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Introduction
This story traces the transformation of an American high school over the course of the twentieth century. In 1914, when Germantown High School officially opened, it provided its students with the finest academic education available at the time. Students took coursework in Latin, Greek, Botany, and Rhetoric. Faculty held doctorates in a variety of disciplines. When Germantown students graduated, they attended the nation’s leading colleges and universities. The young men went to Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. The young women went to Radcliffe, Wellesley, and Smith. They assumed roles as leaders in business and civic life throughout Philadelphia. They maintained their allegiance to their high school alma mater through its active alumni association. In 1914, Germantown, the quaint neighborhood on Philadelphia’s northwest corner, had one of the leading secondary schools in the nation—it provided its graduates with a first-rate education and the necessary credentials to secure a prosperous future.

Almost a century later, Germantown High School was featured in national headlines. However, unlike earlier coverage that had celebrated its students’ academic success, these articles described the violence that had plagued the school for decades. One incident, in particular, illustrated the school’s difficulties. On February 24, 2007, two young men violently attacked Frank Burd, a veteran teacher in the Philadelphia public schools, after he reprimanded one of them for using an electronic device in his math class. The School District of Philadelphia had instituted a district-wide policy that banned the use of electronic devices, such as cell phones and portable media players, in its public schools. However, teachers and students knew that the high school applied this rule inconsistently. Germantown High School students routinely used them; Germantown High School administrators and teachers, including Burd, did not always
confiscate them.¹

On that fateful February day, Burd heard a faint sound of music in his room as he tried to teach his students the mechanics of algebra. When he asked the students where the music was coming from, they pointed at one of the young men in the back of the room with his headphones on. Burd asked the student to remove the headphones; he did and pushed them on the edge of the desk. Burd walked over to pick them up, and in his words, “that’s all I remembered.”² The young man, who Burd reprimanded, leapt out of his seat, dragged his teacher by the collar, and with the assistance of another student, pulled Burd out into the hallway where they physically assaulted him. When that happened, two other students left the room. One chased down the two young men who were involved in the incident. The other used Burd’s cell phone and called 911. Students were not supposed to use cell phones. Fortunately, this student did not follow that rule. Within minutes, one of the 13 police officers stationed in the building responded to the call. The School District of Philadelphia had hired these men and women to do just that.

When the police arrived, they arrested the two young men who had committed the crime. The police handcuffed them in front of the others and brought them to the school’s police station, which was conveniently located on the high school’s first floor. They called the local 14th police district and waited for Philadelphia police to escort the students out of the building. Rumors spread throughout the entire building about what had transpired. Within a few minutes, students and teachers gathered in the hallway to confirm what they had heard. When they saw Burd being carried out of the school on a stretcher, they knew the rumors were true. Burd spent the next eleven days recovering

from his injuries—a broken neck and several broken bones—at Einstein Hospital. Within a week, Germantown youth assaulted the young man who had stopped the perpetrators in the hallway on the streets near the high school, away from the purview of school officials. In response, the young man’s father pulled him out of the school and transferred him to another school district away from this violence. Burd’s attack was not the only violent incident that had occurred at the high school, but it was the worst.

Accounts of the teacher attack and urban school violence spread throughout the city. Residents were infuriated that school violence had reached this point. Their outrage prompted a citywide debate about the violence that permeated the city’s schools. Frank Burd became an iconic figure. He spoke out about the attack on local radio and television stations. He publicly forgave the young men who committed this crime and urged city officials to institute polices that would address this kind of violence. The debates and suggestions about how to address the violence in the City of Brotherly Love were short-lived—they focused primarily on Burd’s injuries. Germantown High School youth made their own film footage since no one had included them in these discussions. Despite these conversations, within a few weeks, Germantown High School had returned to its normal state of chaos and disorder. The high school hardly resembled the institution that it had once been. Rather, by 2007, Germantown High School represented the prototype of a failing urban high school that seemed beyond repair.

While the attack on Frank Burd happened at Germantown High School, it could

---

3 Moss-Coane, “Philadelphia teacher Frank Burd.”
have happened almost anywhere. In a national survey of school violence, 90.9% of the high schools who completed the survey reported at least one or more violent incidents during the school year—27.6% of these were serious incidents, meaning they were either sexual assaults or involved a weapon.⁶ Furthermore, 8.6% of the high schools teachers who completed the study stated that their students had verbally disrespected them and 14.3% of teachers who completed the survey said that their students had disrespected them with acts that went beyond verbal abuse.⁷ Beyond the school, violence is even more extreme. In 2010, nearly 700 youth were shot by gunfire in Chicago alone. After careful analysis, the Chicago police realized that these incidents occurred in an area that only encompassed 8.5% of the city.⁸ Even though the attack on Frank Burd could have happened anywhere, as these statistics suggest, it is more likely to happen in neighborhoods that the urban poor call home. Neighborhoods like Germantown.

Scholars from a variety of disciplines have studied the factors that have contributed to the dramatic escalation of violence in urban schools and low-income neighborhoods.⁹ History, however, is largely missing from these analyses. This dissertation, *The Roots of Educational Inequality*, provides this analysis by examining the political, economic, and social factors that led to the escalation of violence and the transformation of Germantown High School and its urban community throughout the

---

⁷ Ibid., 11.
twentieth century. This longitudinal study, accomplished through a careful analysis of daily events rather than sampling key turning points, maximizes the benefits of a case study approach by connecting local conditions to the larger transformation of urban schools, urban communities, and the social welfare state. Specifically, my work links the school’s history to the community and the city’s history to demonstrate how the influx of working class residents, the escalation of residential segregation, and the failures of urban renewal efforts affected a public high school and its urban community.

This dissertation contributes to three intersecting, but rarely connected, bodies of literature. First, it draws on the literature on the history of education, which generally falls into one of two distinct categories: studies of large-scale change or studies of a particular case. The studies that examine large-scale systemic change tend to focus on the transformation of schools from locally controlled one-room schoolhouses to large, bureaucratic institutions. This scholarship examines how national or school district-level processes contributed to this dramatic change during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Other studies in this category examine the political and social processes at the national and school district-level that shaped educational opportunities for a particular groups of citizens, such as African Americans, immigrants, and women. In


addition to these works, historians of education have conducted localized case studies to understand the history of American high schools during the 19th and 20th centuries. However, these studies focus on punctuated moments in a school’s history, the work of a charismatic leader, or the history of an exemplary school. No one has studied the history of an American high school over the course of the twentieth century. This dissertation does that by connecting the history of one American high school to the history of national and school district-level policies to show how the history of this high school was simultaneously shaped by and shaped these policies.

In addition to the scholarship on the history of education, my dissertation contributes to scholarship on urban history. Urban historians have examined the impact of the rise and decline of manufacturing; the segmentation and segregation of the housing market; the continuation and escalation of ethnic and racial conflicts; and the connections and tensions between government policies and grassroots politics. These


historians are particularly interested in analyzing how historical processes contribute to economic and social inequalities that exist in cities and metropolitan areas today. However, urban historians generally have not used schools as a primary lens to understand the changes that have occurred in urban spaces during the twentieth century. Rather, they tend to see schools as peripheral to their analysis. I argue that to understand the inequalities that schools produce, schools must be at the heart of the analysis. By placing an American high school at the center of its analysis, my study contributes to our understanding of the history of schools and cities during the twentieth century by examining the relationships between large-scale urban transformations and an important urban institution: a neighborhood high school.

Finally, my dissertation draws on scholarship in comparative theories of gender and sexuality. Scholars in these fields typically focus on the ways in which institutions, including schools, replicate and reinforce power relations in society. In their analyses, they pay close attention to the cultural and ideological processes that promote these practices and how individuals resist these practices. This framework is central to my


14 Recent works by urban historians, such as Thomas J. Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North*, 1st ed. (New York: Random House, 2008); Levenstein, *A Movement Without Marches*, include research on schools. However, schools are not the primary focus.

work, for my dissertation argues that the history of Germantown High School is not a declension narrative from an institution’s glorious past to its current failures. Rather, inequality was imbedded in the fabric of the high school from its very beginning. This inequality, as these scholars suggest, reflected the prevailing cultural norms and ideologies about race, class, gender, and sexuality that existed in the community, the city, and the nation. Thus, some youth were affected more than others. In Germantown, like many other places, these inequalities shaped the educational experiences of female and black youth more than their white, male peers. As a result, these individuals resisted and challenged these inequalities at several points during the school’s history. Moreover, this scholarship pushes historians to examine both formal and informal mechanisms of education. My dissertation does this by linking the history of Germantown High School to a network of charitable organizations that augmented the educational and recreational activities of youth during the 20th century. Like the high school, these charitable organizations both reinforced and challenged the inequalities that existed in the school, the city, and the nation.

My dissertation requires the use of a wide variety of methodologies and archival sources. In particular, my study uses quantitative methods, which are more commonly found in social and political history projects. First, I analyze student demographic data, gathered from school yearbooks and the census, to understand how the students’ class, race, gender, and ethnicity contributed to the school’s culture. I compare high school

---


youth with out of school youth to show how student composition changed over the past one hundred years. I have plotted these data using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software to show the spatial distribution of the community’s youth by race and ethnicity, and more importantly, how the residential patterns and student demographics changed over time.

Second, I rely on qualitative methods, such as textual analyses of primary sources. These methods, typically used in cultural history, allow me to examine the political, economic, and social forces that shaped the history of the school and its community to larger historical changes during this period. I have examined city and community newspapers, association meeting notes, political scrapbooks, and Philadelphia Board of Education annual reports. I use school newspapers, yearbooks, and newsletters to document historical changes inside the school. I have drawn on my knowledge of ethnographic methods to conduct and film oral history interviews with alumni and community activists. These interviews give me a unique understanding of student experiences, particularly those shaped by race, class, gender and ethnicity. By linking the history of the community to the changes inside the institution, I am able to show how the school’s history both shapes and is shaped by social, economic, and political factors in the community, the city, and the nation.

The first chapter of this dissertation examines the battle that the residents of Germantown and the Philadelphia Board of Public Education waged against city council to build a new, neighborhood high school in Germantown. This campaign, which lasted from 1907-1914, centered primarily on the dangers associated with the long commute from Germantown, a quiet suburban community on the outskirts of the city, to the public high schools located in the center of the city. As this chapter demonstrates, residents were particularly concerned about the strain that this travel placed on young, native-
born women. They were also worried about the dangers that lurked in the city’s center—strange men and crazy dance halls—that might adversely affect these girls’ futures. In 1914, Germantown finally received what it demanded: a modern, neighborhood high school located within the safe confines of its suburban community.

The second chapter traces the history of the high school’s so-called glory years, from 1914-1928, and demonstrates the community’s commitment to its new public high school. During this period, the high school served primarily white, native-born middle class youth from the area and provided one of the best educational opportunities in the city. However, the Board of Public Education never had the funding that it needed to support the city’s schools. Rather than pressure city officials to provide its schools with the funds they actually needed, Germantown residents subsidized their new institution with private funds to ensure that their children had the educational resources and extra-curricular activities that they wanted. This private funding extended beyond the high school and supported a variety of charitable institutions in the community, which augmented the educational and recreational activities available to Germantown’s working and middle class youth. The influx of private funding provided these institutions with the resources that they needed and helped to establish their legitimacy, but at the same time, it stratified the city’s institutions into those that had to rely solely on the city’s inadequate funding streams and those that did not.

Chapter Three analyzes the history of Germantown High School, its community, and its city during the Great Depression, 1929-1937. The chapter examines the effects of the Great Depression on Philadelphia, Germantown, and its young high school. In doing so, I argue that Germantown fared better than many other parts of the city during this period, yet the Great Depression still brought unprecedented levels of poverty to the community. The unemployment and poverty that occurred during the Great Depression
negatively impacted the community’s ability to fund its high school and its
charitable organizations with private funds. Furthermore, the advent of the Great
Depression pushed new students into the high school that would not have attended the
institution in ordinary economic times. The combination of decreased funding and
increased demand created cracks in the school’s foundation and weakened its legitimacy.

The fourth chapter traces the history of the school from 1937-1945 as the city of
Philadelphia emerged from the Great Depression and the nation entered World War II. I
argue that the city of Philadelphia’s wartime economic boom was a temporary solution to
the challenges that existed throughout the city as jobs slowly moved out of the city to the
suburbs and beyond. Germantown, unlike other parts of the city, did not necessarily
benefit directly from this wartime boom for its industries were not geared towards
wartime production. However, the war and its economic boom did impact
Germantown’s young high school. After the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the high
school responded to the nation’s call for unity and cooperation. This rhetoric masked the
mounting inequalities that existed in the high school and the community. Moreover, the
war diverted private funding from the high school to support the war efforts and pulled
students from the high school to enlist in the armed services or the wartime industries
that existed throughout the city. As historians Goldin and Katz suggest, this created a
“lost generation” of youth, and as this chapter demonstrates, these pull factors affected
black youth more than their white peers and increased inequality at Germantown and
other high schools in the city.  

The fifth chapter examines the history of the high school from 1946-1957 when
the community finally tried to address the inequalities that existed there through a

---
17 Claudia Goldin and Lawrence F. Katz, The Race between Education and Technology (Cambridge:
variety of community surveys, meetings, and committees. As scholars suggest, this period was a precursor to the violence and unrest of the 1960s, and as such, it contained its own set of challenges.\textsuperscript{18} During the 1950s, Germantown residents worried about increased white flight from the community and the influx of black residents from others parts of the city and nation. These patterns were not evenly distributed in the community and, thus, they impacted some neighborhoods more than others, particularly neighborhoods near the high school. As the community worried about white flight, others raised concerns about a dramatic increase in the levels of juvenile delinquency in the city and the community. Residents argued that the community needed to strengthen its recreational activities and support its youth. However, the private funding that had enabled this in the past had basically vanished. The high school reflected these problems and, as the inequalities increased, female and African American students began to challenge and resist the practices that promoted these inequalities in their high school and community. The 1950s might have seemed like the calm before the storm, but the elements that contributed to student unrest and new forms of violence were already there. The foundation that sustained the high school for decades had already crumbled.

The final chapter in my dissertation traces the history of the high school from 1958-1967 when the community struggled with white flight, racial unrest, and urban renewal. For two decades, city planners, local architects, and historical preservationists worked tirelessly to design a revitalization project for Germantown to preserve its finest historical structures and provide a modern shopping mall. They hoped that this plan would attract tourists and commercial development to the once quaint suburban community and curb the negative changes that had occurred over the past several decades. Residents, both black and white, protested these plans, and as they did, they

\textsuperscript{18} Hirsch, \textit{Making the Second Ghetto}.  

revealed divisions based on race and class that had existed in the community for decades. Germantown High School was in the middle of these debates, and in 1958, the community convinced the Philadelphia Board of Public Education to fund an addition to the original building. When the new addition finally opened, the school segregated vocational and academic students in separate buildings, which in turn, increased the inequality between students who received a vocational education and those that did not. As this happened, the city and community dodged efforts to desegregate its public schools, and by 1967, Germantown High School was a school transformed.

In 1848, Horace Mann declared that America’s public schools represented “the great equalizer of the condition of men—the balance-wheel of the social machinery.” Over a century later, it is clear that America’s urban public schools are not the great equalizer that Mann optimistically hoped they might become. Rather, the history of urban public schools demonstrate that these institutions reproduce the same deep structural inequalities that have existed in this country since its founding. While white flight clearly affected the high school and its ability to provide a first-rate education to its students, I argue that white flight, alone, did not lead to the school’s transformation. Rather the transformation of this American high school is connected, at least in part, to the dramatic decrease in the levels of private funding that residents contributed to the high school and charitable organizations during the twentieth century. The availability of charitable funding supplemented government aid and enhanced the opportunities and support available to Germantown youth—this ensured the high school’s early success and legitimacy. As the demographics of the community changed, this funding dwindled and the infrastructure that had supported the high school and its youth quickly deteriorated. By tracing this history over the course of an entire century from the school’s so-called
glorious promises to its current abysmal failures, this dissertation provides a new and more contextualized understanding of the transformation of American public high schools, urban neighborhoods, and the social welfare state over the past 100 years.
Chapter 1:

The Campaign for a Public High School in the Suburban Sanctuary, 1907-1914
On a bright September morning in 1907, Viola C. Fisher's mother, Carrie, knocked on her daughter's bedroom door. It was a momentous occasion for the young fourteen year old. It was her first day of high school. Viola’s mother had already pressed her finest clothes, a crisp, white blouse with a high collar bordered by a hint of lace and a long, black skirt that draped to the edge of her ankles. Viola looked at her new clothes with excitement. As a primary school student, she could only wear a plain black jumper and white blouse. However, in high school, her clothes epitomized refined femininity, marking her as a young woman with a bright future. A small percentage of Americans attended high school at the turn of the century—in Philadelphia, in 1910, only 4% of children ages 14-18 attended high school. Viola was part of a select group of girls who attended high school in the city. It truly was a special day.

Viola’s new high school, The Philadelphia High School for Girls, was the only public high school to admit girls at the turn of the twentieth century. Middle class families knew that a high school diploma virtually guaranteed a white-collar occupation, and then, a courtship and marriage to an appropriate suitor. The Philadelphia High School for Girls was located on 17th and Spring Garden Street in the heart of downtown Philadelphia, almost eleven miles away from Viola’s Germantown home (see figure 1.1).

---

2 While I do not have evidence of Viola’s dress, I have looked at several photographs from Girls’ High School from this period showing the girls in pristine white shirts and long dark skirts, for examples, see Yearbook, 1907, The Philadelphia High School for Girls. Similarly, the Germantown Historical Society has several photographs of primary school children during this period, see Box 3, Public Schools, Germantown Historical Society.
4 Ibid., 167.
Figure 1.1

Viola Fisher's Home and The Philadelphia High School for Girls, 1907

Viola, and others like her, had to travel on the crowded, electric trolley that linked her bucolic community to the city’s chaos and corruption. Many families worried about their young daughters. They had read newspaper accounts about girls who had been seriously injured when their long skirts caught the electric rails and ignited in flames. After she cinched her skirt and laced her black leather boots, Viola rushed down the oak staircase and gathered her belongings. Before she left the safe confines of her home located at 307 Rex Avenue, she gave her beloved mother a kiss goodbye. Her father, Gilbert, a machinist, accompanied Viola on the half mile walk from her home to Germantown’s main thoroughfare, the Avenue, with its historic cobblestone streets and modern electric trolleys. Gilbert wanted Viola to board the trolley, attend high school, and return home safely. However, as she left the protected confines of her quiet community and entered the bustling city, he could not guarantee this.

At the turn of the century, Philadelphia was a mixture of inner-city urban neighborhoods with diverse residents—working class immigrants and African Americans living near upper and middle class native-born blacks and whites (see figures 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5). It was also home to outlying suburban communities, such as Germantown, with sprawling mansions for the city’s elite, modern twins for middle class families, and modest row homes for the hired help. For example, Viola’s middle class family lived in one of the modern twins that lined both sides of Germantown’s Rex Avenue at the turn of the century. John S. Jenks, Jr., one of the city’s leading businessmen, lived around the corner from Viola in a stately mansion on Seminole Avenue with his wife, Isabella, their

---


6 For information about her home and her father’s occupation, see ancestry.com. For images of Germantown Avenue at the turn of the twentieth century, see Judith Callard, Germantown, Mount Airy and Chestnut Hill (Mount Pleasant, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2000).

7 Photograph, 307 Rex Avenue, Germantown Historical Society.
two young sons, and six Irish domestics. Germantown’s geographic location, on the edge of the city’s limits, afforded its residents a suburban lifestyle, with fresh air and quiet streets, near the city. Germantown’s suburban appeal and easy access to the city attracted a wide variety of individuals—middle class families like the Fishers and upper class families with several working class domestics like the Jenks. It was diverse, even at the turn of the century.

Philadelphia’s geography split the city into two gendered spheres: Germantown’s private suburban periphery, where native-born white women could travel safely, and Philadelphia’s public urban core, where, according to received wisdom, they could not. These divisions did not apply to the men who traveled to the city each morning. While these “gendered geographies” clearly existed at the turn of the century in Germantown, a woman’s race, class, and ethnicity also figured into the equation regulating the movement of women. In 1900, there were approximately 4,000 domestics living in Germantown. These women, most of whom were African American and Irish, were permitted, perhaps even expected, to move between Philadelphia’s bustling city and Germantown’s sheltered suburb. The suburb did not offer these women the same protection or regulation as the native-born white women who governed the homes where these domestics worked. Girls who left the suburban neighborhoods—West

---

8 See ancestry.com, John S. Jenks, Jr.
11 This data is from ancestry.com. In 1900, Germantown (Philadelphia County, Ward 22) listed 4,045 servants, 8 cooks, and 53 housekeepers.
Philadelphia, Germantown, and Frankford—to attend high school in the city were actively challenging the gendered boundaries that had governed their lives for decades.
Figure 1.2

Population Density by Ward, 1910

Source: National Historical Geographic Information System, U.S. Census (1910)
Figure 1.3

Percentage of Native-Born White Residents, by Census Tract, Philadelphia, 1910

Figure 1.4

Percentage of Foreign-Born White Residents, by Census Tract, Philadelphia, 1910

Source: U.S. 1910 Census, Table V, Composition and Characteristics of the Population for Wards of Cities of 50,000 or More, Pennsylvania, 605-608.
Figure 1.5

Percentage of Black Residents, by Census Tract, Philadelphia, 1910

Source: U.S. 1910 Census, Table V, Composition and Characteristics of the Population for Wards of Cities of 50,000 or More, Pennsylvania, 605-608.
When Viola traveled to her new school in the center of the city that morning, Philadelphia’s Board of Public Education was in the middle of a heated debate with City Council. The Board wanted Council to approve a five million dollar school loan to relieve the overcrowded conditions in the primary schools and to build new high schools in the city’s "outlying districts." When the Board’s attempt to secure this loan failed, the leaders of the high school campaign linked their crusade to the negative effects of co-education and urban space on adolescent girls. The men who led the campaign for new high schools worried that very presence of native-born white women in the city threatened their futures as dutiful wives and loving mothers. The high school campaign, they argued, benefited the future of these girls, and, in the turn, the future of their city and their nation. The leaders told Council that the city needed new high schools in these suburban neighborhoods to protect female bodies and morals.

The campaign to establish high schools in the outlying districts spanned almost a decade, but when it ended, the city had three new institutions: West Philadelphia High School (1911), Frankford High School (1914), and Germantown High School (1914). Residents in these communities rejoiced because these schools offered their native-born, white daughters protection in the secluded suburbs and a distinct educational program that emphasized the differences between boys and girls. These new high schools were
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1 To ease reading, Council refers to Philadelphia’s City Council throughout the paper.
3 For historical and theoretical work on female bodies, see Professor Kathleen M. Brown, Foul Bodies: Cleanliness in Early America, 1st ed. (Yale University Press, 2009); Dorothy Ko, Cinderella’s Sisters: a Revisionist History of Footbinding (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); T. W. Laqueur, Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992); Judith Butler, Undoing Gender (New York: Routledge, 2004).
4 Typically, the word, suburb, refers to areas outside the city. This study challenges that notion and argues that Germantown residents thought of themselves and their neighborhood as geographically, culturally, and politically removed from the city. For a larger discussion of this, D. R. Contosta, Suburb in the City: Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, 1850-1990 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1992). For descriptions in primary sources on Germantown, see Henry Edmunds, “Report of the President,” in Twenty-third Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, First School District of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Walther Printing House,
technically co-educational institutions, but they were not “gender neutral.”

Instead, the high school campaign and the buildings that it created reproduced and reinforced inequality.

**The Origins of the American High School Movement**

The crusade to establish high schools in the United States began in 1821 with the creation of Boston English High School. When English High School opened, the founders boasted that the new high school promised to provide “a reputation and fortune” to “young men of talents and learning.” Fifteen years later, in 1836, the Pennsylvania state legislature passed a bill that gave Philadelphia permission to create “one central high school and to support it by money obtained in the same way that money was obtained for the support of other public schools.” In 1838, when the all-male Central High School officially opened, it admitted 63 boys ranging from ten to sixteen years old. Residents raised the idea of opening a similar high school for girls, but at the time the opposition outweighed its support. Central was the first high school to open in the mid-Atlantic region, and when those boys entered their new high school building, it seemed that Philadelphia might become a leader in the nation’s high school movement.

In the nineteenth century, educational leaders, such as Horace Mann, argued that the nation’s economic and moral prosperity was directly tied to a strong system of public

---


schools. The high school was the pinnacle of Mann’s educational system. However, instead of providing students with the same course of study, most high schools offered students two distinct programs: Classical and English. The Classical program of study included coursework primarily in Latin, Greek, and mathematics. The English program included a wide range of courses, which gave students more flexibility. The majority of students who attended high schools enrolled in the English program, which was a point of pride for early reformers, because this program focused on providing students with practical, not academic skills. These practical skills, reformers argued, would be more appropriate preparation for the world of commerce and business.

Only a tiny fraction of youth attended high school during the nineteenth century, and of those youth, the majority were sons and daughters of the middle class. Historians have suggested that the link between the middle class and high school attendance stemmed from socioeconomic uncertainties during this period. Technological advancements coupled with the advent of capitalism weakened the social and economic positions that the middle class had enjoyed during earlier times. As machines replaced their time-honored craft skills, the goods that they produced lost market value. At best, middle class families lost earnings. At worst, these families closed their businesses and shops. As this economic change rattled their security, middle class families looked for other means to help their children secure employment in the emerging manufacturing and commercial sectors.

The rising tide of middle class anxiety during the first half of the nineteenth century fueled the development of the public high school, and within a few years, these

---

families were totally committed to this innovative, yet controversial, institution.\textsuperscript{12} David Labaree claims that middle class loyalty to public high schools was directly linked to the value of the diploma as a marketable good. In Philadelphia, Central High School admitted only male students who passed its difficult entrance exam. The school even restricted the number of admissions each year despite a dramatic rise in applicants. This combination, high demand and low supply, made Central’s credential valuable and legitimate, which in turn, “provided a powerful incentive for middle class families to pursue it.”\textsuperscript{13} The relationship between the middle class and the high school was mutually beneficial: high schools survived because middle class families sent their children to these schools; middle class children enrolled in public high school to earn a merit-based credential that was the “ticket to a white-collar occupation.”\textsuperscript{14} In this way, American high schools blended elements of public and private institutions. High schools were public institutions because they were funded with tax dollars. They functioned as private institutions because they were not open to everyone. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, high school students were youth like Viola, whose families had enough financial security to forgo their children’s earnings in the labor market while their sons and daughters attended school.

Despite the city’s early entrance into the high school movement, Philadelphia followed a different trajectory from other cities in the nation. Instead of opening academic high schools, the city established a series of manual training schools to “demonstrate the advantages of hand-training in conjunction with head-training.” The city built the first of these schools, Central Manual School, in 1884 on Seventeenth and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Michael B. Katz, \textit{Reconstructing American Education} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987);
\item Labaree, \textit{The Making of an American High School}, 37.
\item Goldin and Katz, 169.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Wood Streets. During its first year, the school enrolled 130 students; by 1888, this number had almost tripled to 326. In 1889, the Board of Education decided to build another manual training school in Northeast Philadelphia on 8th Street and Lehigh Avenue. Northeast Manual High School opened its doors a year later and welcomed 120 students to its program. These schools dominated the landscape in Philadelphia. By incorporating academic and vocational training in one place, the manual training schools deviated from the Classical and English programs that existed in most American high schools at the time.

Philadelphia high schools differed in another way. Scholars note that most Americans preferred co-educational high schools at the turn of the century. The co-educational nature of the nation’s high schools made them distinctly different from Europe’s single-sex high schools. However, Philadelphia actually instituted single-sex education in its high schools. In 1848, the city opened the Philadelphia High School for Girls to accommodate girls who wanted a high school education. It was the only high school available to young women, like Viola, at the turn of the century. In the beginning, Girls’ High School, as it was also known, had an academic course and a normal school to train teachers. However, as the enrollment increased, the school created a business department in 1893. This department offered a three-year course geared toward those individuals who wanted to enter commercial or clerical professions upon graduation. Records suggest that this program was incredibly popular among the young women at Girls’ High. Enrollment between 1893 and 1900 increased 354% (from 240 students to 15

---

In 1850, there was only one high school in Philadelphia; in 1900, there were four—three for boys, one for girls.

Philadelphia’s high school system did not necessarily match the prevailing structure in the country, but there was a marked increase in secondary school enrollment during this period. As the enrollment increased, students attended overcrowded schools and makeshifts annexes. Even though this was a difficult situation, progressive activists were much more concerned about the city’s antiquated school governance structure. Instead of pressuring the city to build new high schools, the city’s progressive reforms began a campaign to reform the school governance structure from a corrupt parochial system to a streamlined modern bureaucracy. New high schools, it seemed, would have to wait.

**Philadelphia’s Revolution to Reform School Governance**

In 1900, the Philadelphia Board of Public Education and its superintendent were at the mercy of the city’s sectional school boards. The city had vested these boards with the power to govern all primary schools. At the turn of the century, the city had 41 wards; thus, there were 41 unique administrative units governing the schools. This division of governance promoted a corrupt system where sectional school boards stole funds, hired friends as teachers and administrators, and forced teachers to contribute to political campaigns to retain their positions. The Republican bosses who ruled city and state-level politics actively sought to retain this system of school governance because it

---

directly benefited them. The sectional school board members shared the bosses’ class and ethnic backgrounds; thus, they willingly provided the bosses with immediate access to local schools and their associated patronage sources.

