
The Summit Negotiations: Chicago, August 17, 1966— August 26, 1966

JOHN MCKNIGHT

This is a report of the meeting in Chicago on Wednesday, August 17, 1966, between the power people of the city of Chicago and the Chicago Freedom Movement. [Editor's Note: See pages 93-94 for a complete listing of the individuals attending, along with their affiliations.] The meeting was called by the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race. Chairman of that Conference is the Suffragan Bishop of the city of Chicago, Bishop James Montgomery. The meeting was chaired by Ben Heineman, Chairman of the Board of the Northwestern Railroad. Also in attendance were myself and

John McKnight was invited to attend these negotiations by the Chicago Freedom Movement in his capacity as Midwest Director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. He took careful notes of what was said in the meetings and then dictated them into a tape recorder immediately after each session. This document is a transcription of his dictation. While quotation marks have been used to indicate that a particular person is speaking, the words within the marks are the essence of their point rather than the precise spoken words.

Sam Dennis, a representative of the Community Relations Service of the Justice Department.

The press was not permitted in the meeting. The meeting was held in a large meeting room in the parish house, the Cathedral House of the Episcopal Diocese. It was held there because the group calling the meeting, the Conference on Religion and Race, is chaired by the Episcopal Bishop who provided the space for the meeting. It is perhaps of some significance to note who was not in attendance. Particularly notable as non-attendants were the Chicago Negro Aldermen and Congressman William Dawson. Here at a moment of great meaning for the Negro community, their elected political representatives were not even present, and they were not present because they are irrelevant: the Mayor could make any decisions that were necessary without them.

The immediate cause of the meeting was the demonstrations of the Chicago Freedom Movement in all-white neighborhoods. The political machine was being challenged. The political machine had always straddled the ghetto and had lived in and outside the ghetto and now this situation challenged the machine. The basic fact revealed by the meeting was that the marches had been so damaging politically to the machine that Mayor Daley was ready to overcome all of his pride and engage in some significant negotiations.

The meeting had been announced as a two hour meeting beginning at 10:00 a.m. to be over at 12:00. It turned out to be a meeting that lasted much longer. That was the result of the Mayor's determination that everything possible should be done on this day to end the marches.

With that background I will report what was said at the meeting. And in most cases rather than to say that person said it I will say who said it and say it in the first person. I will try to say from my notes what he said the way he said it to the degree that is possible.

The meeting was opened by Bishop Montgomery, Suffragan Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese. He was chairing a meeting where people were sitting around three large long tables laid out in "U" fashion. At the base of the "U" was seated Ben Heineman and the religious leaders of Chicago. The left hand column of the "U" held Mayor Daley and the political and economic leaders of Chicago. On the right hand arm of the "U" were seated the Freedom Movement. In the middle of the "U" were seated some trade union representatives, at a little table that was positioned there.

Bishop Montgomery opened the meeting by explaining that the church needed to be relevant to the concerns of our time and his group felt that the church should provide the meeting ground for all the people to be present and to begin to discuss this great issue of an open city. Then he introduced Ben Heineman whom he said would be chairman, and he said that Ben Heineman, who was not a member of the Conference on Religion and Race, which had called the meeting, was to be the chairman because the conference members wanted to be free to speak. They did not feel that they were neutral; they agreed with the demands of the Chicago Freedom Movement.

Then Ben Heineman, after making brief remarks, asked the Mayor to speak. Now this was in violation of the agreements that had been made with the Freedom Movement the night before, when it was agreed that Dr. King would speak first, then Daley would speak, and then King would present the demands. The meeting actually developed so that Daley spoke first, then King, and Daley's people, the Commission on Human Relations, placed their proposals, and the Movement's proposals were placed last. The meeting could have foundered on that point if it had not been for the fact that the Mayor seemed willing to negotiate. Heineman turned to the Mayor and asked him if he would like to say something and he said (and incidentally, everything that I am reporting as being said, was said, but I only noted the most important and significant things that were said), "proceed to restore peace and tranquility. I want to congratulate all of you for your participation. We have to do something to resolve the problems of the past few weeks." He was noncommittal about anything else.

Heineman then turned to Dr. King. Dr. King stood up and said, "I want to thank the Conference on Religion and Race. This is the kind of constructive dialogue that is necessary." Then he went on to describe the ghetto in terms of dualism, and I think that's very significant. "We have a dual school system, a dual economy, a dual housing market, and we seek to transform this duality into a oneness. We can not solve this alone: we need the help of the people with the real power. I have recently been in Jamaica where I was very impressed with the motto of that country which should enlighten us today, 'Our of many people, one people.'"

Then Al Raby, the Co-chairman of the Chicago Freedom Movement, spoke, and he said, "I am very pessimistic about the negotiations today because my experience with negotiating has indicated that our success has always been very limited. We need everybody here, including myself, to know that we have just not done the job that is needed. Fifteen years ago

in Cicero a Negro family moved in and there was a riot and they burned their house down. Fifteen years later when Negroes again say they may go into Cicero everyone is agreed that it will take the National Guard to protect any Negroes who go in that city. So there has not been any significant change through the natural process. The Movement has exposed by its marches how we all have failed. We must admit that this dialogue that's beginning today would not have occurred without the marches. But there will be no resolution of this situation until we have a factual change in the circumstances of Negroes. We will not end our marches with a verbal commitment."

At that point Al Raby ended his presentation and Heinenmen turned to Ely Aaron of the Commission on Human Relations who had a series of proposals to present. As mentioned earlier it was at this point that it had been agreed the Chicago Freedom Movement was to present its proposals.

After Aaron read the proposals of the Commission, A. L. Foster, the Negro executive of the Cosmopolitan Chamber of Commerce, stood up and said that one of the Commission's proposals—that the Chicago Real Estate Board support open occupancy—was key. He said, "Since the Chicago Real Estate Board was the agency that designed the nationwide system of exclusion that was developed through the restrictive covenants, it is particularly appropriate that they now be asked to take the leadership to revise the situation. You may not remember," said Foster, who was an older man, "that the Chicago Real Estate Board brought its proposals for establishing a network of restrictive covenants to the National Real Estate Board in Atlantic City and sold restrictive covenants, a device for racial exclusion, to the nation. So it is particularly appropriate that we demand of them that they now completely change their position and sell the national real estate industry on the proposition that it has got to support open housing rather than closed housing." Then the president of the Chicago Real Estate Board was asked if he had any comments and he stood up (and before saying what he said it should be noted that he said nothing that indicated any change from positions that the Chicago Real Estate Board has taken for the last ten years including their presentations before the United States Commission on Civil Rights in 1960. It is as though they did not realize that times had changed.) The president, Ross Beatty said, "This meeting is a good thing and the most important thing for us to understand is what the situation really is as it exists; not what we would like it to be or want it to be but what it really is. Also we must approach things on the basis that the

past is past. My associates are decent honest gentlemen. They are leaders in their community. And now I want to tell you how they feel. This is our statement. We are not here to negotiate because the problem can't be solved between us and the civil rights people. We have Negro members and we are proud of our record. Not all brokers, you must remember, are realtors and therefore we can't speak for the real estate industry totally. Many apartments are operated by businessmen, not by realtors. You must understand that realtors accept property as an agent. The realtor doesn't own or control the property. And it is this agency relationship—we are the agent that binds the realtor under the laws to the person for whom he is an agent. Now we have concluded after considerable experience that we cannot persuade property owners to change their attitudes about whom they want to sell their property to. And therefore we will reflect their attitudes. Now we know that there are problems and we are the ones that are easy to blame since someone is needed to blame. But the problem is not ours. The realtor is an agent; we must represent our clients. And therefore, because our clients are opposed to the open occupancy law, we must oppose the law if we are to honestly represent our clients. We would propose that a market research corporation be hired to assess community attitudes to see whether or not the community is properly reflected by our position. We are asking also that there be conferences with community leaders to see if they will take the leadership in changing attitudes. The realtors cannot take the lead in this for various reasons. We would also like a clearer definition of the Chicago city open occupancy ordinance and we will urge our people to obey the law. And we will ask our Board to restate their position."

Then Al Raby said that the Chicago Freedom Movement had its demands and he read those demands. Then Leonard Foster of the Garfield Park Community Organization or Garfield Park Chamber of Commerce, a Negro man, the son of A.L. Foster, said, "I've heard Beatty's position and he says we are not responsible, yet he has in the Real Estate Board the key people for setting trends. The Board has excluded Negroes until recently and he says the Board people are only agents but the client's capacity, the agent-client capacity, is not one in which the agent must do and does do anything the client wants. There are many directions that realtors take or that clients take from their agents. Basically, they now assume that the client is discriminatory and they take his listing as discriminatory unless the client indicates the reverse." And, finally, he said he thought that several of the Freedom Movement demands could be acted upon today.

Clarke Stayman of the Chicago Mortgage Bankers, with whom we have been working, then stood up and said that the demands that mortgage availability be made in all neighborhoods without regard to race or religion could be absolutely accepted by the Mortgage Bankers Association; this was a good first break-through.

Then Mayor Daley asked if the demonstrations would stop if the demands were met. And then Dr. King said, "Yes, the demonstrations in the neighborhoods might stop but," he said, "we have demands also in the areas of education and employment and you are hearing here only our demands in the area of housing." And then Daley said, "If we do all we can as a city, then why can't the marches stop. I thought this was supposed to be a kickoff for a conference table."

