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At the corner of Queen Street and King Street in downtown Lancaster stands the defunct shell of a once thriving department store. The Watt & Shand building rises four stories above Penn Square, which is the intersection of the city’s major North/South and East/ West arteries. The Watt & Shand company no longer supplies Lancastrians with their clothing and household goods. Many residents have since sought out suburban shopping malls to accommodate their needs. Until J.C. Penny hired an African American sales clerk in 1963, every single sales position in the major department stores in Lancaster’s downtown was filled by a white person. The building that remains represents more than just a period of a bustling city; it is also part of a history of discrimination and inequality evident in a place far removed from the country’s Jim Crow South.

Right down the street from the empty department store building lies an open square located on North Queen Street. In an effort to revitalize the downtown victimized by suburbanization and white flight, Lancaster city officials work to formulate creative means that would draw people back to the city. One proposition has been to put the carousel from Rocky Springs amusement park in the square. While some residents view the carousel with nostalgia and symbol of a simpler time, the underlying racial implications resonate strongly with black Lancastrians. Longtime resident Ron Ford, and a former County Commissioner, recalls that each summer his family, along with hundreds of other black Pennsylvanians, traveled to the amusement park for the annual Coatesville Picnic. One thing perpetually missing from the day was the swimming pool. Ford recalls a sign that hung on the gate of the pool that read, “Closed for Repairs.”
While the grounds of the park were completely integrated, the swimming pool remained strictly closed to African Americans.\(^1\) During protests, demonstrators expressed discontent with the policy and some carried placards that read, “We Feel the Heat Too.” Leroy Hopkins, a Civil Rights protestor and professor at Millersville University, found this situation ironic. Many of the rides in the park encouraged close contact between patrons. He states, “It was okay to push up against each other on the rides, but blacks could not swim with whites.”\(^2\) The presence of the Rocky Springs carousel would in essence be a celebration of a place that consciously practiced racism. Ron Ford agreed when he said, “I never felt excited about that, [the carousel]. Maybe it is because it was a reminder [of the segregated pool].”\(^3\) Lancaster’s experience of discrimination and the fight to end it remains a hidden part of the city’s history.

Most Americans perceive that the Civil Rights Movement took place in the South, where segregation was enforced by law. However, areas in the North, such as Lancaster Pennsylvania, also worked to ensure equal rights for black Americans. During the hot summer months of 1963, residents fought to end discrimination practices with a series of demonstrations in order to protest the obvious racism in the city. Interviews with Lancaster’s civil rights activists reveal that the movement in Lancaster was only partly successful. For each contentious issue—equal employment and access to public accommodations—the Civil Rights Movement in Lancaster can claim some success. But this thesis shows that the legacy of Lancaster’s civil rights protests is mixed. Many employers and business-owners offered effective resistance to integration, but civil rights
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1 Ron Ford, Personal Interview, December 7, 2005.
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activists claim other victories, including winning more popular support for integration and creating county facilities open to whites and blacks. Using seven oral histories, this thesis examines the goals of nondiscriminatory hiring and open public accommodations as well as the changes—large and small—that grew out of this turbulent summer.

Using the oral history methodology may pose a few limitations on the study. Since the interviews took place a number of years since the actual events, individual accounts may have changed over time, or memories may have become unclear. Also, during the course of an interview, an interviewee might lead the historian to believe her or his individual role as more important than it may have been. Finally, locating a willing population that will reveal significant trends and results could also limit the study. Despite these problems, oral histories still remain a rich source in the discovery of civil rights history.

The only way to evaluate fairly just how much progress was made in Lancaster is to examine, first, the goals of the movement. One goal was to obtain fair hiring practices in the city’s department stores in an effort to promote African American economic opportunity. The hiring of African Americans as department store sales clerks did not immediately take place. However, this does not mean that the entire movement was a failure. Interviews reveal that just bringing attention to the issues meant that efforts did succeed.

A second goal of civil rights activists was the opening of public accommodations to African Americans. Again, the success in this area was limited. In one sense, the
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protests did succeed because the county opened an integrated pool in 1967.\textsuperscript{5} And it was more difficult for white-only pools to remain open. Rocky Springs, for example, closed its doors to the public following the 1963 demonstrations. The following summer, owners of the Rocky Springs swimming pool rented it to the Lancaster Lodge 299, Loyal Order of Moose and it was only accessible to “members of the Moose and Women of the Moose and their families.”\textsuperscript{6} On the other hand, blacks did not gain access to the exact pools they sought to enjoy. Instead each pool found inventive ways to perpetuate discrimination. For example, Brookside and Maple Grove converted to private membership pools that made patrons undergo an admissions process, and the owners could deny membership to any candidates they wished.\textsuperscript{7}

Another important element to examining the Civil Rights movement in Lancaster is identifying the major players. Churches were responsible for a great deal of the activity both before and during the summer of 1963. White churches included Trinity Lutheran Church and the United Unitarian Church. Bethel A.M.E. was the major black church essential to furthering civil rights in Lancaster. In each instance, church members who protested also had liberal ideologies. Black and whites churches combined their networks to form a coalition with the same goals, but with very different motivations.

Blacks saw the Northern resistance about which historian Arnold Hirsch writes.\textsuperscript{8} Hirsch claims that the Northern cities resisted integration with the same or more vigilance as their Southern counterparts. For example, the Lancaster pools remained segregated in

\textsuperscript{6} Intelligencer Journal, “City Moose lodge rents Rocky pool for summer.” May 27, 1964.
\textsuperscript{7} Intelligencer Journal, “City Moose lodge rents Rocky pool for summer.” May 27, 1964.
the summer of 1963, whereas Atlanta, Georgia, mandated integrated swimming pools that same summer. The Lancaster Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement for Colored People also observed Lancaster’s persistence in resisting integration. An open letter to the *Intelligencer Journal* stated,

That this method [demonstrations] of seeking justice offers very real prospect of success, is attested to by the significant advances made throughout the nation in the past year. This progress, however, has not been as apparent in Lancaster as it has been elsewhere. Negroes can now swim, for instance, in Atlanta, GA., but not in Lancaster.10

White activists cited the passivity of black groups and decided that in order for change to occur, they had to initiate reform and encouraged blacks to take part in the efforts.11 Theologian Gabriel Fackre writes that because Lancaster was a medium sized city, such a coalition was successful.12 In larger metropolitan areas, such a coalition was often unsuccessful because more people became involved in the efforts and, in turn, led to arguments within the group. In Fackre’s analysis of why the coalition worked, he explains the role of whites as a resource to blacks. He states, “Throughout the… struggle, whites saw their function as supportive and secondary. It came in form and…general availability when needed and sought after by Negro leadership.”13 However, some black protestors saw the white involvement as paternalistic, rather than an equal partnership of
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white and black activists. Lancaster demonstrates that an individual’s network certainly influenced the decision to protest, but, in some cases, how individuals perceived the networks to which they did not belong could also be a source of motivation. The participants in the Civil Rights Movement in Lancaster were part of a coalition that fought for racial justice, but did not exist completely independent of racial tensions.