Beginning in 1881, the Public Educational Association, a group of progressive reformers, tried to overhaul this system and replace it with a centralized Board of Education and a strong superintendent to manage the public schools. The association believed this approach was more efficient and more likely to curb corruption. The political bosses disagreed and argued that the sectional school boards provided residents with local control over their own schools. The political bosses did not want the “educational cranks” or “old maids” from the Public Education Association meddling in their affairs, and, thus, when legislation to reform the schools reached them in Council, the Republican bosses refused to pass it.  

The association fought back and enlisted the support of prominent muckraking journalists to expose the corruption in the city’s public schools to educational reformers at the state and national level. The state responded to the journalists’ accounts by passing the Philadelphia Public School Reorganization Act of 1905. This act shifted control of the public schools from the 540 members of the parochial, ward-based sectional school boards to the 21 members of the Philadelphia Board of Public Education. The individuals who worked on the campaign referred to

---


21 Issel, 381.
this legislation as “Philadelphia’s Revolution of 1905” and hoped that it would usher in a new approach to education in the city.\textsuperscript{22}

On July 1, 1906, only a few months after the Reorganization Act went into effect, the Board of Education appointed Dr. Martin Grove Brumbaugh as the superintendent of the city’s public schools. Brumbaugh had extensive experience in education—as a professor of education at Juniata College and the University of Pennsylvania, as the superintendent of schools in Huntingdon County, as the first United States Commissioner of Education in Puerto Rico, and as the vice-president of the reform-oriented Public Education Association.\textsuperscript{23} The members of the board shared an unwavering faith in its new superintendent to realize the potential of the reorganization act and reform the city’s distressed school system.\textsuperscript{24}

When he assumed his position, Brumbaugh eagerly sought to prove that the Board had selected the perfect candidate for the task and initiated an intensive survey to assess school conditions. The survey documented school building conditions, primary school enrollments, and staff qualifications among teachers and administrators. The results revealed that the situation was worse than anyone had expected. School buildings throughout Philadelphia lacked adequate heat and indoor plumbing. Primary schools were filled beyond capacity largely due to the passage of compulsory education and child labor legislation. In addition, sectional school boards had hired teachers and

\textsuperscript{24} Licht, \textit{Getting Work}, 67–69.
administrators based on personal connections rather than on academic qualifications.\textsuperscript{25} Brumbaugh began a public campaign to guarantee “a decent seat in a decent school for every child in Philadelphia” and enlisted civically minded residents and political leaders to assist him in his crusade.\textsuperscript{26}

Despite these efforts, many challenges lingered. In 1900, Philadelphia had 146,432 children in the primary schools; in 1907, the district had 163,969.\textsuperscript{27} The city had not built enough high schools to accommodate the increased enrollment. In September 1907, 16,573 pupils lacked seats in the schools.\textsuperscript{28} Brumbaugh assured residents that the Board had used its funds judiciously and blamed Council for its refusal to provide adequate school funding. He asked Council to provide the Board with a five million dollar loan to finance new school construction throughout the city to accommodate the city’s children.\textsuperscript{29} Brumbaugh promised to split the loan between the primary and secondary schools. He knew that the need for new primary schools was much more critical than the need for high schools; however, as a staunch supporter of high schools,
Brumbaugh wanted to use at least part of the loan to reform Philadelphia’s outdated high school system.  

In 1907, Philadelphia had five high schools: three manual training schools that provided vocational training—Central Manual Training High School, Northeast Manual Training High School, and the Philadelphia Trade School—and two academic high schools—the all-male Central High School and the all-female Girls’ High School. These public high schools presented several challenges for residents, particularly to those who lived outside the city’s center in suburban communities, such as Germantown. Most importantly, the city’s public high schools were located in the city’s center, which suburban residents viewed as both costly and dangerous to their children. The demands for entrance to these schools outweighed the availability of seats, and thus, admission was not guaranteed. The academic schools only admitted students who passed the schools’ entrance exams; the manual training schools only admitted male students. Philadelphia families had a much more difficult time finding space for their daughters in the public schools because only one of the five public high schools, the Philadelphia High School for Girls, allowed girls to enroll. As the number of students seeking a high school education in the city increased, the competition for seats in these schools grew increasingly fierce. As David Labaree suggests in his study of Central High
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31 For the history of the manual training schools, see Licht, *Getting Work*, 57–97.
School during this period the pressure to build new high schools was “more pronounced in Philadelphia than in other cities because public access was narrower there.”

The Board of Education responded to the intense competition by opening a series of makeshift annexes in primary schools and vacant buildings that were connected with the two academic high schools, Central and Girls’ High. These annexes alleviated the immediate crisis. However, between 1902 and 1907, Central High School’s enrollment increased by 39% and Girls’ High School’s enrollment increased by 76% (see figure 1.6).

**Figure 1.6**

![Student Enrollment, Central and Girls' High School, 1902-1907](image)


The Board had a difficult time trying to keep pace with the growing demands for seats in its high schools and became increasingly concerned with the rising costs to rent

space for the new high school annexes in the center of the city. Furthermore, the Board argued that the number of high schools in Philadelphia lagged behind other metropolitan areas and threatened the city’s ability to compete economically in the nation. As high school enrollment and rental costs skyrocketed, the Board urged Council to allocate its proposed five million dollar loan to build new high schools beyond the city’s urban core. Brumbaugh knew this was the amount he needed to improve the schools and hoped Council would grant the Board these funds.

Even though the Board of Education emphasized the importance of public high schools, for the most part, Germantown’s wealthier residents sent their children to one of several prestigious private secondary schools located in their community. However, by the turn of the twentieth century, these schools did not necessarily match these residents’ needs. Perhaps most importantly, many families could not afford private school tuition. Many of these schools barred African American, Jewish, and Catholic children either formally or informally, and thus, they were not viable options for the small, but growing black and ethnic residents. Finally, at the end of the nineteenth century, college-educated women moved to Germantown and opened small, independently managed private schools in the community. These small schools resembled the independent academies that existed during the early part of the nineteenth century. Like the academies, these schools often lacked endowments to weather economic downturns. As a result, many of these schools closed unexpectedly forcing families to scramble for educational institutions that met their demands. As

35 “School Board Finances,” Public Ledger, September 25, 1907. See also “$5,000,000 Will Not Fill School Bill,” Public Ledger, September 26, 1907.
upper and middle class residents realized the shortcomings of private schools, they started to consider the benefits of the proposed school loan and the possibilities of building a public high school in the community.\textsuperscript{38}

\textit{The Board of Education Campaigns for Adequate School Funding}

As Germantown residents garnered support for the proposed five million dollar school loan, the Philadelphia Board of Public Education hosted a lavish parade on September 21, 1907, to commemorate the opening of the Southern Manual Training High School for Boys. Brumbaugh used the occasion to celebrate this new school and to pressure political leaders to pass the Board’s proposed school loan. Brumbaugh reminded his listeners that high school students paid carfare each morning to travel long distances on “crowded trolleys.” However, according to Brumbaugh, Philadelphia had many “honest and worthy families” who wanted their children to attend high school, but did not because they could not afford the trolley fare. Brumbaugh worried about this because he believed the city had effectively “denied an army of boys and girls” the benefits of a high school education because these institutions were located in one part of the city. The expense of the trolley fare forced students to forgo their education. Brumbaugh told listeners that the trolley carfare represented a private tax on individuals who lived in the suburban districts and used public schools. Brumbaugh urged Council to approve the school loan immediately so that the Board of Education could begin construction on high schools beyond the city’s center.\textsuperscript{39}

A week after the parade and Brumbaugh’s call to action, Mayor Reyburn denied the Board of Education’s request for funds and told residents that the problems in the

\textsuperscript{38} See Box 3, Private Schools, GHS. For a discussion about the outdated nature of private schools during the high school campaign, see “Germantown Hits Out from Shoulder for a High School,” \textit{Independent Gazette}, May 8, 1908. George P. Darrow Scrapbook, Box 3 Schools, Public, Germantown Historical Society.

public schools stemmed from the Board’s inability to manage its funds efficiently.\textsuperscript{40} In response, the Board of Education publicly condemned Mayor Reyburn for denying the severity of the situation. The Board drafted a pamphlet that outlined how it would have used the loan that the Mayor had refused and bluntly stated that Philadelphia’s public school system jeopardized the city’s “reputation” as a leader in the nation.\textsuperscript{41} The Board sent hundreds of pamphlets to influential residents and civic associations throughout the city to pressure Council to allocate funds to relieve the overcrowded and dilapidated school conditions.

In December, the Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association (GCHIA) discussed the implications of the Board’s pamphlet during its monthly meeting. The GCHIA was founded in 1906 for men in Germantown “irrespective of party to further the interests” of their community; the Association leveraged their connections in the city to raise public funds to pave dirt roads, to install street lamps, and to improve public education.\textsuperscript{42} After the members of the association discussed the pamphlet, they drafted a resolution stating their support for the school loan that the Mayor had refused. The resolution condemned the “unsanitary and overcrowded” school conditions and urged Council to pass the loan and build new schools to accommodate Germantown’s “increasing school population.” The association echoed Brumbaugh’s concerns about the city’s public high schools stating that the “overcrowded conditions and remoteness” of the city’s high schools “deprive” Germantown youth from a secondary education. The

\textsuperscript{40} “Reyburn Assails Education Board: Declares Members Are Not Competent to Spend $5,000,000 Loan if Obtained,” \textit{Public Ledger}, September 27, 1907; “Mayor Puts Blame on Education Board,” \textit{Evening Bulletin}, September 27, 1907.

\textsuperscript{41} “School Board Finances,” \textit{Public Ledger}, September 25, 1907. See also “$5,000,000 Will Not Fill School Bill,” \textit{Public Ledger}, September 26, 1907.

\textsuperscript{42} Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association Meeting Minutes, December 17, 1906. Box, Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, Minutes, 1908-1929, Germantown Historical Society.
resolution demanded that Council pass the loan and allocate part of the funds for a high school site in their community.

The association approved the resolution unanimously and mailed copies to James McAllister, the finance chairman on Council, and several Germantown Councilmen. This was a marked shift in their position. In the past, the association had criticized Council for its corruption and patronage. The members of the association thought that the Councilmen had routinely overlooked the needs of the outlying areas. The high school situation elicited a different response. Rather than avoiding Council, the members of the association publicized the resolution in local and citywide newspapers to demonstrate the association’s support for the school loan and its demands for a district high school. The members of the association assumed that Council would approve the loan, allocate the funds, and open a district high school within a year. After all, the association enjoyed limited but significant influence on the new Board of Public Education. William T. Tilden, a prominent Germantown resident and GCHIA member, led the Board’s property association and made recommendations about new school sites and facilities throughout the city. Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson, another member of the GCHIA, served as the president of Central High School and directly influenced the city’s high school policies. The Association members believed that once Council approved the loan these men could positively influence the Board’s decision to allocate funds for a new high school in Germantown.

Unfortunately, the GCHIA members overestimated their influence and underestimated Council’s resistance to provide funds to build a high school in Germantown.

43 Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association Special Meeting Minutes, October 2, 1907, Box, Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, Minutes, 1908-1929, Germantown Historical Society.
44 McCafferey, When Bosses Ruled Philadelphia, see chapter 6. McCafferey suggests that middle and upper class suburban residents were the least likely to support the Republic machine in the city. For an editorial that displayed Germantown’s optimism, Editorial, Independent Gazette, January 25, 1907.
Germantown’s suburban community. Council refused the Board’s request and passed a two and a half million-dollar loan to build new schools. Brumbaugh and the Board expressed its disappointment. Brumbaugh told residents that he would use Council’s modest funding to build new primary schools. The Joint Committee on High Schools, a sub-committee on the Board, stated that Council’s meager allocation made it impossible for the Board to build district high schools. The committee assured residents that it would continue to pressure Council for more funding in the future to construct secondary schools. The Joint Committee on High Schools argued that Philadelphia’s “public educational system is a twelve year system and the State is under obligation to see that it is treated and developed a symmetrical whole.” The members of the committee tied the district’s needs to national data: Philadelphia ranked 23rd on a list of American cities in the percentage of children who enrolled in high school. This, they argued, threatened the city’s livelihood and blamed Council for failing to “furnish adequate facilities.” Instead of retreating, the leaders of the high school campaign urged Council to pass a new school loan and built momentum for their high school campaign by connecting it to anxieties about the negative effects of co-education and city life for adolescent girls.

**The Perils of Education and Work among American Women**

Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, educational experts, political leaders, and social reformers raised concerns about the expansion of educational opportunities for American women that had occurred following the Civil War. These individuals—mostly men—worried that academic education strained women’s bodies and threatened their ability to assume their “proper” role as obedient

---

wives and loving mothers. While they did not explicitly state it, they were equally anxious that men were being shortchanged by the presence and success of American women at all levels of education. Statistical data confirmed their fears. From 1870 to 1910, the number of women who attended school and earned academic credentials increased steadily. Women made up 56% of high school graduates in 1870 and 60% of high school graduates in 1910. Even more impressive, they represented 15% of college graduates in 1870 and 34% of college graduates in 1910 (see figure 1.7). This increase aroused anxieties that the supposed weaker sex was outperforming American men.46

**Figure 1.7**  **High School and Postsecondary Graduates, Female Percentage, 1869-1910**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Female Graduates, High School</th>
<th>Percentage of Female Graduates, Institutions of Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1869-1870</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-1880</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1890</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1900</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The surge of women entering the nation’s high schools and colleges incited a heated debate about their intellectual capabilities and the effects of intellectual activity on their bodies, particularly their reproductive functions. In 1873, Dr. Edward H. Clarke, a prominent professor of medicine at Harvard University, published Sex in Education, a study which argued that educational opportunities open to women in the late nineteenth century “fostered” deadly illnesses that “torture a woman’s earthly existence.” Clarke

---

46 For a variety of primary sources on this topic, see Louise Michele Newman, ed., *Men’s Ideas/Women’s Realities* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1985), 69-104.
justified his claims based on seven case studies from his medical practice. He argued that the expansion of education for women caused hysteria, nervousness, and infertility. Clarke stated that some women retained their fertility, despite their education; however, he asserted that advanced education bred “germs” which threatened a women’s health later in life and produced a “feeble race” of children.47

Clarke’s work ushered in a nationwide campaign to curb the expansion of women’s higher education and encouraged feminists to voice their opposition to his ideas. Stanford University’s co-founder Jane Stanford implemented a policy to limit the number of female students to assuage faculty anxiety and encourage “able men” to return to the institution.48 Women’s colleges heeded Clarke’s warnings and routinely screened their applicants’ physical fitness and monitored the effects of academic studies on their bodies through periodic medical screenings.49 Feminists involved in educational endeavors, including Alice Freeman Palmer, the president of Wellesley College, and Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, a medical doctor, lambasted Clarke for publishing a book that lacked rigorous scientific evidence and that retarded women’s educational advancement.50 Even though these women were critical of Clarke’s ideas, they remained silent on issues of class, race, and ethnicity. Clarke and his critics shared one thing: they were focused only on the detrimental effects or positive benefits for college educated women. In other words, they were primarily concerned with the women who they

47 Edward Hammond Clarke, Sex in education: or, A fair chance for the girls (J. R. Osgood and company, 1873), 20-26. For other articles on this topic, see Ibid.
thought attended college—white, native-born women from upper and middle class families.⁵¹

As these men continued to push these ideas, new data heightened anxieties that higher education was detrimental to women. At the turn of the century, research indicated that women with higher levels of education were more likely to delay marriage and enter the labor market. Women not only found jobs in sectors traditionally reserved for women as textile factories and public schools, but they also secured positions in new sectors as telephone operators and department store girls.⁵² College educated women channeled their ambitions into the professions that were open to them—primarily teaching, social work, and nursing. They established settlement homes and leveraged their academic skills to conduct research on the lives of working class residents and urged progressive reforms to address the problems in their increasingly industrialized cities.⁵³

However, the concerns about these women went beyond their participation in the labor market. As historian Kathy Peiss and others have pointed out, the entry of these women into the labor market gave them “access to new forms of social life in the public arena.”⁵⁴ In other words, it moved an unprecedented number of women from the private

---

sphere of the home and family to the public sphere of the street and work.\textsuperscript{55} This shift, in turn, forged a new youth culture that challenged conventional sexual norms.\textsuperscript{56}

Women worked in office buildings alongside men, and after work, they used their meager salaries or allowed men to treat them to an evening of thrilling excitement in urban dance halls, penny arcades, movie theatres, and amusement parks. They flaunted their sexuality in public and private places—strolling through the dimly lit city streets donning the latest fashions and dancing the night away in private venues. These secluded venues “allowed young women to use their bodies to express sexual desire and individual pleasure in movement that would have been unacceptable in any other public arena.”\textsuperscript{57} This newfound freedom spurred longstanding concerns that these women might succumb to the city’s temptations and ruin their future prospects for marriage and motherhood. Middle class reformers—mostly women—urged the state to intercede and regulate the venues that these women frequented. In some cases, these reformers even removed these “delinquent daughters” from the corrupt environments that supposedly promoted their immoral behavior.\textsuperscript{58}

While middle class reformers focused on rehabilitating women, other individuals obsessed over data from the 1900 United Census. Census data indicated that white American women in the 1900 cohort had fewer children per family than previous generations. Even more startling was the statistic that revealed that native-born white

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{55}] Historians have shown that women of various classes challenged the separation of public/private before the twentieth century, for this scholarship, see Deborah Gray White, \textit{Arn't I a Woman?: Female Slaves in the Plantation South, Revised Edition}. (New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1999); Stansell, \textit{City of Women}; Ryan, \textit{Women in Public}. However, the dramatic surge of women in the work force at the turn of the twentieth century put new pressures of these distinctions.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
women in this group had produced fewer children than foreign-born white women and African American women. President Roosevelt boldly proclaimed that the decline in birthrate among native-born white women promoted “race suicide” and weakened the nation’s future. Social scientists condemned the women for delaying marriage beyond their prime childbearing years or for rejecting the sacred institution altogether. These critics had new evidence to bolster their claims that an academically oriented education damaged the lives of native-born white women and threatened the nation’s prosperity.⁵⁹

The perils of an academic education for women re-emerged with a vengeance when a new prophet, G. Stanley Hall, published his two-volume study, *Adolescence*, in 1904. Hall researched “scientific” studies conducted throughout the world to demonstrate the vast evidence of sexual differences and the fragility of youth during the adolescent period. According to Hall, the adolescent period occurred somewhere between the ages of eight and twelve. It was characterized as a period when “bones and muscles” develop rapidly to make a “man aggressive” and to prepare a “woman's frame for maternity.”⁶⁰ Hall noted that this rapid development made adolescent youth particularly susceptible to disease and argued that these dangers were even more severe for children in cities. Perhaps even more terrifying, Hall told his readers that a child’s hereditary background, in other words his or her race and ethnicity, provided no protection from the perils of adolescence. He wrote, “the momentum of heredity often seems insufficient to enable the child to achieve this great revolution and come to complete maturity, so that every step of the upward way is strewn with wreckage of body,

---

mind, and morals." He wanted native-born, white “non-laboring” readers to understand that their children’s racial and ethnic superiority did not protect them from this “wreckage.” These families, Hall urged, needed to be vigilant about the challenges that even their children faced during this tumultuous period. Hall condemned American high schools for ignoring the effects of this “wreckage” and argued that the “hoodluminism, juvenile crime, and secret vice” stemmed from this neglect. Co-educational high schools, he argued, threatened the future of American children because these institutions ignored the distinct “nature” and “needs” of adolescent boys and girls.

Hall believed that the biological changes that occurred during the adolescent period were more extreme for women than they were for men, and as a result, he argued that women were more susceptible to fatigue, headaches, and hysteria. He argued that “excessive intellectualism” contributed to these disorders and instilled young women with an “aversion” to their roles as mothers. He stated that this “intellectualism” ruined the “tone of her body, nerves, or morale” and encouraged women “to escape” their “function” to procreate. In addition to the effects on the physical body, Hall warned his readers that this “intellectualism” coupled with adolescent development threatened women’s moral virtue and prized virginity. He wrote:

American girls come to this crisis [adolescence] without having much control or restraint, and with their habits and actions almost entirely unsystematized. They appear rosy and healthy because energies, which should go to perfecting other parts and functions, have been diverted to cerebration. Influences from those about her tend to make her give up
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free and girlish sports and romping, and to feel herself a woman too suddenly.”

According to Hall, American girls were more likely to succumb to the temptations that existed in the city—women were not passive beings, as the past had suggested, rather they were sexually assertive individuals who might act on these heightened sexual urges and desires before marriage. He bluntly told his readers that academic education for women threatened the livelihood of American society, and echoing Roosevelt’s earlier concerns, he stated that it must be abolished immediately to preserve “our [American] civilization.”

To preserve women’s place in society, Hall told his readers that it was “high time” for the nation to question “the theory and practise [sic] of identical education, especially in the high school, which has been carried to a greater extreme in this country” than anywhere else in the world. These institutions promoted “grave dangers,” according to Hall, because they neglected the differences between men and women and wrongly encouraged women to see themselves as equals with their male peers. Co-education promoted a “new love of freedom” among women, which contributed to societal ills, and a “feminization of the school spirit, discipline, and personnel” that impeded male scholastic achievement. After he pointed out the “grave dangers” of this system, Hall offered his “ideal” high school plan for adolescent girls. These schools, he suggested, should be located “in the country in the midst of hills, the climbing of which is the best stimulus for heart and lungs, and tends to mental elevation and breadth of view.” He continued:
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There should be water for boating...gardens for kitchen vegetables and horticulture; forests for their seclusion and awe; good roads, walks, and paths that tempt to walking and wheeling...unheated space favorable for recreation in weather really too bad for out-of-door life and for those indisposed; and plenty of nooks that permit each to be alone with nature, for this develops inwardness, poise, and character, yet not too great remoteness from the city for wise utilization of its advantages at intervals.\(^{71}\)

Hall’s book rekindled the debate on co-education and advocated for a new educational approach specifically designed for the needs of native-born white adolescent girls that protected them from the city’s perils, that built in periods of regular rest, and that promoted motherhood above all other pursuits. As the next section illustrates, the men who led the high school campaign quickly echoed Hall’s ideas as they made a case for new high schools.

**Reframing the City’s High School Campaign to Preserve Feminine Virtue**

On May 12, 1908, the anxieties about the negative effects of educational advancement and city life on native-born, white women surfaced as hundreds of Germantown residents gathered together at a mass meeting to press Council to allocate a new school loan for district high schools. The sponsoring associations, which included the Germantown Business Men’s Association and the Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, published advertisements and editorials in local newspapers and sent personal letters to their members urging them to attend.\(^{72}\) The men who spoke at the event argued that Philadelphia’s system of high schools lagged behind other

---

\(^{71}\) Ibid, 636-637.

industrial cities—Philadelphia had six high schools whereas Boston, a much smaller city, had twelve. Then, they presented data that indicated that Germantown had a higher percentage of high school students than any other region in the city. These data, they argued, illustrated the demand for a high school in Germantown.

Several speakers discussed the hardships on high school students forced to commute to and from the city’s high schools to earn their secondary school credentials. Milton C. Cooper, Germantown’s district superintendent, stated that Germantown youth traveled between “ten” and “sixteen” miles daily to attend high school because these institutions were “located far from the outlying sections” of the city. He argued that the carfare to and from the city put “a serious drain upon the resources of many parents” and forced “nearly four-fifths” of these students to “drop out” of high school. Robert Ellis Thompson, Central High School’s president, echoed Cooper’s claims noting that he knew a young boy who had been walking several miles each morning to attend Central because his “parents were too poor” to pay for his carfare. This story, he argued, was not an “isolated” case—he knew of several boys in similar situations who attended his school.

Cooper and Thompson used these stories to convey the shortcomings of the city’s current high school system and to remind residents that these hardships were real.

Then, Thompson told the residents that the Board of Education had already transferred hundreds of students to makeshift annexes to alleviate overcrowding in the city’s high schools. These annexes, he continued, were unsuitable for learning and risked their children’s safety—one of the girls’ annexes was located on the fourth floor of a functioning carriage factory without a proper fire escape. Thompson recognized that

73 Central High School’s principal was referred to as its president to mark the school’s prestige.
Council would not willingly grant the community’s request for a school loan to build a high school. Philadelphia’s City Council had never funded the city’s public schools to the level that actually met the schools’ needs, and perhaps more importantly the political bosses in Council were much more interested in funding projects in their own districts in the city’s center rather than in Germantown. Germantown residents routinely opposed the political bosses who controlled Council, and as suburban residents, enjoyed a lower tax rate than the residents who lived in the city’s urban core.  

Instead of relying on Council to pass a loan, Thompson proposed that the community convert vacant space in Germantown into a high school annex specifically reserved for girls. When Bayard Henry heard this idea, he suggested that the community use vacant space at the local YWCA for a girls’ annex in Germantown. These men worried that the travel on the trolleys and the “temptations...in the city’s centre” posed a greater risk to the female students than their male peers. Germantown residents wanted to open a high school for girls to remove these dangers from their daily lives. In other words, the city’s gendered geographical boundaries, which delineated respectful and corrupt spaces in the city, applied primarily to Germantown white, native-born girls, like Viola.

The residents who attended the mass meeting applauded Henry’s offer and unanimously adopted a resolution detailing their demands to open a high school annex
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75 McCafferey, When Bosses Ruled Philadelphia., see chapter 6. McCafferey suggests that middle and upper class suburban residents were the least likely to support the Republic machine in the city. For information on the lower tax rate, see Henry R. Edmonds, “Report of the President of the Board of Education,” in the Ninety-Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, 1913, 15-17.
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for girls within the safe confines of their suburban community. In the resolution, they stated that “the remoteness of the existing high schools” in the city made it difficult for Germantown youth to extend their education beyond primary school. The long commute to and from the high schools in the center of the city inadvertently freed their children from “the restraints of home” and produced a “grave risk to their physical health and moral well-being.” In addition to these benefits, the individuals who attended this meeting reminded their councilmen about the benefits of this high school to the rest of the city. They stated that a high school annex, and eventually a permanent building, in Germantown would relieve overcrowding in the current schools and would allow the city to provide high school education in a more efficient and effective manner.

After they listed the reasons for the new high school, the residents asked Council to pass a new school loan and allocate at least $100,000 to purchase a site for a district high school in Germantown. They created a new committee to help the community realize these goals. The men on this committee were white, native-born businessmen in the community. The newly appointed committee signed this resolution and sent copies of it to the Mayor, the Board of Education, and Germantown Councilmen.79 The residents who attended the meeting confidently believed that the Board would approve their plan to privately fund an annex and that Council would pass the loan to build a permanent high school.80

By the end of the month, the YMCA’s Board of Managers passed a resolution to permit the Board of Education to use the building for a girls’ high school. The resolution

80 “Permanent Committee Appointed,” Independent Gazette, May 23, 1908. George P. Darrow Scrapbook, Box 3 Schools, Public, GHS.
stated that the Board of Education could use the second and third stories of the building “without cost” and requested that the Board finance necessary alterations, teacher salaries, half of the heating bill, and a janitor service. The Germantown coalition had strategically crafted an offer that they believed the district could not refuse. Enrollment at the only public high school for girls, the Philadelphia High School for Girls, had increased by 56% in four years—in 1903, Girls’ High had 1591 students; in 1907, it had 2486 students. This new annex, Germantown residents argued, would relieve the overcrowded conditions and open the school to women who desired a high school education. According to the leaders of the high school campaign, this solution “would be eminently suitable” and cost the Board of Education “practically no expense.” Germantown residents were willing to subsidize the costs of a public high school with their own private funds to protect young women from the dangers associated with long commutes and enticing temptations in the city.

On June 8, the committee of men charged with leading the high school campaign met with William T. Tilden, the Board of Education’s property manager and a Germantown resident, to discuss their plan. Tilden reminded the men that as a Germantown resident he supported their cause; however, as a member of the Board, he had to refuse it. The Board of Education had to reserve its funds for primary schools in immigrant districts in the city’s center. Tilden told the men that these districts were teeming with “little beings” on the verge of becoming “either a curse or a blessing to this country.” The members of the Board believed that more public primary schools were

critical to realizing its goal of molding these “little beings” into proper, loyal Americans. Tilden urged the committee of men to pressure Council for “another loan” to fund high schools. Germantown’s scheme to subsidize a public high school for girls with private funds failed and girls continued to travel downtown to attend high school.

Despite this setback, Germantown’s high school committee remained focused on their second goal. A month after they met with Tilden, the members of Germantown’s high school committee formed the Citizens’ District High School Association to unite men from West Philadelphia, Frankford, and Germantown in their campaigns to secure district high schools in their communities. This association represented the first citywide coalition specifically focused on expanding the number of high schools in the city. The Association consisted of seven men (three from Germantown) who elected Germantown’s own George P. Darrow as its president. The Association sent a petition to Council asking for a $500,000 loan to fund a high school building in West Philadelphia ($300,000) and high school sites in Frankford and Germantown ($100,000 for each site).

While this association mobilized support for a new school loan, the Board of Education also connected the city’s rationale for funding new high schools to the fragility of adolescent women. The Board argued that the city lacked adequate high school facilities for young women and promised to construct new high schools in the outlying districts once the loan passed. Then, the Board put forth its recommendations and stated that these new facilities must contain two wings: one “devoted to the education of
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girls” and one designed for “the education of boys.” The members of the Board wanted to separate these two wings with “a central unit” with “all executive offices, an auditorium to be used at different periods by both groups [sexes] of students” and “a series of laboratories to be used interchangeably by both groups of pupils.” Echoing Hall, the Board wanted to build these new schools on “a plot of at least four acres” where these adolescents could enjoy fresh air and “ample play provisions for each group.”