Heineman tried to clarify the various positions of King and Daley. And then King asked Daley if he agreed specifically to the demands placed upon him, which were the demands listed A through F. And so the Mayor picked up the sheet of paper and read each demand and agreed that he would do each of those things. Then Al Raby questioned the Mayor about some of the statements he had made and the Mayor responded affirmatively. Then Raby said that he wanted to make it clear, (and I couldn't tell why he was saying this at the time, it didn't seem to be appropriate) that the Freedom Movement would always try to negotiate first before engaging in demonstrations. (I think Raby felt that there had been implications that these things were new demands and he wanted to say that he felt there had been negotiations previously on these things).

Then Heineman asked for a clarification about what King meant when he said that neighborhood marches would end. And then it became clear that what King was saying was that if these demands were met, the neighborhood marches for the purpose of securing open occupancy by marching to real estate offices would end. But he made clear that marches to neighborhoods for purposes relating to employment or education would not be excluded as a possibility. John Baird, the president of Baird and Warner, one of our biggest real estate management firms, and the president of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council, then said, "The Mayor can't really do all the things that he has said here immediately, with all due respect," although the Mayor had said he was going to do them immediately. "Will the marches stop before the Mayor has been able to accomplish the specifics?" And rather than answer that Al Raby said that the Mayor has only answered what he was willing to do and he said we must hear from everyone.

Then Chuck Swibel, the president of the Chicago Housing Authority, said, "I can't say immediately that we will cease building high-rises in ghetto neighborhoods, because I think the elderly should have high-rises and also we should ask the county and the suburbs if they would provide us land to build low-rises on. But we will agree that we will build non-ghetto low-rise as much as is feasible."

Then Bill Berry of the Urban League said, "On the high-rise we are talking about apartments for families and we are not talking about the elderly." He said, "There is the question of the present twelve sites that you are going to build all in the ghetto and most of them high-rise. We are talking about no more now. That you would not build high-rises in the ghetto on the present sites or those present twelve buildings." And then the Mayor said, "Basically it is the Federal regulations that cause the high-rise because of the costs, because of the dollar value that's allowed for an apartment you have to build high-rise once you pay for the land costs in the city." Then Bill Berry said, "Let's discuss site selection. The Chicago Housing Authority always blames the City Council" and that they are really responsible for the ghetto sites and all the sites are in the ghetto. He said, "Can you get sites out of the ghetto?" Now the Mayor gave an answer and this whole issue was not joined as clearly and directly as it should be. (And the Mayor, when the Mayor talks, he always tends in this area to blur things either intentionally or because of the way he speaks). The Mayor said, "Well, let's get the stuns out of our cities and replace them." He said, "I know about public housing; we've got Negro neighborhoods where they don't want public housing, just like white neighborhoods. Now I don't want to concentrate all the poor people in one place, but we've got to put public housing someplace in some neighborhoods." And then he went off on something he said twice and which is apparently a big personal thing in his mind, "I can't see how we can keep lecturing to children that they live in ghettos because it gives them a ghetto mentality. We should say to them what we can do to make public housing a good place to live in even if it has been a mistake in the past. We're building up great frustrations in our public housing projects." Then Bill Berry again asked Chuck Swibel about the high-rises built without specific community approval. Swibel went on to say that they are now leasing apartments throughout the city and he said that if there must be high-rises built because of Federal regulations, that they wouldn't be multi-purpose bedroom apartments. And then he mentioned the suit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union against the Chicago Housing

Authority for building on ghetto sites and he asked the Movement to ask that suit be withdrawn. Then Ed Marciniak of the Chicago Commission on Human Relations said, "Regarding the problems of the Housing Authority you're talking about a metropolitan problem." And he said to the Movement people, "Have you asked the Cook County Public Housing Authority about whether or not they will help give us vacant land sites and what is their response?"

Then Arthur Mohl, representative of the Chicago Real Estate Board, who has been a power in that organization for years, an ex-president, spoke. (And he and the other reactors, as they spoke, increasingly revealed themselves as people in a dream world. In a situation of great crisis, which focussed on their industry, they seemed to be almost completely confident that they would be able to continue pursuing their past practices. They were cocky. They talked as though the people there were going to have to understand how things really were and they just didn't quite seem to realize that this was the real confrontation, that the game was over. And although the meeting went on and on and on, one couldn't tell whether or not they really understood by the end of the meeting what their real position was). Arthur Mohl then said, "Let me make clear that the Chicago Real Estate Board will obey the Chicago city open occupancy ordinance. (He means they will obey it while it is being tested in court; it is now being tested in the Illinois Supreme Court). In our view each member can interpret his action with his lawyer because we are a trade association and what his legal position is will be defined between himself and his lawyer." He said, "Most of what we are doing here is nit-picking." (He was trying to take the focus off the Real Estate Board.) "Twenty-five percent of the rental housing in this city," he said, "is actually controlled by realtors and the rest is controlled by individuals who are not realtors who own buildings. Now, if we are going to be realists, we must ask how can we deal with the bigoted attitudes in the neighborhoods. You can accuse us as though we created that bigotry until the end of the world but we are not the creators, we are the mirror. (It is interesting that in this setting he agreed that they were a mirror of bigotry). We need a cooperative venture here, not bullying, but a program to sell people in the neighborhoods on the idea that the world won't end if a Negro moves in." (Of course, it was the Chicago Real Estate Board which sold the neighborhoods on the opposite proposition but now its position is that they can't reverse that educational effort of theirs). And then he closed

by saying that the Chicago Real Estate Board is not in the business of resolving social problems.

Dr. King then said, "I disagree. But I want to hear reactions to our specific demands. All over the South I heard the same thing we've just heard from Mr. Mohl from restaurant owners and hotel owners. They said that they were just the agents, that they were just responding to the people's unwillingness to eat with Negroes in the same restaurant or stay with Negroes in the same hotel. But we got a comprehensive civil rights bill and the so-called agents then provided service to everybody and nothing happened and the same thing can happen here."

Then Heineman said that, because several people had said that they wanted to be sure that such and such point was raised he said, "I want to make clear that I don't intend to recess today until we have resolved these issues." And this was a surprise because it had been understood that this was a two hour meeting. And, undoubtedly, the Mayor had indicated, as he said later, to Heineman that Heineman should get this issue settled today. And so, (and this is another part of the initial agreement that was broken), rather than it being a two hour meeting, Heineman said, "We're going to stay here, I have no plans to recess except for lunch; I'm going to stay here all day."

Then Thomas Ayers, president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, and the president of the local electric company, stood up and said that basically he agreed with King about the importance of the law and he reviewed the fact that the FEPC law had a very effective positive effect on bringing about compliance on the part of employers, and that the Association had supported that law. And then he said (and this was the first key statement of reaction from one of the power elite) he said, "I think we support all the points in the proposals of the Chicago Freedom Movement."

So, the head of the Association of Commerce and Industry and the Mayor had both indicated that they were behind everything that had been asked of them. The president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, Bill Lee, was not there so a spokesman said, "We endorse the reforms here, and I will call our executive board immediately to discuss our role in carrying them out."

Then Jim Bevel spoke and he said, "The key problem, the core problem is that realtors refuse to serve Negroes in their offices. And that must change. That is insulting and it is humiliating. And the burden is to change service to Negroes. If the city were opened, then everyone would stop discriminating against Negroes." And then he said, "We have a big problem in Chicago; it's safer now in Birmingham than it is here in Chicago and George Lincoln

Rockwell is leading this city and the Chicago Real Estate Board should begin to lead it." Then the man from the Real Estate Board said that there were three members of the Board there and that the Board would be meeting this afternoon and that he wanted a smaller meeting to discuss this. He didn't like this large forum. And he said, "All of the real estate industry must get together too, not just ourselves, we're only a portion of it." And he said the people who were there were not empowered to answer the specifics that were placed upon them.

Heinemann then clarified the positions that various groups had taken. He said to the Real Estate Board, "Were you saying that there should be a sub-committee of the Conference on Religion and Race, the Freedom Movement and the Chicago Real Estate Board to talk about this further?" Then Beatty said, "We can't sit across the table and bargain with the civil righters for something that we don't have the power to give." And then Gordon Groebe, another representative of the Real Estate Board, said, "If King would come out against the fair housing ordinance then he would lose his supporters and he would lose his position and he would not be a leader. And you've got to realize that you're asking us to do the same thing. When we ask our realtors to abrogate their position as agents then you're asking us to do what you'd be asking Dr. King to do if you told him he had to come out against the fair housing ordinance."

Then Dr. King spoke, "I must appeal to the decency of the people on the Chicago Real Estate Board. You're not negotiating this question with us. You are men confronted with a moral issue. I decide on the basis of conscience. A genuine leader doesn't reflect consensus, he molds consensus. Look at myself. There are lots of Negroes these days who are for violence but I know that I am dealing with a moral issue, and I am going to oppose violence if I am the last Negro in this country speaking for non-violence.