**History of Segregation in Lancaster**

Lancaster has a long history of segregation. Between the years of 1880 and 1950, blacks made up only two percent of the population. In the areas of employment, housing, and entertainment African Americans experienced harsh discrimination. Historian Thomas Winpenny suggests that, as early as 1880, “roughly half of the Negro male labor force earned less than the average non-farm worker.” Black women earned even less because they did not have the opportunity to work in areas outside of domestic service.

This trend of unfair employment and wage discrepancies between blacks and whites continued into the next century. Ron Ford asserts that his own parents could not obtain jobs outside of menial labor. During the 1940s, his father held two janitorial jobs, one at the Sears department store and the other at a local bank. Longtime Lancaster
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resident Nelson Polite Sr.’s experience with Lancaster’s segregated employment practices supports this notion. He remembers that blacks were not allowed to gain positions in Lancaster’s local factories, such as Armstrong and RCA.\textsuperscript{19} A third African American resident, Leroy Hopkins, remembers similar experiences with his own family. His father gained employment by working as a domestic laborer for a prominent white family, the Fultons, while his mother ran the elevator in the Woolworth building.\textsuperscript{20} The elevator position held more regard since it required direct interaction with whites. Mr. Hopkins points to his mother’s very light complexion as the main reason she was able to hold the job. Hopkins, born in the early 1940s, recalled that the only jobs downtown for blacks when he was growing up were shoe-shine boys. He can remember shopping with his mother and having only white women wait on him.\textsuperscript{21} The department stores downtown did in fact hire African Americans, but as Ron Ford asserted, only in the capacity of service jobs away from customers. Watt & Shand and Hager’s had blacks on their payrolls as maids, janitors, and elevator operators. The stores claimed that there were only white sales clerks because blacks did not apply for the positions. The NAACP refuted this claim later by producing copies of actual applications submitted by black job seekers.\textsuperscript{22} Blacks found very little opportunity for white-collar employment in downtown Lancaster.

Housing in the city of Lancaster has also been a source of racial tension. Winpenny demonstrates that blacks in Lancaster were prohibited from buying houses in

\textsuperscript{19} Nelson Polite, Sr. Personal Interview, December 12, 2005.
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\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} Intelligencer Journal, “NAACP planning for more downtown demonstrations.” July 22, 1963, 4.
certain areas of the city, because they were too expensive. Before the turn of the twentieth century, blacks earned less than whites, and were forced to look for housing in areas were they could afford it.\textsuperscript{23} Much of the housing compatible with an average African American’s income was located in the Seventh Ward of the city.\textsuperscript{24} The seventh ward came to be known as the “Ward” and was a reference to the majority black population who resided there. Other areas of the city may have been affordable for the average African American, but housing remained segregated. The Sixth Ward, the Cabbage Hill Section, was home largely to lower middle-class German whites. Robert Pfannebecker, who grew up in this neighborhood, recalls the extent to which he was isolated. Referring to the Manor Street neighborhood he states, “You weren’t thrown together with a lot of people socially or otherwise.”\textsuperscript{25} While the Seventh Ward was generalized as the black section of the city to people who resided elsewhere, those who actually lived there recalled a diverse, tight knit neighborhood. Leroy Hopkins asserts that there were different ethnic groups such as Russian Jews and Italians that resided in the neighborhood. This section of the city was later renamed the Southeastern section in order to eliminate the negative connotations associated with the “Ward.” \textsuperscript{26}

Housing in Lancaster remained segregated well into the twentieth century. In the late 1950s, Mayor Bare appointed a Citizen Housing Committee to evaluate the city’s housing needs. The Committee reported that much of the southeast quadrant was dilapidated and harmful to the residents who lived there. Other observations included the severe shortage of affordable housing in the city. When the 1957 Redevelopment

\textsuperscript{24} Schuyler, A City Transformed, 129.
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Authority formed, they recognized housing as a crucial element to the renewal of Lancaster. To improve the housing situation, especially in the southeast quadrant, old stock had to be torn down and those residents had to be displaced. In order to fund the construction of new housing for the displaced residents, the school board was asked to accept a compromise in lieu of property tax. The school board fought the compromise arguing that the best way to fund public housing was through private investment and not public money. When the school board did allow for a compromise with the Redevelopment Authority, displaced minorities were not promised housing outside of the “Ward,” and so they just moved to houses on the outer ring of the development area. In effect, the Redevelopment Authority did little to improve the segregated residential conditions in Lancaster.27

Pennsylvania enacted civil rights legislation in 1887 and 1939 that specifically stated the people should not be excluded from public accommodations on account of color. However, Lancaster business owners did not adhere to the laws. 28 An example of exclusion because of race happened in places of public accommodations throughout the city, including the Fulton Opera House. Again, because of limited funds, but also due to local customs, African Americans remained separate from whites. Usually blacks sat in the balcony seats of the theater away from white patrons.29 By placing all the seats other than the balcony out of the economic reach of the majority black patrons, the Fulton practiced an informal but nonetheless effective form of segregation.

27 Schuyler, A City Transformed, 123-150.
29 Ibid., 58.
Segregation continued in places of public entertainment well into the twentieth century. In the 1950s in one Pennsylvania movie theater two African Americans were actually arrested after they maintained their right to sit where they wished.\textsuperscript{30} Students from Lincoln University requested to sit in a section usually reserved for whites at an Oxford, Pennsylvania, movie house and two policemen arrested them. The Federal district court in Pennsylvania ruled in favor of the students when it stated,

Let us hope that a larger measure of toleration all around, permitting the working out of the law of affinity which generally associates persons together as individuals and groups will produce a better understanding and greater good will than compulsion based merely on the pigment under the skin or on creed or nationality.