Four-acre plots were not readily available in the city’s center, and thus, the Board clearly wanted to build its new high schools in the outlying districts, which were miles away from the corruptions and temptations of Philadelphia’s urban core.

Germantown newspapers applauded the Board’s proposed plans and urged Council to grant the funds to build public high schools that reflected this approach immediately. The Board of Education and Germantown residents argued that young women needed public high schools in their communities to protect their fragile bodies, their virtuous morals, and their promising futures as wives and mothers. Despite their efforts, Council refused to grant the funds, Germantown’s high school campaign lost its momentum, and adolescent girls continued to commute to the city for high school.

**The Board Officially Proposes a New Four Million Dollar Loan**

In its 1908 annual report, the Board of Public Education assessed the shortcomings in the city’s public school system. The president of the Board, Henry R. Edmunds, admitted that the Board had already exhausted its meager two and half million-dollar loan from Council. The board used this money to build new primary schools, which he stated had alleviated some of the overcrowded conditions in the center of the city. However, he wanted Council to realize that these funds were “insufficient.”
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The Board simply could not meet the demands placed on the city’s schools.

Edmonds urged Council to pass a new four million dollar loan for the construction of new primary and secondary schools.\(^8^9\)

Philadelphia’s superintendent, Martin G. Brumbaugh pushed the weakness of the school system even further than Edmonds. He argued that education had a dual benefit—it provided life training for individuals and promoted a democratic citizenry for the state. He wrote:

> The public school finds its chiefest defense, not in promoting the welfare of the individual, but the welfare of the state itself. Its first concern must be to equip each to co-operate with his fellows and then, and not until then, shall it turn to the more individualistic task of fitting each one for the highest economic efficiency. The first business is to train for participation; then for competition.\(^9^0\)

Brumbaugh advocated for a system of schools that trained youth first for their civic duties, and then, for their economic roles. He condemned the state for its lenient child labor laws and contended that Philadelphians must “oppose the coining of the blood of childhood into the currency of the marketplace.”\(^9^1\) Brumbaugh argued that the city must provide adequate funds to build new facilities and must enforce child labor laws to ensure that these vulnerable future citizens are prepared first, to fulfill their role as citizens in a democratic system, and then, to fulfill their role as workers in a competitive economy.\(^9^2\)

Then, Brumbaugh appealed to taxpayers’ fears of government inefficiency and urban crime and suggested that it was “better and saner” to pay for decent schools
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“surrounded by ample playgrounds and officered by thoroughly trained teacher, than it is to maintain criminal courts, jails, hospitals, and asylums.”

Council had a choice: it could fund decent schools or a growing juvenile justice system. Brumbaugh ended his report arguing that the city’s secondary schools were “deplorable” and begged Council to provide a four million dollar school loan “to place our schools upon an American and civilized basis.”

In September 1909, the Board of Education sponsored a ceremony to commemorate the opening of William Penn High School for Girls, which had been slated for construction before Brumbaugh assumed the superintendency. The Board expressed its excitement that the building was finally ready for occupancy. However, at the same time, it voiced concerns about the fact that the school had already reached its capacity and that its opening had not alleviated the overcrowded conditions at the Philadelphia High School for Girls. When William Penn opened, the enrollment at the Philadelphia High School for Girls had reached a record level—3,700 girls were registered for the fall semester. The Board remarked that this increased enrollment made this an impossible situation. The students were already spread across several annexes. The Board lacked space to accommodate these female students and worried about the costs and conditions of the high school annexes.

The Board admitted that they believed the high school annexes “denied” girls “a fair chance for an education.” Members of the Board argued that the city had to build new high schools in the city’s “unprovided districts” to “escape from these present difficulties.” The Board emphasized the importance of these new schools for female
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students noting that the boys had four high schools to choose from whereas the girls had only two. The Board also highlighted their concerns that the girls’ high schools were “both centrally located.” The members of the Board believed that the “long trips” to and from the city “endangered” the “physical strength, good manners, and sound morals” of adolescent women who attended these two high schools. The men who volunteered their time on Germantown’s Committee for High School Accommodations, a subcommittee of the Germantown Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, concurred with the Board’s assessment. These men sent letters to their councilmen pledging their support for the board’s statement.

As pressure for additional funding mounted, Council had to respond. In October 1909, Council finally decided to discuss the four million dollar school loan that the Board had proposed almost a year earlier. Council agreed that the Board needed additional funds; however, it refused to specify the loan amount or a timeline for its provision.

_Building a Citywide Alliance to Support Philadelphia’s School Loan_

When newspapers published Council’s decision, Dr. William H. Mearns, a prominent educational reformer and Germantown resident, invited concerned residents to show their support for the Board’s proposed loan at a mass meeting on November 10, 1909, at Witherspoon Hall, a few steps from City Hall, on Juniper and Walnut Streets. The invitation stated:

> Outside of our city it is a matter of accepted belief...[that] Philadelphia does not measure up to the standard set by many less significant towns. Before the country, we stand accused...of failure to provide adequate accommodations for a
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large portion of our elementary school pupils, of failure to prove any accommodations at all for many other children of school age, and, notoriously, of failure to bring the opportunity for high school education within the reach of thousands of our school population.

Mearns asserted that the city already had a variety of civic associations that were deeply committed to reforming the schools. He wanted to create a new, centralized organization, the Educational Alliance, to lobby Council for the proposed four million dollar loan.

Agreeing to join forces under the auspices of this Educational Alliance, over 65 organizations, including business associations, trade unions, charitable organizations, and educational groups, attended the mass meeting. These organizations urged Council to pass a school loan immediately and demanded that Council allocate one and half million dollars to fund district high schools. Those present appointed five men—Ernest L. Tustin, State Senator for West Philadelphia; George E. Henderson, president of the Public Education Association; James Christie, councilman of Manayunk; Henry K. Fries, councilman of Frankford; and George P. Darrow, soon-to-be councilman of Germantown—to voice their concerns at the upcoming Council hearing.99

These five men met with Council’s school and finance committee on December 3, 1909, and presented evidence documenting the deplorable school conditions throughout the city. They invited Superintendent Brumbaugh to validate their claims with his own evidence. As Brumbaugh walked to the podium to speak, Councilman McAllister, the chairman of the finance committee, sprang out of his seat. He told his colleagues that these five men were only concerned about “district high schools in Germantown and West Philadelphia.” He condemned these men for ignoring the problems in the primary
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“schools for the children of the congested district, of the poor Jew and Italian in the slums, where I come from, who have to either sit on soap boxes or stay away from the schools” because the schools lacked decent seats. He continued, “No one has mentioned schools for these poor children who now receive their education in the gutters and streets. These are the people who will make up our future citizenship.” McAllister asserted his power as the chairman of the finance committee and urged his colleagues to veto any school loan that contained funds for district high schools until the “poor children” in his district had the primary schools he believed they desperately needed and deserved.

Brumbaugh refuted McAllister’s claims and reminded him that the Board of Education wanted to use the proposed loan for both primary and secondary schools. He agreed with McAllister that the Board had an obligation to the “poor Jews and Italians in the slums.” Brumbaugh encouraged McAllister to recognize the generosity of the Board and reminded him that the Board had already built primary schools for McAllister’s district. Senator Tustin stated that he was not “representing the wealthy” residents who sent their children to private high schools; rather, he was there to speak on behalf of the “vast majority” of residents in the city “whose income is not sufficient” to send their children to these schools. Brumbaugh and Tustin wanted to convince McAllister that they shared common goals: to provide schools to residents who could not afford to educate their children in private institutions. McAllister, however, believed that immigrants needed primary schools; high schools were a luxury reserved for the wealthy.

George Darrow also responded to McAllister’s claims. However, unlike Brumbaugh and Tustin, Darrow did not try to discredit McAllister’s critiques. He told
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McAllister that Germantown residents had told Darrow that they will “move” out of the city “unless they are given the opportunity to continue the education of their children.” Darrow wanted Council to realize that the quality of public schools determined whether Germantown residents remained in the city. These residents knew that the communities over the city’s border, such as Cheltenham and Abington, had already established public high schools. They were willing to move, if the city refused their demands for a high school in Germantown. Even though Germantown residents still enjoyed a lower tax rate than residents in the city’s center, Darrow knew that Council relied on Germantown’s sizeable tax revenues to fund their projects. Instead of trying to convince council that he was committed to the poor, he couched his demands in a way that threatened them with a prospect that might make them reconsider their position.

However, Darrow’s warning had no effect. Council refused the four million dollar loan in lieu of a smaller loan ($1,750,000), which it specifically designated for new primary schools. This announcement outraged the Board of Education and the residents who had demanded funds for district high schools. In response to Council’s actions, Henry R. Edmunds, the president of the Board of Education, warned residents that their city “will be outstripped by its rivals” if Council continued its reckless decision making and blocked funding for high schools. He insisted that high schools were a necessary fixture in twentieth century cities. Edmunds provided a detailed map showing the distribution of high school students to help Council understand the increasing need for new secondary school building in the city (see figures 1.8 and 1.9).

---


Figure 1.8

Percentage of 14-18 Year Olds Enrolled in High School by Ward (January 1910)

Source: Annual Report, Board of Education, 1909 and ancestry.com
Figure 1.9

High School Locations (1910)

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central High School for Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Central High School for Boys (annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philadelphia High School for Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philadelphia High School for Girls (annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philadelphia High School for Girls (annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philadelphia High School for Girls (annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>William Penn High School for Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Central Manual Training School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Central Manual Training School (annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Northeast Manual Training School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Northeast Manual Training School (annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Southern High and Manual Training High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brumbaugh echoed Edmunds’s frustration and returned to the danger that Council’s refusal to allocate funds had on young women, particularly native-born white women, who were traveling to the city to attend high school. He stated that these tender women were “at an age when they need and should receive the finest moral and physical protection” from the dangers that lurked in the city’s center. According to Brumbaugh, forcing girls to travel to the city each day to attend high school inadvertently produced “a frightful loss to the future of womanhood and motherhood in the city.”

Edmunds and Brumbaugh wanted Council to understand that its decision to block high school funding threatened the city’s future economic productivity and its virtuous womanhood.

The Resurgence of an Earlier Proposal: Building a Public High School with Private Funds

When Germantown residents learned that Council had refused the school loan, they revisited their proposal to open a public high school with their own private funds. Several residents suggested that the community “raise special funds” to finance additional annexes in Germantown. The supporters of this plan reasoned that residents were already subsidizing the costs of a high school education because they had to pay trolley fares for their children to attend school in the city. The private funding plan had a certain appeal. It could be implemented quickly. The community would not have to wait for Council to pass a school loan; rather, families could simply divert the money that they spent on trolley fares to fund additional annexes throughout the community. Ultimately, however, residents refused this plan. They knew that high school annexes only provided the community with a temporary solution. They wanted a permanent solution to protect their children in their quiet suburb.

Germantown’s newest councilman, George P. Darrow, proposed that instead of funding more high school annexes the community should start a campaign to build their own public high school. He told residents that he had calculated the costs—they needed only $500,000 to purchase the land and build their own public high school. He acknowledged that the Board of Education lacked the funds to repay the residents for the construction costs but argued that the Board would finance the operating costs of their high school after it opened.¹⁰⁵ Germantown residents did not adopt these plans. However, the debates surrounding these two schemes suggest that Germantown residents were willing to entertain the idea that their community should fund public schools with private funds.

Several months later, in June 1910, the Board of Education finally agreed to grant Germantown permanent high school annexes for their children. The Board transferred $140,000 from other sources to open two single-sex annexes: one for boys in a primary school on West Haines Street and one for girls in the Young Republican’s Club at 6128 Germantown Avenue.¹⁰⁶ The boys’ annex was an extension of the all-male Central High School. It adopted its academically oriented curricula, its highly esteemed teachers, and even, its prized school song.¹⁰⁷ However, in the girls’ annex, the Board implemented the academic curriculum from the William Penn High School for girls instead of the most rigorous curriculum from the city’s prestigious Philadelphia High School for Girls. The Board hired Mary Holmes, an experienced geography teacher from William Penn, to lead

¹⁰⁵ “Germantown Men to Raise $500,000 for High School,” February 12, 1910, Evening Bulletin, George P. Darrow Scrapbook, Box 3 Schools, Public, GHS; “Citizens May Buy High School Site,” February, 11, 1910, Independent Gazette, George P. Darrow Scrapbook, Box 3 Schools, Public, GHS.
¹⁰⁷ The Reflector, December 1911, Germantown Historical Society, Box 1, Public Schools.
the school. Germantown residents praised the Board’s decisions and believed these new annexes guaranteed their “suburb” the finest education available in the city.\(^{108}\)

The Board segregated boys and girls to different buildings and delineated the curriculum that emphasized the “nature” and “needs” of adolescent boys and girls.\(^{109}\) The Board gave Germantown boys an annex based on Central High School, which was the most prestigious school in the city. The members of the Board could have done the same for the girls. However, instead of creating an annex based on the Philadelphia High School for Girls, which was clearly the most reputable high school for girls in the city, the Board based this new annex on the William Penn High School. No one could deny the difference between these two schools. The Philadelphia High School for Girls, like Central High School, had an academic curriculum and prepared many of its graduates for college. William Penn, on the other hand, focused primarily on commercial education and encouraged graduates to apply for clerical positions upon graduation. The Board’s decision to implement William Penn’s curriculum reflected the anxieties about college-bound women: Germantown boys benefited from an academically based education whereas Germantown girls did not. Even though the Board evoked ideals of democracy and opportunity in the high school campaign, its decision ensured that Germantown High School reproduced and reinforced structural inequality. The leaders of the high school campaign applauded the Board’s efforts because it had approved the gendered institutions that the residents of Germantown had demanded.


\(^{109}\) Hall, * Adolescence: its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education*, xiv-xvii.
Despite the enthusiasm about these annexes, Germantown boys seemed reluctant to enroll in Central High School’s latest annex. When the boys’ annex finally opened in September 1910, only 35 boys registered for the fall semester. The girls’ annex, on the other hand, was filled to capacity with 175 girls. This skewed enrollment of 5 girls to 1 boy demonstrated the residents’ commitment to protecting girls in the suburbs. Residents feared that the low enrollment at the boys’ annex might dissuade the Board from building a permanent high school in Germantown.  

In addition to the enrollment issues, residents worried about the temporary nature of these buildings. In September 1910, the Board told residents that building renovations on the Young Republican’s Club were not complete, which in turn, delayed the opening of the girls’ annex. For the first month of school, the 175 girls who had registered for Germantown’s new annex were relocated to the downtown schools. Once again, these girls had to travel on the trolley and attend schools in the city. Renovations, however, were not the only challenge at the girls’ annex. By February 1911, enrollment at these two annexes soared—the boys’ annex increased 149% (35 boys in September 1910 to 87 boys in February 1911) and the girls’ annex increased 63% (175 girls in September 1910 to 285 girls in February 1911). Residents applauded this surge and hoped that they might have a permanent high school soon.

*Philadelphia’s 1911 Revolution and Superintendent Brumbaugh’s Response*

While Germantown residents continued their campaign for a permanent high school, Senator Ernest L. Tustin introduced a bill to reform the state’s school governance.  

---

structure and give the Board of Public Education the power to raise funds for the city’s public schools. Tustin represented the city’s West Philadelphia district and had been an active participant in the city’s high school campaign. After an intense five–month debate in both houses, the bill (P.L. 309) passed the Senate by a vote of 38 to 8 and in the House of Representatives by a vote of 138 to 49. Governor Tener signed the bill into law on May 18, 1911. Newspaper reporters heralded its passage and referred to it as the “most extensive and radical instance of educational legislation that has ever been accomplished in a single act in this country.” In many ways, it was.

The 1911 school code created a centralized, state Board of Education and divided school districts into four classes based on population. The law dramatically altered Philadelphia’s Board of Education and stripped Council of the fiscal powers that it had once enjoyed. The law reduced the number of members on the Board from 21 to 15 and eliminated the local school visitors’ boards. These boards were loosely configured boards that literally visited schools to inspect conditions and were a concession to the ward leaders to convince them to dismantle the old sectional school boards. The 1911 school code gave the Board the power to levy taxes to fund public schools and to borrow money without Council’s approval. After the passage of the bill the Board had the authority to borrow up to $30 million dollars “without recourse to the popular vote.” In exchange for this power, the Board inherited the debt that Council had generated. The bill also standardized the tax rate in the city. Before 1911, suburban residents in Germantown


paid a lower tax rate than city residents. The 1911 school code ushered in a standard tax rate—Germantown residents had to pay the same rate as those in the city.\textsuperscript{116} Finally, the law gave the superintendent complete control over the city’s primary, and most importantly secondary schools.\textsuperscript{117} The Board and the superintendent welcomed the passage of the law and the new powers it gave them and blindly ignored the challenges that they had inherited with this newfound debt. In July, the Board began construction of West Philadelphia High School on 47\textsuperscript{th} and Walnut Street. They had already purchased the land and finally had the power to allocate funds for the magnificent $1,126,750 building.\textsuperscript{118} Germantown residents anxiously watched as West Philadelphia received the first high school and patiently waited for the Board to tell them that Germantown was next.

Even though they were hopeful, Germantown residents worried that their daughters might have to transfer from the local annex to high schools located in the center of the city in the upcoming 1911-1912 academic year. Women throughout the community circulated a petition to expand the facilities to protect their daughters from the city’s “moral corruption.”\textsuperscript{119} After several months, the Board finally responded to their demands. It allocated additional funds to convert the Taylor Mansion into an additional high school annex specifically reserved for first-year females. The Taylor Mansion seemed like the ideal location—it was located a few blocks from the original annex, had a large lawn for outdoor recreation, and had been vacant for several years.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[119] “District High Schools in Peril,” February 24, 1911, \textit{Independent Gazette}.
\end{footnotes}
years. The residents rejoiced that their daughters could remain in the protected confines of their quiet suburb instead of attending “city schools.”

Germantown residents were still concerned that this new annex was not a permanent solution and continued to pressure the Board to grant them a modern high school building in their community. By September 1911, the boys’ annex had 114 students with nine teachers, five who were dedicated to the building and four who split their time between the annex and Central High School. The boys’ annex was finally full to capacity. No one was worried about enrollment; however, residents were concerned about a good location for another annex for boys in Germantown as enrollment climbed. The girls’ enrollment had risen 49% (from 285 in February 1911 to 425 in September 1911). To accommodate these new students, the Board of Education implemented a shift schedule, with a morning session for one group of girls and an afternoon session for a second group of girls, in both annexes. Despite the drawbacks of this system, Germantown residents preferred sending their daughters to school in shifts rather than exposing them to the dangers that supposedly existed throughout the city. Newspaper reporters praised the district for granting Germantown girls the “beautiful grounds surrounding the school building,” which were a “source of much delight” to the students. The residents anxiously waited for the new 15-member Board of Education to take office in November and approve funding for a new high school in Germantown.

121 “Girls High School Annex,” No Date, No Name, Jane Campbell Scrapbook, Vol. XIVb, p. 89, Germantown Historical Society.
Superintendent Brumbaugh Uses His New Power over the City’s High Schools

Instead of funding new high school, Martin Brumbaugh used his new power as superintendent to restructure the city’s five all-male high schools into a standardized system. In 1911, male high school students had at least three options for high school: Central High School’s academic focus, Central and Northeast’s manual training, or Southern Manual’s comprehensive program (academic, manual, and commercial programs under one roof). Brumbaugh and his Board had critiqued this system for years. They had tolerated it because they had to contend with Central’s powerful, autonomous faculty. However, the passage of the 1911 school code finally gave the Board and Brumbaugh the power to reform this hodgepodge array of high schools. On April 9, 1912, the Board converted the city’s all-male high schools into four-year schools with each offering academic, commercial, and manual training courses. Philadelphia moved from a loose conglomerate of schools with unique programs to a system of schools that offered academic, commercial, and manual programs in every high school.

Brumbaugh’s actions on that fateful day simultaneously eroded the market value of Central High School’s credential and elevated the academic offerings at the city’s manual schools. His decision, however, stemmed from local and national concerns. In 1907, William Sayre, the principal at the Central Manual Training School, told the Board that he needed more money to run his school. Manual training schools mimicked real world work and combined habits of the mind with habits of the hand. Thus, the curriculum used in these schools required state-of-the-art industrial equipment and industrial materials for students to use in their studies. This approach was much more

expensive than buying textbooks and a few laboratory materials for an academic school. As Brumbaugh thought about balancing his own budget and expanding his high school system, he had to find ways to curtail the costs. Brumbaugh implemented academic programs in these manual schools, in part, to save money.

In addition to the cost savings, Brumbaugh’s own background as a university professor influenced his decision to incorporate academic programs into the manual schools. As David Labaree suggests, the expansion of high schools across the city (and nation) weakened the market value of a high school credential. Middle class families had to find another way to help their children gain a secure place on the economic ladder, and, increasingly, they believed that their children needed to continue their education beyond high school. Brumbaugh implemented academic programs in the city’s all-male high schools to ensure that that city’s most promising young men had an opportunity to attend college.¹²⁶

Finally, educational researchers were still concerned about the skewed gender distribution of high school graduates. Instead of promoting the detrimental effects of education on women, these researchers focused on the mismatch between boys and school. Like Hall, these researchers believed that boys were different from girls. These researchers argued that girls were more successful in high school because academic learning matched their passive temperament—girls were much better suited to the high school’s lecture-based pedagogy. Boys, on the other hand, needed curricular options and active pedagogy.¹²⁷ The “comprehensive” high schools that Brumbaugh created provided male students with options that met their distinct needs and the demands of

“civilization.” Brumbaugh kept the stratified curricula, with academic schools and commercial schools, intact in the city’s all-female high schools, but promised to restructure them in the near future. He never did this during his tenure.

Despite his efforts, Brumbaugh’s reforms were not formally adopted in the city’s high schools. Central High School, with its college-preparatory curriculum, continued to dominate the high school system and implemented the reforms in name only. In Germantown, the boys’ annex never embraced these reforms. Germantown residents told the Board of Education that their boys’ annex lacked the equipment necessary to accommodate a manual training course, and thus, the school remained focused on its academic program and sent students to Northeast Manual High School for vocational programs.

Germantown residents were much more preoccupied with the overcrowded annexes in their community than with implementing Brumbaugh’s new high school system. In February 1912, the community learned that enrollment had reached a record level with 453 girls enrolled in the girls’ annex. The Board of Education had to transfer 40 girls from the Germantown annex to William Penn High School for Girls and 30 boys from the boys annex to Central High School to relieve overcrowding in Germantown’s annexes. Over the next few weeks, frustrated residents organized a series of town meetings to express their dissatisfaction with the high school annexes. On April 2, 1912, these residents held a mass meeting at Association Hall to convince William T. Tilden, a Board member and Germantown resident, to allocate funds for a district high school in Germantown. Tilden promised that he would “do everything in his power” to

---

pass the “biggest” school loan in the Board’s history. The residents who attended this meeting drafted a resolution that articulated their demands for funds specifically designated for a district high school in Germantown and appointed 24 men and women to present their resolution to the Board of Education on April 9, 1912. They wanted the Board to act.

In September 1912, the annexes in Germantown reached a record enrollment with 477 girls and 112 boys. The schools instituted a shift schedule with a morning session and an afternoon session to alleviate the overcrowded conditions. However, even with this schedule, approximately 100 girls had to transfer from the annex to William Penn High School and 26 boys had to move to Central High School. Their families publicly lambasted the Board of Education for delaying the funds for a district high school and for forcing them to send their children to the city’s center to finish high school. As enrollment increased, the Board worried about the residents’ frustrations as well as the rental costs for these annexes. It had to act.

On October 8, 1912, the Board’s joint committee on finance and property finally responded to the residents’ demands and recommended a five million dollar loan to finance new elementary and high school buildings. The Board unanimously approved the suggestion. However, the following month, the committee on finance urged the Board to reduce the loan from five million dollars to two million dollars. As stated

133 “High Schools’ Big Enrollment,” Independent Gazette, September 13, 1912.
previously, the 1911 school code required the Board to pay back the debt that Council had accumulated. The committee on finance argued that the smaller loan figure met the “immediate required expenditures” and caused “less drain” on their revenues than the five million dollar loan. The committee provided another reason. This smaller loan also avoided “the necessity of a higher specific tax levy.” In other words, the Board could not borrow five million dollars unless it raised the tax rate in the city.

Instead of funding schools to the level that they actually needed, the Board followed Council’s meager approach to school funding and allocated the bare minimum amount to fund its public schools. The members of the Board were still more concerned with maintaining the city’s low tax rate and pacifying the electorate than funding the schools they governed. Germantown residents ignored the shortcomings of this school loan and focused on what it provided them. The Board had designated part of the two million dollar loan for high schools. They finally had funding for a district high school site tucked within the safe protection of their quiet suburban community.

Although Germantown residents rejoiced at the thought of their own high school, Henry R. Edmunds, the president of the Board of Education, raised concerns about the Board’s future in his 1912 annual report. Edmunds reminded them that the city still had “inadequate accommodations” in the elementary schools and admitted that “if a choice must be made between furnishing accommodations for elementary school pupils and for secondary pupils, the former undoubtedly have the stronger claim.” At the same time, Edmunds recognized that “if Philadelphia is to maintain a creditable position among the

cities of America...we cannot afford any delay in attacking the high school problem."  

Edmunds was eager to build new high schools, but he was deeply concerned about their costs. He reminded readers that high school buildings, teacher salaries, and smaller classes cost “three to four times” more than an elementary school, and thus, the “financial bearing of the matter cannot be overlooked by the Board.” Germantown had its high school, but the Board was clearly worried about how to fund these new, costly secondary schools.

While there is ample evidence in this chapter to demonstrate the pressure Germantown residents put on the Board of Education, Henry R. Edmunds, the Board’s president, provided a plausible theory to explain why the Board caved to the high school demands from suburban residents. According to his statement in the 1913 annual report, before 1911, suburban and rural residents paid lower tax rates than individuals living in urban sections. The board had “some basis for giving the central portions of the city fine buildings, excellent equipment, and the best types of school organizations” and providing “outlying” areas with “inferior buildings, meager equipment, and very imperfect types of organization.” The school code of 1911, however, transformed this system and made the tax rate uniform throughout the system. George P. Darrow in Germantown paid the same tax rate as a man living downtown in one of the majestic townhouses on Spruce Street. Thus, suburban residents, like those in Germantown, had “a claim for better schools which the Board can not [sic] justly ignore.” The new taxation system, in effect, entitled suburban residents to district high schools. The Board had no choice. They had to give suburban residents their high schools.

138 Ibid, 12.
139 Ibid, 13.
As Edmunds raised concerns about the Board’s financial situation, Germantown residents deliberated about the site for the community’s new high school. By the spring of 1913, they had narrowed the options to three sites: the almshouse property, which had six acres and was appraised at $150,000; a site with several properties on Chelten Avenue and Greene Street, which had two and half acres and cost $225,000; and the Edgar H. Butler property, located on the corner of Haines Street and Germantown Avenue. On May 13, 1913, the Board of Education met and approved the purchase of the Butler property as the site for Germantown High School.

After several rounds of difficult negotiations, the Board informed Mr. Butler that he could sell his property to the Board for $150,000 or they would invoke their powers to condemn the building—this was legal in the state to secure property for school facilities. The press recalled that Mr. Butler “faced his fate like a Philadelphia gentleman” and sold his estate, which included a stone mansion, greenhouse, garage, stable, several outbuildings, and the Morris-Littel house. This small house had its own history. Miss Margaret H. Morris, the first woman admitted to the Academy of Natural Sciences, lived and worked in that home during the nineteenth century. Supporters who had campaigned for the high school rejoiced. However, other residents mourned the loss of this treasured landmark. Modernity, in the form of a district high school, brought both progress and loss to this secluded suburb in the city.


143 “To Build High School on Old Butler Estate,” May 15, 1913, Jane Campbell Scrapbook, Vol. XXIII, p. 20, GHS.

144 The phrase “suburb in the city” comes from Contosta, Suburb in the City.
The Foundation is Set: Private Funds for Public Schools

On Saturday, September 14, 1914, several thousand Germantown residents walked toward the plot where the Butler mansion had once stood to witness the laying of the cornerstone of the new magnificent high school structure that would soon tower over the entire community. To commemorate the day, Civil War veterans wearing their fully decorated uniforms marched down Germantown Avenue with hundreds of high school aged youth. Families and supporters flanked both sides of the street waving their flags and clapping their hands. They basked in what they had achieved. Germantown residents had finally won their arduous battle with Philadelphia’s City Council and the Board of Public Education. These residents had their own district high school. Their children would never have to leave the safe, secluded confines of this quiet suburban community.

Germantown’s seven-year high school campaign established the mechanisms for the school’s future success and inequality. When the campaign began, the leaders of the high school campaign firmly believed that they could use their social position and status to get the institution that they desired. Council refused their request, and thus, they tried a different approach. These residents linked the high school campaign to the prevailing anxieties about co-education and the city’s corruption and poverty. These residents did not want their daughters attending high school in the center of the city and urged Council to allocate funds for a high school in their suburban community. As they made their demands, the men and women who led the campaign realized that Council was much more interested in funding primary schools for the “poor Jew and Italian”
than funding high schools for the wealthy residents who lived in the “outlying districts.”

