we reached the decision that the Institute should be placed in the city of Miami, we had in our files sufficient material so that we knew what had been going on. Previously a short demonstration sit-in at Grant's was carried on three television stations in Miami and was also covered in the press. This meant that the name of CORE was familiar to many people living in the city.

Once the Institute had been decided upon and it had been definitely placed in the city of Miami, it was the duty of the National office to publicize the Institute, to raise the funds necessary to carry it on, and to select the participants. This was done through press releases to the Negro press and to some other newspapers, through letters to contacts in our local groups across the country, and through large mailings of the Institute announcement. This announcement was designed with two purposes in mind; first, it was to be used as a fund-raising piece of literature; second, it was to be used to interest people in participation in the Institute. It served both of these purposes fairly adequately.

The major difficulty with the Institute promotion was that the Institute was planned far too late, and the promotion came out too late. The material was sent to over 9,000 people on our National CORE list, and to over 50,000 people on other mailing lists. The mailing to our own list produced scholarships for most of those who became Institute members. This mailing was also the prime source of participants. The mailing to outside lists was only moderately successful. However, it did produce several inquiries from persons interested in attending. In August, James T. McCain, field secretary, attended part of the Southern Student Seminar and National Student Assembly in Champaign, Illinois. There he was successful in interesting several students in the Institute, and two of these people later participated full-time.

Selection of Participants

The success or failure of a venture of this kind depends primarily on those who participate in it. All our material tended to stress that courage was necessary and that participants must be willing to take part in action programs. It was made clear to all those who expressed interest that nothing short of devotion to full integration would be acceptable. We also stressed personal stability and indicated a preference for persons with some leadership experience at home. Age as such was not a major criterion.

A great deal of correspondence was carried on with those who indicated an interest in participation. References were asked for and checked. Where interest was expressed by persons living in the area of the National office, we insisted upon a personal interview. It is interesting that several persons who did indicate interest were rejected.

Nevertheless, selection of participants from across the country was done in major portion through correspondence, and correspondence leaves a good deal to be desired.

To some extent, therefore, we must credit luck as a factor in getting so high a caliber of individuals as participants.

Most participants were leadership types, and this contributed greatly to the effectiveness of the Institute. It must be added that it also contributed to the disagreements within the Institute itself. Ages ranged from the upper teens to the forties.

While scholarship aid was given to most of those who came to Miami, no aid was given on travel expenses. This, we think, is important: it means that no one will come to the Institute primarily for a vacation at someone else's expense.

To conclude, the major factor in correcting errors in the preparatory work for the next Institute is one of getting announcements out far in advance of the Institute so that plenty of time is available for selection of participants. This should help increase the number of applicants and enable us to screen more carefully.

FUNCTIONING OF THE INSTITUTE

This discussion will tend to emphasize the criticisms of the Institute, rather than the points on which it did well. After reading the evaluations of the various Institute participants I have attempted to list below the chief criticisms.

First, the directors of the Institute were not in Miami sufficiently well in advance to have the details worked out with the Miami CORE group. As the members of Miami CORE were not themselves in complete agreement on projects or on the tactics to be used in projects, and as Miami CORE had not yet developed a definite organizational framework for handling disagreements within its own group, the directors faced an unusual situation. The indicated solution for this problem is a clearer understanding with the local group in the area where the Institute is to be held next year. It will also be necessary for the Institute directors to be on the scene at least two weeks before the Institute begins.

Second, there was much too much discussion about unimportant details, and this was coupled with insufficient membership participation in such important matters as negotiations with management and project direction. The net effect of running all meetings as rather free discussions is repetitiveness and inefficiency. Almost without exception participants in the 1959 Institute asked that the 1960 Institute have a great deal more strong direction. One helpful suggestion is that all discussion start with a short statement which will give the participants the general field to be discussed. Then the chairman can limit the discussion within this general outline. Another important suggestion is that details such as where a project is to start and when it is to begin should be decided by the director or by a small committee. The membership will then be free to discuss important matters of policy and tactics rather than to haggle over time, place and minor details.

In the third place, there was a lack of coordination of the three directors and a lack of clear understanding of the area of responsibility of each director. James T. McCain took major responsibility for the voter registration canvass, Rev. T. W. Foster for the public meeting, and Gordon Carey for most aspects of the Institute. As negotiations were considered the primary responsibility of the Miami CORE group rather than the Institute, and as persons in the Miami group were not always in agreement, the job of directing the Institute became a particularly difficult one.

The solution for this problem in the coming year seems to indicate that there should be only one director for the Institute and that he should have assistants with specified areas of responsibility. The Institute should itself, have greater latitude in handling projects, without referring every decision to the local group.