Rocky Springs Amusement Park first experienced racial problems in 1948, when the Congress of Industrial Organizations held a picnic on the grounds. When the owner, Joseph Figari refused to allow two black picnickers into the Park swimming pool the men brought suit against the proprietor.\textsuperscript{31} Convicted in County Court, Figari appealed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, but lost in this court as well. Figari argued that he had the right to deny the African American patrons access to the swimming pool, because that exact term was not included in the Act of Assembly, and thus, was not violating the 1939 Act of Assembly law. This law stated,

Whoever, being the owner, lessee, proprietor, manager, superintendent, agent or employee of any… place [of public accommodation, resort or amusement], directly or indirectly refuses, withholds from, or denies to,


any person any accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges thereof… on account of race, creed, or color… is guilty of a misdemeanor.\textsuperscript{32}

However, the appellant court decided, that while the words swimming pool was not specifically cited in the law, amusement park was found. As a result any facility within the park was required to uphold the law.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Why the summer of 1963?}

Despite state legislation requiring equal access to public accommodations and court rulings upholding the laws, segregation persisted in Lancaster. Robert Pfannebecker, a prominent Lancaster lawyer, describes the 1948 court case regarding Rocky Springs and discrimination as similar to getting a traffic ticket. He stated, “My sense of it is it’s like somebody getting fined for going through a stop sign. It doesn’t mean you can’t go through a stop sign the next time.”\textsuperscript{34} By the summer of 1963 residents decided it was time to demonstrate against the injustices. They marched in front of the Watt & Shand and Rocky Springs Park to protest hiring exclusion and separated swimming based on race. What was it about these three months that gave rise to one of the most active time period in Lancaster’s Civil Rights history? The catalysts behind these demonstrations are the combination of national activities and local developments.

Several changes spurred the Civil Rights movement to come into fruition. The first of these triggers was the United States involvement in World War II. Americans’ sensitivity to domestic racism heightened because thousands of soldiers fought to end it

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{34} Robert Pfannebecker, Personal Interview, March 23, 2006.
abroad. David Reimers explains, “One reason Americans paid increasing attention to the race problem at home during the war was that they were fighting Nazi Germany, the power that glorified fraudulent racist doctrines.”\textsuperscript{35} Not only was there a greater awareness of racial issues, but also with Germany’s defeat, there was a reassertion of the belief in equality. Furthermore, the horrors of concentration camps showed just what could become of white supremacist beliefs.\textsuperscript{36} Those who openly expressed a white supremacist ideology declined significantly after the war, and there was a less hostile environment in which civil rights could be discussed.\textsuperscript{37}

A second factor that created favorable conditions for change was the increasing size and role of the federal government. The federal government expanded into citizens’ everyday lives in areas like minimum wage, highway construction, and tax collection.\textsuperscript{38} Since the government could bring these types of changes to an ordinary American life, some believed that it would also have the power to improve racial problems.\textsuperscript{39} Lancaster felt the Washington’s power when factories such as Armstrong and RCA received contracts from the federal government during World War II. One stipulation of the contract was that the factories must begin hiring African Americans. Nelson Polite Sr. reports that his own wife got a job with RCA because of such an agreement.\textsuperscript{40}

A third development that encouraged the civil rights movement was the activism on the part of churches leading up to and throughout the 1960s. Religion has had deep
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connections with race in America. During the nineteenth century, abolitionists began to seek an end to slavery in the South. They called Southerners barbaric and unchristian. In order to both defend their institution and their history, Southerners started to justify slavery as a paternalistic and very Christian organization. They used passages in the Bible to prove that the Christian god approved of slavery. Ironically, it was Christian churches, both white and black denominations that later sought an end to discrimination.

The National Council of Churches, established in 1950, created a coalition of different faiths and denominations. This organization was “a principal inheritor of the tradition of social activism that had animated liberal Protestantism in its early days.” However, the NCC did not make any real attempts towards action during the early 1960s. Some white protestant churches had always played a central role in social justice and politics ranging from abolition of slavery to prohibition in the Progressive era. Their ambivalence towards civil rights was a departure such a tradition. Findlay points to Martin Luther King as one of the crucial factors that helped change white liberal churches’ attitudes toward improving civil rights. In *A Letter from a Birmingham Jail*, King wrote, “If today’s church does not recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early church it will lose its authenticity, forfeit the loyalty of millions, and be dismissed as an irrelevant social club with no meaning for the 20th century.” In essence, King charged white religious leaders with the responsibility of pursuing civil rights. Some took to the
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pulpit and preached to their congregations, others lobbied in the capital for legislation, and still others encouraged church members to use grass roots activism, such as letter writing, to promote change.\(^{47}\) These letters revealed that one reason religious groups were so supportive civil rights movement and pending legislation was largely because of the inherent moral implications.\(^{48}\)

As the country experienced gradual changes, the civil rights movement began to take shape in very visible ways. The first successful battle of the civil rights movement took place in Baton Rouge, Louisiana in June 1953.\(^{49}\) Fighting against segregated buses, which were mainly financed by black patrons, blacks boycotted the use of the city’s buses.\(^{50}\) The following year, the Supreme Court handed down the *Brown v. the Board of Education, Topeka Kansas*. This landmark court victory came about because of the hard work and planning in the years prior to the decision. From 1950-1952, the NAACP filed court cases in South Carolina, Virginia, Kansas, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.\(^{51}\) In each case the courts ruled that the *Plessy v. Ferguson* precedent of separate but equal accommodations should be followed in the schools; essentially segregation was justified.\(^{52}\) The NAACP appealed each case, and finally the Supreme Court released its decision against segregation on May 17, 1954.\(^{53}\)