When they realized this, the leaders of the campaign turned inward and decided that if government was not willing to fund the services and institutions that they needed, perhaps, then, they should use their own private money to fund what they wanted. The residents were willing to entertain the idea of using private money to fund public schools. This set the foundation for the future. When government failed to meet the needs of residents living in this suburban community, they looked to one another to alleviate these challenges and funded their needs with their own private resources. The high school campaign, with its failed private funding ideas, set the foundation for the mechanism that helped to sustain the school’s future success and legitimacy.

\[145\] “Schools for Poor Only-M’Allister,” December 3, 1909, No Name, George P. Darrow Scrapbook, Box 3 Schools, Public, GHS; Edmunds, “Report of the President,” 15–17.
Chapter 2:
Legitimating the New High School in an Increasingly Fractured Community,
1914-1928
On November 1, 1915, 540 boys walked through the hand-carved archway, ascended the marble staircase, and entered Germantown High School’s sunlit assembly room. The young men who sat in the assembly room that morning were among the first students to attend the new Germantown High School. After addressing the boys about the importance of the day, Dr. Harry Keller, the head of the boys’ school, dismissed the male students and directed them to the east side of the school. One the boys had left, 800 girls passed through the beautiful archway, up the pristine staircase, and sat in the same seats that the boys had just used. In the assembly room, the girls listened carefully as Miss Mary Holmes, the head of the girls’ school, addressed them. When Holmes finished, the teachers quietly walked the girls to their classrooms on the west side of the school. Even though the city praised its new, modern co-educational facilities, school district officials still segregated Germantown High School students based on gender the moment they stepped into the school building. As the youth proceeded to their respective corners of the building, the leaders of the high school campaign stood on the corner of Haines and High Street and celebrated this momentous occasion. Germantown residents finally had what they had long fought for: a magnificent, modern high school building tucked away within the safe boundaries of their quaint, suburban community.

This chapter examines the so-called glory years of Germantown High School’s history, 1914-1929. First, I will examine the creation of the school’s culture and curriculum to demonstrate how these elements satisfied the residents’ demands for a premier academic institution. In this section, school culture refers to the practices,

---

routines, and norms that the school promoted, as well as the school’s curricular and extra-curricular activities. School culture refers to the ideals that the school district, high school educators, Germantown residents, and its youth tried to cultivate in its young high school. My analysis shows how the school’s culture was generated both from the top-down—from the School District of Philadelphia, high school staff, and Germantown residents—as well as from the bottom-up—from the students themselves.  

After examining the school’s culture, I investigate how the students, their families, and Germantown residents supported their new high school to ensure that the community had the institution it desired. In 1916, school district officials willingly admitted that they lacked the tax base necessary to meet the fiscal needs of the new, modern high schools springing up throughout the city. Germantown families and residents responded to this need addressing the demands placed on the high school through an array of financial and voluntary support. In many ways, this financial support reflected the community’s proposal to raise private funds during the high school campaign. However, there was one clear difference. Individuals in the high school campaign proposed the use of private funds to subsidize public education; once the school opened, local residents donated private funding to the school to ensure that this

---


new institution possessed the financial support necessary to build one of a few premier academic institutions in the city.⁵

Creating the Premier Academic Institution the Campaign Leaders Desired

When the members of the Philadelphia Board of Public Education finally announced its decision to build a new high school in Germantown, the members of the Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, who had led the seven-year high school campaign, tried to influence the board’s decisions about faculty hires and building design. Initially, the campaign leaders expected the members of the board to defer to local residents to select the school principal and new teachers. At one point, the leaders of the campaign even contacted possible principal candidates without the board of education’s consent.⁶ After several lengthy debates and contentious discussions, the members of the GCHIA passed a resolution that limited the association’s role in school hires stating that the members would rely on “wisdom” of the members of the board of education to make the “best decision” for the school’s future.⁷

On April 6, 1915, the members of the board announced that they had selected Dr. Harry F. Keller as Germantown High School’s first principal. Even though he was not the GCHIA’s first choice, Keller met many of the criteria that the members of the association wanted the principal to have. Keller was born in Philadelphia in 1861, graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1881, and earned a doctorate in

⁵ For the purposes of analyzing the legitimacy of Germantown High School, I will draw on the following social and political theory: Max Weber, Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity, ed. Stephen Kalberg, Modernity and Society 3 (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005); David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life (New York: Wiley, 1965). There are several works that address institutional authority, which in Weber’s theory is related to legitimacy, but with the exception of Kathryn M. Neckerman, Schools Betrayed: Roots of Failure in Inner-City Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), these works do not examine the change in institutional legitimacy in a historical context.

⁶Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association Meeting Minutes, January 19, 1915. Box, Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, Minutes, 1908-1929, GHSOC.

⁷Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association Meeting Minutes, March 16, 1915. Box, Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, Minutes, 1908-1929, GHSOC.
chemistry in Strassburg, Germany in 1888. He spent several years teaching chemistry at the all-male Central High School and had written several books on pedagogy. After careful deliberation, the board of education appointed Miss Mary Holmes to the girls’ school. Holmes had managed Germantown’s girls’ annex since 1910. Before that, she taught geology at the Philadelphia High School for Girls and served as the head of the science department at the Girls’ Commercial High School. The selection of these two individuals satisfied the members of the GCHIA. As teachers in the city’s elite schools, Keller and Holmes understood the importance of an academic curriculum, which made the association members feel confident that they would implement a similar course of study at the city’s newest high school.

The Board of Education designated Keller as high school's principal and Holmes as the “assistant to the principal.” In this role, the Board of Education expected Holmes
to manage the administration of the girls’ school “under the direction of the principal.”¹ With these new titles, Keller earned the standard salary for principals in the city while Holmes earned the maximum salary of a department chair in a girls’ school. In other words, she earned less money than the men who served as Germantown High School’s department chairs.² The Board’s decisions clarified the school’s governance structure and maintained the gendered salary differentials that existed in most American high schools during this period.³

After the members of the Board of Education appointed the administrators, they focused on hiring the faculty for the new high school. The members of the GCHIA wanted faculty members who, like the new administrators, understood the importance of academic learning and the curricula that the city’s elite public high schools offered. To meet these demands, the Board hired experienced teachers who had worked at the elite, all-male Central High School and the elite, all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls to staff the faculty at Germantown High School.⁴ By staffing the school with leaders and teachers who had worked at these elite schools, the Board provided the members of the GCHIA with the ingredients to create an academic institution for the community’s white, native-born, middle class residents. The members of the GCHIA had done what they could to create a school for Germantown’s middle class families, and now, they anxiously
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³ “Higher Pay for Miss Holmes,” 1921 in Box 5, Public Schools, Folder, GHS Academic Matters.
waited to see whether these families wanted to send their children to the community’s new high school.

As the members of the GCHIA worked with the board of education to staff the school, Germantown families evaluated the benefits and limitations of sending their children to the community’s new high school. The families who lived in the community and decided to send their children to Germantown High School differed from those who did not send their children to the local high school. As economic recessions swept through the city, many families could not afford to lose the additional income that their youth provided, so they sent them to work as soon as they finished primary school.\(^5\) Data gathered from yearbooks and the 1920 United States Census indicate that in 1920 Germantown High School graduates were primarily native-born, white youth whose fathers worked in the upper echelon of the labor market. More specifically, a logistic regression showed that Germantown youth were more likely to be high school graduates if their fathers were professionals than if their fathers were craftspeople, skilled laborers, service workers, or unemployed (\(p's < 0.05\), see figure 2.1).\(^6\)


\(^6\) See Figure 2.3a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the full results of the binary logistic regression.
Figure 2.1  Father’s Occupational Status, Germantown High School Graduates & Community Youth, 1920

![Figure 2.1](image)

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1919-1922, GHS; ancestry.com

In addition to these occupational differences, the ethnic composition of Germantown High School students differed when compared to the community youth. Native-born youth with native-born parents were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than immigrant youth ($p < 0.001$). Immigrant youth were less likely to graduate from the high school because many of them had access to social networks that made it easier for them to find work on the labor market without a high school credential. In addition to these differences, many immigrant youth attended

---

7 See Figure 2.3a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the full results of the binary logistic regression. Immigrant youth includes foreign-born youth or native-born youth with foreign-born parents.

Catholic schools in the city during this period instead of their local public schools making it less likely for them to be Germantown graduates (see figure 2.2).

**Figure 2.2** Nativity, Germantown High School Graduates & Community Youth, 1920

Finally, white youth were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than black youth \( (p < 0.005) \). Black youth who lived in the community were less likely to graduate from Germantown High School for several reasons. Black residents in Philadelphia, like most cities, faced racial discrimination in the labor market and often had to settle for lower wages than their white counterparts. Even though black residents had slightly higher citywide school attendance rates than white residents in 1920 (92% versus 90%, respectively), many of these families had to rely on their high-school aged

---

10 See Figure 2.3a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the binary logistic regression.
children to subsidize their family’s income. Many of these children left school once they finished primary school and entered the labor market as unskilled laborers, factory hands, or domestics in one of the homes that lined the suburb’s pristine streets. African American families might have wanted their children to attend their new neighborhood high school, but their family’s short-term financial needs often outweighed the long-term benefits of sending their children to high school.¹²

However, oral history evidence offers another reason to explain this finding. Archibald Childs, a black man who was born in Germantown on May 4, 1912, had attended public schools in Germantown during elementary school. One summer, he visited Germantown High School with his mother, Maude, a southern migrant who worked as a domestic and taught high school in a one-room, segregated school in the South before she married. When they met with staff at the school, the guidance counselor told them that she wanted to place Archibald in the commercial program at the high school. According to Childs, in the 1920s, most black students did not enroll in the high school’s prestigious academic program. Even though he had attended local public schools his entire life, Maude, who had finished her high school education in Virginia, sent Archibald to a segregated school in Virginia to finish high school and earn the academic degree she wanted him to have.¹³ Although many black families relied on their children’s labor to supplement their incomes, other black families refused to send their children to a high school where they would not receive the academic education that their children deserved.

¹³ Archibald Childs, interview by Louise Strawbridge, October 21, 1991, Germantown Between the Wars Collection, GHSOC.
Even though many youth in the community never attended the high school, many Germantown families wanted their children to attend high school and earn their degrees. In 1920, these families had several schooling options. They could either send their children to the local high school, to the elite schools in the center of the city, or other educational institutions, such as private and parochial schools. As they considered their options, many of these families thought about the economic value of their son or daughter’s high school education during their high school years and beyond. They were consumers in an educational marketplace that offered a variety of goods with differing rates of return. The market value that they attached to their schooling options were related to their family’s short-term needs and their own hopes and beliefs about their child’s futures. Their short-term needs, schooling options, and future aims were deeply connected to their father’s occupational status and the child’s race, class, ethnicity, and gender. The choices that these families made about their child’s secondary schooling shaped Germantown High School’s culture and helped to establish its reputation as a premier suburban high school reserved primarily for white, middle class, native-born youth.

During the high school campaign, Germantown residents urged city officials to build a high school in their community so that their children, particularly their young daughters, could attend high school near their homes. Many of the residents were worried about the arduous commute to and from their quaint suburb to the city’s premier high schools that were located in the heart of the city’s center. Data from the school yearbooks indicate that residential geography influenced the educational decisions that these families made. Even though many Germantown youth traveled to

---

attend the new high school, most Germantown families refused to send their children to these elite schools in 1920. According to the data drawn from the school yearbooks and the 1920 United States Census, only 5.7% of the all-male Central High School graduates and only 3.6% of the all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls graduates lived in Germantown during this period.\(^{15}\) Youth who graduated from Central High School and the Philadelphia High School for Girls tended to live closer to these schools in the heart of the city (see figure 2.3 and 2.4). As the maps indicate, the neighborhoods near the elite high schools had higher concentrations of African American and foreign-born residents. As families considered schooling options, their decisions were often related to the costs associated with commuting to and from the elite school in the center of the city and the dangers that supposedly existed in the city’s urban core.\(^{16}\)

\(^{15}\) See Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis
\(^{16}\) See Chapter 1.
Figure 2.3

High School Youth, Black Residents, Philadelphia, 1920

- Germantown High School Graduates
- The Philadelphia High School for Girls Graduates
- Central High School Graduates
- Germantown High School
- The Philadelphia High School for Girls
- Central High School

Rivers

Percentage Black Residents
- 0.0 - 1.3%
- 1.4 - 4.2%
- 4.3 - 7.7%
- 7.8 - 13.0%
- 13.1 - 52.5%

Figure 2.4

High School Youth, Foreign-born Residents, Philadelphia, 1920

- Germantown High School Graduates
- The Philadelphia High School for Girls Graduates
- Central High School Graduates
- Germantown High School
- The Philadelphia High School for Girls
- Central High School

Percentage Foreign-born Residents
- 0.0 - 15.1%
- 15.2 - 18.6%
- 18.7 - 21.1%
- 21.2 - 38.1%
- 38.2 - 44.4%

When one compares the graduates of the all-male Central High School and the male graduates of Germantown High School, children of professionals were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than youth whose fathers were service workers (p < 0.01, logistic regression, see figure 2.5). Native-born boys with native-born parents were more likely to be Germantown High School graduates than immigrant youth (p < 0.01, see figure 2.6). Many of these trends are related to geography—Central High School graduates usually lived near the high school in the center of the city where there were more rental homes, foreign-born residents, and lower-income workers. However, at the same time, it suggests that middle and lower-income fathers were more likely to sacrifice their sons’ wages and pay the trolley expenses if they could send their sons to the most reputable high school in the city. For example, Herbert Biberson, the son of two Russian immigrants who lived in Germantown, paid the carfare to travel to Central High School each morning instead of the new, neighborhood high school located a few blocks from his home. The credential from Central High School was a known commodity, and thus, Biberson’s parents decided to pay the trolley fare so that their son could attend the most prestigious high school in the city rather than Germantown’s new high school.
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17 See Figure 2.4a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the binary logistic regression.
18 See Figure 2.5a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the binary logistic regression. Immigrant youth includes foreign-born youth or native-born youth with foreign-born parents.
19 Central High School Yearbook, 1917; ancestry.com.
**Figure 2.5**  Father’s Occupational Status, Central High School and Germantown High School Graduates, 1920
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**Source:** Central High School Yearbooks, 1918-1922, CHS; ancestry.com

**Figure 2.6**  Nativity, Philadelphia High School Graduates, 1920
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**Source:** Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1919-1922, GHS; Central High School Yearbooks, 1918-1922, CHS; The Philadelphia High School for Girls Yearbooks, 1919-1922, PHSG; ancestry.com.
When one compares the graduates of the all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls and the female graduates of Germantown High School, other differences emerge. Girls whose fathers were managers, clerical workers, and salespeople were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than youth whose fathers were professionals (p’s < 0.05, logistic regression). Native-born girls were more likely to be Germantown High School graduates if they had native-born parents than if they had foreign-born parents (p < 0.001). Finally, white youth were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than black youth (p < 0.001)—the percentage of black youth in 1920 cohort at the all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls (9.3%) was higher than the percentage of black youth in the 1920 cohort at Germantown High School (1.4%, see figure 2.7).  

**Figure 2.7**  
**Percentage of Black Graduates, Philadelphia High Schools, 1920**

![Bar chart showing percentage of black graduates for Germantown, Central, and Philadelphia High School for Girls in 1920.]

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1919-1922, GHS; Central High School Yearbooks, 1918-1922, CHS; The Philadelphia High School for Girls Yearbooks, 1919-1922, PHSG; ancestry.com.
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21 See Figure 2.6a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the binary logistic regression.
Black and immigrant families were more likely to send their children to the elite all-female high school than Germantown High School. While the motivations for sending a young black or immigrant woman to the city’s all-female academic high school differed for each individual, evidence suggests that many families sent their daughters to this elite high school to prepare them for the labor and marriage markets as teachers and nurses or eligible suitors for Philadelphia’s young bachelors. For black families, the Philadelphia High School for Girls had a special appeal because it virtually guaranteed placement in the city’s normal school where young women could take teaching courses and find employment in the city’s segregated public schools. In 1920, Mary C. Dixon, an African American widow who moved to Philadelphia from Virginia and managed the Colored Home for the Aged and Infirm, watched with pride when her daughter, Rita, graduated from the Philadelphia High School for Girls. Even though she knew her daughter would face many hardships on the labor market, she sent her to this prestigious high school where she received an academic education, and perhaps, a more secure future.22

While it was clear that Germantown High School was an institution reserved primarily for white, native-born youth, perhaps the most noticeable characteristic of the new high school was that Germantown graduates were overwhelmingly female in 1920 (73%).23 In 1917, when the school graduated its first class, 54% of the graduates were female. This figure was approximately equal to the percentage of female graduates among the other high schools in the city. However, in 1923, 73% of the graduates were female. This figure was 1.3 times greater than the percentage of female graduates in the

22 See ancestry.com, Mary C. Dixon, mother of Rita Dixon.
23 National data indicates that girls made up a larger percentage of high school graduate than boys during this period, but the percentage of girls at Germantown High School is unusually high. For other comparisons see, David L. Angus and Jeffrey Mirel, The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890-1995, Reflective History Series (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), 33-40.
city’s high schools. The initial drop in male enrollment at Germantown High School might have been related to the influx of wartime employment in the city’s industries, such as Philadelphia’s shipyards and textile factories. However, this factor alone does not account for this sharp difference. Other reasons influenced this shift.

First, in the first part of the twentieth century, Philadelphia’s male youth enjoyed many more secondary schooling options than female youth. Philadelphia had manual trade schools that attracted young men who wanted to find work in a skilled trade; young women did not have these options. Families made other choices, as well. Catherine Insigner, a widow who lived in Germantown with her five children, sent her sons to private school and her daughter, Anna, to Germantown High School. While it is not entirely clear why she decided this, it is possible that she decided to invest in her sons’ education to prepare them to compete on the labor market.

During the 1920s, most upper class women either attended college or worked for a few years after graduation before marrying a suitable man and leaving the labor market to manage their household. Thus, it is possible that their high school experience and credential prepared them for an equally important market: the marriage market. Throughout the late teens and early 1920s, young women filled their time with Friday evening dances at the local YWCA, trips to the movie theatres in Germantown’s commercial districts, and leisurely strolls near the Wissahickon creek. The school yearbooks and personal scrapbooks depict a time where finding a steady beau was often as important to one’s high school experience as being accepted to a prestigious college.

---


26 Anna Insinger, Germantown High School Yearbook, February 1920; ancestry.com.
To reinforce this point, the school newspaper regularly published articles about students who met at the high school and ultimately married one another.\(^{27}\)

Edith Royal Smalley, a white woman who graduated from Germantown High School in June 1928, and Wilfred Thorton Mitchell, a white man who graduated from Germantown High School in 1925, were one of many couples that met one another at Germantown High School. Edith’s father, Joseph, owned a plumbing business and installed indoor plumbing in the old, colonial mansions that lined the streets and avenues throughout Germantown. As a young adolescent, she enjoyed many luxuries. Her father hired a man to guide a yacht from Philadelphia to Florida. Every summer, her family left their home in Germantown with a caravan of other upper class residents to spend the warm summer months in Ocean Grove, New Jersey. Wilfred came from a more modest Germantown family. His father worked in a local textile mill and wanted his son to attend high school so that he could secure a professional position on the labor market. When he graduated from high school, he attended college at the Drexel Institute of Technology and studied engineering. Edith him letter each day detailing her experiences in high school and her time away from the city during the summer. When she graduated from high school, Edith entered Temple University and finished a two-year program in business. She moved in with her older sister, Ada, and worked as a stenographer. In 1930, a few months after the stock market crashed, she finally married Wilfred. Her high school credential enabled her to attend college, graduate, find a work as a stenographer, and perhaps more importantly, and to secure a suitable husband, which in the late 1920s, might have been more important for a women in her position.

When the high school first opened, it primarily served white, middle class native-born youth, like Edith and Wilfred, creating a distinction between those families who could and could not afford to send their children to the new neighborhood high school. The leaders of the high school campaign had hoped that the new institution would serve upper and middle class, native-born, white youth. The families who lived in the community did not disappoint them. When Germantown High School opened, its graduates were predominately native-born, white youth who lived with families whose fathers worked in the upper echelon of the labor market. Educational inequality was built into the fabric of this institution from the moment it opened.

**Creating an Educational Institution that the Residents Desired**

Throughout the 1910s and 1920s, progressive leaders worried that nation’s public schools privileged academic learning driving thousands of American youth out of these institutions before they received the education necessary to prepare them for their futures. In 1918, educational experts drafted the *Cardinal Principals of Secondary Education*, which recommended shifting the curriculum in American high schools from a strictly academic program to a program that focused on building vocational skills.\(^\text{28}\) While the national debates focused on implementing vocational education programs to attract youth, Germantown High School faculty concentrated on creating academic programs to compete with the elite high schools in the city and instituting vocational programs to support students who did not meet these academic standards. Even in the beginning, Germantown High School faculty implemented a stratified curricular program with an academic program reserved for a particular set of students and vocational programs reserved for another set of students.

In 1920, the majority of graduates selected the academic program (49%) followed by the commercial program (33%). The remaining graduates selected a variety of vocational programs segregated by gender—a general program and a domestic science program for girls (11%) and a mechanical arts program for boys (7%). Among the male graduates, the academic course represented the most popular option while the mechanical arts and commercial course followed. Similarly, the majority of female graduates enrolled in the academic program followed by the commercial program (see figure 2.8). Although there were no significant differences between a student’s course enrollment and their gender, there was a negative relationship between female youth and academic course enrollment in 1920 (p < 0.07). The curricular choices that students made reflected the gender bias on the nation’s labor market. Male students selected the academic course to prepare them for college and the commercial course to help them secure white-collar positions as clerks and office workers throughout the city. The mechanical arts course, which combined academic skills with vocational training, remained popular at the high school because it prepared students for college and professional work in the small, artisan factories that existed throughout Germantown and Philadelphia at the time. In 1920, female students represented 47.3% of American youth in higher education. Even though many young women from Germantown attended the finest colleges in the country, they knew their prospects on the labor market differed drastically from male graduates. As a result, many female graduates selected the commercial program to prepare them for office work, and perhaps, marriage in the

29 See Figure 2.7a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the multinomial regression.
future or the domestic course to prepare them for married life or a position as a domestic worker in an elite Germantown home.\textsuperscript{32}

\textbf{Figure 2.8  Course Enrollment, Germantown High School Graduates by Gender, 1920 Cohort}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Study</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1919-1922, GHS. Vocational Category includes: domestic science and general programs (girls only) and the mechanical arts program (boys only).

In addition to these differences, black and white youth differed with respect to their curricular placement. In 1920, the majority of white youth enrolled in the academic program (49%) followed closely by the commercial program (33%). The majority of black graduates selected the academic program (75%) with the remaining youth were split between the commercial and general programs (13%, each). According to the regression analysis, black youth were significantly more likely to be placed in the academic track than white youth in 1920 (p < 0.03).\textsuperscript{33} In 1920, the majority of black


\textsuperscript{33} See Figure 2.7a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the multinomial regression.
graduates were female and had fathers who worked as skilled laborers and service workers. Sending their children to high school was a financial sacrifice for many of these families, and thus, they most likely encouraged their children to select the academic program in the hopes that that might help their children, but particularly their daughters, secure a more prosperous future.

In addition to the differences, youth whose fathers worked as professionals, a category which included lawyers, doctors, and teachers, were more likely to be in the academic program than youth who fathers were employed as clerical workers, salespeople, skilled laborers, service workers, and unskilled laborers (p’s < 0.04, multinomial regression). Young women whose fathers were employed as professionals were more likely to be enrolled in the domestic science program than the daughters of craftsmen (p < 0.04) and the daughters of clerical workers and salespeople (p < 0.05).

The relationship between father’s occupation and the youth’s curricular placement reveals the complexity behind these course decisions. The men who worked as professionals in the community knew the importance of a college education because most of their positions required a college degree. Thus, they wanted their children to be placed in the academic program. High school administrators and faculty complied with their demands—upper class youth were more likely to be placed in this program than middle and working class youth. On the other hand, the young women whose fathers worked in middle-income occupations, such as clerical workers, salespeople, and craftsmen, were less likely to enroll in the general and domestic science programs. Many of these young women wanted a high school credential than led to employment, even if it was short-term, and thus, were less likely to enroll in the general or domestic science course. The existence of these hierarchical curricular programs affected the value of one’s

---

34 See Figure 2.7a, Appendix, Chapter 2 Data and Analysis for the results of the multinomial regression.
high school credential and future prospects, which in turn, influenced the legitimacy of the education that Germantown youth received at their new high school.

Figure 2.9  Course Enrollment, Germantown High School Graduates, Father’s Occupational Status, 1920 Cohort

Even though curricular placement clearly shaped one’s postsecondary plans, when Germantown High School officially opened in 1915, administrators, faculty, and students worked tirelessly to cultivate a prestigious scholastic culture. In 1920, an editorial in The Cliveden, the school newspaper, reminded students that “first place” for scholastic achievement in the city “is generally conceded to Germantown.” 35 Educators generally encouraged Germantown students in the academic course of study to attend college upon graduation. The school created a college entrance committee that oversaw

the application and placement process for “qualified” students at Germantown High School.  

During the school’s first decade, numerous colleges and universities advertised their programs in the school’s newspaper. The school newspaper even published articles highlighting the more prestigious colleges and universities and documented alumni experiences at these schools.

In addition, city officials and local institutions sponsored a wide variety of scholarships to encourage Germantown High School students to pursue their education beyond high school. In 1921, *The Cliveden* featured an article that reminded students of these opportunities and highlighted the accomplishments of alumni. The most prestigious award in Philadelphia at the time, the Mayor’s Scholarship, entitled recipients to a full four-year scholarship to the University of Pennsylvania. Beginning in 1921, a committee awarded these scholarships to Philadelphia students who attended public and private schools and received the highest scores on a citywide examination. The article that appeared in the school’s newspaper reminded students that six Germantown students (two boys and four girls) had won these scholarships in the previous year. The authors encouraged students to pursue this award, arguing that since “Dr. Keller [the school’s principal] is a member of the Committee, it should be a matter of pride” for the school “to enter a large number of candidates and to win as many of these scholarships as possible.”

During this period, the state offered eight scholarships worth $100 a year for four years for state colleges and universities. Several local colleges and universities, such as Haverford and Bryn Mawr College, offered selective scholarships for Philadelphia youth.
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37 Many of the advertisements were for local colleges. See Stayer’s Business College, *The Cliveden*, October 1924, 41; Drexel Evening Diploma School, *The Cliveden*, October 1924, 42; Peirce School of Business Administration, *The Cliveden*, Back Cover, November 1924, 43.
39 Ibid.
Citywide college clubs, for example, the Princeton Club of Philadelphia, also sponsored scholarships for city youth. Finally, Temple University and the College of Pharmacy offered scholarships specifically designated for Germantown High School students. *The Cliveden* article argued that the school needed more “distinguished” and “meritorious” students so that “we may be prepared to compete for such scholarships.”

City officials and local institutions recognized Germantown’s academic reputation and willingly contributed funds for scholarships to reduce the costs of higher education for qualified city youth. These scholarships demonstrated the commitment that city and local higher education institutions had to supporting their local youth. The constant reminders about the school’s prestige and the availability of these scholarships encouraged young men and women to engage in academic work at their new institution.

In addition to the curricular offerings that made Germantown High School a first-rate institution, the school had a wide array of extra-curricular activities that enhanced the students’ academic work and increased the legitimacy of the young institution. The school offered academic clubs, such as the chemistry club; musical clubs, such as the orchestra; and, of course, athletic clubs, such as football and tennis. While many of the clubs admitted boys and girls, the clubs segregated students by race and gender. For example, the chemistry club admitted only boys whereas the hospital auxiliary club permitted only girls. These distinctions mirrored the upper and middle class ideas about gender and education that existed in Germantown and throughout the nation.

---

40 Ibid.
Evidence also suggests that black students rarely participated in extracurricular activities at Germantown High School because the clubs barred them on the basis of race. Geneva E. Edney, an African American female who graduated from the high school in 1925, recalled that “the prejudice [at Germantown High School] was more noticeable because it was close to me. We did not swim...I can’t say for sure if we were barred, but we were never permitted.” She continued, “Only a few colored graduates ever went to the senior prom. The well-known outstanding colored family, Dr. Warrick and his daughter [Dorothy] went to the prom.” Edney remarked that race did not affect Dorothy Warrick’s life as much as it did other black students in the high school. As the daughter of a prominent doctor in the community who served both white and black patients, Dorothy Warrick enjoyed the benefits of coming from an “exclusively high” family. Dorothy’s father allowed his white patients to use the front door while relegating his black patients to the rear entrance. This practice might have been part of his class mobility. Dorothy Warrick’s class background, in some ways, trumped the racial discrimination that other black youth in the community experienced. School clubs enhanced the institution’s legitimacy for white upper and middle class students, but at the same time, their very existence reflected the racial and gender barriers that existed in Germantown and beyond.

The School District of Philadelphia Faces New Fiscal Challenges

In 1916, a year after Germantown High School officially opened, Philadelphia’s Board of Education announced that the school district had “reached a point where revenues are insufficient to meet the expenditures.” Henry R. Edmunds, the president

---

of the Board, acknowledged that the Board of Education had generated a 40% increase in tax revenues from 1906 to 1916. The city’s school-aged population, he noted, had experienced a slight increase during this period. Edmunds explained that it was reasonable to expect that the increased revenues “would meet the current obligations [in the school district] much more easily than it did ten years ago.” After all, the Board had a much larger budget with only slightly more students. Edmunds stated that this assumption, however, only worked when “educational conditions remained static.”

In Philadelphia, educational conditions had not remained static over the past ten years. As president, Edmunds had ushered in many dramatic changes in educational conditions that increased costs.