Now the real estate people must act on principle in that same manner, or they're not leaders. The real estate industry has not only reflected discriminatory attitudes, it has played a significant part in creating them. In fact, in California, the real estate people spent five million dollars to kill the open occupancy law there. Now don't tell me that you're neutral." He also said that the day before he'd been talking with Attorney General Katzenbach about another problem and that Katzenbach had told him that if the money that the real estate industry was using to fight the Federal open occupancy law were available to the government that they could eliminate all the slums in one major city. He said, "I appeal to the rightness of our position and to

your decency. I see nothing in this world more dangerous than Negro cities ringed with white suburbs. Look at it in terms of grappling with rightness. People will adjust to changes but the leadership has got to say that the time for change has come. The problem is not the people in Gage Park, the problem is that their leaders and institutions have taught them to be what they are."

Then the man from the Real Estate Board said that, "Well we will recommend to our Board that we sit down with you and discuss this further. But we have got to be clear on what the Chicago open occupancy ordinance really requires." Now he said this several times and it's an amazing thing because that ordinance has been on the books since 1963. And then he said, "We must find a way of reaching the people."

Then the chairman of the Church Federation, a Presbyterian, head of the Presbytery, named Zimmerman, said, "I want to call us back to the three points in the Freedom Movement demands and these demands are basically for the Real Estate Board to change its present actions in regard to legislation and laws and I think the Chicago Real Estate Board can act on these." (This was a very astute comment. He was saying we don't have to depend on the neighborhoods to get the Chicago Real Estate Board to stop its litigation against the city's open occupancy ordinance. We don't have to rely on the neighborhoods to get the Chicago Real Estate Board out of the courts trying to enjoin the open occupancy bill).

Then Rabbi Marx, representing the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, said, "We have heard this same thing from the Real Estate Board over and over. They must understand that we must have a change now." Then Bob Johnston, the regional director of the United Auto Workers, said, "I agree we must have change. This is an urgent situation. The Real Estate Board must realize that there must be a change now. All the realtors are not going to go out of business if they change their practices. The Mayor has made a good statement. We must continue to meet. No one can stand in the road of progress. You can't go back now and do your business as usual. We should establish a permanent committee of this type and at the community level we should hold meetings to try to change attitudes."

Bishop Montgomery then said he agreed with the Chicago Freedom Movement's demands of churches and he wanted to specifically accept the blame for the failures of the religious community and to admit that the religious community had not translated its ethics.

Then Al Raby suggested that the meeting be adjourned. Mayor Daley then said, "No, let's not adjourn the meeting. The Chicago Real Estate Board should get on the phone to their members and do something about these demands now," which really surprised everybody and placed a terrific burden on the Chicago Real Estate Board. But, the Real Estate Board representative, even in the face of the combined power structure telling them, "Gentlemen, now is the time to move," said, "We cannot possibly deal on the phone; we cannot possibly work out a resolution to these things today."

Then Ben Heinemann said, "Let me summarize. Gentlemen, the big stumbling block here is the Chicago Real Estate Board and what it's going to do about the demands on it. And the representatives of the Real Estate Board must realize that they are the key to this thing. The monkey, gentlemen, is right on your back, and whether you deem it as fair or not, everyone sees that the monkey is there. And the question is how are you going to deal with the demands placed on you." And then Chuck Swibel, the chief cheerleader for Mayor Daley, and president of the Housing Authority, stood up with a final little statement which ended with, "We need a victory for Mayor Daley, a victory for the City of Chicago." And when he said a victory for Mayor Daley there was a groan from the Freedom side. It was then agreed that the meeting would be reconvened at four o'clock to hear what the Chicago Real Estate Board had been able to accomplish at its meeting in the afternoon, which had been previously scheduled. And it was agreed that nobody would say anything to the press. Generally, statements were not given to the press, except that apparently the *Chicago Daily News* did have a contact because at the close of the meeting they seemed to have the story and the other papers did not. The meeting adjourned between 12:30 and 4:00, for the main purpose of waiting with bated breath to see whether or not the Chicago Real Estate Board was going to meet the basic demands placed upon it.

These demands were that they would immediately withdraw their support of the suit they had initiated contesting the legality of the Chicago fair housing ordinance; that they would withdraw their opposition to the Governor's fair housing executive order; and to the fair housing provision of the 1966 Federal Civil Rights Bill; and that they would persuade other realtor groups to cease their warfare against the order and the proposed Federal legislation. And that they would pledge to support an effective state fair housing law to apply to property owners as well as brokers in the coming session of the state legislature.

The Movement people had lunch and caucused and discussed whether or not and under what conditions they would agree to a moratorium on the marches. It was rather clear that they were unwilling to agree to a moratorium without results and that they wanted to focus on the reality of an open city rather than a law.

When the meeting was reconvened at four o'clock (and everybody was there promptly at four o'clock) the newspapers were allowed in for a few minutes to take pictures and sent out. Heinemann opened the meeting and asked Mr. Beatty of the Real Estate Board to report. And then Mr. Beatty read a statement. It was a very confusing statement and was read rather quickly. Basically, the statement said as follows, and copies of it were distributed shortly thereafter, as soon as they were prepared: first, that they would support the principle of freedom of choice in housing as a right of every citizen (it never was determined what that meant); second, that they believed that race relations progress was produced only by a favorable climate and that the techniques of street demonstrations hardens bigotry and slows down progress, and that if demonstrations, and I'm reading this incredible sentence specifically, "if demonstrations do not terminate promptly we may lose control of our membership and be unable to fulfill the commitments we have here undertaken," third, they said that as a Chicago organization (and this was their major agreement, really), they would withdraw all opposition to the philosophy of open occupancy legislation at the state level provided it is applicable to owners as well as to brokers; that they would reserve the right to criticize detail as distinguished from philosophy; and that they would also request the state association of real estate boards to do likewise; and, fourth, they agreed they would remind their members that it is their duty to obey the Chicago fair housing ordinance. But they said, "as their lawyers interpret its meaning," meaning, as the realtors' lawyers interpret its meaning. But they said, "We do not accept the Governor's order as proper and will not ask compliance so long as it is under injunction." Finally they said, "We object to the proposal by the Freedom Movement that the city or citizens engage in testing real estate offices, this is an unwarranted harassment." (The Movement had asked the City to engage in affirmative compliance testing). And they couldn't sacrifice the principles they had espoused in their objection to the Constitutionality of the Chicago ordinance. So, basically, they were meeting none of the specific demands and agreeing only that they would not oppose in the future a state open occupancy law as they had opposed one in the past.

Al Raby then said, "I want to see that in writing, but we have nine demands here and we haven't gone over all of them, there are others to go over, so let's go over them." Then King said he would like Beatty to clarify what he had said and so Beatty, from the Real Estate Board re-read his statement, and it was a little more understandable the second time around. It was still not exactly clear what the situation was as a result of the Real Estate Board's statement. So Raby asked Beatty, "We've heard your statement. We're not sure what you're saying. What is your position on our demands A, B, C?" Basically the response Beatty gave was, "On your demand A, which is to withdraw our support from the suit testing the legality of the Chicago Fair Housing ordinance, no. B, to withdraw our opposition to the governor's fair housing executive order, no." C, they did not agree to support an effective state fair housing law but they did agree to withdraw their opposition to a law.

Then Jim Bevel stood up and said what he said almost all the time during the meeting, "Gentlemen, I don't think the important thing is what your position is about A, B, and C. The question is whether Negroes are going to be served at your office tomorrow morning." Then Bob Ming, who is a professor of law at the University of Chicago, key member of the NAACP Legal Defense Committee, and a member of the Chicago Commission on Human Relations, in which capacity he was at this meeting, said, "The ordinance is clear. Ever since September, 1963 every broker has been obliged to abide by practices which are in compliance with what it is that Mr. Bevel wants. The Negro is protected by this ordinance. He must be served under this ordinance by realtors." Then Bill Robinson said, "It is obvious that there are wholesale violations of this ordinance." Bob Ming said, "The City has opposed the Chicago Real Estate Board suit and we fought it in the courts. Brokers got on the stand and made it clear, and the evidence showed that they really decide on the tenants in buildings that they control. Although they are pleading that they don't control things, they do make the decision on the race of tenants, in contrast with sale buildings." John Womer, of the Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council, then said that he thought the proposals of Chicago Freedom Movement were very restrained, but he thought it was inconsistent with a free society for them to try to stop people from seeking legislation or litigation that they wanted.

Then Jim Bevel stood up again and said, "Gentlemen, in Memphis, in 1960, we had a series of marches to try to open up the restaurants, and, finally, we had a meeting like this and what was agreed was not that they

were going to pass a law or anything like that. The power structure said that they were going to see to it that we could eat in Memphis and one week later we went out and we ate and we have been eating in Memphis ever since. Now that's what we want here today. I want to re-emphasize that we need Negroes to be served in real estate offices. And you people here can see that will happen. That's a conservative, simple, humane request, and let's not confuse the issue with all these A's, B's and C's."

Then Andy Young, Dr. King's chief aide, stood and said, "Now, gentlemen, I want to reaffirm what has been just said here. In Savannah, for instance, in 1960, in Savannah, in the deep south, we got change in a movement activity there in the schools. Legislation, and a court decision in the schools followed that but we got the change before the legislation and the courts. Now, we need leadership to bring a result. Where they have had ordinances and laws, they don't work to produce the result we want. We need a plan to do right and not a law to stop wrong." And Beatty said, "I couldn't agree with you more; (always trying to get off the hook) we should take the monkey off our back and put it on the back of all the people."