A decision like *Brown* carried radical implications for the future of the Civil Rights movement. Blacks and whites, Northerners and Southerners, all interpreted the
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ruling’s impact differently. Whereas the importance of the ruling did not reach white northerners, blacks and Southerners found Brown very significant. For example, Robert Pfannebecker, a young white Lancastrian who had graduated from Franklin and Marshall College during the same month as Brown was rendered, does not feel especially connected with the event. He states, “I don’t have any recollection of it being a big deal.” As the years after the ruling passed, blacks did not see any drastic efforts to desegregate schools. Instead, attention turned to things that the courts could not immediately fix, for example public accommodations. In order to ensure equal access to public accommodations, the Supreme Court would have to rule that the Constitution bans segregation in privately owned places of public accommodation. Civil rights activists wanted new laws and so they tried to get Congressional attention in the protest of public accommodations.55

White Southerners saw the decision as a federal imposition on their local rights, as education came under state discretion. However, those who opposed integration found some comfort in the Supreme Court decision. The Court articulated the difficulties in implementing integration because of “great variety of local conditions.” Politically, whites in the South polarized between segregation and integration, thus ending any ideologically moderate platforms.57 Historian Kevin Kruse explains that Southern whites divided mainly along class lines. He writes,
Court ordered desegregation, instead of closing the old divide between blacks and whites, actually aggravated a new one between classes of whites. In the eyes of working-class whites, the desegregation of public spaces was nothing short of a disaster. To the shock of working-class whites, who had long assumed that all white southerners stood united in support of segregation, upper class whites not only went along with court-ordered desegregation but then had the gall to brag about it.\textsuperscript{58}

White supremacist social organizations also mobilized after \textit{Brown}. Aldon Morris concludes that groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the American States Rights Association turned to “violence and terror.”\textsuperscript{59} These tactics were used during the 1955 lynching of Emmett Till, a fourteen year-old northern boy visiting Mississippi. His castration and lynching after he whistled at a white woman demonstrated how passionate some white Southerners felt about maintaining a culture of segregation.

The fight for civil rights reform continued in 1957 when President Eisenhower called the National Guard to Little Rock, Arkansas in order protect nine black children as they registered in a white high school.\textsuperscript{60} In 1960, four students bravely sat down at a Woolworth’s counter that was reserved for whites in Greensboro, North Carolina. They chose Woolworth’s because it was a national chain and protests there could bring a great

\textsuperscript{58} Kruse, \textit{White Flight}, 107.
\textsuperscript{59} Morris, \textit{The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement}, 29.
deal of attention to the Southern stores discrimination practices.\textsuperscript{61} Sit-ins, and boycotts continued in the early years of the movement, which eventually led to arrests and riots.

Presently, most literature focuses on the fight to end the blatant discriminatory practices in the Southern section of the country. However, in order to fully understand the Civil rights movement in Lancaster, it is important to remember that opposition to the movement extended above the Mason-Dixon Line. Arnold Hirsch studied Trumball Park, a public housing project located in Chicago. The overwhelmingly white neighborhood surrounding the project, South Deering, was alarmed at the prospect of blacks choosing to live in Trumball Park. Since it was illegal to prohibit blacks from moving in, residents took part in what Hirsch termed “massive resistance” during the 1950s.\textsuperscript{62} Historian Thomas Sugrue reveals similar behavior in Northern cities. Sugrue’s study on Detroit after World War II demonstrates that working class whites desperately tried to keep blacks from moving into white neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{63}

Part of this massive resistance was the denial of the rights of blacks in the area of public accommodations. Hirsch’s research shows that Northern whites used means to perpetuate segregation such as intimidation or the search for legal loopholes. While the Trumball Park residents used violence to enforce segregation, Lancastrians were more subtle. The 1939 Pennsylvania Act of Assembly prohibited discrimination in public

facilities on account of race. However, owners claimed their clubs were private and not open to the general public. Rocky Springs’ owners first used this tactic in 1948, when the CIO brought a suit against them because African Americans were denied access to the swimming pool during an annual picnic. The eventual realization that access to public facilities should be available to everyone led to the desegregation movement in Lancaster during 1963.

According to sociologist Sidney Tarrow, social movements arise when certain conditions are met. Under his theoretical framework, the key components of a protest cycle involve heightened conflict, geographic diffusion, and the appearance of new organizations or reformed older groups. According to Tarrow heightened conflict happens when “the magnitude of conflictual collective action rises appreciably above what is typical both before and after.” Geographic diffusion occurs when protest activity spreads from large metropolitan areas or places heavy industry in areas that are more rural or have a light industry. As more collective action takes place in more diverse areas, people begin to join together in an effort to perpetuate a social movement. Oftentimes, people do not fully agree on methods or even goals of social movements. So, a variety of organizations form, or reconsider goals in order to accommodate all those interested in the movement.
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Increased collective action was clearly evident in Birmingham, Alabama, during the spring of 1963. Martin Luther King and leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference decided on Birmingham both because of the resources the SCLC had there and because the city represented the epicenter of racism in the United States. The civil rights workers set out to achieve the goals of “desegregation of lunch counters and other public facilities, fair hiring practices, dropping of all charges against demonstrators, reopening of parks and playground that the city had closed rather than comply with federal court order’s of integration, and appointment of a biracial commission to set up a timetable for the desegregation of public schools.”

On April 3, 1963, demonstrations began at lunch counters, department stores, and drugstores. Activity intensified with marches on the City Hall and kneel-ins at white churches. In a matter of two weeks, almost one thousand people were jailed as a result of protest activity in Birmingham. One month after the initial protests began thousands of students were attacked by fire hoses, dogs, and clubs when the set out on the day’s demonstrations. Inroads were finally made as Northern economic interests began to be affected by the protests. On May 7th businessmen and movement leaders reached agreements on the issues at stake, and a massive riot was avoided. Because thousands of people became involved in the protests against segregation in Birmingham, the level of collective action rose substantially over what had taken place before 1963.

Similarly, the city of Atlanta saw increased pressure to integrate its public accommodations, particularly its swimming pools, in the early summer of 1963. The
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district court of Atlanta ordered the city to desegregate all of its recreational spaces in 1962 and again in 1963. Pool integration was viewed as the most controversial because of the intimacy swimming implies. A common notion among whites held that blacks were unclean and carried venereal diseases. A healthy white was apprehensive about swimming in common waters. Despite fears of sharing water, Atlanta first opened its newly desegregated its pools the June of 1963. However, once pools opened to blacks, whites that could afford to go to a private membership pool did so, and white attendance at the cities’ pools plummeted.  