Edmunds noted that the number of students attending Philadelphia’s public schools had soared during the last ten years. Between 1906 and 1916, the student population increased by 26 percent (from 170,582 students in 1906 to 215,752 in 1916). The rise in school enrollments alone, Edmunds argued, would have “almost entirely absorbed” the net gain in revenues from taxation during this period. Edmunds pushed the issue further and pointed out that the rise in enrollments was most striking “in those parts of the school work in which the cost of instruction is relatively high.” Figure 2.10 illustrates the increase in enrollment in several levels of education—from the least expensive, kindergarten, to the most expensive, the city’s trade schools.

46 Ibid, Ibid.
His point was clear: school enrollments had increased most dramatically in schools where the costs of education were the highest. The Board’s increased tax revenues had done little to offset public school expenses over this ten-year period.

Edmunds also pointed out the increased costs associated with staffing the schools. In 1906, he noted that the district paid 4,210 teachers and principals on average $807 annually. The total district’s annual expenditures in 1906 amounted to $3,395,000. In 1916, the district had 5,851 teachers and principals with an average yearly salary of $1,065 for a total of $6,230,000. This represents an increase of 83 percent for teacher and principal salaries. According to Edmunds, in 1906, Philadelphia
had one of the lowest teacher salaries in the state and “teachers of experience were leaving Philadelphia” as soon as they found positions in places that offered better salaries. He justified the salary increases in his district “to check what threatened to become a serious drain upon the teaching force of the city” and “to induce teachers to remain in our service.”47 In addition to the rising salary costs, the district established a retirement fund for teachers in 1906. Even though teachers contributed significantly to the fund and a private benefactor, the Elkins Fund, subsidized the expenses, the Board also had to finance part of it, which in turn, raised expenditures during this period.48

Finally, Edmunds reminded readers that the Board of Education had been engaged in building new schools and renovating old schools to house the ever-increasing number of students in the city’s public school. In 1906, most children only attended primary school and left to work when they turned 14. In 1900, only 4% of the high school aged youth in Philadelphia attended high school.49 By 1916, the Board of education had expanded the number of high school from five in 1906 to nine in 1916. As Edmunds had noted earlier, high school construction was much more costly than primary school construction—on average, high schools costs over one million dollars to build. He argued that the Board had to build new high school, however he admitted that the Board lacked the financial resources to build additional high schools despite the demand for these institutions.50 He warned the Board that city officials might need to raise the current taxation rate to meet the needs of the district. He optimistically believed that if this happened, “the community will not interpose serious objection to

48 Ibid, 23.
any such increase as is necessary to put and keep the schools of Philadelphia on a credible plane as compared with the other progressive cities of the country.”

The financial concerns that Edmunds raised in his report were not new. The Board had been struggling with its finances for decades. However, ever since the passage of 1911 school code, the Board worried about its mounting debt. Even though it had the authority to raise taxes, the Board did not want to agitate taxpayers, so it simply borrowed money. By 1916, Edmunds was not only worried about the costs of funding the schools, he was also worried about paying back the Board’s mounting debt.

John P. Garber, who had replaced Martin G. Brumbaugh as the city’s interim superintendent of schools, echoed Edmunds’ concerns. However, instead of highlighting the Board’s problems, the superintendent focused his report on the growth and progress of the schools. Garber stressed the importance of the new buildings and expanded curricular offerings in the schools. He urged the Board to support the ongoing expansion of high schools in the city to meet the growing demands. Garber reminded the members of the Board that in 1906 Philadelphia had only a small “village” of secondary schools located in the center of the city, but now, the city enjoyed a “metropolitan” system of schools that exhibited “uniformity and standardization.”

Garber also praised the city’s private and public agencies for providing “material assistance” to public schools. He reasoned that “public schools belong the people,” and thus, these agencies had a “responsibility” to contribute to “their excellence.” Garber’s praise was long overdue. Since at least 1906, high school principals had acknowledged

53 Ibid., 51.
the resources that these agencies provided to their schools. Garber's predecessor, Martin G. Brumbaugh, routinely commented on the significant connection between philanthropy and public education and commended Philadelphia's agencies for providing additional resources to the schools. In 1910, Brumbaugh stated, "private initiative, both individual and corporate, has added greatly to the service rendered in the schools." He even suggested that the philanthropies had subsidized the costs associated with opening "social centers" in the schools to provide recreational activities to Philadelphia youth. In 1916, Garber finally thanked these "extra-school" agencies for subsidizing and enhancing the educational opportunities throughout the city. He knew that the financial situation would have been much worse without their support.

**Germantown's Solution to the Fiscal Crisis: Private Funds for Public Schools**

In 1916, Germantown residents understood that the Board lacked the resources to create and sustain the kind of institution that they desired. Instead of waiting for the Board to raise the funds for the high school, the community—the school's faculty, families, students, and residents—subsidized academic and extracurricular programs at their new high school. In other words, these individuals finally used private funds to

---

support their public school. This mechanism ensured Germantown High School’s early success and legitimacy.

From the moment the new high school opened, Germantown faculty, families, students, and residents contributed money to provide “proper nourishment” to the community’s “infant” high school. During this period, each graduating class held a monthly meeting to discuss upcoming events and collect class dues from each student. The class dues defrayed the costs of school dances, graduation, and the popular trips to Washington D.C. that Germantown students took during their senior year. The school expected each student to donate dues. In addition to class-level giving, the school sponsored fundraisers throughout the community, such as musical variety shows at the Germantown and Lyric Theatres. Students sent invitations to their families and friends and publicized these events in local newspapers. Finally, the school senate, an elected student government, charged every student a “poll tax” to vote. This funding provided financial resources to various clubs and organizations in the school—at one point this fund even paid for the damages to a street car after a raucous student celebration marking a Germantown football victory. In 1916, Germantown students told their peers that they had “only begun to realize our ambition,” thus it behooved “every individual in this institution to continue striving on the road to success—for his school first, and then, as an important but secondary consideration, for himself.” Germantown High School students were expected to engage actively in these activities and donate their money willingly to ensure the school’s future success and legitimacy.

60 “Minutes of the Senate,” The Cliveden, February 1919, 22; “Minutes of the Senate,” The Cliveden, December 1920, 32.
Others—faculty, families, residents, and alumni—also contributed time and money to support the young high school. In 1921, faculty and students hosted the school’s first annual frolic for students, alumni, and community members. In the invitations, students reminded the community that the frolic was an event to raise money for “a permanent scholarship fund...the expenses of the Senior Classes...[and] the Athletic association.” The frolic lasted for four days, to increase donations and accommodate schedules, and it consisted of student, staff, and alumni performances.\(^{62}\) The school sponsored two parent groups, the Mothers’ and Fathers’ Associations, that contributed funds to support the school. For example, in 1924, the Mothers’ Association donated twelve uniforms to the basketball team and textbooks to the Domestic Science department; in 1925, the Mothers’ association raised over $300 to provide funds for students “who need such help to pursue their studies in the High School.”\(^{63}\) These associations paid monthly dues to cover the costs of meetings and to raise money for the school. Finally, local businesses placed advertisements in the school’s monthly newspaper, *The Cliveden*, to encourage student patronage and to decrease the paper’s publication costs.\(^{64}\) The Chelten Trust Company, a local bank, donated prize money annually for the best student essay on Germantown history.\(^{65}\)

Germantown High School blended public funds from the Board with private funds from the community to subsidize the school’s budget. By providing additional resources to the school, the community enhanced the legitimacy of its new high school and ensured that it met the community’s demands. During this period, Germantown


\(^{64}\) For examples of these advertisements, see, “The Saving Fund Society of Germantown,” and “List of Advertisements,” *The Cliveden*, Front Cover and p. 1, October 1916.

\(^{65}\) “Prize Essay Contest,” *The Cliveden*, p. 6, January 1921.
High School provided its students with the city’s finest academic and extra-
curricular activities.

Germantown’s philanthropy extended beyond the high school’s boundaries and
provided additional support to Germantown’s high school and out-of-school youth. The
*Evening Public Ledger*, one of the city’s leading newspapers, interviewed Milton Cooper,
the regional superintendent of schools in the Germantown area, about the success of the
schools in his district. When the reporter asked Cooper to explain how Germantown’s
young high school had earned such a respectful reputation in the city, he remarked,
“pride and interest in a community’s school is fostered by the school through co-
operation with other institutions, such as the YMCA and the boys’ club, etc. in the
neighborhood.”66 Cooper recognized that the key to the school’s early success and
legitimacy rested on its ability to leverage community support for its youth through these
charitable organizations. Germantown’s charitable organizations provided additional
educational and recreational activities to Germantown youth that the Board of education
and the high school could not afford. Like the high school, residents funded these
organizations with their own money. These organizations enhanced the support that
Germantown youth received and replicated the structural inequalities that existed in
Germantown and the nation.

In the 1920s, Germantown already enjoyed a wide variety of charitable
organizations that supported the community’s middle and working class youth (see
figure 2.11).67 These organizations provided youth with coursework in stenography,
wickerwork, bookkeeping, mechanical drawing, and carpentry. The Germantown YMCA,
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67 Charitable organizations existed in Philadelphia throughout its history, however my work makes a
distinction between the organizational structures during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
For an analysis of the earlier period, see Bruce Dorsey, *Reforming Men And Women: Gender in the
Antebellum City* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).
like others in the nation, offered free English and Americanization courses for immigrants who had moved to the community. The YMCA provided courses at night for young men “who left school early” so that they could “make up much of their schooling and fit themselves for positions of greater usefulness” in society.\footnote{71} Some of the organizations, including the YMCA, charged a small tuition fee for the courses; others allowed members to take them for free.\footnote{69} These organizations provided youth with employment bureaus to help them find a job in the community.\footnote{70} The Germantown Boys’ Club even sponsored a college league, which helped “deserving boys” finance their college education by “aiding them to find employment during the college year and summer vacation.”\footnote{68}

\footnote{68}{“Seven O’Clock,” p. 26, Box 1 YMCA, Germantown Historical Society.}
\footnote{69}{Annual Report, 1915, YMCA, Box 1 YMCA, Germantown Historical Society.}
\footnote{70}{“After Work, After Supper, After School,” 1920-1921, p. 2, Box 1 YMCA, Germantown Historical Society; Wissahickon School Club, Ninth Annual Report, 1912. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society; “Workingmen Form Club,” 1909 in Box 6, Other Boys’ Clubs, Folder Morton Boys’ Club, Germantown Historical Society; Twenty-third Annual Report of the Germantown Boys’ Club, 1910 in Box 2, Boys’ Club, Germantown Historical Society; “Helping Boys to Pay for Education,” Box 2, Boys’ Club, Folder, Germantown Boys’ Club, Newspaper Clippings, Mostly Pre-World War I, Germantown Historical Society.}
\footnote{71}{Twenty-third Annual Report of the Germantown Boys’ Club, 1910 in Box 2, Boys’ Club, Germantown Historical Society; “Helping Boys to Pay for Education,” Box 2, Boys’ Club, Folder, Germantown Boys’ Club, Newspaper Clippings, Mostly Pre-World War I, Germantown Historical Society.}
Figure 2.11  Germantown Charities, 1925

Legend
- 1. "Colored" YWCA (1917)
- 2. Germantown Boys' Club (1887)
- 3. Germantown High School (1914)
- 4. Germantown Relief Society (1872)
- 5. Morton Boys' Club (1902)
- 6. West Rittenhouse YMCA
- 7. Whosoever Gospel Mission (1895)
- 8. Wissahicken Boys' Club (1903)
- 9. YMCA (1871)
- 10. YWCA (1873)
In addition to the vocational support, these organizations also offered recreational activities, such as competitive athletic activities and “learn to swim” campaigns. Germantown High School’s swim team hosted its weekly practice at the YMCA.\(^\text{72}\) The YMCA and Germantown’s four Boys’ Clubs had tennis courts and swimming pools that looked like “a regular country club.”\(^\text{73}\) Finally, the all-white Germantown YMCA provided summer camp activities at the Pennsylvania State YMCA camp on Marshall’s Island and at Camp Wilson, which belonged to the Trenton YMCA.\(^\text{74}\) The all-white Germantown Boys’ Clubs sponsored a summer camp at Stone Harbor, New Jersey while the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club spent the summer at Camp Emlen, named for its benefactor, Mr. and Mrs. John T. Emlen, near Morwood, Pennsylvania, a western suburb of Philadelphia.\(^\text{75}\) The clubs financed these camps and covered the costs for children whose families did not have the income necessary to pay for camp tuition. During the summer, boys’ club graduates staffed the summer camps, allowing them to earn extra income to help pay for college and exposing younger members to graduates from their club.\(^\text{76}\) These camps provided children from middle and working class families with the same recreational opportunities during the summer that upper class children in the community had always enjoyed.

The educational and extra-curricular activities that these charitable organizations sponsored subsidized the high school’s role because they provided Germantown’s youth


\(^{73}\) “The Germantown YMCA Red Triangle,” June 1925, p. 3, Vol. 1, Number 1, Box 1, YMCA, Germantown Historical Society.


\(^{76}\) Charles Shirley, Jr., Interview by Author, July 27, 2010.
with a wealth of activities and a safe haven before and after school. As the superintendent of public schools noted in his annual report, the Board of Education could not afford to support these activities due to a lack of funds. Germantown residents donated private funds to these charitable organizations to provide Germantown youth with educational and recreational activities that they believed they deserved and to maintain the peacefulness of their quiet suburb.

Germantown’s charitable organizations benefited the community’s youth, however they also appealed to elite residents because they were “economical” and “efficient.” In their annual campaigns, these organizations assured donors that they would use their funds wisely and that these funds supported “worthy” and “deserving” children in the community. They reminded Germantown residents that the staff members and volunteers in each of these organizations conducted annual home visits and had good relationships with the members’ families. The all-Black Wissahickon Boys’ Club even assured donors that staff members reported “special cases” to the appropriate authorities, such as the local probation officers, to alleviate “difficult” problems in the community.

Germantown residents willingly donated to these organizations because they appreciated that their neighbors both founded and controlled these organizations. Germantown residents still felt that they lived in a suburban community that was removed geographically and culturally from the corruption and poverty that plagued the
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77 Wissahickon School Club, Ninth Annual Report, 1912. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Other Boys Clubs, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society. See also Letter from Business Men’s Committee of the Germantown Boys Club to Dr. Herman Burgin, Jun 4, 1920, in Box Six, Other Boys Clubs, Folder, Germantown Boys’ Club, More Papers 1, Germantown Historical Society.


79 Wissahickon School Club, Tenth Annual Report, 1913. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society.

80 Wissahickon School Club, Tenth Annual Report, 1913. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society; Wissahickon School Club, Seventh Annual Report, 1910. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society.
Germantown residents preferred to donate to local charities because they felt assured that these organizations were free of corruption and only benefited those in their community.

Germantown residents had other motives for donating to these groups. Every year, these charitable organizations published annual reports that listed the names of the elite families who had contributed money to these organizations. In 1915, 51% of the donors to the Morton Boys’ Club and 48% of the donors to the Germantown YMCA in 1915 were listed among the city’s elite in the Philadelphia Social Register. Upper and middle class residents knew who donated and who did not, thus there was an element of maintaining social prestige attached to donating to these charitable organizations. Prominent Germantown residents donated to these organizations because they controlled them and because they wanted to appear to their elite, social circle as fine, upstanding citizens.

Finally, residents donated to these organizations because the organizations preserved the quiet charm of their suburban community and kept unruly children off the streets. The all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club explained that the club’s main objective was “keeping young boys off the streets...away from places of evil influences.” Even though these organizations mirrored many of the activities that the high school provided to its students, there was a clear difference between the programs that the high school offered and the ones that these organizations offered. While the high school served
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81 Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association Meeting Minutes, July 10, 1907, Box, Germantown and Chestnut Hill Improvement Association, Minutes, 1908-1929, GHS.
82 Morton Boys’ Club, Annual Report, 1915, Box 6, Other Boys’ Clubs, Germantown Historical Society; Germantown YMCA, Annual Report, 1915, Box 1, YMCA, Germantown Historical Society; Philadelphia Social Register, 1915.
83 Wissahickon School Club, Ninth Annual Report, 1912. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society. This idea was also reflected in the publication for the national organization, for this, see “The Street Boy Problem and Its Solution,” National Work for Street Boys and Boys’ Club Association in Box 1, Folder, Boys’ Club of America, Germantown Historical Society.
primarily upper class, native-born white youth, these organizations provided recreational activities and after school support primarily for middle and working class youth from a diverse set of racial and ethnic backgrounds. The appeals made this distinction clear. The annual reports reminded supporters that these organizations kept “young boys off the streets” and replaced “evil influences” with “wholesome amusement.” According to the appeals, these programs aimed to substitute the perceived dangers of the dance hall and saloons with morally upstanding amusement for the community’s youth and mitigated against the “inconvenience” that amusements on the streets posed to “other classes of citizens.”

The Germantown YMCA and YWCA also promoted this in their philanthropic appeals reminding donors in an article entitled, “Fill the Y.M.C.A. and Keep the Prison Empty,” that the Y needed financial support to “purify the minds” of immoral boys in the community. In other words, these appeals reminded donors that the organizations offered working class youth the same social activities that middle and upper class residents provided to their own children, and perhaps more importantly, the activities that these organizations offered kept their quiet, suburban streets free of unruly youth. Germantown residents were willing to donate private funds to these organizations to maintain their quiet streets and to alleviate the dependency of the community’s working class children on charitable relief as they moved towards adulthood.
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84 Wissahickon School Club, Ninth Annual Report, 1912. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society.
85 “Our Work,” Issued by the Germantown Boys’ Club, September 1910, Box 4, Boys Clubs, Folder, Germantown Boys’ Club, Other Papers, 1, Germantown Historical Society.
The existence of these charitable organizations raised the social and cultural capital of high school aged youth and provided additional benefits, like stable housing prices and low crime rates, to Germantown residents.

While these may have been the long-terms stated goals of charitable relief, Germantown residents also supported these organizations they increased the availability of black domestic labor. For example, the Pulaskitown Free Kindergarten, which eventually became the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club, was one of the only organizations that actually remained open on Sundays. The Board of Directors of the Wissahickon Boys’ Club decided to do this so that working class black children had a place to stay while their mothers and fathers served Sunday dinner to the wealthy residents who employed them as domestics in their households.\textsuperscript{88} These charitable organizations provided relief to poor children and ensured that their mothers and fathers who worked as domestic servants were available whenever their wealthy employers wanted them. Individuals donated to these organizations because they provided educational and recreational activities to youth and because they supported the suburban lifestyle that elite donors wanted to maintain.

Even though the reasons for donating to these organizations might have differed from the reasons for donating to the high school, these organizations mirrored the inequalities that existed in Germantown High School, the community, and the nation. These biases affected the ways that these organizations approached their work and delivered their services. For example, even though these organizations provided additional coursework and support to youth in the community, typically, these activities were geared to help members develop the skills necessary for working class jobs. These organizations offered “industrial” courses in wickerwork and carpentry for boys and

\textsuperscript{88} M. Frances Hunter, Germantown Resident, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
sewing and cooking classes for girls. These activities corresponded neatly with the skills needed for the second-class jobs that many of these young men and women would eventually fill as adults. Thus, while the organizations provided additional support that the high school could not afford, they did not challenge the rigid economic structure based on race, class, and gender that existed in Germantown.

During the early part of the 20th century, Germantown mirrored the racial segregation that plagued the North. Germantown’s white community blatantly barred blacks from eating at particular restaurants, shopping at local department stores, swimming in community pools, and sitting in the lower half of the movie theatres. The community established separate branches for the YMCA, YWCA, and boys’ clubs for black and white residents. In short, their actions conformed to the unwritten racial codes in effect at the time. These organizations mirrored the racism and inequalities that pervaded American society.

Each of the boys’ clubs sponsored an employment bureau to help their members find jobs in the community. However, the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club had a more difficult time securing jobs for their members because, as John Emlen, who had worked as a volunteer teacher at the Hampton Institute and helped organize the Armstrong Association in Philadelphia, told the Board of the all-black Wissahickon that it faced “a double problem…the boy problem and the negro problem.” Emlen noted that while white boys could apprentice or work at virtually any organization in Germantown, he knew that many businesses in the community had refused to accept members of the Wissahickon club.

---

89 Wissahickon School Club, Ninth Annual Report, 1912. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society.
Even though Emlen acknowledged the challenges that racial discrimination posed for Wissahickon members, he did not directly attack the racism in the community that had created these barriers to employment. Rather, he told his members that the organization should focus on the “more able Negroes” in the club since “the consensus of opinion on the part of the colored workmen themselves is that race prejudice is less” for skilled workers. Emlen urged the organization to “guide our better and brighter boys into better paying work, so that they may have better homes and that the boys’ wives in the homes may be able to give more time to the children.” By focusing on job placement for the most skilled individuals in the club, Emlen and his supporters believed they would eventually be able to “obliterate race prejudice” in the community.92 Emlen wanted to give his African American male members the ideal white, middle class home: a decent job with a wife who stayed at home to raise her children. Unfortunately, this approach did not obliterate the pervasive racism in Germantown that barred Wissahickon’s black members from jobs that paid middle class wages.

Even though these organizations mirrored the racism that existed in Germantown, they simultaneously provided a haven from the racism that many of these black youth experienced at the high school and throughout the community. As one member of the club recalled, the Wissahickon represented the “only place” that young black children felt truly welcomed.93 In 1913, the club hired William T. Coleman to serve as its director. Coleman had attended the Hampton Institute from 1910-1912 where he studied cabinetry and received his teaching degree. After that, he attended the University of Pennsylvania and studied social work. He seemed to be the ideal candidate

92 Wissahickon School Club, Eighth Annual Report, 1911. Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society. For biographical information on Emlen, see “Gets Award for Service Given to Colored,” Philadelphia Tribune, January 23, 1941.
93 Louise Strawbridge, “Interviews with Pulaski Town Resident,” Germantown Crier, Fall 2006, 37. See also Dr. Merritt Wilson, Interview by Louise Strawbridge, November 4, 1991. Between Two Wars Collection, Box 2, Germantown Historical Society.
for this position because he understood the challenges and tribulations that young black adolescents faced. To cultivate high aspirations throughout the club, he hung a sign in the entranceway to the club that read: "A boy is a diamond in the rough; add character and you have a jewel."94

According to former members, Coleman cultivated this motto throughout his club by ensuring that his black members had opportunities that other black youth in the community lacked. For example, he hosted movie nights at the club on Saturday evenings so that his members were “spared the humiliation of sitting in the segregated section” of the movie theatres in Germantown and other parts of the city.95 He showcased his members in various competitions throughout the city and nation and exposed them to a world beyond their own community.96 Coleman displayed the Wissahickon’s accomplishments and headlines throughout the club, explaining to a visitor, “the boys like to read about themselves, and besides that, it has a tendency to spur them on to make them work hard to keep up their record.”97 He assisted his members with college applications and helped them secure scholarships and/or employment to realize their goals.98 In 1913, the Boys’ Federation of America appointed Coleman as the first black field director to visit and oversee black clubs throughout the

95 Ibid., 16.
nation. His new position gave the Wissahickon, its young black members, and its director additional exposure to highlight the clubs' programs and accomplishments.

In addition to his credentials, Coleman also brought personal experiences and perspectives that provided club members with the adult mentorship that they did not find in the high school. When he was an adolescent, Coleman had routinely walked past a laundry business owned by a Chinese man on his morning commute to and from his segregated Baltimore high school. One day, he and his friends decided to harass the owner and yelled a racial slur at him. The owner retaliated and threw an iron at young Coleman, which Coleman, in turn, threw it back at the man, smashing the launderer's storefront window. Instantly, the police started a search to arrest him for this crime. When he told his mother that the police wanted to arrest him, she worried about the consequences that this might have on his future. Fortunately, Coleman’s mother had connections outside of Baltimore—her childhood friend was the president of the Hampton Institute. To avoid her son’s arrest, she called and asked her friend to admit Coleman to the school; the following day Coleman boarded a train headed for Hampton. He was only 14 years old.

This incident had a profound affect on him. When he became the director of the Wissahickon Club, Coleman worked closely with the police so that his members could avoid the experiences that he had endured as a young man. His son, William T. Coleman, Jr., recalled that the Germantown’s fourteenth police district routinely brought club members to his father’s home instead of arresting them. When the police left Coleman’s home, he asked the child to explain what happened and invited the child’s
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99 “Wissahickon Boys Club: 42 Years of Progress,” M. Frances Hunter, personal collection, author has copy in her possession.
family to his home to discuss the consequences of the incident. In a world where police tended to target and arrest young black men more often than their white counterparts, residents and journalists credited Coleman’s approach with reducing juvenile delinquency in the community.

In addition to segregating youth on the basis of race, the Germantown YMCA and boys’ clubs the organizations told members and donors that they existed to counteract the “gang spirit” that Germantown boys encountered in “the streets and mills.” These organizations wanted to help young men develop “useful and honorable manhood and citizenship” and replace “moral confusion” with “moral strength.” Charles W. Bainbridge, the director of the all-white Germantown Boys’ Club, remarked that his organization served as a “lighthouse” to keep young men away from “trouble, the police and the courts.” According to Bainbridge, in the past, men lacked the support that the boys’ club offered; yet the country still produced great “men like Lincoln.” With the additional support that the boys’ club provided, Bainbridge predicted that this modern “machinery” would “produce some of the much-desired supermen that we hear about.”

The organizations sponsored courses in citizenship, religious training, and of course,
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100 William T. Coleman, Jr., interview by author, August 10, 2010.
101 Beaupre, “Negro Boys’ Activities at Wissahickon: The Leading Boys’ Club of the B.C.F.,” 14. Beaupre acknowledges the higher rate of arrest of black juveniles in Philadelphia at the time as well as the efforts by the Wissahickon and its director to curb this. M. Frances Hunter, personal collection, author has copy in her possession.
competitive athletics of every kind.\textsuperscript{105} The focus on “muscles and morals” promoted the ideals of manhood that the community, and the nation, wanted to cultivate during the progressive era.\textsuperscript{106}

Additionally, these organizations promoted separate institutions for boys and girls, such as the YMCA for men and the YWCA for women. The all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club permitted girls to visit the clubhouse one or two days a week. This segregation served two purposes. First, it provided space for the organizations to cultivate manhood for the boys. It also gave the organizations room to articulate their ideals of womanhood for the girls. The organizations offered young women coursework in domestic science, nursing, and library work and sponsored lectures on “How to Make a Home Beautiful.” The Germantown YWCA conducted a “sensible shoe drive,” reminded young women to dress “sensibly,” and organized a “face powder was more deadly than gunpowder” campaign. The YWCA wanted their members to conform to the standards of middle class womanhood. The Girls Reserves for the YWCA even conducted research on the “influence of motion pictures on sex attitudes of children and youth.”\textsuperscript{107} While the girls’ reactions to these programs are not entirely clear from the available sources, it is evident that these programs attempted to transform working class girls into ideal middle class women. While these charitable organizations provided resources and activities to Germantown youth that the school district and the high school could not afford, these organizations also reflected the segregation that existed at Germantown High School and throughout much of the community.

\textsuperscript{105} Wissahickon Boys Club, Ninth Annual Report, 1912, p. 8-9, Boys’ Club, Box 6, Folder Wissahickon School (Boys’) Club, Germantown Historical Society.
In his inaugural edition of the *Crisis*, W.E.B. Du Bois condemned Philadelphia and other northern cities for creating separate educational institutions for blacks and whites. Du Bois believed that “human contact, human acquaintanceship, human sympathy” represented “the great solvent of human problems.” Segregated institutions, whether by class or race, prevented the kind of interactions and contact that Du Bois believed essential for democracy. Du Bois described the consequences of segregated schools and organizations. He bluntly stated, “the segregation of black folk in public institutions, or the segregation of Italians...is almost a shirking of responsibility on the part of the public—a desire to put off on somebody else the work of social uplift while they [white, native born, upper class citizens] enjoy its results.”

The segregated institutions in Germantown, as Du Bois suggests, also curtailed the public’s responsibility to ensure that poor children had access to the same resources that middle and upper class families provided to their own. Although Du Bois vehemently lambasted Northern cities for segregation based on class and race, he did not address the fact that these charitable organizations segregated individuals based on gender.

Even in its earliest days, the high school relied on the community’s charitable organizations to provide the necessary resources to Germantown youth. This relieved the high school from this responsibility and hardened community divisions. Berthold Levy, a white graduate of the 1930 Germantown High School class, recalled that in Germantown, even in the 1920, there were “two worlds in Germantown.” One world was reserved for upper and middle class white residents; the other world was reserved for working class residents, who were generally the sons and daughters of immigrants or blacks. The charitable organizations in the community served the latter group. While

these charitable organizations afforded children opportunities that they could not find elsewhere, they also reflected these two worlds: the high school provided the academic education that middle class residents desired and these charitable organizations subsidized other educational and recreational opportunities for working class youth. This distinction between these two worlds became increasingly clear as poorer residents, primarily immigrants and blacks, moved to Germantown seeking stable employment and the advantages for their children that this elite, suburban community supposedly offered.

**The Limitations of Private Funds**

Germantown High School and the charitable organizations clearly benefited from the influx of private funds. However, their budgets often fluctuated wildly. These fluctuations were directly related to the amount that elite residents donated as well as the amount that the organizations needed. In Germantown, the unstable economic situation in the 1920s and the influx of new residents—African Americans, from the South and the city, and immigrants, from Europe and the city—strained the organizations’ financial capacity. In 1915, the all-white Germantown Boys’ Club announced that it had a four thousand dollar deficit. In 1921, the all-white Germantown YMCA told its donors that the organizations had only collected a little more than half of its fifty thousand dollar operating budget. The Y told its members that the organization might have to curtail programs if they did not raise more funds.