And then Art Brazier, of TWU, said, "The question is whether a member of the Chicago Real Estate Board will obey the law." Then the president of the Church of Federation of Greater Chicago said, "Does the ordinance provide that realtors should do what Mr. Bevel says, that is, serve Negroes?" And Ming said, "Yes." Then Zimmerman said, "When you tell your people to obey the ordinance, will you tell them that they should serve Negroes?" And Beatty said, "We're still not clear on some points of the ordinance. We can ask them to obey the law." Zimmerman, of the Church Federation, said, "Can you exercise your leadership by explaining to them about serving everyone?" This was a little bit coy and not stated so directly that the Real Estate Board couldn't wriggle out.

Then Al Raby said, "Now, I want to know when the Mayor will see that an ordinance is enacted to require that all real estate dealers post in their windows the open occupancy law and a statement of policy on nondiscrimination." The Mayor said, and here he was a little flustered, "I said already this morning that I would do that, and I keep my word and that will be done and actually I've got my corporation counsel checking on it right now to see whether we can do it without an ordinance, whether we can just require it under the existing law." Then Bill Robinson said, "What about state law?" And Daley said, "The Democrats have always supported a state open occupancy law and the Republicans have fought it. We need

a state law that covers the metropolitan area." Then Arthur Mohl of the Real Estate Board said, "We are hesitant to give our people advice because we've been told as brokers we can't do that, but we'd be glad to submit the interpretation of the Human Relations Commission as to what the law means to our brokers."

Then Rabbi Marx, in a very astute comment, asked the president of the Chicago Real Estate Board to look at his statement that he had presented at the beginning of the afternoon and he called attention to the fact that this sentence was in the statement of the real estate brokers, and he said, "If demonstrations do not terminate promptly, we may lose control of our membership and be unable to fulfill the commitments we have undertaken." Rabbi Marx, after reading that statement said, "You have been here all morning saying to us that you don't have control over your people and that therefore we are asking the wrong people to change. Now, do you have control or don't you have control?" Then Jesse Jackson, of Dr. King's staff, said, "Let's go back to the basic issue," and then he talked about the theological issues involved and then he said, "I'm not concerned about your law. Dr. King has told you what the needs are and your law must come to a higher level than it has come. It must come to the theological level."

Then Al Raby said, "I think we must ask, can a Negro walk into a real estate office and be served? If we find that in fact is true, then whatever it is that the Real Estate Board is trying to say in its statement will not be of any concern to us because that's what we want. And if we find that's true in fact, then your statement is all right. If not, it is not." Bill Berry said, "It seems to me that outside the first paragraph, your statement is totally unacceptable, and I want to ask Mayor Daley, if the Chicago Real Estate Board can't do something about our demands, can you?" And then Daley, having previously put the finger on the Real Estate Board, came to its defense. He said, "I think they've done a lot. It shows a real change that they've come in here indicating that they will no longer oppose open occupancy. We will act as an agency through the Human Relations Commission. We shouldn't ask the Real Estate Board to withdraw its suit. We have agreed to virtually all the points here and everyone says that they are going to move ahead. Now let's not quibble over words; the intent is the important thing. We're here in good faith and the City is asking for your help." And then Ben Heineman said to Bill Berry, whom he knew very well, "Bill, now you said the statement is worthless, but isn't point three, the willingness of the Board to stop opposing the state open occupancy law, a

significant change?" And Bill was caught a little off guard by that, and he said, "I've had long experience with them; they'll say that they will withdraw it but they're still fighting the principle in court." And then Heineman still tried to make a virtue of the statement. And Bill said, "Well, on fourth reading I would have to concede that the third statement is something." And Heineman said, "It is a concession."

Then King said, "I hope that people here don't feel that we are just being recalcitrant, but we do have a little history of disappointment and broken promises, and I certainly wouldn't want to argue with Mr. Ming. Mr. Ming was my lawyer who saved me in court in Alabama from ten years in prison and he's my great counselor, but I would remind him that ten years ago we got a court decision and a law three years ago now that says that segregation is illegal and we now have 5.3% of the children integrated in the South. And Bob Ming is telling me now that the ordinance will do the job. We see a gulf between the promise and the fulfillment. We don't want to fool people any longer; they feel they have been fooled; so we are asking today that Negroes can buy anywhere. When will that be? Tell us, so that we won't fool the people. We need a timetable, something very concrete. We want to know what your implementation is." Then Ben Heineman said, "We don't see you as recalcitrant. Anyone here can understand why you want to nail down the terms of this agreement."

Then Heineman said, "I want to try to attempt a summary here. The Mayor has accepted your demands on him. The Real Estate Board has stated that it will withdraw its opposition to a state open occupancy law. And this is a great victory, a major victory, and probably insures passage of that legislation. The other demands have been mainly accepted. The only one that hasn't been involved the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and they aren't here and I can pass your claim along to them." And here he left the neutral chairman's position and he said, "The Chair feels that we are well on the way to realization and that the demonstrations could now cease until we see if these agreements are working out."

And then Jim Bevel said, "Most all the laws have not been effective in providing men housing. We're asking the Board of Realtors and the city of Chicago to go beyond that law. We don't want a commission investigation. If you discriminate against a man trying to find a place for his family, that's a crime. Let's deal with our principles. I can't suggest anything to the Negro people of this town until I can say to them, to a man, to a Negro man, 'You can buy land from the people who sell land.' Nothing less. Now white

men don't go to commissions to get a house, and I'm a man like white men and I go to a real estate office and anything that you come up with, any scheme or game, that's short of that is inadequate."

Then A.L. Foster, or rather the son of A.L. Foster said, "The Chicago Real Estate Board, now, we've got too many myths here. The Chicago Real Estate Board has moved a little and it doesn't have absolute control over the market, but it is not just an agent, and we've got to realize that they just can't play this game anymore. Homes are not sacred things. Today statistics show that most people are moving once every three to five years. They are buying autos every three to five years, so homes are being sold just like autos and, if tomorrow, all the automobile dealers were to die, we'd have to have more automobile dealers and, you don't have to worry, people will be buying and selling houses and needing brokers to do it. And therefore, a change in your policy isn't going to hurt anything."

Then Bob Spike, who had been the director of the Conference on Religion and Race in New York for the National Council of Churches and is now on the faculty of the Chicago Theological Seminary, University of Chicago, said, and I think that everybody was rather surprised by his position, "I consider the change by the Chicago Real Estate Board as profound and I don't think, on the other hand, that we should take Bevel's frustration lightly. But we've got to make clear here that the Chicago Freedom Movement didn't say, in its three demands to the Real Estate Board, what Bevel is saying, and that is that Negroes would be served in all the offices. I think we need some terms here for a moratorium." And he was the first person outside the establishment who had said anything for a moratorium.

Raby said, "Now, I want to say that I don't think we're nearly so clear on all of these things as Mr. Heinenan thinks. I'm not very clear on where we are on points four, five or six for instance." So then they began to go over those points. One of these points had to do with the Department of Public Aid placing welfare recipients only in ghetto neighborhoods, Negro welfare recipients. And so the chief of the Housing Department of the Department of Public Aid stood up and said, "We let people pick their own housing, and we have fifty housing men who are in thirteen district offices and they go around and look up and try to find housing for people and certify housing. We try to find housing for everybody and we're controlled by price ceilings." Then Bill Robinson stood up, and in very strong language, said, "Negro families are encouraged by your people to find housing inside the ghetto."

And then the Mayor said, "Now, the real fact is that the recipients pay the rent, not the Department, so they control things." And Robinson refused the Mayor and said, "No, there are all kinds of recipients who are paid directly from Springfield." And the man from the Public Aid Department said, "No, there are a limited number of these people." Then Kale Williams of the American Friends Service Committee, who is a relatively silent person, stood and said a very profound and certain thing, and that was that he felt the common thing about point three, four and five, which Al Raby had raised, which had to do with the Public Housing Authority, and the Public Aid Commission and the Urban Renewal Commission, the important things were that the public policy and practice of these agencies had not had any effect on opening up the city and that if their tenant placement and site selection policies were affirmatively administered they could be used to begin to provide an open city. A very important point to be made.

Then Andy Young said, "The question is, 'Who is going to bear responsibility for desegregating the city?' The society must change the patterns so that the individual can and will be moved out, rather than producing laws that put the individual in the position of having to move himself. We must take the responsibility here for implementing a plan for an open city. We need a plan to aggressively desegregate this city." He said, "And as to your fears of violence, let me say that it is more dangerous in Lawndale with those jammed-up, neurotic, psychotic Negroes than it is in Gage Park. To white people who don't face the violence which is created by the degradation of the ghetto, this violence that you see in Gage Park may seem like a terrible thing. But I live in Lawndale and it is safer for me in Gage Park than it is in Lawndale. For the Negro in the ghetto, violence is the rule. So, when you say, cease these demonstrations, you're saying to us, go back to a place where there is more violence than where you see violence taking place outside the ghetto."