The summer of 1963 in Lancaster could be considered a peak year in Tarrow’s model of protest cycles. This summer saw more “confictual collective action” than any other time period. The marches on the department stores in combination with the protests at Rocky Springs brought more people together and produced tangible, non-violent action. While earlier efforts towards achieving civil rights brought together smaller groups of people, this particular summer involved both the key elements of heightened protests and a greater number of participants that parallel Tarrow’s stipulation about heightened collective action.

In the mid 1950s, a group of about thirty concerned Lancastrians joined together and called themselves the Freedoms Committee. The goal of the group was the promotion of civil rights in the city. Founders included Charles Holzinger, professor emeritus at Franklin and Marshall College, Gabriel Fackre, a professor of Christian ethics at Lancaster Theological Seminary, and Ruth Van Horn, who taught chemistry at Franklin and Marshall. According to Holzinger, members were “invested with the desire to

improve racial relations.” He states that members of the group included, “liberal-minded individuals from RCA, Franklin and Marshall College, and the Lancaster Theological Seminary.” Robert Pfannebecker had a contrasting view of the group: he described members as bedrock Republicans or at least semi-conservative. His observations may have stemmed from the large number of religious people in the group. Not only did the Lancaster Theological Seminary provide membership, but so did the Unitarian Church and Quaker Meeting, however the latter two groups are generally considered very liberal. While the classification of ideologies varies, both Pfannebecker and Holzinger agree that the group recognized that something needed to be done with regards to racial tensions in Lancaster.

The first step the Freedoms Committee took was to take legal action in efforts to integrate the area’s swimming pools. They wanted to do “something dramatic and tangible,” and the pool project would produce the exact results for which they were looking. Next, the Committee took was to recruit a young Lancaster resident and graduate of Franklin and Marshall College and the University of Pennsylvania law school, Robert Pfannebecker. Pfannebecker had a heightened sensitivity to prejudices because he served his lawyer’s apprenticeship under a Jewish attorney named Jacques Geisenberger. It was with Geisenberger that Pfannebecker saw, first-hand, that even highly educated professionals held prejudices. Geisenberger was not invited to join the Hamilton Club because of his religion, and Pfannebecker recognized the injustice of the situation.
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Pfannebecker’s role in the Freedom’s Committee pool desegregation campaign closely mirrors Tarrow’s model for the diffusion of social movements. The first instance of diffusion occurred when Pfannebecker ventured from the small city of Lancaster to the major metropolitan center in Philadelphia for law school. Pfannebecker states that he “went to Philadelphia and got radicalized.”77 As a student in West Philadelphia, he witnessed a growing liberal sentiment and saw the “ferment” rising in the city.

After returning to Lancaster and becoming involved in the Freedoms Committee’s pool campaign, Pfannebecker turned once again to nearby Philadelphia. He researched a case decided in Philadelphia entitled *Everett v. Harren* decided on January 3, 1955.78 The case involved a Philadelphia pool owner who refused to admit blacks, because, he maintained his facility was a private club and could exclude at will.79 The decision rendered stated, “Whoever, being an owner, lessee, manager, superintendent, agent or employee of any such place, directly or indirectly refuses…any person, any of the accommodations… on account of race…is guilty of a misdemeanor.”80 The case provided Pfannebecker and the Freedoms Committee with not only an example of how to prove segregation at the local pools, but also the legal precedent on which the case could be brought forth.81

From *Everett*, Pfannebecker learned that the prosecution garnered evidence against the defendant by utilizing a sandwich scheme. The plan called for the participation of three groups. First, a white family entered the pool and gained admission.
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Next, a black group entered, but instead of gaining admission was asked to fill out an application and informed that they would not be allowed to swim until their application was approved. The last part of the sandwich was a second white family that easily entered the swimming area, just as the first family. 82

On June 11, 1960, the Freedoms’ Committee members executed the scheme three times in order to prove that Lancaster’s pools practiced discrimination. 83 At each of the three pools in the area, Rocky Springs, Brookside, and Maple Grove, white members of the Freedoms Committee and three black duos tried to gain admittance to the pools in the sandwich pattern. In each instance, the African Americans were barred entry. Because the pools claimed they were semi-private, each had fake admissions policies. This guise attempted to show that the pool’s private status allowed them a greater degree of selectivity. However, the policies were illegal if they discriminated on the basis of color. At Rocky Springs, which was not a membership pool, managers of the pool relied on a “Members Only” sign when African Americans tried to gain admittance. Apparently, the membership sign went unnoticed as long as a patron was white. 84

Pfannebecker eventually won a favorable decision for the Freedoms Committee, but not before much opposition from the defense lawyers. Pfannebecker faced some of the best lawyers in the city on these cases. One of the tactics the defense used was to have the case thrown out on the grounds that the blacks entrapped the owners. The defense claimed that the plaintiffs “did not apply for admission to the pool out of a desire to swim there, but pursuant to a preconceived plan, to entrap the defendant into violation of a
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penal statute.” 85 Judge Joseph Wissler failed to uphold the entrapment objection and later decided the case in favor of Pfannebecker. 86 During the court battles Pfannebecker remembers feeling some nervousness, but refused to be intimidated because he felt, “the issues were too important.” 87

One of the pool cases, Lackey v. Sacoolas was appealed all the way up through the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. This was the suit brought against the owners of Maple Grove. It was not decided until June of 1963. However, from 1960, or the time the cases were first brought to court until the decision of Lackey, none of the pools changed their discrimination policies. Even after the highest court in the state ruled against segregated swimming facilities, Lancaster pools continued to bar blacks from swimming with whites. Citizens in Lancaster learned, as did the black school children of the South, that the courts could not guarantee equal access to public accommodations just because a court ruled against discrimination.