In the fourth place, some of the participants felt they did not get a sufficient variety of types of projects. Most of the projects which the Institute worked on involved public accommodations: restaurants, lunch counters, taxi cabs, and theatres. The amount of testing done on projects of this type was most significant. The other major work done was in the field of house-to-house canvassing to get Negroes to register and vote. For the amount of time spent on the registration project the results were valuable, and several participants indicated they thought this was the most important phase of the Institute's work. As projects often take many months of preparation, with investigation, negotiation, and so forth, it is probably too much to expect to have a very wide variety of projects for any Institute. This criticism, however, should be kept in mind for future institutes so that we can give as much training as possible in a range of various projects. However, concentration on one project, when forces are not available for wider efforts, can yield good results in training and in achievement.

In the fifth place, there was some criticism of insufficient training in the theory of nonviolence. One suggestion made was that material should be sent to all Institute participants well in advance of their participation, so that they could read books and pamphlets and have a broader background to enrich the short time they spend at the Institute itself. Another suggestion made is that the evaluation discussion following a project should be generalized to cover other projects of the same type and to lead into a discussion of nonviolence itself. In this connection next year we shall ask several members of our National Advisory Committee to come down and lead discussions on the theory of nonviolence.

There is necessarily some tendency when involved in action projects to get so much concerned with the winning of the project that the technical points involved take precedence over the general application of the same technique in other areas of the country. This needs to be watched particularly in an Institute, for one of its major functions is to train its participants so that they can work more effectively when they return to their home communities.

On the public meeting, most of the work was done by Miami CORE members and by Rev. T. W. Foster. We failed to give Institute participants a real chance to tackle and learn from experience the difficulties of running a public meeting. However, much more time is needed in the preparation of a public meeting if inexperienced people are to use it as a workshop.

On publicity and releasing information to the press, again we failed to give general training to all Institute members. Several members with previous experience did work on press releases and leaflets. Good work was done. Perhaps for many releases which have to be made quickly, experienced workers are required. Nevertheless general training for the entire membership might readily be accomplished.

FROM THE EVALUATIONS MADE BY INSTITUTE MEMBERS

Harlan Randolph of Ohio State felt that the focus of the Institute was too close on the particular situations and projects and was not sufficiently generalized to other similar situations. He felt also that Miami CORE members did not participate sufficiently with members of the Institute. Chaired discussions tended to be diffuse and repetitive and he suggested that we have the lecture method first and then the discussion. "This method permits the objective of a discussion, the role of the participants, and the functions of the leader to be more sharply defined, and in this way restricts much of the rambling."

Mr. C. W. Cobb, Jr., of Virginia felt that the Institute was not sufficiently long. This resulted in the voter registration work being incomplete. Mr. Cobb felt that in addition to the door-to-door canvass of potential voters, participants should actually take potential registrants to the place of registration and see to it that they are registered. It seems obvious that we attempted to do too many things this year in two weeks, and the 1960 Institute is planned to last for three.

Don De Vault traced some of the disagreements between Institute members to the differences between pragmatic practitioners of nonviolence and those who emphasize nonviolence in more inclusive terms. Mr. De Vault obviously falls into the latter category (in spite of his genuine interest in practical application). His suggestion for theoretical discussion based on a debatable -- if not controversial -- psychological premise seems to me to be precisely what future Institutes should avoid. It would transpose discussion from the immediate project not to other similar projects but to a purely conceptual level. On such a level, unity among CORE people does not, and is not likely ever to exist.

Malcolm Nelson of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, thought the Institute was particularly good training in non-violent, direct action methods. On theory, however, he felt it was somewhat weak. One of his suggestions is a list of books to be read beforehand by the 1960 Institute participants. The mass meeting, which drew 500 people, was felt to be successful by Miami CORE, but Mr. Nelson felt that it was too small. Also, he felt it should have been more definitely aimed at recruiting membership for Miami CORE, and less aimed at general education. Mr. Nelson, who is white, made this interesting observation: "I know, far better than I did before, what it is to be a Negro in America."

In every evaluation, one of the points of praise is the smoothness of the interracial living arrangement. Miss Vera Williams, of St. Louis, Missouri, who has had considerable experience working with St. Louis CORE, says "I would like to say that the CORE Institute is the most wonderful idea National CORE could have dreamed of. It is one of the most fruitful experiences I have ever had. The Institute has proved that Negroes and whites can eat, work, and live together." Miss Williams goes on to say, "Actual participation in projects was more valuable to me than anything else. I feel that one can discuss CORE techniques all day, but cannot really see how it works until they are actually put into the situation."