These fiscal challenges plagued other charities in the city as the city’s economy began to tumble and the demands on these organizations began to rise. On November 6,
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1919, the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce appointed four men—Alfred Cross, Bishop Thomas J. Garland, Charles Z. Tryon, and Louis Wolf—to a committee to study charity fundraising in the city. The committee argued that Philadelphia suffered from a chaotic fundraising approach that pitted charitable organizations against one another for funds. Instead of competing for funds, the committee suggested that the organizations join forces and solicit funds under one body: the Philadelphia Welfare Federation. This approach mirrored the techniques from the War Fund Campaigns that existed during World War I and had already been proven successful in other cities, such as Cleveland and Detroit.\textsuperscript{113} The Federation’s first board of directors included prominent businessmen and civic leaders. However, unlike the past, none of these men and women lived in Germantown.\textsuperscript{114}

As the Chamber prepared for the Federation’s first campaign, an editorial appeared in Germantown’s local newspaper, the \textit{Independent Gazette}, about whether Germantown charities should join the Philadelphia Welfare Federation. This editorial stated that “in the abstract the Federation plan is meritorious” as it would most likely “arouse general public interest” in the ideas of charitable funding throughout the city. However, the editorial warned that these city-wide campaigns actually “take much more money from Germantown than is returned to Germantown charities.” While acknowledging that some members of the community wanted to donate funding to “downtown charities,” the author tried to persuade readers that “such help should not be given at the cost of lessened contributions to Germantown.” To further this claim, the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{113} Edward Thomas Devine et al., \textit{The Survey} (Survey Associates, 1921), 204-205.
\end{footnotesize}
editorial stated that local charities recognized this and that “many, probably most, of the charitable organizations in Germantown and vicinity” would not join the new Federation. Instead, the charities would appeal to local residents “for adequate support” to meet their needs, and as they had proven for so many years, Germantown residents would “see the wisdom of making provision first for home institutions.”

Despite these warnings, several months later, six Germantown charities—the Germantown Hospital, the Morton Street Day Nursery, the Americanization Committee of Germantown, the Wissahickon Boys’ Club, the Germantown YMCA, and the Germantown YWCA—announced that they had joined the Philadelphia Welfare Federation. Apparently, these six charities did not share the editorialist’s confidence in Germantown residents to provide “adequate support” to meet their needs, or they worried about trying to compete with this citywide federation.

This announcement marked a shift in the approach that Germantown charities used to raise funds. Previously, charitable organizations in Germantown had formally sent personal letters asking prominent residents for their support. Residents made private decisions about whether or not to give to the organization. The organizations put together elaborate annual reports detailing their expenses and revenues as well as lists of donors and the amount given. Even though the decision to donate was private, prominent residents knew who gave to these organizations. Thus, there was a public dimension to private philanthropy. Most importantly, as was evident in the high school campaign, many Germantown residents had a strained relationship with the city of Philadelphia and its governance. To many who called this neighborhood their home, Germantown was the pristine suburb removed from the city’s poverty and city council’s corruption. The appeal of donating directly to local organizations for many residents

---

rested on the fact that their donations aided the poor in their own community, and in turn, kept them protected from the poverty that existed elsewhere.

The Welfare Federation’s campaign for funding differed from this approach. Even though the Welfare Federation accepted donations allocated for specific organizations, most of the funds were appropriated based on each organization’s needs. Thus, when Germantown residents gave to the Welfare Federation they could not be entirely sure how the Welfare Federation would use its funds. The editorial noted this distinction and reported that at least one Germantown charity, the Whosoever Mission, recognized that the Federation’s centralized approach to fundraising would not necessarily appeal to Germantown residents and decided not to join the Federation.\(^\text{116}\)

When the campaign ended, the Welfare Federation announced that it fell almost two million dollars short of its four million dollar goal. However, the Welfare Federation and its members raised one million dollars more than the organizations had collected individually the previous year.\(^\text{117}\) Even though many Germantown residents preferred their traditional approach to charitable fundraising, the success of the first campaign tempted others organizations in the community and city to join the Federation. As Germantown charities found themselves increasingly strapped for funds due to lack of donations and mounting poverty in the community, the temptation to participate in this new movement for a centralized Welfare Federation seemed even more enticing. The Welfare Federation’s centralized system eroded the connection that the community had with its local charities and moved Germantown’s philanthropy to individuals who did not necessarily embrace the community’s values. As we will see, this had benefits and limitations.


Establishing the High School’s Early Success and Legitimacy with Private Funds

Even in the beginning of the twentieth century, the School District of Philadelphia lacked the necessary funds to provide an educational program that these middle class residents desired. Germantown families and businessmen used private funding to subsidize their new neighborhood high school and supported charitable organizations that provided support to middle and working class youth once the school day ended. However, as this chapter demonstrates, these organizations were increasingly strapped by lack of funding and promoted segregation based on race, class, and gender.

Even though there were numerous shortcomings with this approach, the high school’s early success and legitimacy stemmed from two factors. First, as the demographics indicate, Germantown High School served primarily native-born, white middle class youth; these children possessed the social and cultural capital that guaranteed success in high school and beyond. Second, the availability of private funding supplemented government aid and enhanced the opportunities and support available to the community’s high school aged youth. As a result, in its earliest days, Germantown High School fulfilled the desires and goals that its residents put forth in their seven-year campaign to secure a neighborhood high school: the school had earned a reputation as a first-rate academic institution in the city. The school’s reputation circulated throughout Philadelphia and attracted middle class residents seeking a quality education for their children to the bucolic suburb. However, as the next chapter demonstrates, the onslaught of the Great Depression wrecked the city’s economy and ushered in wave of new residents increasing the demands on the high school and these charitable organizations. At the same time, wealthy families began moving out of the community
taking the private funding that the high school and these charities depended on with them to their new communities. Once this happened, the infrastructure that had ensured Germantown High School’s early success and legitimacy began to crack, revealing the fragility of the relationship between the high school and the charitable organizations that had enabled its success and legitimacy during these so-called glory years.
Chapter 3:

The Foundation Begins to Crack, 1929-1937
October 24, 1929 was a cool afternoon in Germantown, typical of the changing season. As school ended at the elite Greene Street Friends School, Marian Garrison, a precocious white girl from an elite family, met her chauffeur at the school entrance for her commute home. Marian, who was only ten years old, had no idea how that day would shape her future. While she was at school, share prices on the United States stock market had taken a disastrously sharp slide downward raising panic among investors. The following Tuesday was even worse. Marian’s father, C. Kenneth Garrison, a prominent stockbroker on the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, had watched as the charts continued to plummet. As the stock market continued to dive, C. Kenneth Garrison, and others like him, lost the lucrative career that had provided his family with luxuries and goods reserved for a small percentage of Americans. After the stock market crashed, Marian’s family sold their seven-passenger limousine. They relinquished their family jewels. They fired their hired help. They sold their spacious home at 616 West Hortter Street. In October 1929, Marian Garrison’s family lost the only lifestyle they had ever known. Eighty years later, Marian recalled, “when that crash came in October 1929, the bottom fell out of our [her family’s] world. You hear about people going from rags to riches. Well, we went from riches to rags.”

Marian recalled that her family’s world had been turned upside down after the market crashed. Her family moved into a modest, middle-class apartment building located near Germantown Avenue. They pulled her out of the quaint private school that she adored and transferred to the all-white public school, the Charles W. Henry School. Marian recalled that the teachers at the Henry School tried to acclimate her as best as they could, but she found it difficult to be in a new school with children she did not know. Her private school classroom felt like a cozy family with only 11 girls in her classroom. Henry, on the other hand, had between 28 and 30 children in a classroom,
which she said seemed impersonal. According to Marian, there were times when it seemed that her father lost “his desire to keep on living.” Her father sank into a deep depression. He felt guilty that others had lost their savings under his care. He eventually accepted a position as a customer’s man and joined a brokerage house where he continued to sell stocks, even though “no one was buying them.” Her mother tried to pull the family together, and while she had never taken care of a house on her own, she settled into her new status as a middle-class homemaker. Marian stayed in public schools and in 1936 graduated from Germantown High School, an institution she never truly enjoyed.¹

When the market crashed, only a small percentage of Americans owned stocks. Thus, many residents did not experience the events of October 1929 as Marian did. Throughout the 1929 and 1930, Hoover and other insisted that the economy was in the midst of a routine recession. The country, they argued, would bounce back.² Even though many residents in Philadelphia did not own stocks, the economists knew that Philadelphia’s economy would not bounce back as Hoover and his colleagues had hoped. Whereas earlier depressions had challenged certain segments of the city’s labor and housing markets, the 1929 crash shattered these markets in ways that no one could have predicted.³

¹ Marian Garrison, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, April 23, 2011.
Germantown fared better than the other parts of the city, but it still felt the effects of this Great Depression, and as it did, the high school community—its faculty, students, and families—tried to weather the storm and maintain the traditions that had cultivated the institution’s legitimacy in the past. However, the city’s economic problems strained Germantown’s private funding mechanisms and the school district’s ability to fund schools adequately. As the Great Depression lingered on, it affected the high school’s curricula, challenged its private funding mechanisms, and raised new questions about its future. By the 1930s, the strong foundation that the community had built at its young high school had already begun to crack.

*Philadelphia Sinks into the Great Depression*

During the Great Depression, unemployment skyrocketed to unimaginable levels. In 1930, a study of the nation’s nineteen largest cities ranked Philadelphia third, behind Detroit and Cleveland, in the severity of unemployment. A year later, school district officials conducted a survey of the levels of unemployment throughout the city and found that the rates ranged from 6.6% to 19.4%. These rates differed for black and white workers—16.2% of black workers and 11.5% of white workers were unemployed. Between October 1929 and October 1931, the city’s unemployment rate rose by 335%. As the unemployment surged, government officials insisted that the country was in the midst of another cyclical recession. Philadelphia, perhaps more than any other city,

---


shared Hoover’s optimism that the economic hardships would not last long, and thus, did not warrant government attention. In addition to Hoover’s optimism, the city’s civic leaders shared his belief in philanthropy to relieve the suffering that the city’s widespread unemployment had created.  

On November 7, 1930, over 200 of Philadelphia’s civic leaders gathered at the famed Bellevue-Stratford Hotel to generate ideas about how to address the high rates of unemployment and escalating levels of poverty throughout the city. The individuals who attended the meeting toyed with the idea of increasing government aid but rejected this approach in favor of a relief campaign based solely on city’s extensive network of private philanthropies. To coordinate the efforts among the city’s various charitable agencies and organizations, the civic leaders founded the Committee for Unemployment (CUR), headed by Horatio Gates Lloyd, a prominent banker and highly regarded philanthropist.  

In 1930, Lloyd commenced a campaign to raise four million dollars in private funds “to tide over the temporary distress.” Philadelphia’s civic leaders wanted to show the nation that private philanthropy, not government intervention, was the best way to address poverty and unemployment.  

Historian Irving Bernstein called Philadelphia’s approach the most imaginative approach to relief in the early years of the Great Depression. The extent and coordination of Philadelphia’s relief efforts were indeed remarkable. Horatio Gates Lloyd assembled a diverse network of university professors to study the conditions and social workers to provide direct services to those in need. He opened several centers throughout the city—one each in Germantown, Kensington, North Philadelphia, South  
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8 Philadelphia Public Ledger, June 20, 1930, 4.  
Philadelphia, and West Philadelphia--to screen relief applications and refer them to specific local agencies based on their needs. These agencies provided work and food to families, breakfast programs to public schools, and homeless shelters to worthy men. The Bureau of Unemployment reimbursed the agencies for their work so that it could oversee spending on the local level. In November 1931, Lloyd's committee joined the city's Welfare Federation and the Federation of Jewish Charities to raise nine million dollars for poor relief in Philadelphia. By the end of the campaign they had exceeded their goal and raised ten million dollars, the largest amount ever generated, to support the city's social service agencies and poor relief efforts. The Lloyd apparatus made Philadelphia a national model—President Hoover praised the city for "going over the top" with its relief efforts and upheld it as a national model of relief during these trying times.

However, as unemployment and foreclosures reached new heights, Lloyd worried that the funds were “barely enough” to meet the need. He warned Pennsylvania's Governor Gifford Pinchot that the funds would be exhausted by May and appealed to the governor for public aid. The overwhelming needs in the city challenged his faith in private philanthropy, and eventually, Lloyd advocated for direct government intervention for the poor. Pinchot, after a long battle with the state legislature and the state supreme court, allocated ten million dollars in aid; Philadelphia received two and
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half million dollars, an amount which lasted less than two months. In his final statement, Lloyd argued:

The situation today is quite different from what it is appeared to be when the Committee was first formed. The duration of the depression, the vast and increasing numbers of unemployed, and the general economic conditions are such that it requires no argument for the realization that the situation has progressed far beyond any possibility of relief from sources of private philanthropy, even for the most primitive necessities of life.

The present need is on a scale that calls not for more charity but for governmental action to save the health and indeed the lives of a large portion of the citizenry.

Lloyd knew that private philanthropy could not meet the city’s relief needs. While he had support from their progressive governor, Philadelphia’s mayor, J. Hampton Moore, refused to acknowledge the suffering in his city. As the funds dwindled, Moore toured the tiny street and alleys that dotted South Philadelphia and told residents no one was starving in his city. Philadelphia’s political officials still refused to allocate relief, and in the city of brotherly love, the poor had to rely on one another for support.

Happy Days Are Here Again, but the Government Fails to Respond in Philadelphia

When Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office in March of 1933, Philadelphia’s unemployment reached its peak with 46.4% of the city’s wage earners unemployed. The rate of unemployment was slightly lower among women—42% of native-born women, 31% of foreign-born women, and 55% of black women—compared to men—44% of
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14 Philadelphia Record, June 20, 1932, 1; Fox, “Unemployment Relief,” 104-107.
16 Billikopf indicated his concerns about the ability of “private charity” to address the challenges as early as March, 1931, see Billikopf, “The Social Duty to the Unemployed,” 69.
native-born men, 46% of foreign-born men, and 61% of black men (see figure 3.1). In his first hundred days, President Roosevelt instituted sweeping changes by providing federal relief and innovative programs to generate employment throughout the nation. Although many residents welcomed the President’s new programs and government aid, the situation in Philadelphia seemed locked in the past. Mayor Moore staunchly refused federal aid to appease the city’s Republican machine, and thus, the city had to rely on state funds for relief. Even with the influx of state funds, only half of Philadelphia’s unemployed were on relief rolls. Many residents lacked the support that they desperately needed.

Figure 3.1 Percentage of Unemployed Wage Workers by Race, Nativity, and Sex, Philadelphia, 1931-1936

Note: Data for 1934 is unavailable.

Even though Philadelphia’s political leaders initially refused aid, Roosevelt’s programs eventually managed to find their way into the city when Republican S. Davis Wilson replaced Mayor Moore in 1935. While he had staunchly opposed New Deal programs during his campaign, Wilson altered his position when he assumed office and finally encouraged the city to accept federal funds to improve city streets, municipal parks, and public buildings.\textsuperscript{21} Roosevelt’s funds supported educational and recreational programs, such as nursery schools and playground construction. However, throughout his presidency, Roosevelt did little to help the nation’s public schools. Instead, he allocated funds and created programs for the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, which provided employment and training for American youth, and used WPA funds to hire individuals to work in auxiliary positions in the school as tutors and artists. While these programs offset some of the challenges that the schools faced during the Great Depression, the NYA, CCC, and WPA did not alleviate the dramatic decrease in funding or the dramatic increase in segregation among the nation’s public school in the North and the South.\textsuperscript{22}

\textbf{The Great Depression Affects the Bucolic Suburb in the City’s Northwest Corner}

Despite its seclusion from the city’s center, Germantown was not immune from the effects of the Great Depression. Between 1929 and 1930, the rate of unemployment in the community rose by 81\%. The patterns of unemployment mirrored the city—African American residents were more likely to be unemployed than white residents.

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\end{thebibliography}
(11.3% and 9.6%, respectively). However, reports suggested that the duration of unemployment among Germantown residents was considerably longer than the duration of unemployment among residents in other parts of the city.\textsuperscript{23} Like the civic leaders in the city, Germantown’s social elite remained steadfast in their belief that local, privately funded philanthropies were better suited to relief efforts than direct government intervention.

Throughout the 1930s, Germantown charities continued to provide residents and youth with a wide variety of services and goods. During the holidays, the YMCA and the YWCA distributed “three tons of coal, clothing, and toys” for needy children in the community.\textsuperscript{24} In the summer, the all-black Wissahickon Boys Club and the all-white Germantown Boys’ Club subsidized the expense of summer camp for children who could not afford the costs. The all-white YMCA and the all-white YWCA opened summer camps in the community to augment the programs for those in need during the Depression.\textsuperscript{25}

In addition to these activities, Germantown’s local charitable organizations implemented programs that specifically addressed the dramatic surge in unemployment and poverty. William T. Coleman, the director of the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club, approached his donors and asked them to hire his members for odd jobs throughout the community, such as raking leaves and shoveling snow, so that these young men could earn money to support their families. Coleman also initiated a gardening club at the Wissahickon so that his members could learn how to create a small garden to grow vegetable for their families. The members donated the crops to needy families who lived near the club.\textsuperscript{26} In addition to the service project, these organizations sponsored employment bureaus to

\textsuperscript{23} Dewhurst and Nathan, \textit{Social and Economic Character of Unemployment in Philadelphia, April, 1930}, 54.
\textsuperscript{26} William T. Coleman, Jr., interview by author, August 10, 2010.
help their members find employment in Germantown and beyond. But as the Depression continued, Germantown’s social elite finally acknowledged that the levels of unemployment represented a national problem well beyond their control.\textsuperscript{27} The men and women who managed these organizations increasingly relied on federal aid and local support, but they still lacked the funds they needed to meet demand.\textsuperscript{28}

Even during the Great Depression, these organizations still segregated their members on the basis of race and gender. Black males could only be members in the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club or the all-black Rittenhouse YMCA; female youth were only permitted to be members at the all-white YWCA or the all-black YWCA. This segregation simultaneously limited and enhanced the experiences of Germantown youth. For example, black youth were not allowed to swim in pools reserved for white youth, to participate in interracial athletic activities, or to visit employment bureaus at all-white organizations. However, at the same time, these organizations provided black youth with programs on African American history and lectures by leading civil rights activists, such as Marcus Garvey and W.E.B. Du Bois. The clubs provided movie nights for black youth so that their members did not need to sit in the segregated balconies in local theatres.\textsuperscript{29}

Even though these organizations provided black youth with courses and activities that they might not have enjoyed, the Great Depression weakened the funding streams that these black organizations had relied on for decades. In 1934, the Philadelphia

\begin{footnotes}
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Tribune, the city’s leading African American newspaper, featured several articles about the programs at the all-black Wissahickon Boys Club where members often had to attend lectures or athletic events in “quarters cramped beyond expression.” The Great Depression had taken its toll on African American families who were often the last ones hired and the first ones fired. Although these black institutions provided their members with a haven from the racism that existed in their community, city, and nation, they increasingly lacked the levels of funding that the white institutions enjoyed. The Great Depression placed new demands on these charitable organizations as the level of unemployment and poverty increased. As they tried to address inequality at the local level, they often found that they lacked the financial resources they needed.

The Philadelphia Board of Public Education Faces Another Fiscal Crises

Throughout the 1920s, Philadelphia’s public school enrollment continued to rise, particularly at the secondary school level where it increased by 116% between 1922 and 1930. This surge in enrollment mirrored national school enrollment patterns and raised concerns among the city’s Board of Education members about the rising costs of accommodating the city’s ever-expanding public school population. In addition the concerns about the rising enrollment levels, Philadelphia’s superintendent of school was worried about another shift: the regional school districts in the center of the city had reported a significant decline in student enrollment while the regional school districts in the city’s outlying districts, such as Germantown and West Philadelphia, had reported a

significant increase in student enrollment (see figure 3.2). Superintendent Broome attributed this shift to the “removal of several large industries in the city” and to the movement of upper and middle class families to the suburban parts of the city and beyond.\textsuperscript{34} These city’s shifting enrollment patterns reflected the city’s dynamic labor and housing market and marked the beginning of an increased migration of upper and middle class white families from the city’s urban core. As the nation sank into the Great Depression and economic conditions worsened, the dramatic increase in student enrollment and the exodus of families out of the inner city strained the Board of Education and its Superintendent in ways that they could have never imagined.\textsuperscript{35}

Confident that the economic problems would be short-lived, the members of the board of education supported the city’s decision to lower its tax rate in 1930. The members of the board thought that a lower tax rate would encourage city residents to pay their taxes on time.\textsuperscript{36}


Percent Change in Student Enrollment, Philadelphia, 1921-1930

These plans backfired. Between 1925 and 1931, the percentage of homeowners who filed delinquent taxes rose by 320%--from less than 5% in 1925 to more than 21% in 1931.\textsuperscript{37} Residents suggested that the board of education reduce teacher salaries and remove married female teachers and non-resident teachers to save revenues. The president of the Board assured residents that the Board of Education had already put measures in place to ensure that it could maintain the tax rate and support excellent schools. He reminded residents that Philadelphia had one of the lowest teacher-salary scales in the nation. In 1931, teachers in Philadelphia made less money than their colleagues in Washington, D.C., Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, New York, Trenton, and Chicago, which the president pointed out, protected the schools from a fiscal crisis during this economic downturn.\textsuperscript{38} He also reminded residents that Philadelphia had the second lowest per-pupil expenditure rate among the largest twelve cities in the nation.\textsuperscript{39} The president of the Board told residents that these policies safeguarded the schools from a fiscal crisis and maintained the “best educational advantages to the children of the city.”\textsuperscript{40} His optimism was short-lived.

In 1932, the members of the Board of Education finally admitted that the city’s fiscal challenges threatened its ability to cover the schools’ operating expenses. However, once again, they assured residents that they had maintained the “high quality of educational service” and decreased the “burden on the taxpayer” by implementing “a

policy of rigid economy.” The Board members increased class sizes throughout the city with an average of 40 students per teacher in the elementary schools; 27.5 students per teacher in the junior high schools; and 26.5 students per teacher in the high schools. Through this process, they terminated 158 teaching positions and instituted a hiring freeze for teachers, supervisors, and clerical assistants. Finally, they cut after-school physical education, its successful summer school programs, and closed school recreational centers and playgrounds.

In 1933, the president of the board told his colleagues that they lacked the revenues to fund the budget and outlined their options: they could raise city taxes or eliminate additional programs. No one wanted to raise taxes. First, the members of the board did not want to burden city taxpayers with higher taxes during these difficult times. Second, city council had to grant the board of education permission to raise taxes beyond a certain limit. The members of the board did not want to approach city council or to overwhelm taxpayers, so they slashed educational programs even further. They increased class size, especially in the high schools, and reduced the school district’s teaching staff by 2.8% and its administrative staff by 20%. They placed teachers on a new graduated salary scale to save costs; teachers lost between 2.75% and 10% of their salaries. Finally, the members of the board reduced funding for books, equipment, and supplies to “an irreducible minimum.” By 1934, between 1931 and 1934, the city’s school enrollment had risen by 2,000 children while school revenues had decreased by 4.6%

million dollars. \textsuperscript{44} Philadelphia’s per pupil expenditure had decreased from $97.07 in 1931 to $90.77 in 1935. \textsuperscript{45} Between 1931 and 1936, the Board reduced the burden on the taxpayers by eliminating educational programs and services that had existed in the city’s schools for decades.

In his 1933 annual report, the superintendent stated that educators had slowly begun to realize that “all men are not created equal” with respect to “mental endowment and capacity to accomplish desired ends.” During the Great Depression, Philadelphia schools registered “a considerable percentage” of “mentally subnormal” students as well as students living in “poverty, resulting from their own incapacity to succeed, from improvidence, or from conditions beyond their control.” These poor children, Broome argued, would most likely not “rise above the plane of mere living” in the future. \textsuperscript{46} Broome told the Board that it was fulfilling the nation’s ideals “by just feeling sorry for these unfortunates, or by referring them to charitable institutions.”\textsuperscript{47} He urged government officials to provide educational provisions so that “mentally subnormal” students “may live as happily and fully as their capacities will permit.” While these students placed new burdens on the schools, he believed that poor students presented the Board and the schools with “an even more serious problem.” In contrast to his earlier remarks, Broome argued that “a large proportion” of poor students “owe their condition to social and economic practices for which they are not responsible and which they are powerless to correct.” He stated:

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
...so long as it is legally possible for one man to amass wealth by exploiting the poor; so long as the farmers have to accept starvation prices for their products, due to a series of intermediate profits between the farm and the consumer; so long as it remains possible for powerful groups of men to secure special benefits, privileges, and immunities through paid legislative lobbies and other influences; so long as these conditions continue, poverty will be a major problem of the American people, even in “prosperous” times.

Broome acknowledged the existence of national movement to improve these conditions but reminded residents that change happens “slowly in a democracy” since “people have not, as a whole, been educated to know what their “inalienable rights” are or how to secure and to preserve them.”

Broome reminded the members of the board about the importance of equality of opportunity in American thought and urged them to consider the benefits of this approach in schools. He wanted them to realize that American schools, unlike their European counterparts, had never favored individuals from “an upper or favored class.” Rather, Americans “rejoice when a rail-splitter or a boy who worked in a village store becomes President.” At the same time, however, he argued that educators know that many of their students “cannot become presidents, that few will attain wealth, and that space in the social register is limited” to a select group. Americans, he contended, were not troubled by these inevitable inequalities as long as “the doors of opportunity are kept open” for the “worthy” youth. Broome justified the link between equality of opportunity and the nation’s public schools, but worried that its promise had never been fully realized in practice. He wanted Philadelphia’s Board of Education to embrace

equality of opportunity in the schools and demonstrate its promise to the nation. According to him, equality of opportunity in the public schools means that “there shall be an open door ahead leading on and upward until...all American children, rich or poor, dull or bright, academic-minded or practical minded...has realized the fulfillment of his capacities.”

Even though Broome never mentioned race in his commentary, his concerns about the “mentally subnormal students” and belief in the equality of opportunity coincided with dramatic demographic shifts in the school district. Between 1917 and 1932, the number of students enrolled in the school district increased by 9%--the percentage of white students increased by 2% and the percentage of black students increased by 151%. As figure 3.3 shows, the increase in the percentage of black students was much larger in some regions of the city than other. Many of these black youth had moved from other region of the state and nation as their families searched for better educational and employment opportunities in the city of brotherly love. Some might have found this, but the vast majority of black residents who lived in Philadelphia in the 1930s found many of the same problems that they thought they had left behind. Black men and women found a labor market that offered them few opportunities, and as Broome pressured the public schools to implement the ideals of equality of opportunity, black youth found an increasingly segregated school system that offered distinct opportunities based on race and class. Equality of opportunity, at least in practice, ushered in new inequalities that hardened the lines between the youth who had access to the educational resources that they needed and those who did not.

---

Percent Change, Black Students, Philadelphia, 1925-1935

Source: Table No. 17, Annual School Census, Comparative Statement for Ten Year Period, Classified by Districts and by Race, 1926-1935, Board of Education Annual Report, 1935, 155.
During the Great Depression, Germantown families found that their secondary options had expanded. In 1925 and 1931, the School District of Philadelphia opened two new high schools in the area to accommodate the ever-increasing level of high school enrollment in the city. Simon Gratz High School, which opened in 1925, was located on the corner of 18th Street and Hunting Park Avenue in a neighborhood that was home to white ethnics and African Americans, who had moved out of the city’s center or other parts of the country, to enjoy the amenities that this suburban community offered. Olney High School, which opened in 1931, was situated on the corner of Duncannon Avenue and Front Street in a sparsely populated area of the city with a mixture of white ethnic residents who had taken advantage of federal housing loans to move out of their older homes into new homes on the city’s periphery. Families that wanted to send their children to public schools welcomed these new options. At the same time, many Germantown families, particularly upper class families, found that the Great Depression actually constrained their schooling options. Marion Garrison’s family, like many other families who lost their wealth when the market crashed, had to transfer their children from their elite private schools to local public schools because they could no longer afford the tuition costs. As families and high school-aged youth considered the benefits and limitations of their schooling options, the choices that they made affected the demographics of Germantown’s original neighborhood public high school.

Data gathered from yearbooks and the 1930 United States Census indicate that the Germantown High School population generally consisted of youth from native-born families in the upper echelon of the labor market. Germantown youth were more likely to
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54 Marian Garrison, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, April 23, 2011; Rosalie August, Germantown High School Class of 1949, Interview by Author, May 10, 2009.
graduate from the high school if their fathers were professionals \( (p < 0.03, \text{ logistic regression}) \) than if their fathers were craftspeople, skilled laborers, service workers or unemployed. In addition, youth whose families owned their homes were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than youth whose families rented their homes \( (p < 0.01) \). In other words, youth from upper class families were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than youth from middle and working class families.\(^5^5\)

Scholars have argued that that there was a dramatic increase in high school enrollment during the Great Depression due to the challenges that youth faced on the Depression’s tight labor market.\(^5^6\) High school enrollment clearly grew during this period as Philadelphia expanded its system of secondary schools.\(^5^7\) However, the data from these samples suggest that 46% of the non-Germantown graduates were engaged in the labor market. The data, drawn from 1929-1931, indicate that many Germantown youth were still able to find work making it impossible for them to attend high school.