Mayor Daley then, apparently intentionally or out of emotion or ignorance, responded to this superb statement by saying, "Did I hear you say that we are going to have more violence in this city?" And then Andy Young, who is always very cautious and kindly in his answers, said, "No, I'm saying that Negroes who are jammed into ghettos are people who are forced into violent ways of life, I'm saying that the Blackstone Rangers are the product of what happens to people when you live in a ghetto. I'm saying that the ghetto has to be dispersed, that this city must be opened up, and this high concentration ended, or we will have violence whether there is a

movement or not." Then Mayor Daley said, "The city didn't create this frustration or this situation. We want to try to do what you say." And then Young said, "Well, we need a program. We need to know how much is going to be accomplished in thirty days, and how much in sixty days. We will find families to move into twenty communities in the next thirty days. The United Auto Workers could find twenty or twenty-five families to move near their plants rather than being so far away from their plants. We've got to have a plan for an open city to take to the people."

And then, having really begun to talk about some real realities for affirmative planning for an open city, the Movement was caught up a little in the anomaly of having defined its goals in terms of specific actions rather than results. And, since the demands were actually more conservative than the results which Andy Young and James Bevel had been defining, Ben Heineman, the chairman, said, "Now, I think we've got to understand what we're talking about here. We understood that your proposals were on these two pages, and it sounds now like you're changing things." And then Andy Young backtracked a little, and said, "No, what I'm talking about is a plan to implement what is on those two pages. For instance, we say that the Public Aid Commission will end its enforced ghettoization of Negro recipients. So, the woman who works in a hospital on the North side who is an aid recipient who lives in the apartment below our apartment, the Public Aid Commission would go out and look for a house for her on the North side, near the hospital where she is working so she wouldn't be spending an hour a half every day getting to work and an hour and a half going back. And the Public Housing Authority would go out and find a site in Jefferson Park where we could build the next low-rise public housing units."

Then Chuck Swibel, of the Chicago Housing Authority, stood up and said, "I will pledge to you that we will move people out. Take our word. I want to see these marches ended today. If we are dealing on top of the table, then call off the marches for twelve months. (There was a groan from the Freedom Movement people when he said twelve months). We can't get an okay on Jefferson Park public housing sites in less time than that because the Federal government will require so much red tape." Then, a couple of not very significant statements were made, and Al Raby said, "I think the Movement would like fifteen minutes to adjourn to talk among themselves."

And before the adjournment, Charlie Hayes of the Packinghouse Workers, a Movement person, said, "I think that you need to be a Negro to really

understand what the situation is here. I represent Negro people, laboring people. I am a Negro first; I was born that way; I'll die that way. I am a trade unionist since I was nineteen. And I want you to know that there are a whole lot of people in this town who believe in Jim Bevel. And no one here is holding anyone responsible, but what we're asking, what I'm saying here, is, we've got to see that we're in changing times and we can't go out after these negotiations and tell the guy on the street that what we got was an agreement from the Chicago Real Estate Board that they philosophically agree with open occupancy. The people want to hear what we're going to do for them now. If I as a union negotiator ever came back to my men and said to them, I got the company to agree that philosophically they were in support of seniority, I'd be laughed out of court." And, somehow, that statement was very real, I think, to people who were there and they recognized that what was being said was the case.

The meeting was then adjourned while the Freedom Movement people got together to review their position. At the meeting which they had, there was no one who felt that the agreements were such that the marches should cease. Coming back into the meeting, everyone turned expectantly to Al Raby as he stood to announce the results of the discussions that had just transpired. He said, "We view this meeting as very important and significant. For the first time there are verbalizations at least that show that we have some opportunities for change. But I would remind you that the important thing, that we stressed at the beginning of the meeting was the actuality, the implementation; that's the key. We can see the need for further discussions. In your mind the question may be a moratorium, but we would have to say that we would have a moratorium on demonstrations if we had a moratorium on housing segregation. We would like to see a meeting one week from now to see what you're doing in terms of implementation. In the meantime we would meet in a sub-committee on specifics. I can remember everything this city did to see that a bond issue was passed and we need that same kind of campaign on open housing. During this week we will have to continue our present plans." Then Heineman asked him to clarify whether that meant that there would be demonstrations in the next week. And the answer was, "Demonstrations will continue for the next week." And then the Mayor stood up abruptly and said, "I thought we were meeting to see if we couldn't, if there couldn't be a halt to what is happening in our neighborhoods because the use of all the police and the crime rate rising throughout our city. I repeat, as far as the city is concerned, we are prepared

to do what is asked for. I appeal to you as citizens to try to understand that we are trying. I ask why you picked Chicago? I make no apologies for our city. In the name of all our citizens I ask for a moratorium and that we set up a committee. We're men of good faith and we can work out an agreement. The police can't give our people adequate protection now. What's the difference between today and a week from today with men of good faith? We're defending your rights, and also there's no question about the law. Can't you do today what you would do in a week?"

Then the president of the Association of Commerce and Industry said, "We started on this document, this two-page document, I don't think we should leave it now. We've gotten substantial agreement; we ought to make sure at least that we know what the outstanding areas are." Raby said, "Well, let me give you an example. Is the Mayor going to ask for the legislation to require brokers to post the ordinance in their window; will he ask for that legislation next Tuesday and will he get it? Will that actually be implemented? The Mayor said, 'We've got to show the City Council that you'll do something. We'll pass what we said we'd pass if we get a moratorium.' This was the first time that there was any indication that this was a trade.

And then Raby was infuriated and said, "If I come before the Mayor of Chicago some day, I hope I can come before the Mayor of Chicago with what is just and that he will implement it because it is right rather than trading it politically for a moratorium." Then Ben Heineman tried to cool things down and to censure Raby a little, and he said, "In a cooler moment, I think you'll realize that the Mayor cannot help but want fewer demonstrations, he's concerned about the safety of the people. And the Mayor is accustomed to having his word taken."

Well, Raby was just not satisfied with that statement by Heineman and he said, "I won't reply to what you've said for the sake of harmony." But he went on then in a very angry and tense voice, to go down the list and to make clear just exactly how vague the agreements were and how specific he wanted the agreements to be. And I think that this was a very effective moment because it did make clear to everybody just exactly what the Movement was expecting to be done and how far the agreements that had been made were from the specifics, that Raby was talking about. "So," he said, "the Real Estate Board hasn't done anything meaningful here. I'm not clear on what the Chicago Housing Authority is really going to do about high-rises. The Cook County Department of Public Aid has got to change;

it can't tell us that it has all Negro recipients in one area and all white recipients in another area and that's an accident. That's an insult to our intelligence. The Urban Renewal program is going to have to do something about its relocation policies. I want to hear the details about what the Savings and Loan people are going to do. The open city program must be like the bond issue program. I want to see companies and unions who have been asked to do something here to kick out their members, to kick out their employees who are acting like Fascists in the neighborhoods. If they steal something, if an employee stole something and was arrested, they would be fired immediately, but when they're stoning Negro cars and innocent Negro people nothing happens at all. I am not going to go back to our people with a philosophic program. We want a real program; a moratorium on discrimination will bring a moratorium on marches." This was a very hot statement.

And then Dr. King stood up and with the grand and quiet and careful and calming eloquence which he has, changed the mood completely. "This has been a constructive and a creative beginning. This represents progress and a sign of change. I've gone through this whole problem in my mind a thousand times about demonstrations, and let me say that if you are tired of demonstrations, I am tired of demonstrating. I am tired of the threat of death. I want to live. I don't want to be a martyr. And there are moments when I doubt if I am going to make it through. I am tired of getting hit, tired of being beaten, tired of going to jail. But the important thing is not how tired I am; the important thing is to get rid of the conditions that lead us to march. I hope we are here to discuss how to make Chicago a great open city and not how to end marches. We've got to have massive changes. Now, gentlemen, you know we don't have much. (He meant the Movement.) We don't have much money. We don't really have much education, and we don't have political power. We have only our bodies and you are asking us to give up the one thing that we have when you say, 'Don't march.' We want to be visible. We are not trying to overthrow you; we're trying to get in. We're trying to make justice a reality. Now the basic thing is justice. We want peace, but peace is the presence of justice. We haven't seen enough for the massive changes that are going to be needed. To the Chicago Real Estate Board, I want to say particularly that your second point about the demonstrations being the wrong approach bothers me. Because the problem is not created by the marches. A doctor doesn't cause cancer when he finds it. In fact, we thank him for finding it, and we are

doing the same thing. Our humble marches have revealed a cancer. We have not used rocks. We have not used bottles. And no one today, no one who has spoken has condemned those that have used violence. Maybe there should be a moratorium in Gage Park. Maybe we should begin condemning the robber and not the robbed. We haven't even practiced civil disobedience as a Movement. We are being asked to stop one of our most precious rights, the right to assemble, the right to petition. We asked Chicago to bring justice in housing, and we are starting on that road today. We are trying to keep the issue so alive that it will be acted on. Our marching feet have brought us a long way, and if we hadn't marched I don't think we'd be here today. No one here has talked about the beauty of our marches, the love of our marches, the hatred we're absorbing. Let's hear more about the people who perpetuate the violence. We appreciate the meeting. We don't want to end the dialogue. We don't see enough to stop the marches, but we are going with love and non-violence. This is a great city and it can be a greater city."