Finally, Tarrow’s social movement model discusses the creation of new organizations or the revamping of old organizations. In the same year that Lancaster’s Freedoms Committee sued the local swimming pools, the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People reorganized its chapter in Lancaster. 88 The group first secured a charter in 1923, but went through a period of
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inactivity until 1960.\textsuperscript{89} One of the group’s earliest protests proved modest; the NAACP called for a boycott of the concessions at Rocky Springs Amusement Park.\textsuperscript{90} Such activities were deemed conservative; both by Lancaster residents and the country at large.\textsuperscript{91} Gabriel Fackre agreed that the NAACP was not doing enough to promote civil rights in the city. Prior to 1963, he said, “there was a lot of talking going on but little action.”\textsuperscript{92}

As a national institution, the NAACP was often criticized on the grounds that it was not aggressive enough. Founded in 1909, the NAACP was organized to seek equal rights for people of color.\textsuperscript{93} In the first five decades of its existence, the organization used persuasion and legal action as its primary vehicle for change.\textsuperscript{94} As they won victories in the Northern cities surrounding its headquarters in New York City, the NAACP spread throughout the country, especially into the South. In 1956, the organization voted to incorporate direct action tactics as a part of its strategies for seeking equality.\textsuperscript{95} Direct action tactics include sit-ins, boycotts, and protests all carried out in a non-violent way.\textsuperscript{96} One of the benefits of direct action was that it involved more people than court action, where only the lawyers could participate.\textsuperscript{97}
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In 1963, the Lancaster NAACP elected new leadership, and the organization began, as Tarrow states, “to adjust their discourse to reflect a broader, more aggressive stance.” 98 Kenneth Bost was elected President of the group, and vowed to “turn over every stone of segregation in Lancaster County.” 99 Bost was first alerted to the racial prejudices in the city when he tried to gain housing outside of the Seventh Ward, and a real estate agent denied him the opportunity. 100 The leadership in the NAACP emphasized a more aggressive stance by sponsoring peaceful protests to promote African American status, in contrast to the beginning years of the NAACP’s existence, when little protest activity took place.

Motivations to Protest

The summer of 1963 was fundamental in changing the practices of discrimination in Lancaster city. After a series of meetings with local department store owners, the NAACP concluded that it was necessary to both demonstrate outside of the stores and to abstain in protest from purchasing any items. The initial plan was to protest three department stores, but when the Garvin’s department store officials alerted the NAACP that the store was in the process of training an African American clerk, the store was eliminated from the protest plans. 101 The stores that remained in the protest plans were Watt and Shand and Hager’s Bros. 102

The local chapter of the NAACP contacted Dr. Gabriel Fackre, who taught Christian ethics at the Lancaster Theological Seminary and who was also a member of
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the Freedoms Committee, in hopes to expand the numbers of protesters. The goal of the
demonstration was to “focus attention on the lack of opportunities for non-whites in
Lancaster County.” One protestor articulated the injustices in hiring policies when he
said, “We are tired of being the second rate citizens of Lancaster.”

Before setting out to the protest, members of the NAACP met at the Bethel AME
Church, located at Strawberry and North Streets. Here they received guidance and
instruction from officers of the local chapter. President Kenneth Bost emphasized the
peaceful nature of the protests. Those who had participated in other protests around the
country also focused on the non-violence aspect of the protests. Miss Diane King told the
meeting, “There are two things I see that link you to all the other places. You are a group
of concerned citizens interested in making a change in the community and the means you
want to use is non-violence. Non-violence says we’re not out to defeat you; we’re out to
win you.”

The protests at the local department stores were, according to Gab Fackre, “the
first real effort to bring awareness to Lancaster.” The demonstrations at the department
stores were initiated after demonstrations against the Rocky Springs swimming pool were
postponed. While the purpose of the marchers at the department store was more
economically focused, the pickets at the swimming pools hoped to end the discriminatory
practices there. Picketing was not the first option of the NAACP however. The
Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission was notified of the alleged discrimination at
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the pool, asked to evaluate the situation, and reach an agreement with the pool. When an agreement could not be reached, the NAACP decided that further action was necessary and they devised a plan for a peaceful weekend picket along the fence of the swimming pool. \(^{107}\)

The participants in both types of demonstrations came from a variety of backgrounds. Some were high school or college students, while others were middle-aged members of the Bethel church, or professors at local colleges such as Franklin and Marshall or Lancaster Theological Seminary. The last group that provided marchers was the white liberal churches of the city, for example Trinity Lutheran Church. \(^{108}\)

While much research shows factors that influence each group’s decision to protest, little work has been done to pinpoint exactly why each individual decided to participate in demonstrations. Studies on protest participation have focused mainly on the social characteristics of the participants as the key element in predicting whether or not a person will act. Political scientist, Peter Eisinger’s study on the differences between white and black protestors in Milwaukee during the 1960s concludes that socioeconomic status influences participation. \(^{109}\) A person’s socioeconomic status was vital to the Eisinger study because in the cases of both white and black groups, participants were more affluent than their non-participating counterparts. \(^{110}\) This was true in Lancaster. Black protestors were largely students or middle-class working people. The majority of white protestors were upper middle-class educated professionals: lawyers, a chemist,
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professors, and pastors. An important aspect of the Eisinger study, which was also
evident in Lancaster, pointed out that protest was used by those who had conventional
indicators of middle-class attainment such as income or education, but lacked political
legitimacy.\textsuperscript{111} Given Lancaster’s overwhelming conservative culture, those holding more
socially liberal ideologies were not recognized as legitimate forces, despite their
relatively high income.

Another factor, according to sociologist Doug McAdams, is that the social
networks of protestors play a fundamental role in the decision to participate in
demonstrations.\textsuperscript{112} These social networks refer to the interactions individuals have on a
daily basis and also to the institutions to which a person belongs. An individual’s job,
church, and voluntary associations all make up a social network. The social network
framework applies particularly well to Lancaster because of the numerous organizations
working for civil rights during the time period. Oral histories with participants in the
summer of 1963 protests reveal that the social network and social status theories
remained true, with some individual nuance.