In addition to these economic differences, Germantown High School graduates had a different ethnic composition compared to the community population. A logistic regression analysis showed that youth with native-born parents were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School compared with native-born youth with foreign-born parents \( (p < 0.01) \). However, foreign-born youth were more likely to graduate from the high school than native-born youth with native-born parents \( (p < 0.01) \).\(^5^8\) Historians have pointed out that immigrant youth often left school prematurely to work, even during the Great Depression, which explains why foreign-born and immigrant youth in

\(^{55}\) See Figure 3.3.a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.


\(^{58}\) See Figure 3.3.a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.
this sample were less likely to graduate from high school.\textsuperscript{59} In addition to these pull factors from the labor market, Italian immigrants represented Germantown’s largest immigrant group in 1930.\textsuperscript{60} Many of these Italian immigrants, like other Catholic groups, sent their children to parochial schools in lieu of the city’s public schools. This parochial school preference among immigrant groups helps to explain why foreign-born and immigrant youth had a low rate of representation among Germantown graduates. At the same times, these data indicate that foreign-born youth were more likely to graduate from Germantown High School than native-born youth with native-born parents. This suggests that even during the Great Depression immigrant families sent their children to high school to earn the credential that would hopefully provide an economically secure future.

Finally, the data suggest that black youth were less likely to graduate from Germantown High School than white youth (p < 0.01). This finding is related, at least in part, to the challenges that African Americans faced on the labor market in Philadelphia. Black workers were often the last ones to be hired and the first ones to be fired, and as the citywide studies indicate, the unemployment levels among African Americans during this period were higher than their white male and female counterparts.\textsuperscript{61} As a result, black families often had to forgo their children’s secondary education to subsidize their families’ incomes.

Oral history evidence highlights additional reasons that black youth were less likely to graduate from Germantown High School. Simon Gratz High School was located in a mixed neighborhood with middle and working class white and black residents living


\textsuperscript{60} Dewhurst and Nathan, \textit{Social and Economic Character of Unemployment in Philadelphia, April, 1930}.

\textsuperscript{61} Palmer, \textit{Recent Trends in Employment and Unemployment in Philadelphia}, 36. See Figure 3.3.a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.
side-by-side. Helen Faust, who worked at Simon Gratz High School during the Depression, recalled that the high school was filled with hundreds of African American migrants who had left the deeply segregated school system in the South only to find an equally segregated school system in the North. School officials often encouraged black residents to enroll their children at Simon Gratz High School instead of Germantown High School so that the school official could maintain segregated school enrollments at these two schools. These practices, Faust argued, instilled “distrust and hostility” among black parents and school officials who promoted these racist policies. At the same time, Simon Gratz High School provided students with new options that they lacked in the past. Throughout the 1930s, black youth often decided to attend Gratz High School to avoid the upper class character and racist practices that existed at Germantown School.

Even though the Great Depression dramatically shaped the educational options available to Germantown families in their community, the demographic differences between Germantown High School graduates and the city’s elite high school graduates remained remarkably consistent between 1920 and 1930. Like the 1920 sample, the percentage of black youth who graduated from the elite, all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls in 1930 was larger than the percentage of black youth who graduated from Germantown High School (11.6% versus 1.5%, respectively, p < 0.01, binary logistic regression). Similarly, the percentage of native-born youth who graduated from the Philadelphia High School for Girls (43.2%) was significantly smaller than the percentage

---

63 Evelyn Kelsh Carter, Interview by Gregory Woods, August 19, 1992, Between the Wars Collection, GHSoc; Alyce Jackson Alexander, Interview by Gregory Woods, no date. Between the Two World Wars Collection, GHSoc.
of native-born youth who graduated from Germantown High School (73.1%, p < 0.01). Among the graduates in the 1930 cohort, the percentage of black youth who graduated from the elite, all-male Central High School was larger than the percentage of black youth who graduated from Germantown High School (4.3% and 1.5%, respectively). Even though this difference is not statistically significant, the trend suggests that black youth were less likely to graduate from Germantown High School. The percentage of native-born youth among Germantown High School graduates (73.1%) was higher than the percentage among Central High School graduates (20.4%, p < 0.01). Finally, the sons of service workers and unemployed workers were less likely to graduate from Germantown High School (p < 0.02).

These patterns reflect many of the trends from the 1920 data with race, nativity, and father’s occupational status being significant factors in a family’s decision to enroll their children at these elite schools.

In addition to these factors, geography also influenced a family’s decision to send their son or daughter to one of these elite schools. The percentage of black and immigrant youth was larger among the elite school graduates because these youth were more likely to live near these schools located in the center of the city and did not have to pay the costly trolley fares to travel to school during the Great Depression. However, between 1920 and 1930, the percentage of elite school graduates who lived in Germantown’s ward 22 and 42 rose by 77% among Central High School graduates—from 5.7% to 10.1%—and by 222% among Philadelphia High School for Girls graduates—from 3.6% to 11.6%. Residence near these schools, it seemed, was less important than it was to the 1920 cohort. As families weighed their options and economic conditions
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64 See Figure 3.4.a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.
65 See Figure 3.5.a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.
66 See Figure 3.1.a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.
worsened, many mothers and fathers worried about their children’s futures and decided to send their sons and daughters to these elite schools, which many believed offered more valuable educational credentials than their local, neighborhood schools.\textsuperscript{67} No one knew what the future would bring, and thus, these educational consumers took a risk, made the sacrifice, opted out of their local high schools and enrolled their children in the most prestigious high schools the city offered. The lines between the city and the suburbs were becoming blurry as parents rushed to find ways to secure their children’s futures.

\textit{Germantown’s Young High School Tries to Weather the Storm}

As Germantown youth returned to their high school after the stock market crashed in 1929, their administrators, faculty, and families tried to cultivate a sense of normalcy at their young high school even though many knew that their worlds were crumbling. Germantown youth wrote editorials in the school newspaper reminding the incoming students to focus on their studies and participate in the school’s extra-curricular clubs and activities.\textsuperscript{68} They documented the lavish annual class trip to Washington, DC, the plans for the school’s upcoming opulent prom, and stories about their Grand European Tours.\textsuperscript{69} Others wrote articles about the excitement of returning to their beloved high school and the sadness that they felt when they realized that many of their peers had left high school early to enter “the business world.”\textsuperscript{70}

The only difference in their lives, according to the students, was that their high school had finally become a co-educational institution. In 1928, Germantown

\textsuperscript{68} “Boosters Organized for the Term,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, October 9, 1929; “Boosters Turn Into Salesman,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, October 22, 1929.
\textsuperscript{70} “Sad But True,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, October 9, 1929.
administrators announced that they were removing the iron gates that had divided the boys and girls schools into distinct parts.\textsuperscript{71} The administrators and youth praised this decision and hoped that it would alleviate the chaotic school environment that had existed throughout the 1920s where "some girls scattered among the boys' classes and some boys scattered among the girls' classes."\textsuperscript{72} There were other reasons beyond the overcrowding. The newest high schools in the city were co-educational. Germantown's administration wanted to ensure that its high school met the standards of these modern times.\textsuperscript{73} Finally, boys nationwide had demonstrated noticeable gains in the rate of high school and postsecondary graduation during the 1920s, which had alleviated some of the anxieties about academic achievement among American women.\textsuperscript{74}

When the 1929 crash happened, the school newspaper never featured stories about the crash or its aftermath. The members of Germantown High School's community—its faculty, students, and families—tried to shield Germantown youth from the harsh realities of the Great Depression. However, their ability to maintain a sense of normalcy was short-lived. The shortage of funds from the Board of Education coupled with the massive unemployment and influx of new students affected the culture and legitimacy of Germantown's young high school. The high school administration ushered in new vocational programs to meet the needs of these new students who in ordinary economic times would have left school after eighth grade to enter the workforce. As the level of poverty increased in the school, the community diverted the funds that had once supported these traditions and activities to help students in need. Despite this support,

\textsuperscript{71} "Rumors of Co-Ed System Are Formally Confirmed," \textit{The Clipper}, December 11, 1928.
\textsuperscript{74} 120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait (National Institute for Educational Sciences, January 19, 1993), 55.
the Depression hardened the lines of inequality in the high school, particularly along the lines of race and gender. Black students and female students quietly began to challenge these inequalities in their school and community; however, the administration rarely responded to their demands. By the end of the Depression, the foundation that the community had helped to cultivate at its young high school had begun to weaken.

In 1930, Germantown High School still offered students several different courses of study—academic, commercial, vocational arts, mechanical arts (boys only), and domestic science (girls only). With the exception of vocational arts, these 1930 course offerings reflected the course offerings that the school offered in 1920, but there were noticeable shifts in the enrollment patterns among Germantown youth. Even though the nation was in the midst of the Great Depression, the majority of graduates still selected the academic course followed by the commercial course. From 1920 to 1930, the percentage of youth who enrolled in the academic course increased by 29% whereas the percentage of youth who selected the commercial course decreased by 24%. Among male graduates, in 1930, the academic course represented the most popular option with the mechanical arts program and the commercial program being the second and third most popular choices. Between 1920 and 1930, the percentage of male youth who enrolled in the academic program rose by 37% while the percentage of male youth who opted for the commercial program dropped by 40%. During the Great Depression, the majority of female youth enrolled in the academic program followed by the commercial program. The percentage of female youth who selected the academic program increased by 20% and the percentage of female youth who chose the commercial program decreased by 8% over the past decade (see figure 3.4). The multinomial regression indicates that when one controls for race, nativity, and father’s occupational status, female youth were less likely to enroll in the academic program than male youth (p <
These shifts reflect the dramatic increase in college attendance among male youth as well as the transition from male clerical workers to female clerical workers in the labor market between 1920 and 1930.\(^\text{76}\)

**Figure 3.4 Course Enrollment, Germantown High School, 1920 and 1930 Cohorts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Study</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{75}\) See Figure 3.7a, Appendix, Chapter 3 Data and Analysis for a full description of the binary logistic regression.


In addition to gender, race continued to affect course placement. In 1930, the majority of white youth enrolled in the academic program (63%) followed by the commercial program (25%) and the mechanical arts program (8%). While the number of black graduates remained small (n = 10), the trends among black youth mirrored these patterns—the majority enrolled in the academic program (80%). Oral history evidence suggests that school administrators and guidance counselors were often resistant to having black youth in the academic program, but black youth and their families refused
to comply with the racist practices at the high school. Many of the black youth who graduated from the high school were the sons and daughters of craftsmen, skilled laborers, service workers, and unskilled laborers (70%). Sending their children to high school was a financial burden for many of them, and like their white counterparts, they wanted their children to receive the prestigious, academic education that Germantown High School offered despite the racism that existed in their nation, community, and schools.

Throughout the 1930s, Germantown faculty bombarded students with messages about the budding reputation of their college-preparatory high school and the importance of developing academic skills so that they could attend the college of their choice in the future. The faculty urged students to learn about the entrance requirements at the colleges that they wanted to attend to ensure that they had the necessary course load in high school. In addition to the faculty, Germantown youth published a series of articles in the school newspaper that described local colleges and universities to expose students to the wide array of postsecondary options. These articles often highlighted the accomplishments of Germantown students who attended these college and universities to remind students about the possibilities that awaited them after high school. In 1931, one student criticized his peers who arranged their course loads so that they could simply “just scrape through” high school. When it was time to apply for college, many of these students, the student argued, found that they lacked the “hard courses” that they needed to enroll in the college that they wanted to attend. In
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77 Savannah Holman, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; Marion Campbell, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
other words, students who tried to breeze through high school by taking easy
courses often found that they had limited options when they applied for college.⁷⁹ These
messages promoted college placement as a goal that every Germantown student should
strive to achieve to help them with their futures and to maintain Germantown’s
prestigious academic stands.

Although the faculty and students urged Germantown youth to attend college
after high school, evidence indicates that the economic conditions brought on by the
Great Depression made it increasingly difficult for families to finance their sons and
daughters’ postsecondary education. Berthold Levy, who graduated from Germantown
High School in 1930, recalled that the Great Depression did not affect his family like it
did others. His father, Alfred, who never graduated from high school, worked as an
insurance salesman in Philadelphia, which at least initially, provided his family with a
lucrative salary and a financially stable lifestyle. Berthold remembered that he traveled
regularly to the city’s center to visit his father at his office and his cousins who lived
downtown. In the late 1920s, his family embarked on a Grand Tour of Europe where
they stayed in the finest hotels and dined at the most elegant restaurants the continent
offered. When Berthold graduated from Germantown High School in 1930, the school
district award him the city’s coveted mayor’s scholarship, which covered four years of
tuition at the University of Pennsylvania, where he had enrolled for college. Alfred Levy
told his young son, Berthold, to relinquish his scholarship because he knew that other
youth needed the financial reward more than his son did. Instead of using the
scholarship, Berthold’s father paid his college tuition at the University of Pennsylvania

⁷⁹ “Does it Pay?,” Cliveden Clipper, April 14, 1931.
where his son earned a law degree so that he could maintain the upper class lifestyle he had always enjoyed.\footnote{Berthold Levy, Germantown High School Class of 1930, Interview by Author, July 28, 2009.}

As the Great Depression continued and the economic conditions in the city worsened, Germantown youth often found that the financial resources for postsecondary education had vanished. The loss of these financial resources and the high rates of unemployment made it increasingly difficult for Germantown youth to attend college. Savannah Holman and Marion Campbell, two African American women who graduated from Germantown High School in 1936, recalled that they had to forgo their college education and find employment after they graduated to support their families. Savannah wanted to go to college to become a nurse, but instead, had to accept a part-time position as a nurse’s aid at Germantown Hospital. In her interview, Savannah said that she did not regret her decision since she knew that college was not an option for her even though she had enrolled in the academic program.\footnote{Savannah Holman, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; Marion Campbell, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.}

Other students were more fortunate. Marian Garrison, a white woman who graduated from Germantown High School in 1936, knew that her family could not afford to send her to college after her father lost his saving on the stock market. However, Marion Garrison had access to social networks that Savannah Holman, due to her race and class, never enjoyed. One evening over dinner, Marion told her cousin that she did not think her family had enough money to send her to college. Fortunately for Marion, her cousin knew a man who was affiliated with Beaver College, a local college that was highly regarded for its education programs. Marion received a full four-year scholarship so that she could earn her degree without worrying about her family’s financial burden. When she graduated, she returned to Germantown, became a teacher in a nearby...
suburb, and supported her family with her modest salary.  

Marion’s upper class, white status gave her access to the social networks that provided her with the educational opportunities that her black peers never had. As the economic conditions worsened and fewer students attended college, Germantown faculty and youth ended their emphasis on the importance of college placement and focused on finding ways to cope with the rising rates of student enrollment at the young high school.

During the 1930s, Germantown High School, like other high schools in the nation, experienced a dramatic influx of students as the limited options on the labor market pushed youth into high school who ordinarily left school after their finished their primary school education. Between 1929 and 1938, Germantown High School’s student enrollment rose nearly 42%—from 2,199 youth in 1929 to 3,117 youth in 1938. This rapid increase in student enrollment coincided with the school district’s budget shortages, a 30% drop in the level of Germantown High School’s per pupil expenditures, and the opening of several new high schools in the city (see figure 3.5). As these new schools opened and the budgets shrunk, school district officials had to find a way to staff these new high schools even though they were in the midst of a hiring freeze. To meet these needs, they transferred ten Germantown High School teachers to the city’s new public high schools in 1932. When the school district transferred these teachers and refused to replace them, Germantown High School’s class size skyrocketed creating an untenable situation for Germantown faculty and youth.
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82 Marian Garrison, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, June 27, 2011.
83 Board of Education Annual Reports, 1929 and 1938.
84 “Transferring of Several Teachers Reduces Faculty,” Cliveden Clipper, February 23, 1932. See also, “Depletion in Faculty Ranks to be Caused by Transfers,” Cliveden Clipper, January 20, 1931.
As new students flooded the high school, the members of the faculty and the student-led school senate instituted a series of rigid school rules to help these newcomers acquiesce to the school’s behavioral norms. The school senate members created rules to curb the rise in student tardiness, hallway loitering, and cigarette smoking among the students. They even forbid the use of mirrors among female students, who apparently routinely stopped in the hallways as they moved from class to class to inspect the volume of their hair, the brightness of their rouge, and the staying power of their lipstick. The faculty gently reminded the youth that since the administrators had entrusted them with the authority to make the rules, they should be willing to following them.

To ensure compliance with these new rules, the members of the school senate stationed themselves in the different parts of the school—the hallways, lunchrooms,
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85 “Senate Passes New Laws During Recent Session,” Cliveden Clipper, March 10, 1931.
86 “Senate Issues New Mandates,” Cliveden Clipper, November 4, 1930.
staircases, and bathrooms—to monitor student behavior. The monitoring even extended beyond the school. In the winter of 1930, local storekeepers complained about Germantown boys who had frequented their lunch counters during the school day and turned their business into “smoking rooms.” The girls were immune from these charges since they were not permitted to leave the school building during the day. When the administration heard these complaints, they threatened to end the open-lunch policy and urged the boys to remember that their behavior in the community reflected poorly on their school. The boys either stopped or they found other places to smoke their cigarettes.\(^87\) If a member of the school senate witnessed one of their peers disobeying a school rule in the school or community, they reported the students’ names and infractions to the Committee of Ten, a subsidiary of the school senate. The Committee of Ten listened to the account of what had transpired and doled out punishments accordingly.\(^88\)

As the school senate and Committee of Ten members tried to institute new policies, several students complained about senators who wielded their policing powers unjustly. Marian Garrison recalled that the school hallways were always overcrowded and that she had to routinely push through large hoards of students who enjoyed loitering between their classes. The school senate had instituted one-way traffic patterns on the stairways to reduce loitering and improve the traffic patterns. Marian found these new policies irritating because it meant that she had to walk around the entire building to find the appropriate staircase. Sometimes she disobeyed the rule and tried to use the staircase that was closest to her, but as Marian recalled, the school senate members

\(^{87}\) “Closed Lunch if Smoking Continues,” Cliveden Clipper, December 2, 1930; “Strauss Urges Senate at Meeting,” Cliveden Clipper, December 16, 1930.

usually reprimanded her. In her words, the school senate members “thought that they were the policemen.”

In response, the members of the senate told their peers that they had created the rules “not to show [their] power, but as a since effort to aid and improve conditions in the school.” Eventually, the members of the school senate expressed their own frustrations with students who consistently refused to obey the rules that they had put in place.

Even though the members of the senate had instituted these policies to improve the conditions in the high school, these new rules and increased surveillance divided the student body into two groups: those who had power and those who did not.

While the members of the school senate and Committee of Ten focused on these new policies and compliance measures, Germantown faculty and students raised concerns about the lack of student participation in the school’s extra-curricular clubs and activities. Students noticed that many of the clubs were dominated by the same group of students and worried that these trends had negatively impacted the school spirit and community that these clubs had promoted in the past. Students published articles about the clubs and hosted school-wide assemblies to boost participation and showcase the club members’ achievements. The members of the school senate instituted a point system where they assigned a number value to each club and gave students a quota for the semester—once students reached their quota, they could not join any other clubs.

However, evidence suggests that the decrease in enrollment was related to several factors. First, as the school district moved teachers from Germantown High School to

89 Marian Garrison, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, June 27, 2011.
90 “Strauss Urges Senate at Meeting,” Cliveden Clipper, December 16, 1930.
staff the new high schools, several clubs ended because they lacked a faculty sponsor. 92 Second, many of the students who attended Germantown High School during the Great Depression had to work after school to support their families. 93 Finally, the level of participation decreased because the student body lacked the funds it had used to subsidize the costs of these clubs in the past.

**The Depression Strains Germantown High School’s Private Funding Streams**

During the Great Depression, the school senate collected assessment and poll taxes from each student to subsidize the school’s clubs and activities. The senate used these funds to purchase equipment for the sports teams, uniforms for the school band, and “other necessary things not furnished by the Board of Education.” 94 In 1931, the members of the school senate noticed that their collections were much lower than they had been in the past even though the student enrollment had dramatically increased. 95 To encourage giving, the senate lowered the tax rates, ran collection campaigns in each homeroom, and urged their peers to remember that these voluntary contributions helped their high school maintain its cultural traditions, extra-curricular activities, and school clubs. 96 These campaigns had little impact. The students who attended the high school during the Great Depression either lacked the funds or lived with families who never had access to the financial security that their peers had enjoyed in the past. They simply

---

92 Savannah Holman, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; Marion Campbell, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
93 Savannah Holman, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
95 “Senate Election Tax Bring Small Return,” *Cliveden Clipper*, December 8, 1931.
96 “Senate Passes New Laws During Recent Session,” *Cliveden Clipper*, March 10, 1931; ”Annual Senate Dance Scheduled for Friday, Jan. 4 in Girls’ Gym,” *Cliveden Clipper*, December 11, 1934.

The depletion in school funds promoted new inequalities at the high school between the youth who could still cover the expenses associated with the school’s activities and those who could not. For example, in the spring of 1930, Germantown youth worried that they would have to cancel the school’s annual senior trip to Washington, D.C. because the class did not have enough students registered for it. Even though the expense was too costly for most students, several members of the senior class pressured their peers to register for the trip, and a few days before the trip happened, they finally reached the number that they needed to take the trip. When they returned, the seniors boasted that the trip was one of the best that the senior class had ever made—on the train ride home the students even used their portable Vics to turn the train into a legitimate dance hall.\footnote{“Seniors Invade Nation’s Capital,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, November 4, 1930.} By the spring of 1930, the trip to Washington represented a vacation reserved for a small group of students who could still afford it rather a class trip that everyone could enjoy. Germantown students struggled to convince their peers to pay for the trip, but in October 1931, faculty finally decided to cancel the trip that Germantown alumni had cherished for decades.\footnote{“Senior Class Trip to Capital Undecided,” Cliveden Clipper, March 24, 1931. See also, “Senior Class Plans Trip to Washington,” Cliveden Clipper, March 10, 1931; “Seniors Offered B & O Trip to Washington,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, November 24, 1931; “Ten Seniors Visit Capital,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, December 8, 1931; “12B’s Plan Trip to U.S. Capital,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, March 10, 1932; “Washington Trip Definitely Called Off for Seniors,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, May 17, 1932.}

As Germantown seniors struggled to finance their trips to Washington, D.C., the Germantown Businessmen’s Association worried about the Great Depression’s impact on
its $400,000 campaign, which it began in 1928, to build a modern, athletic field for the high school. In 1930, the members of the association paid $51,000 for the plot of land for the new field, which drained most of the campaign’s funds. Colonel Potter, who led the campaign for the association, told supporters that the association still needed $30,000 in outstanding pledges to build the field and encouraged them to pressure their friends and families to give generously. Potter and the other members of the association worked closely with the high school’s physical education to promote the project telling reporters that they wanted the new athletic field to “be a Mecca, a sort of country club, for the whole student body.”\textsuperscript{100} However, black students rarely participated on any of the athletic teams and female students were formally barred from these teams.\textsuperscript{101} Thus, the athletic field, which finally opened on June 13, 1933, was reserved primarily for white male students who could afford to participate on the high school’s sports teams.\textsuperscript{102} In other words, the new athletic field reinforced the inequalities that had existed at the high school since its founding.

As the economic conditions worsened and the level of poverty increased, the school community—its faculty, students, alumni, and families—shifted their fundraising efforts from supporting school traditions and activities to providing financial assistance to students in need. During the 1920s, the community had created a student-aid fund to assist students who needed financial support to finish high school.\textsuperscript{103} From 1929 to 1931, students and alumni raised money to support this fund by selling Germantown pennants.

\textsuperscript{100} “Germantown High School Obtains Athletic Field,” \textit{The Beehive}, November, 1930, Germantown Historical Society.
\textsuperscript{101} Savannah Holman, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; Marion Campbell, Germantown High School Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010. See also, Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1929-1937.
\textsuperscript{102} “Germantown High School to Open Home Field Next Tuesday,” \textit{Germantown Bulletin}, April 20, 1933. For a discussion about the connection between sports and the cultivation of white manhood, see footnote 152
\textsuperscript{103} “Mothers’ Association” [mismarked as “Boys’ “A” Class Notes], \textit{The Cliveden}, p. 30, October 1924; “Mothers’ Association,” \textit{The Cliveden}, p. 33, March 1925.
to their peers and sponsoring school wide fundraising campaigns. The drama club even staged a musical for the community and donated the proceeds to the fund.\textsuperscript{104} Despite these efforts, in the fall of 1931, the school community finally admitted that its traditional fundraising approaches were “far too small to meet the present needs.”\textsuperscript{105}

In response, the high school faculty increased their fundraising efforts to meet these new needs. They hosted private parties in their homes to raise funds for needy students where they sold handmade cards and other crafts.\textsuperscript{106} They spoke to local reporters about the dire conditions at the high school and urged wealthy residents to give what they could to alleviate the suffering among their students.\textsuperscript{107} They sponsored a faculty-parent party in the school gymnasium with a miniature golf tournament to raise money for the student aid fund.\textsuperscript{108} Mary Holmes, who had led the girls’ school since its founding, used scraps from the school play costumes to make a quilt that she auctioned off to generate money for the school.\textsuperscript{109} The domestic science teacher, Miss Allen, sponsored several bake sales where students made “gingerbread and sunshine” and donated the proceeds to support their peers in need.\textsuperscript{110} In 1935, Dr. Pennycook thanked the school community, particularly her colleagues, for their generous support during the Great Depression. According to her, the school used approximately $1,500/year to help

\textsuperscript{104}“Boosters turn into Salesmen,” Cliveden Clipper, October 22, 1929. See also, “The Student Aid Fund,” Cliveden Clipper, October 27, 1931; “Footlight Club to Aid Students’ Fund by Groups of Plays,” Cliveden Clipper, May 9, 1933. See also, “Baskets Collected and Distributed by Germantown High Students,” Cliveden Clipper, December 17, 1929; “Pupils Respond Nobly to Needs of Poor Families,” Cliveden Clipper, December 22, 1931; “Record Classes Will Provide for Poor Families,” Cliveden Clipper, December 20, 1932.
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\textsuperscript{108}“Faculty-Parents Party a Success,” Cliveden Clipper, November 18, 1930. See also, “School Teachers to Contribute to Unemployed Fund,” Cliveden Clipper, March 10, 1931.

\textsuperscript{109}“Quilt Offered in Lottery,” Cliveden Clipper, October 27, 1931.

\textsuperscript{110}“Orders Taken for Cakes,” Cliveden Clipper, April 10, 1934; “Faculty Members Buy Cakes from Foods Class,” Cliveden Clipper, May 15, 1934.
students purchase school lunches, trolley fares, dental exams, eyeglasses, and leg braces.\textsuperscript{111}

In 1933, the members of the Board of Education argued that it had provided adequate resources to its schools through its public and private charities and urged its teachers to restrain from using their salaries to provide “relief to school children.” The Board contended that teachers lacked the training necessary to determine their students’ needs, and thus, they might be inadvertently giving “indiscriminate relief” to youth who did not actually need their help.\textsuperscript{112} The following year, the members of the Board reiterated their position reminding teachers that the city had created a network of agencies to address the high rates of poverty in the public schools. Teachers, they argued, should not provide relief.\textsuperscript{113} Germantown High School teachers, like others in the city, defied the advice of these board members for several reasons. Even though their salaries were relatively low, public school teachers enjoyed a level of job security that few residents had during the Depression, and thus perhaps, they were able to give more. In addition to the job security, most of the teachers who worked at Germantown High School had been there since its founding, and as they watched the brothers and sisters of families that they had taught in the past come to school without their lunches or in disheveled clothing, they felt an obligation to give what they could.\textsuperscript{114} They knew that poverty had always existed in their community, but as teachers, they witnessed the intense escalation of poverty and unemployment during the Great Depression firsthand and gave generously to help their students during this time of great need.

\textsuperscript{112} “Report of the Division of Compulsory Education,” Board of Education Annual Report, 1933, 324-327.
The relief that these groups provided did not last beyond the worst years of Depression in Germantown. In 1934, the mothers’ association diverted its attention away from the student assistance fund. Instead, the association focused on hosting lectures about parenting and raising funds for new band uniforms. The members of the association believed that the Depression had ended, and thus by the mid-1930s, Germantown students did not need the same levels of financial support. Students, alumni, faculty followed the mothers’ association’s lead and shifted their focus back to raising funds for school activities and community organizations. In the mid-1930s, the high school still had students living in poverty who would have benefited from the financial assistance that these groups had provided during the early part of the Depression. The absence of these funds hardened the lines between students who lived in poverty and those who did not. Even though the Depression was coming to an end, inequality persisted in the Philadelphia school district, the Germantown community, and the high school.

**Unequal Opportunities: Discrimination and Resistance in the High School**

During the 1930s, Philadelphia’s public schools witnessed a surged in the percentage of black student enrollment—between 1925 and 1934, the percentage of black students increased by 56%. Germantown’s School District Eight reflected these trends, but to a lesser extent—black student enrollment in Germantown’s public schools

---


increased by 36%.\textsuperscript{117} This surge, however, did little to alleviate the racist practices that existed in the city’s public schools, including Germantown’s young high school. The small percentage of African American Germantown High School youth and their families challenged the racism that they experienced and demanded that the faculty treat them like their white peers. Marion Campbell, a black woman who graduated from Germantown High School in 1936, recalled that her teachers routinely separated black and white students in their classrooms. According to Marion, her teachers usually seated the white students alphabetically in the front of the classroom, and then, relegated the black students to the remaining seats in the back of the classroom. She remembered that her guidance counselor had discouraged her from enrolling in the academic course and urged her to enroll in the commercial course, which she believed was better suited to her disposition and future aims. Marion ignored these recommendations recalling, “since I’m stubborn, I took the academic course.”\textsuperscript{118} As the course enrollment data suggests, Marion was not the only “stubborn” black youth who graduated from the high school. Seven of the nine black students who graduated between 1929 and 1931 selected the academic course.\textsuperscript{119}

As black youth in the high school’s academic program, Marion and her friend, Savannah, painfully recalled the discrimination that they experienced. During their senior year, their algebra teacher gave both of them an “F minus” in the course. At the time, Marion and Savannah worried that this failing mark might have barred them from graduation. It did, and so, they retook the course the following semester and graduated a semester late. At the time, Marion felt bitter and angry. Her family needed her to work to support the family during this great time of need. Over seventy years later, Marion

\textsuperscript{117} Table No. 17, Annual School Census, Comparative Statement for Ten Year Period, Classified by Districts and by Race, 1925-1934, Board of Education Annual Report, 1934, 163.