Mrs. Estelle Wyckoff of Atlanta, Georgia says that interaction of personalities in any group produces difficulties. Therefore she advocates strong organizational controls to keep personality problems from destroying the group. She says "I felt that we accomplished a great deal in the Institute in the area of desegregation of places of public accommodation in Miami and that through these concrete accomplishments we reactivated the spirit of Miami CORE, and our own, in the knowledge that CORE techniques "do work" ... in a rather amazingly short period of time tremendous gains can be accomplished by a disciplined group. It was readily apparent, however, that the project of

desegregating Miami had been given precedence over everything else and that there really was not time to both train leaders and carry on such a project." Mrs. Wyckoff makes this interesting suggestion, "as well as a director, I would suggest another position which in group dynamics circles has been termed an 'objective leader'. His job is to record and evaluate the relationships and interaction of the members. rather than being involved in the discussion himself."

Newton J. Casper, of Los Angeles, California, felt that Institute members were not sufficiently utilized in negotiations or in the leadership of projects. The discussion meetings were wastefully rambling, particularly on small details, and the project experiences were not as varied as he desired. Nevertheless, he felt he was well justified in spending his brief vacation period at the Institute and spending the large transportation cost in coming to Miami from Los Angeles. He says, "I feel we gained much in emotional and spiritual discipline of meeting hostility and insult without replying in kind, and even - speaking for himself - in attaining some degree of compassion toward those who were moved to act in such manner toward us."

Mrs. Susan Bodan, of Brooklyn, New York, puts her finger on a problem which frequently faces CORE groups. This is the question of the interaction of negotiations with pressure of the type used in sit-ins. She says "I sensed an inconsistency in CORE's practice of its method of persuasion. On one hand CORE does exert pressure to accomplish its end; pressure where it hurts, namely, economic pressure, which is what a sit-in is -- though it is not only that. When CORE has pursued this course to the point where it has an advantage, should it not negotiate from this advantage? Seemingly it wishes to create the impression of being very moral people who do not press an advantage. I agree that CORE's forte is persuasion. However, when CORE has worked for an advantage and has it, why should it not, in perfect good faith, in friendly and per-

suasive manner, tell management that it will go more than half way but that it expects management also to give some earnest of good faith?" I think this points up the need for our CORE groups as well as for future Institutes to realize that public pressure and negotiation with management should go on simultaneously. There has been some tendency to feel that negotiation ceases when public pressure starts and that when public pressure has brought a temporary advantage that it may then be called off while negotiations are resumed. The fact is that the two go together and that it is CORE's emphasis upon direct action which leads us frequently to be successful in negotiations.

Another paragraph from Mrs. Bodan's evaluation may contain a suggestion for future institutes "We had a session one day when we dramatized possible on-the-spot developments in testing and sit-in projects. In acting out the parts, those participating and those looking on extended their understanding in this make-believe experience. Later discussion pinpointed the arguments of the opponents and suggested possible improvements in CORE members' conduct and argument. Such dramatizations might further be developed and used as a part of Institute training."

Like so many others, Mrs. Bodan's critical comments do not mean that she did not find the Institute valuable. Her concluding remark is "I would not have missed the Institute for anything." It is also significant that she is interested in attending the Institute again and has urged us to have the 1960 Institute in Miami.

In discussing the Institute with me, one of the directors, Rev. T. W. Foster, has suggested that future institutes should run on a fairly clear-cut daily schedule, outlined, insofar as possible, day by day in advance of the opening of the Institute.

Admittedly, the exigencies of project work will occasionally cause schedules to be washed out. But there seems to be no reason to allow Institute participants to alter the schedule to the extent that was done this past year. It is important to schedule a daily meeting of the director and his assistants, and it also seems very important to schedule at least one recreation period each day. Group recreation for one hour each day will tend to reduce the tensions which generate in any group which works so hard and so continuously.

Admittedly, the exigencies of project work will occasionally cause schedules to be washed out. But there seems to be no reason to allow Institute participants to alter the schedule to the extent that was done this past year. It is important to schedule a daily meeting of the director and his assistants, and it also seems very important to schedule at least one recreation period each day. Group recreation for one hour each day will tend to reduce the tensions which generate in any group which works so hard and so continuously.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE INSTITUTES

1. The most important single change needed is that national staff responsible for the Institute must do more preparatory work and some of this work must be done well in advance. This includes not only earlier promotional efforts on the part of the National office but also work on the scene where the Institute is to be held. One of the suggestions which seems feasible is to have two periods of local preparatory work. The first of these could be aimed toward getting projects under way in cooperation with the local CORE group if one exists.

2. Instead of having three directors, it seems that only one director is a better idea and that such a director should have assistants with definite areas of responsibility.