A commissioner from the Illinois Commission on Human Relations then asked if it wouldn't be possible to have symbolic marches in one place to take the heat off the police. Then Bevel said, "You're still saying that the problem is the demonstrations, and that's not the problem." Then Andy Young said, "We need a working committee. The Real Estate Board did a good job, they moved along in the hour and a half they had, and tomorrow by noon we could start working out a program. As soon as concrete proposals are worked out we can get back together." Then Bob Johnston of the UAW made a long plea that the negotiations be continued. He said, "The UAW has struggled a lifetime for freedom. I know about negotiation, we've talked with Bill Lee of the Chicago Federation of Labor and his reaction was a hundred per cent in favor of the Movement's demands. Let's meet tomorrow. We should get together tomorrow. We're talking about the future of America and we can't work it out in one day. We should meet tomorrow. I believe we shouldn't break off negotiations. Let's find out by tomorrow night how much further we can get than where we are today."

Then there was a consultation and I'm not exactly sure what happened, because it seemed to me as though the Movement people might have accepted this promise, but instead, and rather surprisingly, Heineaman made a new proposal. He said, "The Chair will appoint a committee, under the chairmanship of Bishop Montgomery, that will be composed of no more than five representatives of the Freedom Movement, two representatives of

the Real Estate Board, the president of the Association of Commerce and Industry, an officer of the Commercial Club of Chicago, a representative of labor, and the Mayor of Chicago or his representative. And they will meet at the call of Bishop Montgomery. We'll re-convene this group to have a report from them. I propose that we re-convene this group a week from this Friday." Which made ten days and was more time than anybody thus far had talked about, and it was obvious that there wasn't going to be a moratorium until this group came back.

Somebody asked Heineaman what the purpose was, and he said, "The purpose of the sub-committee is to come back with proposals designed to provide an open city." And so Bishop Montgomery called for the first meeting of the sub-committee on Friday, giving a day in between, Thursday, for the groups to consolidate, to work on their various positions, I presume. The remainder of the meeting was a lengthy discussion about what should be said to the press. And Heineaman proposed that he would say, in company with Bishop Montgomery, "We had a full discussion; it was profitable but not conclusive; a sub-committee has been appointed to work out details, if possible;" and that he had recommended that the group be called together again a week from Friday. "As to the demonstrations, there was no commitment to terminate them in the interim, but the Chairman hopes that whatever is done will be done with the view to the overall interests of the city, and that the Movement would proceed with great restraint."

The Movement people were very unhappy with that conclusion, and most of the debate which followed was to persuade him that he shouldn't say anything about the demonstrations that would make people in the city feel as though there were going to be a change. And Dr. King said, "Can't you say that if there are demonstrations, you want to call on the violent people to be restrained?" And Mayor Daley wanted it made very clear to the press that there weren't any agreements reached at the meeting today. The CHA president made one final plea that the marches be called off. And Raby said, "That question has already been answered."

There was considerable debate about whether or not Heineaman should say that the Movement will proceed with restraint. And Dr. King said, "I think we've been restrained." Bevel suggested that he say that he hoped that in the interim rather than that the Movement would be restrained, that Negroes wouldn't be discriminated against. Bob Ming suggested that some showing be made that progress was underway and that they not just say that a committee had been appointed. He suggested that it be said that everybody

agreed that they can't solve the problems of this city and maintain the present residential segregation and that the problems can't be solved by violence. Al Raby said, in a disgusted voice, "I can stand anything you say about me, I really don't care. The important thing is what is the substance of what we're willing to do to open up this city." It was then obvious that there couldn't be an agreement reached as to what ought to be said, so Mayor Daley stood up and said, "I think everybody should be allowed to say anything they want to and that it be made clear that this is a continuing meeting, and that this has been a beginning." And the meeting just sort of dissolved in a babble. And then King made his statement; Daley made a statement; the Chairman made a statement. All of the statements were rather neutral and there were not any significant charges by one party or another.

On Friday, August 26, at 10:00 a.m. in the Monroe Room of the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, the full negotiating committee was re-convened. For ten days the sub-committee of the negotiating committee had been meeting, actually doing the negotiating, and this was a meeting to report back on the agreements that had been reached. The tables in the room were in a "U", the religious leaders at the base of the "U", the Chicago establishment on the left hand leg of the "U" and the Freedom Movement on the right hand leg of the "U." I sat with the Movement people, next to Rev. Arthur Brazier of The Woodlawn Organization, and Sam Dennis of the Community Relations Service, the other Federal agency that was represented. Shortly before the meeting was opened, the press was allowed in for a few minutes to take pictures. Then the meeting was opened a few minutes after the press was dismissed by Bishop Montgomery, the chairman of the Chicago Conference on Religion and Race and Suffragan Bishop of the Episcopal Church. It was opened with a prayer. He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Ben Heineman, the president of the Northwestern Railroad.

Heineman said, "This is a closed meeting. I want to ask the sub-committee chaired by Thomas Ayers, president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry to report on their work. They have been working for sixty hours." Then Thomas Ayers distributed the written recommendations of the sub-committee and he read the report to everyone. [Editor's note: see pages 147-154 for the full text.] Ayers is a rather mild mannered, youngish man who is president of Commonwealth Edison and the Association of Commerce and Industry. After reading the report (which struck me as being much more general than I had expected the report to be coming from this

committee), Heineman thanked the sub-committee. Ayers said that the report had been unanimously accepted by the negotiating people, although the representatives from the Chicago Freedom Movement had said they would have to review the document with their constituency and thereafter Ayers moved the acceptance of the report. Mayor Daley was then asked if he had any comments and he stood and thanked the sub-committee and said, "When men of good faith sit down and talk they can solve problems. We said at the last meeting we would do everything possible as a city to meet the demands. I asked therefore for the assembling of a permanent organization to solve at the negotiating table these problems before there would be any further demonstrations. We want to recognize the right of people to demonstrate, but there isn't any reason why men of good faith can't bargain before there are any demonstrations." He then moved a vote. Before a vote could be called Al Raby of the Chicago Freedom Movement, said "Well just a minute here, we are all concerned in the Freedom Movement about the personal commitments of the individuals who are here. For instance, we want to know whether or not the churches will take responsibility for a specific number of Negro families in each all white community. Will we be able to have one per cent Negro occupancy in every community in the city of Chicago by 1970? Will there be a concrete date when the city and the Chicago Real Estate Board can guarantee us that the communities are opened to all. And the ultimate question is still the question raised by Jim Bevel, "When do we foresee the time when a Negro can go into a real estate office in Chicago and be served?" And as Raby said "In Chicago", Mayor Daley interrupted him and said "And the suburbs" which indicated Mayor Daley's great concern that there be a movement to evacuate Negroes from the city to the suburbs. (An idea, to my personal knowledge, that he had had for the last few years. It is an idea that I suspect is purely political, because he understands that his political base is being eroded by the increase in the Negro population and the decrease in white population).

Bishop Montgomery stood up at that point and said that he thought that he could speak for all the faiths and say that they do endorse the agreement, they recognize their responsibilities and their failures. And he said that, for the Episcopal Diocese, he could pledge that everything in the diocese's power would be preached in every parish and every pulpit. Since Raby had raised the question about what the actual commitments of the member bodies were, it seemed that everybody then felt, after Bishop Montgomery spoke, a move to make their own statement of commitment and although I will report these

they were to me not significant commitments because they did not have any specific content. They were statements of good will and good faith but nobody was really throwing anything into the pot, saying, "and to demonstrate our commitment we will do this or we will do that."

Next stood Archbishop Cody of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese, saying "I endorse the agreement and pledge our support: In fact you will note in this morning's paper that the Rogers Park Community Council has already spoken up and indicated its willingness to accept Negro families. This is the first community that has done this and we have encouraged this effort. I believe that with the relief in the tensions that we are working out today we can now sit down and discuss and find some solutions. We have already had priests in many parishes working with select groups of laymen. We have 454 parishes and all ethnic groups. We are like a little United Nations and we will commit our moral, financial and religious resources to the fulfillment of this agreement." Then Rabbi Marx of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations stood up and said, "A week ago, one of our congregations in Rogers Park called me and asked 'What should we do? Our real estate offices are being tested' and I think the answer we gave is indicated by the statement in this morning's paper which shows the first results; all faiths participated in Rogers Park in the statement that was just released indicating that community's willingness to accept Negro families. We have here today the new president of the Board of Rabbis, who has personally acted to bring Negro families into his community of Glencoe. We are ready to make a total commitment." Rev. Zimmerman, President of the Church Federation said, "The Church Federation is composed of twenty-seven denominations and I can assure you that when our Board next meets, that the Board will accept these agreements. Any document," he added, "needs a means for amendment, and the genius of this document is paragraph ten which provides for a continuing committee which will audit and be able to revise the agreements here and move them forward and this is vital." Rabbi Siskind, the new chairman of the Chicago Board of Rabbis, then stood and said that the rabbis supported the agreement.

He was followed by Bill Lee, the president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, who made a rather lengthy statement. (Lee speaks in the vein of Mayor Daley—many words, but they have so little content, they're so general, that you are not sure that anything has been said when the individual who spoke is done). Bill Lee spoke in this manner and he said in terms of content only that labor had wanted such a conference as this and

that labor intended to carry out its commitments in this document to the letter.