Solomon Wank was a professor of history at Franklin and Marshall College when
he became involved in the local chapter of the NAACP, which eventually led to his
participation in the protests. He was young and liberal, which were common
characteristics of many of the whites involved in the civil rights movement.\textsuperscript{113} He states
that his main reason for protesting was, “The United States has the strongest democracy
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in the world and I wanted to see to its promotion.”\textsuperscript{114} Paralleling the sentiments that were evident after the end of World War II, Wank felt that the America could not really consider itself a democracy as long as segregation was allowed to exist.\textsuperscript{115}

Another white protestor who took part in the only the department store protests was Gabriel Fackre. His involvement stemmed from both his long commitment to social change and the pragmatic approach he sought in instituting change.\textsuperscript{116} His interest in social action first surfaced during the time he spent as a student at the University of Chicago, where his early focus was on labor justice, and later turned overwhelmingly to civil rights. During his time in Chicago, Fackre looked to inspire change through faith. As early as his late teens, Fackre took part in campaigns to end racial discrimination by participating in a strike against a faculty club that would not amend its by-laws in order to admit an African American professor.\textsuperscript{117}

Fackre saw discrimination on account of race in Lancaster and felt not enough was being done to end it; the protests were long overdue. In his view, the NAACP was not doing enough to force the issue of integration of the city. According to Fackre, “there was a lot of discussion going on, but no action was taking place.”\textsuperscript{118} The campaign against Watt & Shand and Hager’s was modest, but a way to make a significant impact. After only a week of picketing store officials agreed to meet with members of the NAACP in order to discuss their grievances. The department stores believed that it was not their fault that blacks did not apply for jobs as clerks, and offered payroll sheets with
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black employees as proof of non-discrimination. The NAACP was quick to point out that not one of these employees held a clerk position and that the only jobs open to African Americans were those as a janitor or similar position. The demonstrations ended when the NAACP accepted a proposal by the stores, which promised, “good faith in hiring practices.” Though the stores never actually gave a concrete date when the hiring of African American sales clerks would begin, the NAACP saw the “good faith” measure as great progress. By the fall of that year, JC Penny department store, which was not even a target of the demonstrations, hired Lancaster’s first black sales clerk. This was the type of tangible improvement that motivated Fackre to demonstrate.

Students composed a second group in the Lancaster protests, which is not uncommon to social movements. Ron Ford was home on summer vacation from Morgan State University and so spent time taking part in meetings and activities of the NAACP. His decision to protest at Rocky Springs was a direct result from personal experiences. As a child, Ford remembered going each summer to Rocky Springs for the annual Coatesville picnic. While the food supplies were endless and the amusement park’s rides were available for everyone brave enough to board, one thing always missing from the day was access to the pool. “Each year there was a sign on the fence that said ‘Closed for Repairs,’” Ford reminisces. The initial disappointment of not being able to swim faded with each passing year and eventually became part of the picnic’s experience. When the opportunity arose to protest the injustices at Rocky Springs, Ford remembered “that he never got the chance to swim there as a little boy.” Though he had not been to Rocky Springs in years and had also declined to participate in a similar protest at a pool in his

college’s town, the fact that he was never allowed to swim motivated him to seek justice at the pool.

Leroy Hopkins was looking forward to his junior year at Millersville University during the summer of 1963. Like Ford, he remembers going to the Coatesville picnic; however he was not upset that he could not swim in the pool. Since African American children in Lancaster had very limited options for swimming Hopkins never learned to swim. The only place where blacks could swim, other than the local high school pool was called the Pogey. The Pogey was a swimming hole located in the Conestoga River, which also served as a depository for untreated human waste. Discouraged by the pollution and safety concerns, Hopkins avoided swimming there. Motivated not by his own desire to swim at the pool, Hopkins cites that he protested because he wanted to give others the opportunity to swim there.\textsuperscript{120}

A second influence in his decision to swim was the role of his church, Bethel AME. The charismatic pastor, Alexander Stephans, was a very active member in the NAACP, and so persuaded many church members to participate in the summer’s marches. Stephans came to Lancaster from southern Delaware, in May of 1963. He attended Boston University’s divinity school at the same time as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.\textsuperscript{121} He became involved with the NAACP because “of the way in which it can help in the forward movement of community progress. I am interested in people and seeing that they themselves and their environment improve.”\textsuperscript{122} The young Hopkins felt a great
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attachment to Stephans and the church and felt a degree of responsibility to both when deciding to march.

Finally, the social network theory that MacAdam perpetuates was the last motivation for Hopkins. He stated, “everyone else was doing it, so I did it too.”

Even though he was significantly younger than the average civil rights activist in Lancaster, Hopkins joined a variety of associations. He attended meetings of the Freedom’s Committee, the NAACP, and the Great Books Club. This club gave those interested in social change an opportunity to meet and discuss ideas in a safe and open environment.

When evaluating the work of each group, Hopkins thought about Rev. Stephans’ emphasis on African American agency in securing their own rights, and later regarded groups like the Freedoms Committee as paternalistic. He felt that the groups like particular one did not really believe blacks had neither the ability nor the agency to achieve success in civil rights by themselves. However, this sentiment did not inhibit his continued attendance at meetings.

Similarly, the attorney for the early court cases, Robert Pfannebecker, became involved because of his social network. He remembers that, “people just used to have more parties, there were faculty parties [for Franklin and Marshall College]. That’s how I got to know the faculty. At one point I represented ten to fifteen members. Part of it was social; I got to know a couple of the people because they were interested in the issues [too].”

His involvement in the Democratic Party and membership in the Unitarian Church also connected Pfannebecker with other groups sympathetic to the civil rights

---
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cause, and eventually inspiring him to take on the cases during the early 1960s. All of these convergent factors demonstrate the influence one’s face-to-face interactions can have on participants’ motivations.

One final protestor who represented a major group of demonstrators was Fred Manners. As a prominent member of the Bethel A.M.E. church, he found that religion was the primary force behind his decision to march. Prior to the Rocky Springs protests, he remembered that its congregation would walk from their church at North and Strawberry Streets to the center of Lancaster city for the protests on the department stores. Manners recognized that segregation was morally wrong and that as a Christian and he was obligated to seek its end.

Black churches in particular had a tight connection to the civil rights movement because of their ties to local chapters of the NAACP. In Lancaster, the NAACP held its meetings in the Bethel AME church. Not only did the church provide the civil rights group with a meeting space, but also with a population of potential protestors. Fred Manners remembered that the congregation was a “captive audience” for leaders who wanted to promote equality. Sociologist Aldon Morris supported this evaluation of the black church when he observed that the church could pass on information to the masses both quickly and efficiently. Also, as Leroy Hopkins mentioned, a key factor was the presence of a charismatic preacher. Ron Ford likened Bethel’s preacher, Stephans, to Martin Luther King because “of his ability to command respect and attention.” Leroy Hopkins echoes this sentiment when he states, “Reverend Stephans was quiet but he commanded respect. He persuaded us that [protesting] was the right thing to do.”
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Success of the Summer

As the summer of 1963 drew to an end, the entire nation became focused on the Civil Rights Movement as hundreds of thousands of people participated in the March on Washington, on August 28, 1963. Lancaster city sent two delegations to Washington D.C. One bus consisted of the United Church of Christ and the Lancaster Chapter of the NAACP filled the other bus.\textsuperscript{128} The following year President Johnson signed into law the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That same year, in the summer of 1964, northern whites and members of the Congress on Racial Equality and Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee went south in an effort to register blacks to vote. Some, like Gabe Fackre, faced open and often violent opposition to their efforts.\textsuperscript{129} The combination of these two events shows the success of the movement throughout the country, but to what extent did the Lancaster campaign during the summer of 1963 succeed?