3. The Institute should have less of the forms of democracy and more of the substance. The director and his assistants should better keep in mind the several purposes of the Institute and should therefore be willing to make many decisions themselves. In any case, whatever is done is primarily their responsibility, and this cannot be escaped through the forms of a discussion held with Institute members. On the other hand, the Institute members are making sacrifices in coming to the place where the Institute is held and they are the raw material used in carrying out the projects. To give them adequate training in how a project is run, they need to be included in everything from selection of projects through the action itself and negotiating with management. In the 1959 Institute, many of the members apparently felt that too many of the ultimate decisions rested on the desires of Miami CORE.

4. National staff will spend more preparatory time at the place the Institute is held this year. There should be less dependence of the Institute on the local CORE group, and this should free Institute members to participate more fully in all the decisions having to do with projects.

It will therefore be highly desirable to have some full-time participants from the local CORE group. This will be essential to prevent a feeling of division between the Institute and the local CORE group. It is also important if the local CORE group is to carry through on the Institute projects. For many of the Institute projects will not be carried through to a final conclusion before the end of the Institute.

To accomplish both of these purposes, I suggest that we try to have at least two separate projects which reach the direct-action stage. One of these projects would be a local CORE project prepared for by the local group, in which the Institute, with its numbers, could give good support at the direct-action stage. Another project might be merely suggested by the local CORE group. Institute members would then have the opportunity to run the project from the very beginning, starting by the usual tests and carrying through the negotiation stage and into action.

5. Our next Institute will be held in 1960, an extremely significant year for voter registration work. This work should start at the very beginning of the Institute and should be greatly expanded over the work done in 1959. Potential registrants should be actually carried to the registration centers. Field secretary James T. McCain is well qualified to lead this project. In 1959, even without very much local cooperation, we were successful in voter registration work.

6. More varied project experiences: One of the projects we should attempt at the next Institute should deal with opening employment in a particular situation to Negroes. This kind of project is especially important, for employment projects are equally applicable, North and South, in any city where Negroes form a substantial element in the population. Use of public beaches, parks and so forth, might be a subsidiary project of interest, depending on the city selected for holding the Institute.

At the same time, we must restrict any Institute to a manageable number of projects -- even if this decreases variety.

7. Theory of non-violent direct action: We hope to broaden and deepen the understanding of non-violent direct action in the coming Institute. One idea is to have several of our advisory committee members come to the Institute for several days and lead discussions on this philosophy. At the same time we hope to keep the discussions of philosophy tied down to the specific projects in use -- so that each Institute member can see the limitations of theory when applied to a practical situation.

8. To increase the amount of education given to each Institute member, it is suggested that at least one session be run on how to write a press release. One idea is to have each person write a press release about the same information and then to have a directed discussion which will lead to a final release which will actually be sent out. This should give each member a chance to see how a press release should be developed, what should be put in, and what should be left out.

9. Public meeting: The 1959 Insitute was too short to allow the Institute members to have a great deal to do with the planning and carrying through of the public meeting. In 1960 several planning and work sessions of the Institute, preferably with help from the local CORE group, should be held. The aim of these sessions is to train local CORE members, as well as Institute people, in all the difficulties involved in a public meeting.

The aims of the public meeting should be three: first it should interest as many people as possible in the action project and in membership with the local CORE group. This function will help speed up the work against segregation in the local community.

Secondly it should raise funds to help carry on the Institute. Any Local community which receives the benefit of Institute work should be willing to help pay its expenses. Thirdly the public meeting should be aimed at gaining publicity for local CORE, for National CORE, and for the interracial action institute as a training project.

10. Procuring and selecting Institute participants: First we should be more concerned in getting a greater number of local CORE members to participate in the Institute. By local members, we mean not only members of the local CORE where the Institute is held, but also members from the various CORE groups across the country. People already active in their CORE groups are the ones who are sure to bring back from the Institute additional training and experience which will be helpful locally. Secondly our promotional material should be out very much earlier, and we should do more in the way of press releases on participation in the Institute. This should result in a greater number of applications for the Institute and therefore should permit us to be more selective in choosing those who participate. CORE's emphasis upon selectivity in accepting action participants grows out of the realization that the success of a project depends not only on how it is conducted but also on who participates -- a single undesirable participant can cancel the effectiveness of an action project.

We believe that the Interracial Action Institute is a project which is typical of CORE and which is very different from any other summer training opportunity. From the experience gained in 1959, we feel we can run a 1960 Institute which is more tightly organized and more fruitful to its members.

At the same time we know that any time we are involved in action, we shall make mistakes, and that through these mistakes the members of the Institute may learn a good deal. We may aim at perfection, but

we know that all we can get is progress toward our goal. We recognize that human beings are necessarily fallible, but we also believe that advances toward interracial justice can be made through direct non-violent action on specific projects.

The 1959 Institute --- though far from perfect --- was good. We hope that the 1960 Institute will be larger and better.

We want to thank, on behalf of National CORE, all those who participated in the Institute and those others who made this project possible.

January 20, 1960

James R. Robinson