Then Mr. Beatty, the president of the Chicago Real Estate Board stood and said, "We had a meeting yesterday of the Chicago Metropolitan area realtors; these included non-members of the realtor group as well as the suburban Boards and it was a long and frantic meeting and everyone there felt that this was a area-wide problem and not just a Chicago problem. It was a very, very difficult meeting but it seemed to be a first move. (And one had the feeling that even Mr. Beatty of the Real Estate Board sitting with this group assembled and seeing the great concern and commitment of so many, felt that he had an obligation to try to do something, to try to move things along.) He said, "We accept this document but we have to say that the fact remains that there is a tremendous job ahead of us. Ninety per cent of the transactions in real estate are handled by real estate men and while we believe in what is being done here, we want to say as strongly as possible that we need everyone's help, because the realtor is usually a small businessman in a small office and we are placing a tremendous burden upon him."

Dr. King then interrupted and said "Now I think that it would be very bad to have any wrong statements made by anybody that would hurt the acceptance of this agreement by our people." He said, "I am wondering about a statement that you made yesterday on the radio, Mr. Beatty. It went to the effect that if realtors are forced to sell and rent to Negroes, the real estate industry will go out of business." Beatty then responded in a very confusing way saying that he had been widely quoted and misquoted and not agreeing or disagreeing that he had made such a statement. He said, "But this is a complicated thing; it is extremely difficult, and we will do all we can." Then he began to equivocate and express the fact that I am sure is prevalent among real estate men. (They are completely out of touch with their time when, with their backs to the wall, when even wanting to do something, they are so far out of touch that they don't even know what to do. They don't understand. They are the last people to be dragged into our century.) He expressed this in a way that one could see looking at Mayor Daley that even upset Mayor Daley. He went on to say in response to King's request "We'll do all we can, but I don't know how to do it. Frankly, I am confused. The last two weeks have been the most confusing of all my life. I think that there are a lot of specifics that we just aren't going to be able to work out here. But I hope that everyone will understand that we are

all nor bums. Real Estate dealers are people and we need commitment from all people in this community, but on the other hand we are not hedging on anything." Well, his statement made everybody very nervous, even Mayor Daley. I could see that Daley was afraid that Beatty was going to blow the deal, because it sounded after his statement like nothing was firm.

Bishop Montgomery then jumped into the picture and said, "Well I want to say that we all recognize this is a joint problem and Section 8, Part 3, of the agreement speaks to Mr. Beatty's need. I know it is hard for Mr. Beatty to represent those that he does not have authority over. But we need to give, and we are committing ourselves to give massive support to the Chicago Real Estate Board in its efforts."

Then Bob Johnston spoke, Regional Director of the United Auto Workers, the only union person who has attempted to keep a close relationship with the Movement but still a person with a close relationship with the Democratic party and Mayor Daley. (At one point it was clear that he was acting as an agent for the status quo and the administration but counter pressures were applied and he moved close to the Movement. None-the-less, the Movement was unhappy about his role.) He said, "This is a historical document that we can accept with pride. No city has had a similar breakthrough and no one ought to leave without a definite and a full commitment. The executive committee of the AFL-CIO met last week and reaffirmed its commitment to non-discrimination and I called Walter Reuther this morning and he said 'We will do everything we can do to cooperate in the implementation of this agreement.' And I have gotten specific commitments of support for this agreement from many unions. Specifically the following unions have made agreements: Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Furniture Workers, the State, City, County and Municipal Employees Union, Oil and Chemical Workers, United Auto Workers, ILGWU, Shoe Workers, Metallurgical Workers, United Transport Workers, Packinghouse Workers, Textile Workers, and the International Association of Machinists. Also I want to say that I have a staff of forty-three members and all of them are going to be committed and totally committed to the implementation of this agreement." Then he went rambling on in a speech making points that one could not discern. He closed by saying that Milton Olive, Jr. would represent the UAW in further meetings of this nature and that he felt that this agreement could be a design for every major city.

Al Raby then said "Before we vote, I think we should understand that this vote is indicative of an intent to facilitate the agreement. We can't accept a vote that is binding. It should only be an indication of sentiment."

Ben Heineman, together with Mayor Daley, was pushing for a vote that made clear the fact that all were in complete agreement with the document that had been established. Heineman said, "Let me say that the Chair concedes that there has been a lot of hard work in getting this document together. And normally I don't believe in votes; I don't believe in overly structured efforts of this nature, but I would think that the Chicago Freedom Movement would want a unanimous and a binding vote and on the other hand I am sure that those who are committing themselves to the Movement's demands, want also to see the Movement's commitment." Then Al Raby said, "Well, before we take such a vote I think we may need to caucus on the details. We want to be sure of some things. It is unfair for any of us to make commitments unless we are perfectly clear, so I ask for a fifteen minute recess." It was clear that Heineman and Daley were not enthusiastic about this idea, and that they wanted a vote and acceptance, and to close the affair. But the meeting was adjourned for a fifteen minute recess.

During the recess the Freedom Movement people walked out, and it was my understanding that in the debate the people who were not in favor ultimately of accepting the agreement were Jim Bevel and Jesse Jackson, who were the two essential Negro Southern Christian Leadership Conference leaders of the marches. (I think this has great significance, that the two people who had been leading the marches, who were most in touch with them and who would have to sell the marchers on discontinuing the marches, were the people who were most opposed to the agreement as it stood. And I suppose I should record here that in my mind after ten years of working with and in government that the document as it read in my mind was so vague as to be an unreliable instrument for securing significant progress.)

When the meeting was reconvened, Dr. King spoke first. "We have decided that we are prepared to vote on the issue before us and we want to agree that this is a most significant document. However, we have one or two questions that still remain. First, while we recognize that this was not a matter involved in these negotiations, we are much concerned about the injunction we face." (Here he was speaking about the injunction that Mayor Daley had secured after the initial negotiating meetings; the injunction that limited the Movement to one march a day, in the daytime, twenty-four hours

notice, no more than 500 people, in one neighborhood only). "We feel that injunction is unjust and unconstitutional. Thousands of people were deeply hurt as a result of the injunction. Now if we want to have a great meeting at Soldiers Field and to march to City Hall with thousands of people as we did then, we can't do that. This denies freedom of assembly. If we want to have a great march, only 500 people can march and thousands of people will be denied their freedom of assembly. We are acting in good faith and since we are, we will agree to limit the demonstrations. And, therefore, we want to know if the City will withdraw the injunction; we make the request of the city "What will you do?" Second, we are very concerned still about implementation. Maybe we are over-sensitive but there have been so many promises that haven't materialized, that this is a great thing in our minds. We want to know if the continuing body that will be established to hammer out the specifics will be an action body or whether it will be just a forum. We want to know how soon it will be underway. Because ultimately we want to know how soon a Negro can go to a real estate office and feel reasonably sure that he will get fair treatment: that he will be served. And we also want to know how we can deal with the Negro that is not served."

Bishop Montgomery then said, "On Monday, we hope to have the organizing body set up and an action group and ready to roll."

Rev. Zimmerman of the Presbytery of Chicago and Chairman of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago stood up and made a speech which stunned everyone. I think he said, "This matter of an injunction has troubled me and I remember at our last meeting we heard one individual" (he was referring to James Bevel) "who said that he did not like the legal recourse as an approach to resolving these problems and that he felt that he wanted to go to a real estate office and be served and not to a commission. However, recourse to the courts is the basis of our society, and indeed it is a right and an obligation to use the courts and I would like to see this injunction rested in the Supreme Court of the United States, so that we can know, finally, what rights people have to assembly and petition." Dr. King interrupted and said, "I'm sure you're aware that this will take at least three years and \$200,000 of the Movement's resources to get an answer to." "Well," said Zimmerman, "perhaps it could be at least a continuing item to be discussed on the agenda." Al Raby was so affronted by Zimmerman's proposal that he stood up and said, "I am forced to respond here. I don't see that the judicial process has really helped the Negro. I think it is very generous of anyone to suggest that we suffer this injunction for three years just to get

a legal opinion, because legal opinions haven't done us much good. The same process, the process of legal opinion, got us twelve years ago a decision of the United States Supreme Court that would have integrated schools, that segregation would be done away with. And the result of that legal opinion twelve years later is largely insignificant. We want from the city an answer and not a debate. I felt it was bad faith for the City on Wednesday to say that they would negotiate with us and then go out on Friday and seek an injunction against us."

Mayor Daley then stood and was not flustered when he said, "People can make all the statements that they care to about bad faith." Then he went on to make this statement (which was the most coherent and relatively reasonable statements I have ever heard Mayor Daley make), "Last Friday I acted on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Police of Chicago. I want you to know that I was raised in a workingman's community in a workingman's home. My father was a union organizer and we did not like injunctions. I know the injustice of injunctions. But I also faced the decision of what to do with three and a half million people. Because the Superintendent of Police had said that the crime rate was soaring as his police resources, crime fighting resources were being thrown into protecting the Freedom Movement. He also told me that the Freedom Movement wouldn't cooperate on giving him the routes or giving him advance notice or in any way helping him in an effort to provide protection. So the decision had to be made. There were many people who were demanding that we stop the marches entirely, but we said that they had a right for the marches. The course I took was the only one that I could take. I took an oath to preserve law and order and the Constitution. Now as far as this agreement and injunctions are concerned if this agreement is made and everybody keeps to it you will have no worry about the injunction because you won't need to march. And if we agree to the document, then the injunction means nothing to you. We don't want long litigation either and long legal fees and this matter can be heard as an emergency matter, I think. It was with heavy heart, yet firmness, that I sought that injunction. There was no other course for me."