The first of the campaign’s goals was to improve hiring practices of Lancaster’s department stores. Though the department stores protested against never explicitly stated they would begin to hire African American sales clerks, other department stores, such as JC Penny’s and Garvin’s quickly began to hire blacks. Lancaster celebrated tangible results like the securing of clerk jobs by African Americans.

The pool protests made up the second part of the summer’s activities to promote integration in Lancaster. The success of these protests requires a much more complex evaluation. Following the summer’s protests Rocky Springs’ pool owners decided not to open its gates to the public again. Instead they rented the pool to the Lancaster Moose
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Lodge until 1966. This proved the last year that the entire Rocky Springs Park would operate because owners sought to sell the park at the conclusion the summer of 1966.

On one hand, the protests could be viewed as successful because the pool was not open for anyone to swim in anymore, and the owners had to eventually close the entire operation. Leroy Hopkins estimates that when the Coatesville picnic was moved from Rocky Springs because of the discrimination in regards to the pool, the owners lost a considerable percentage of their income. However, Rocky Springs was able to remain open in a more segregated condition for several years after the protests. If the goal of the protest was to integrate the pool and not to close it, the protests were largely a failure. Also, the other two pools in the area remained open, but with reinforced membership policies. For example, Brookside transformed into a private club, which mandated that any person who wanted to join needed to have a membership application successfully approved.\(^{130}\)

It is unfair to characterize the activities of 1963 as a failure mainly because the protestors who participated viewed the demonstrations within the larger context of the success of the national Civil Rights Movement. Solomon Wank supports this notion when he stated that “The American civil rights movement was the most successful grassroots social movement in history.”\(^{131}\) In most cases, the protestors pointed to the passage of the Civil Rights Act as a culmination of their actions in Lancaster. The Act contained three major policies crucial to the civil rights movement. Discrimination in public accommodations was banned. This included hotels, stores, restaurants, and
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amusement parks.\textsuperscript{132} In addition, a section strengthened the Supreme Courts ruling on school segregation. The last important policy implication was the act banned discriminatory hiring practices.\textsuperscript{133}

Even though the protestors were united in seeking the passage of the Civil Rights Act, each had unique goals that he or she expected to see achieved as a result of their participation. For Solomon Wank, his goal-- to see the pool closed rather than integrated-- was a product of his personal motivations for action. He marched in an effort to further democracy. If no one had access to the pool, the citizens of Lancaster were to some degree equalized. The eventual closing of the pool meant that, to him, the protest was successful. Robert Pfannebecker similarly rationalizes the pools’ closing as a success. His court victories did not result in the opening up of the pools and, tragically, some businesses closed. However he believes the court cases “provided us with an opportunity for people from the Southeast area to go to the county commissioners and say we don’t have any place to swim and we’re a large part of this community.”\textsuperscript{134}

Black protestors wanted to have the pool integrated so that they could have a safe, clean place to swim. At the close of the summer, the NAACP wrote a letter to the owners of local swimming pool operators that encouraged them to end the segregation of their facilities. The letter stated:

You will soon be making plans for the next season. May we ask that you prepare now to eliminate those practices of the past which have denied us this use of the facilities to you fellow Americans on grounds condemned
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by civilized opinion. As you ponder this step we ask you to explore not your charters but your conscience, and we ask you to remember that in further postponing a step now universally regarded as inevitable, you pass judgment not only on yourself, but on the citizens of Lancaster.\textsuperscript{135}

While they did not achieve immediate success on this issue, their protest actions did raise a discussion in the following years about the creation of the county’s first integrated public swimming pool. Residents signed petitions and city council entered into a discussion about the building of a county pool. The pool was eventually built and first opened for the summer of 1967 and never experienced the segregation that other private local pools in the city did.\textsuperscript{136}

Following the summer of 1963 the Civil Rights Movement continued in Lancaster. Members of the Freedoms Committee moved on and founded PACE, or Program for American Cultural Enrichment. This group formed when teachers in the School District of Lancaster recognized that the textbooks used in classrooms were racist. They crusaded to eliminate the books, and to elevate African American history in the curriculum. Furthermore, the mostly female teaching population saw how segregated the city’s schools were and decided that a freedom school would provide extra help to students who suffered from the separate but unequal accommodations in Lancaster’s schools.\textsuperscript{137} As PACE saw success in its textbook project and the enrichment school, they eventually turned to the total desegregation of the city’s middle schools. PACE successfully lobbied for the school board to pass an open enrollment policy. Gabriel
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Fackre’s pioneer daughters were two of the three white children that transferred into mostly black schools immediately after the policy became effective.\footnote{Gabriel Fackre, Personal Interview, March 30, 2006.}

As participants look back on their involvement in Lancaster’s Civil Rights Movement, their feelings are mixed. Charles Holzinger describes the fight for civil rights as a parallel to the myth of Sisyphus, an audacious man condemned for eternity to roll a boulder up to the peak of a mountain, only to have it roll back down again. The battle will never be won for Holzinger. To some extent Leroy Hopkins agrees with this assessment. In Lancaster today, he sees more color than ever in the streets and businesses downtown. However, it is hard to judge just how much progress has been made, because Lancaster’s downtown no longer represents the same prestige it once did. Furthermore, many whites have fled the city’s boundaries for the more homogenous suburbs.\footnote{Schuyler, A City Transformed, 225.} While the debate of the success of the entire movement remains open to interpretation, the activities during the summer of 1963 in Lancaster reflected a larger culture. A broad coalition of residents refused to submit to the status quo of northern resistance, and over the course of three months, opened their city’s eyes to the harsh reality of racism and discrimination.
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