Martin Luther King then said (and I felt here that he felt that Al Raby had gone too far, and he was trying to back away from Raby's position), "I appreciate what Mayor Daley has said, and I know he made the decision with heavy heart. I don't want to stress bad faith. I hope we are operating here by the law of life which is that reconciliation is always possible. But I think

I've got to say, that if that injunction stands, somewhere along the way we are going to have to break it. We are going to have to break it tomorrow, or in a week, or a month, or sometime as the Movement proceeds."

Then Ben Heineman interrupted Dr. King and said, "Now I haven't seen the injunction and I'm not interpreting it legally, but as I see it, this agreement has to do with the cessation of neighborhood demonstrations, and I think Dr. King, that you are saying that this injunction isn't limited to neighborhood, enjoining neighborhood marches, but to assemblies as well. Now, Mr. Mayor, would you be willing to sit down with the legal representatives of the Chicago Freedom Movement to negotiate a modification that will allow them broader demonstration rights outside of neighborhood demonstrations?" Mayor Daley said, "The city will sit down and talk over anything with anybody. Speaking specifically, we can amend our injunction, I know, as a lawyer, and we would be glad to sit down and discuss . . ." (Interruption on the tape) ". . . asks whether or not the Mayor will withdraw his injunction and I think we deserve an answer to our question." Before the Mayor could answer, Ben Heineman said, "I think that the Mayor is saying, he will not at this time withdraw the injunction but he will discuss its amendment." The Mayor nodded and then said, "I call for a vote." Al Raby said, "No, let's wait. We want to discuss this more." Then there was a hurried conference around Dr. King with many people saying many things and finally Dr. King said, "I don't think that we can accept a conference to modify the injunction because we are opposed to the injunction totally, but we would accept a separate negotiation through the continuing body on this issue." (Incidentally this position, it seemed to me, was a very, very reasonable one).

At that point the question was called, again by Ben Heineman pushing always for this resolution, and the vote was unanimous.

Ben Heineman then said, "Given the tensions and the problems we faced, I think everyone has conducted themselves in exemplary fashion, and I want to thank everyone who is present here. I am familiar with the trail of broken promises, but I think we are all committed here to seeing that cynicism will not grow as a result of the work of this group. I want to thank everyone."

Mayor Daley then stood and said he wanted to thank Ben Heineman and Tom Ayers for the fine work that they had done. And then Dr. King stood and in his beautiful and magisterial terms, said these closing words. "I do want to express my appreciation for everybody's work and the appreciation of the Chicago Freedom Movement. I want to thank the subcommittee. We

read in the scripture, 'Come, let us sit down and reason together,' and everyone here has met the scriptural mandate. There comes a time when we move from protest to reconciliation and we have been misinterpreted by the press and by the political leaders of this town as to our motives and our goals, but let me say once again that it is our purpose, our single purpose to create the beloved community. We seek only to make possible a city where men can live as brothers. I know this has been said many times today, but I want to reiterate again, that we must make this agreement work. Our people's hopes have been shattered too many times, and an additional disillusionment will only spell catastrophe. Our summers of riots have been caused by our winters of delay. I want to stress the need for implementation and I want to recognize that we have a big job. Because I marched through Gage Park, I saw hatred in the faces of so many, a hatred born of fear, and that fear came because people didn't know each other, and they don't know each other because they are separate from one another. So, we must attack that separation and those myths. There is a tremendous educational job ahead of us. Now, we don't want to threaten any additional marches, but if this agreement does not work marches would be a reality. We must now measure our words by our deeds, and it will be hard. I speak to everyone on my side of the table now, and I say that this just be interpreted, this agreement, as a victory for justice and not a victory over the Chicago Real Estate Board of the City of Chicago. I am as grateful to Mayor Daley as to anyone else here for his work. I think now we can go on to make Chicago a beautiful city, a city of brotherhood." And following his speech, there was the only applause of the meeting.

Then Ben Heineman suggested that all the major principals join together in a joint press conference. But Mayor Daley, said, "No, Ben Heineman, why don't you speak for all of us and we will all sit and listen to you." So the press was admitted and while everybody sat, Ben Heineman spoke and as he spoke he said, "This is a great day for Chicago. We are all gathered here and through the great democratic process, we have worked out an agreement."

When Ben Heineman said, "We have worked out through the great democratic process, Al Pitcher turned and started to walk away and said to me, "Democratic process, shit, it was forced out of them!"

George Jones, President, Joe Louis Milk Company, Conference on Religion and Race

Rev. James Bevel, Southern Christian Leadership Conference
 John McDermott, Director, Catholic Interracial Council
 James Wright, United Auto Workers
 Rev. Jesse Jackson, Southern Christian Leadership Conference
 Charles Hayes, United Packinghouse Workers
 Bishop James Montgomery, Co-Adjutor Bishop, Episcopal Diocese
 Clark Stryman, Chicago Mortgage Bankers Association
 Lewis Hill, Director, Department of Urban Renewal
 John Ballew, Acting Director, Cook County Department of Public Aid
 Leonard P. Spacek, The Commercial Club; Chairman, Arthur Anderson Associates
 Paul Lund, Assistant to President, Illinois Bell Telephone Company
 William A. Lee, Chicago Federation of Labor

NOTES

1. King, Martin Luther, "Freedom's Crisis," *Nation*, March 14, 1966, 202-288-92.
2. Chicago Urban League, "Commentary on Areas of Negro Residence Map," May, 1965—published research paper.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. "Dr. King Carries His Fight to the Ghetto," *Ebony*, April, 1966, p. 94-96.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
7. "Riot in Chicago," *America*, July 30, 1966, p. 117.
8. *Ebony*, p. 95.
9. Good, Paul, "Chicago Summer: Bossism, Racism and Dr. King," *The Nation*, March 14, 1966, p. 240.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
11. Chicago Freedom Movement, "Program for the Chicago Freedom Movement," July, 1966.
12. *America*, p. 117.
13. Koko, Karen, "Chicago's Race March—A Walk on the Wild Side," *National Catholic Reporter*, August 10, 1966, p. 1.
14. Riddick, Edward, "An Observation of Gage Park," September, 1966. Mimeographed.
15. Commission on Human Relations, *Minutes*, August 9th meeting.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*

Chicago Urban League, "Commentary on Areas of Negro Residence Map: 1950-60, 64," Research Report, May 1965.
 Commission on Human Relations—"A Report on the Chicago Fair Housing Ordinance," August 5, 1966.
 Commission on Human Relations—Minutes of the Special Commission Meeting held on Thursday, October 13, 1966.
 Riddick, Edward, "An Observation of Gage Park," and "Some Notes on Race and the Protestant Churches," (mimeographed).

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE ON OPEN HOUSING

Thomas G. Ayers, President, Commonwealth Edison Company, Assn. of Commerce & Industry
 Warren Purcell, Cook County Council of Insured Savings Associations
 Sam Dennis, Community Relations Service, Justice Department
 Sydney Finley, NAACP National Office Field Director
 Kate Williams, American Friends Service Committee
 Rev. Arthur Brazier, President, The Woodlawn Organization
 Edwin C. Berry, Director, The Urban League
 Rev. Edward Egan, Archdiocesan Commission on Human Relations
 Rev. Robert Spike, Professor of Christian Ministry, University of Chicago
 Rev. Arthur Griffin, President, The Westside Federation
 Albert Ransom, American Friends Service Committee
 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Southern Christian Leadership Conference
 Eugene J. Callahan, Chicago Conference on Religion and Race
 Albert Raby, Convener, Coordinating Council of Community Organizations
 Rabbi Mordecai Simon, Chicago Conference on Religion and Race
 Archbishop John Patrick Cody, Archbishop of Chicago
 Ben W. Heineman, Chairman, Chicago and Northwestern Railway
 Rabbi Robert Marx, Union of American Hebrew Congregations
 Ely M. Aaron, Chairman, Chicago Commission on Human Relations
 Mayor Richard J. Daley, Mayor of Chicago
 Dr. John Gardiner, Church Federation of Greater Chicago
 William G. Caples, Vice-President, Inland Steel Company
 William R. Ming, Jr., Attorney, Chicago Commission on Human Relations
 Roger Nathan, Illinois Commission on Human Relations
 Ross Beatty, Chairman, Chicago Real Estate Board
 Jack Kleeman, Chicago Real Estate Board
 John Samos, Chicago Mortgage Bankers Association
 David M. Kennedy, President, Continental Illinois National Bank
 A. I. Foster, Cosmopolitan Chamber of Commerce
 Leonard Foster, Garfield Park Chamber of Commerce
 Gordon Grocpe, Real Estate Board
 Arthur F. Mohl, Chicago Real Estate Board
 Sgt. Samuel Nolan, Chicago Police Department, Human Relations Division
 John Womner, Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council
 John Baird, Baird and Warner Real Estate Company
 Edward Marciniak, Director, Chicago Commission on Human Relations
 Charles R. Swibel, Chairman, Chicago Housing Authority
 David Schucker, Illinois Commission on Human Relations
 Robert Johnson, United Auto Workers
 Thomas Paul, Chicago Federation of Labor and Industrial Union Council
 John Gray, Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry
 William Robinson, Republican Ward Committeeman
 Rev. Andrew Young, Southern Christian Leadership Conference