\textsuperscript{118} Marion Campbell, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010

\textsuperscript{119} Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1929-1931
still asks herself, “How can any student earn an F minus?” She knew that her teacher was racist, but there was not much that she could do about it. She and Savannah complied with the school’s demands, took their algebra course the following semester, and earned the academic credential that they knew they deserved.¹²⁰

In addition to the discrimination in the classroom, black youth often found that they were not welcomed on the school’s clubs and activities—in some cases, they were formally barred from participating and in other cases, they were strongly discouraged from participating.¹²¹ Despite these entrenched policies, black students routinely challenged the racist policies that existed at their high school. In 1936, Savannah Holman, the African American youth who graduated from Germantown High School in 1936, joined the girl’s volleyball and basketball teams even though black youth were often barred from these clubs and activities.¹²² Marion Campbell, another black youth from Savannah’s class, recalled that Germantown faculty told the black youth that they could not stay at the hotel that the senior class had selected for its annual trip to Washington, D.C. because the hotel did not permit African Americans in its facility. The faculty urged the African American students to find a private home in the area where they could stay if they wanted to participate on the trip. Marion recalled her confusion and frustration when she heard this. She did not know anyone who lived in Washington, D.C. and refused to sit quietly while the faculty support racism. That year, several

¹²⁰ Marion Campbell, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; Savannah Holman, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
¹²¹ Marion Campbell, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; Savannah Holman, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010; William T. Coleman, Jr., Germantown Class of 1938, Interview by Author, August 10, 2010.
¹²² Savannah Holman, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
Germantown students, including Marion and Savannah, banned together and protested the school’s hotel choice. In response, the school cancelled the trip.123

As African American students challenged racism at the high school, female students raised their own concerns about the level of gender discrimination at their new, co-educational high school. In 1929, when Germantown High School opened the iron gates that had separated the school into distinct parts for boys and girls and created a co-educational school, the faculty merged the girls and boys school senate into one unified body. When these two school senates combined, male students routinely dominated the ballots, won the elections, and served as the school senate’s president from 1929 to 1935. In 1935, the tides changed when the student body nominated a female student for the school senate’s presidential ballot. Editorials appeared in the school newspaper suggesting that female students had not been given a “fair chance” in the past elections. The editorialist encouraged their peers to give the girls a fair chance to win the election rather than simply telling your representative “to put your vote in for the boy.”124

A week after these editorials surfaced, another student published an editorial arguing that until recently American women “were ranked legally with idiots and children” and that marriage represented the only career choice for them. The editorialist argued that these stereotypes had changed. According to her, by the mid-1930s, women enjoyed the same privileges in society as their male counterparts since they had proven the worth in “every world activity.” However, Germantown High School, she argued, did not reflect these new sentiments about the finer sex. At the high school, girls “do not enjoy the same privileges as the boys.” Girls were not permitted to leave the school grounds during lunch, use their personal lockers between classes, or participate on

123 Marion Campbell, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010. I asked Marion if both black and white students protested the trip, but she could not remember.
interscholastic sports teams. The editorialist asked administrators why they had given the boys personal lockers to store their books while they forced the school’s “weaker sex (?)” to store their wraps in communal wardrobes and “carry an armful of books” to and from school each day. Even though the editorialist put a question mark after her assertion that women are the weaker sex to challenge this idea, she appealed to gendered stereotypes about the fragility of women’s bodies to convince administrators to treat female students like their male counterparts.125

When the election results were finally tallied, the school senate announced that Muriel Manship had won the election becoming the first female to lead the Committee of Ten since 1929.126 Even though many students heralded this victory, little changed in the high school. The same week that Manship won the election, high school administrators announced that the Board of Education had finally given the school the funding necessary to build lockers in the boys’ gymnasium so that the students could shower after class.127 A week after the administration announced the “New Deal” lockers, an editorial appeared in the school newspaper entitled, Feminine Anger Aroused, which suggested that administration’s favoritism towards the male students had “aroused the girls to a higher state of feminine anger than ever before.” The editorialist urged Germantown’s female students to understand that the administration had neglect them because everyone knew that women were, in fact, the weaker sex in society. The author criticized the female students for relinquishing their “dignity” and demanding equal rights as if they were actually equal citizens. The editorialist encouraged the young women to take a “more diplomatic approach” to the inequality and suggested that “a dignified silence would produce better results” than complaining about the inequality

126 “Committee of Ten Has First Girl President,” Cliveden Clipper, October 1, 1935.
that existed in their high school.\textsuperscript{128} The female youth who attended Germantown High School in the 1930s broke the expectations of feminine gentility and demanded that the high school administrators and faculty give them the same privileges that their male peers enjoyed.

\textit{Germantown High School’s New “Youth Problem”}

The Great Depression brought many changes to Germantown High School. In the beginning of the Depression, Germantown High School’s community tried to preserve the academic programs and cultural traditions that had cultivated the school’s legitimacy in the past. As the Depression worsened, Germantown High School faced challenges that few could have imagined. The Board of Education reduced its per-pupil expenditures and increased its class sizes. Students who in ordinary economic times did not attend high school enrolled in the high school. As poverty increased in the school, the high school community—its students, alumni/ae, families, and faculty—defied the Board of Education’s recommendations and raised private funds to support students in need. While these campaigns provided students with relief, these efforts were short-lived. By the mid-1930s, these campaigns ended even though poverty persisted. As new students funneled into the high school, Germantown’s administration and faculty ushered in a series of new vocational programs specifically tailored to meet their needs. This eroded the school’s academic curricula and hardened the lines of inequality. Black students and female students began to challenge these inequalities in their high school, however the administration rarely responded to their demands.

In the spring of 1937, Dr. Leslie B. Seely, the principal of Germantown High School, told local reporters about the new “youth problem” that plagued the city and affected the high school. According to Dr. Seely, this “youth problem” stemmed from the

\textsuperscript{128} “Feminine Anger Aroused,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, October 1, 1935.
fact that the high school had an increasing number of students who lived in “homes that are not homes, but places where the boys and girls merely stop to eat and hurry out on the streets in search of some pastime that will offer a thrill.” Dr. Seely explained that these children were “retarding education,” and suggested that, “many boys and girls” at Germantown High School “do not have the desire or the ability to progress with the normal members of their ages...[they] never get to reading above the fifth or sixth grade level.” According to Seely, these new youth enjoyed being on the streets after school. He stated that no educational program could solve that problem.\textsuperscript{129}

Seely’s statements indicate the extent of the transformation that had occurred at Germantown High School during the Great Depression. Seely now had students in his high school who had never entered these institutions before 1929. His faculty, who had been accustomed to teaching primarily college-bound students, was struggling to reach these new students. The young men and women who in ordinary times left school after elementary school and entered the labor market represented the new youth problem. However, instead of looking for ways to change the high school, Seely placed the blame for these new problems on these youth and their families. Seely argued that it was impossible to create an educational program to help these youth since their problems stemmed from their dysfunctional lives at home.\textsuperscript{130} By the end of the Depression, the school’s foundation with its prestigious academic program, highly regarded extra-curricular activities, and cherished cultural traditions had already begun to crack.

\textsuperscript{129} “Failure of Home Retarding Youth,” \textit{Germantown Courier}, March 10, 1937.
\textsuperscript{130} “Failure of Home Retarding Youth,” \textit{Germantown Courier}, March 10, 1937.
Chapter 4:

The Rhetoric of Wartime Unity Masks

Inequality, 1938-1945
In February 1938, Robert Tresville, Jr. was one of eight African American students to graduate from Germantown High School. In high school, Robert lived with his uncle, Walter Tresville, at 6502 Musgrave Street, in the heart of one of Germantown’s historically black neighborhoods while his father served in the army. As a high school student, Robert ignored racial boundaries and enrolled in the academic course and became a star athlete on a variety of sports teams. When he graduated from high school, Tresville received a Congressional appointment to West Point from Arthur W. Mitchell, an African American Democrat from Illinois who confronted racial discrimination throughout his career. Within a few days, his peers at Germantown High School learned about his appointment and published an article in the school newspaper to publicize his achievements. In it, the author described Tresville as a young “colored man from the South” who had earned a good scholastic record and become a leader in recreational and social activities “among the colored boys of this community.”

The author emphasized his achievements as well as his racial background to promote the idea that Tresville epitomized the characteristics of a model student despite his skin color.

When Tresville began his studies at West Point in 1939, he entered the academy with another African American man, Clarence M. Davenport. As cadets, these two men endured four years of racism on a daily basis. None of the white cadets or officers spoke to Davenport or Tresville unless the conversations were about official business. Unlike their white peers, these men never had roommates. No one, it seemed, wanted to share a
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1 “Two Race Lieutenants West Point Graduates,” The Pittsburgh Courier, January 23, 1943.
2 William T. Coleman, Jr., Interview by Author, August 10, 2010.
4 “Tresville Appointed to Military Academy,” Cliveden Clipper, April 20, 1939.
room at West Point with a black man. Cadets cherished the traditions that the academy had established to mark their transition from one phase of the program to another. At the end of their plebe year, cadets lined up in order and received handshakes from upperclassmen to commemorate the fact that they had survived their first year at West Point. In 1940, Tresville and Davenport watched their white peers walk down the line; however, when it was their turn to partake in this tradition, the white cadets refused to shake their hands. White cadets even tried to dissuade Tresville from participating on one of the many sports teams at the academy. Tresville ignored their wishes and became the first black man to represent West Point at an intercollegiate competition.

After completing his basic army pilot training at the Tuskegee Army Flying School, Tresville became the seventh black cadet to graduate from West Point and the first to receive a commission as a second lieutenant in the United States Armed Forces since the academy’s founding in 1802. The African American press praised his achievements. Four days later, he married Vivien Louise Murphy, and in December 1943, only a few months after he graduated from West Point, the armed services deployed Tresville to Europe as the commander of the 100th fighter squadron. On June 24, 1944, Tresville led an attack on an enemy supply line near Airasca, Italy. He told his squadron to fly low, near the sea, to avoid detection by enemy radar. However, the mission was rife with problems. The fog was thick that morning, which made it difficult for the pilots to see the surface of the ocean. Several planes crashed into the sea.
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8 “Smiles of Pride and Joy,” The Pittsburgh Courier, January 20, 1943.
Tresville’s plane was among them. In July, reports surfaced throughout the nation that Robert Tresville, Jr., the famous African American, West Point cadet, was missing in action. According to accounts from those who witnessed the event, the initial hit with the calm sea sheared off his wings, bent his propeller, and cut his engine. Somehow, he pulled the airplane out of the water, only to plunge, moments later back into the sea. In December 1944, the army finally pronounced him dead and awarded his young wife an air medal and a purple heart to commemorate his service to the nation. After his death, Vivien raised his daughter, Barbara, whom he never met, and dedicated her long life to the nation’s civil rights movement.

Germantown High School’s newspaper never covered the racism he experienced at West Point or his untimely death. The students at the high school only wanted to focus on the aspects of his life that reinforced the promises of democracy rather than its shortcomings, and thus, they only focused on the fact that Tresville, a black man, enrolled in one of the nation’s most elite institutions and ignored the racism that tainted his experiences there. In many ways, Tresville’s life story and the school newspaper’s coverage of it exemplifies the challenges that Germantown High School, its community, and its nation faced during the war. In the late 1930s, Philadelphia’s economy was still struggling to rebound from the Great Depression. Unemployment, particularly among the youth, continued to fluctuate and still remained above pre-Depression rates. Government officials and concerned residents became increasingly concerned about the escalating rates of inequality and the horrible housing conditions that existed throughout
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10 “I Saw Capt. Tresville Die And Aided In The Sinking Of A Destroyer,” The Pittsburgh Courier, December 9, 1944.
the city, including Germantown. However, when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, these problems seemed to vanish. The city’s sluggish economy transformed into the Arsenal of Democracy bringing new jobs and new workers to the city for the first time in decades. Germantown High School administrators, faculty, and students shifted their efforts from supporting their high school to supporting the war effort at home and abroad. The war diverted attention away from the challenges that the high school faced and masked the inequalities that continue to grow in the high school, the community, and the nation.

The City’s Sluggish Economy and Housing Crisis

Even though the city’s economy showed some signs of improvement, it was still sluggish. The rate of unemployment decreased steadily between 1934 and 1937, but then, increased again in 1938 with almost a third of the city’s employable workers unemployed. The rate of unemployment was not evenly divided. Black workers were much more likely to be unemployed than white workers, regardless of gender, because of racial discrimination on the labor market. Men were more likely to have full-time employment than women while women were more likely to have part-time employment than men. Like much of the nation, Philadelphia youth, ages 16 – 24, had the highest rates of unemployment, which caused many challenges for the city and the nation. Even though city officials worried about Philadelphia’s weak economy, they were much more concerned about the escalation of poverty and the conditions of the city’s homes.

On December 19, 1936, Alberta Richardson, a young black woman, felt her row home teeter back and forth in the middle of the night. Moments later, two huge chunks of plaster fell from her ceiling and crashed to the floor. Then, she heard a terrifying rumble as her home and an adjacent home collapsed to the ground killing six people and injuring another 20. The tragedy propelled the city’s unsafe housing conditions into the national spotlight. The following day, Mayor S. Wilson Davis visited the site and told reporters that Philadelphia’s housing conditions represented a public safety emergency. Unlike his predecessors, he promised to address the housing problems and secure federal funds to build new homes. After months of deliberation, Mayor Wilson created the Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) to oversee slum clearance. He petitioned the federal government to fund low-income homes through its Wagner-Stegall Act, which established the United States Housing Agency and provided federal loans to local housing authorities, like the PHA. In December 1938, Mayor Wilson asked the federal government for $20,000,000 to build low-income housing in his city. As housing activists throughout the city praised the Mayor’s actions, black residents staged a series of strikes to demand access to better homes on the private housing market, which had discriminated against African American tenants for decades. The mayor knew he had to act quickly to alleviate the city’s mounting problems.


As the Mayor worked to secure federal funds, the Philadelphia Housing Authority focused on finding sites and planning development for these new homes. In 1938, the PHA announced that it wanted to build new homes in areas "where the slums are just beginning to seep through." The authority argued that this approach was better because it believed that the slum areas were simply too unstable. Shortly after the authority made this announcement, the Tenant's League urged the PHA to draft a non-discrimination clause to ensure that these new homes were available to residents regardless of race and creed. The authority refused this request and told the League that the new housing projects must conform to the prevailing racial composition of the neighborhood. In other words, new homes located in predominately white neighborhoods should have white residents whereas new homes located in predominately black neighborhoods should have black residents. Only two of the PHA's ten proposed sites were located in predominately black neighborhoods. African American housing activists were outraged.

As one journalist stated:

The slums of Philadelphia are no accident. They are planned slums. Neither was the invasion of better class homes in North and West Philadelphia in recent years an accident. It was planned by property speculators too and the Negro, as in the slums, paid the price and acted unknowingly as the pawn in a game of millions.

Between 1938 and 1940, the Philadelphia Housing Authority used federal money to build four housing communities: Hill Creek (258 homes), Tasker Homes (1077 homes), James Weldon Johnson Homes (589 homes), and Richard Allen Homes (1324 homes).
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apartments). The PHA kept its promise. Hill Creek and Tasker Homes were located in predominately white neighborhoods and housed white residents; the Johnson and Allen Homes, located in predominately black neighborhoods, were reserved for black residents. African American activists condemned these practices, but nothing changed. The PHA maintained the racist housing practices that Philadelphia’s private housing market had perfected. These new homes offered black residents limited housing options and relied on government funds to increase racial segregation and perpetuate inequality.19

“The Second Battle of Germantown”: Residents Try to Remove Unsanitary Housing from Germantown’s Slums

Since its founding, Germantown had been a neighborhood with stately mansions, modest homes, and tiny row homes to house the city’s wealthiest residents, middle class artisans, and working class domestic help. During the 1930s, residents were increasingly concerned about the housing conditions in the community and initiated a community-wide campaign to encourage homeowners to repair their homes. The residents were particularly worried about homes near Germantown High School after surveyors with the 1937 Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC) classified the homes in this area as hazardous, which was the HOLC’s lowest grade and made these homes ineligible for federal loans (See Figure 4.1). Many of these homes lacked indoor plumbing and adequate heat, which created unsanitary conditions for working class residents and unsightly views for the well-to-do Germantowners who lived near them.20 Germantown’s voluntary campaign had little effect, and thus, beginning in the late

19 Sugrue, The Origins of the Urban Crisis, 33–70; Bauman, Public Housing, Race, and Renewal, 40–55.
1930s, several residents decided to approach city officials to discuss the possibility of providing government funds for slum clearance and new housing in the community.

On April 17, 1939, B.W. Frazier, the chairman of the Germantown Community Council, wrote a letter to the Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) detailing the members’ concerns about the housing conditions in their community. The Germantown Community Council was founded in 1934 and served as a hub for Germantown’s charitable organizations to coordinate services and discuss community problems. Each organization paid annual dues, attended the council’s monthly meetings, and worked with the elected governing board to address community concerns. In the letter to the PHA, Frazier told the PHA that the members of the council were interested in securing federal funds for a slum clearance project near Germantown High School.\(^2^1\) Baynton, Mechanic, Musgrave and Price Streets bounded the area under consideration; the neighborhood was a mixture of working and middle class white ethnics and African American residents. James B. Kelly, the executive director of the PHA, responded stating that the authority was in the middle of discussing several sites for slum clearance, including several in Germantown.\(^2^2\)

\(^{21}\) Letter to Hon. Frank Smith, Philadelphia Housing Authority, from B.W. Frazier, Chairman of the Germantown Community Council, April 17, 1939, Urb 39, Temple Urban Archives.

\(^{22}\) Letter from James B. Kelly, Executive Director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, to B.W. Frazier, Chairman of Germantown Community Council, April 29, 1939, Urb 39, Temple Urban Archives.
1937 Home Owners Loan Corporation, Housing Grades, Philadelphia

Source: Home Owners’ Loan Corporation (HOLC), Residential Security Map Grade. Data courtesy of Amy Hillier.
Several months later, on August 10, 1939, the PHA announced that it had granted six million dollars to demolish the "scene of dilapidated homes and squalid living conditions" and build government-sponsored housing between Baynton and Haines Street, which flanked the southwest side of Germantown High School (see figure 4.2).\textsuperscript{23} Roland R. Randall, the vice chairman of the PHA, told residents that the authority had selected this area because it "was endangering a high-class residential" community. He urged residents to approve these plans and argued that these new homes saved taxpayers money by ridding the community of "wide spread crime, bad health, unsanitary homes, and conditions necessitating heavy police and fire protection." He promised to replace the residents of these homes with "a class of people who have the money asked for rent, and who will raise the standards of the neighborhood."\textsuperscript{24} Randall and his colleagues tried to market the housing units as a benefit for the entire community, including its young high school.


\textsuperscript{24} "Local Area Gets $6,000,000 for Rehousing Work," \textit{Germantown Courier}, August 17, 1939. See also, "Outlines Plan of Housing Authority on Local Project," \textit{Germantown Courier}, January 4, 1940. Housing officials and economist framed the housing projects as a way to save taxpayer money throughout the city, see "Accept Help of U.S.,” Says Pa. Economist,” \textit{Philadelphia Tribune}, April 1, 1937.
Figure 4.2

PHA's Proposed Housing Project, 1939, Percentage Black Residents by Census Tract, 1940

Despite his efforts, Randall’s justifications for the new housing project did not persuade the white ethnic residents, particularly Italians, who lived in the proposed site. As soon as the PHA announced the project, these residents prepared their ammunition for the “Second Battle of Germantown” to show their opposition to the PHA’s proposed project. In February 1940, the PHA received a petition with over 1,000 signatures. The individuals who signed the petition wanted the PHA to end its proposed project. Residents who opposed the PHA’s plans created a Home Defenders Committee and marched through the streets with signs stating, “Don’t Make Beautiful Germantown a Hall of Horrors” and "Germantown is Not Glenwood Cemetery.” Glenwood Cemetery was one of the PHA’s original proposals for an African American housing project, and thus, these signs indicate the racial undertones of their opposition.

As the opposition intensified, Randall publicly stated that the Philadelphia Housing Authority had no intention of building homes on sites that residents opposed. He tried to assuage fears by opening an office and publishing pamphlets in Italian and English to highlight the benefits of PHA housing programs. However, the individuals who opposed the PHA’s plans had effectively created a climate of fear and suspicion that seemed virtually impossible to change. In May 1940, only four months after the protests began, Mayor Lamberton decided to halt construction on all new housing projects in the city. Housing activists condemned the mayor’s decisions; the residents who had opposed the Baynton-Haines project replaced their handmade signs with
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25 "Second Battle of Germantown Rages over Housing Plans," Germantown Courier, February 8, 1940.  
27 “Housing Opposition Opens Office and Pickets Streets; Hearing Again Delayed," Germantown Courier, April 11, 1940.  
28 Wolfinger, Philadelphia Divided, 68.  
American flags and patriotic signs.\textsuperscript{30} Even though the residents rejoiced, the housing conditions around the high school continued to deteriorate as city officials became more concerned about the imminent war than the city’s housing problems.

Several months after these residents won their campaign to block an affording housing project, Nellie R. Bright, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, author in the Harlem Renaissance, and principal of Germantown’s all-black Hill School, raised concerns about the limited housing options for black residents in Germantown. Bright and her students at the Hill School conducted a block-by-block study of housing conditions in the school’s catchment area to expose the disparities between housing for black and white residents.\textsuperscript{31} Once they had finished the survey, Bright published the findings. The report indicated that 37\% of the homes needed major repairs. 10\% of her students lived in homes that lacked indoor plumbing and sufficient heat, gas, and electricity. Finally, Bright’s students found that the delinquency rate was 15\% higher in this area than other parts of the community. Bright attributed the rise in crime to overcrowded and unsanitary housing conditions as well as a lack of employment for adults and recreational activities for youth. Bright knew that black residents lacked “decent low costs houses” in the community. Since the government refused to alleviate this problem, Bright decided to do it on her own and formed the Germantown-Chestnut Hill Housing Committee (GCHHC), an interracial, grassroots committee who worked together to improve housing conditions in the 22\textsuperscript{nd} and 42\textsuperscript{nd} wards.\textsuperscript{32}


\textsuperscript{32} Nellie R. Bright, William E. Coale, and Emily Crosby, “Demonstration Project in Neighborhood Improvement,” Report of the Germantown and Chestnut Hill Housing Committee, July 1943, Germantown Community Council Collection, Urb 39, Box 50, Folder 10, Chestnut Hill Housing Committee, Misc. 1943-
While the GCHHC pressured city officials to end discrimination in the public and private housing markets, Bright and her colleagues focused primarily on repairing existing homes in the area. The organization raised private funds to hire a consultant housekeeper. The consultant housekeeper visited local tenants in their homes, gave them advice on home repairs, discussed their rights and obligations as tenants, and counseled them on proper housekeeping, diet, and hygiene techniques. The consultant assisted tenants with monthly budgets to ensure that they paid their rent on time and mediated tenant-landlord disputes. In some cases, the GCHHC reported housing code violations to the PHA and published newspaper articles in local paper to shame neglectful landlords to maintain their homes. Finally, the GCHHC worked with youth in a variety of organizations—the American Friends Week-end Work Camp, local high schools, and local charitable organizations—to volunteer and repair homes throughout Germantown. In return for this free labor, the GCHHC asked landlord to pay for supplies, such as windows, lumber, and paint. Between October 1942 and June 1943, the GCHHC repaired 39 homes in the community and enlisted the support of 148 high school students from over ten schools in the area. While the GCHHC did not end the discrimination that blacks faced in the housing market, it supported residents who desperately needed help and educated Germantown youth about the housing problems in the community.


As Germantown residents searched for solutions to improve housing conditions in the area, educational experts and the superintendent of schools focused on the challenges in the school district. On May 12, 1936, Dr. George A. Works, a professor of education from the University of Chicago, began an intensive yearlong study of Philadelphia’s public schools. The study brought together a team of educational researchers and practitioners to examine the school district’s fiscal policies, building plans, and school curricula. In 1937, the team issued a report with its findings and recommendations to Philadelphia’s Board of Education. Works and his colleagues found that Philadelphia’s Board of Education had several problems. First, the Board of Education faced a severe budget shortfall. The report stated that Philadelphia ranked high on its ability to fund its public schools when compared with other major cities in the nation. However, its reliance on property taxes and meager state support had created a fiscal disaster. From 1931 to 1937, the city’s tax revenues for the public schools had dropped by $8,590,000 and its per pupil expenditure ranked well below the national average (see figure 4.3).

The report attributed this discrepancy to the state’s rigid school funding policies, its weak financial support, and the city’s low property tax rate. In Pennsylvania, the state contributed 8.5% of the school district’s total budget; in New York, the state provided New York City with 24.5% of its total budget. Works and his colleagues encouraged city officials to seek additional state support for the schools, but reminded them that this would be very difficult. The state did not want to provide aid to Philadelphia’s public

schools. In 1937, the experts who conducted this study told Philadelphians that they had a choice to make: either they could assess housing at its true valuation and raise taxes to meet school funding needs or it could maintain status quo and eliminate educational programs in the city’s public schools.  

![Figure 4.3 Reduction in School Tax Levy, 1930-37](table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax Rate</th>
<th>Total Levy</th>
<th>Under 1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>97.5c</td>
<td>$33,652,402</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>95.0c</td>
<td>32,989,312</td>
<td>$663,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>95.0c</td>
<td>32,813,076</td>
<td>839,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>95.0c</td>
<td>30,929,203</td>
<td>2,723,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>92.5c</td>
<td>28,414,871</td>
<td>5,237,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>92.5c</td>
<td>26,887,426</td>
<td>6,764,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>92.5c</td>
<td>25,391,323</td>
<td>8,261,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>92.5c</td>
<td>24,135,017</td>
<td>9,517,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In addition to these recommendations, the report critiqued the city’s secondary schools curricula for its academic focus. Works argued that the city’s high schools were not meeting the needs of Philadelphia youth or the city as a whole. The commission made several recommendations to improve these conditions. High schools, the commission argued, must alter their emphasis on academic programs because these experts thought academic work was “a waste of time” for many youth in the late 1930s because they were not necessarily attending college after graduation. According to Works and his colleagues, the Board of Education needed to implement stronger guidance programs to help students find their way and to provide support to teachers who did not know how to work with “the intellectually and vocationally low grade pupils

---

who are now entering secondary schools in large numbers.”\textsuperscript{38} In addition to providing vocational advice, better guidance programs, the experts argued, would also alleviate the random promotion procedures that existed in the high schools.\textsuperscript{39} Researchers encouraged the Board to revise its vocational educational program to match the city’s labor market needs and the requirement for federal aid.\textsuperscript{40} Finally, Works and his colleagues urged the Board of Education to discuss policies with secondary school teachers and principals because these individuals understand the “real educational problems” better than the members of the Board.\textsuperscript{41}

In his 1937 annual report, Edwin C. Broome, the superintendent of the city’s public schools, finally admitted that the Board of Education had failed to solve the myriad problems that the Great Depression had created. He stated that the most pressing problem for the Board was the fact that it was trying to maintain adequate educational opportunities with less financial resources. He told his constituents that this challenge stemmed from the residents’ demands to have better educational opportunities with the same tax rates. Broome argued that these demands put the Board of Education in an impossible situation because it depended on property taxes for 90% of its revenues. He assured taxpayers that the Board had managed its revenues as strictly as it could. There simply was not enough money to fund the city’s public schools.

According to Broome, two factors caused the financial crisis. First, over the past decade, the Board of Education witnessed a shift in school enrollment—between 1928 and 1937, elementary school enrollment decreased by 14% while secondary school

enrollment increased by 77%. Secondary schools were 64% more costly to operate than elementary schools, and thus, the district needed more money. As enrollment surged, the city’s high schools, with the exception of Germantown High School, were filled beyond capacity. Broome urged the Board to plan for the future: the city needed more high school buildings, which were extremely expensive. Second, this dramatic increase and shift in enrollment occurred at the very moment that real estate assessment and tax rates decreased. As a result, between 1932 and 1937, the Board of Education’s revenues had been reduced by eight million dollars (See Figure 4.4). Edwin C. Broome urged Board members and City Council to support a modest tax increase to ensure that the city’s public schools received the funding they needed.  

**Figure 4.4   Real Estate Assessments, Philadelphia, 1932-1937**

![Graph showing real estate assessments from 1932 to 1937.](image)


Broome’s appeals did not matter. Mayor Wilson did not support a tax increase to support the city’s public schools, and so, he filed a lawsuit as a private taxpayer against the Board of Education. On October 22, 1937 the Common Pleas Court No. 2 ruled on a

---

lawsuit that Mayor Wilson and his wife brought against the Board of Public Education. In it, the court declared that the Board of Education’s unlimited taxing powers were unconstitutional because the Board was an appointed, not an elected, body. The Board fought this ruling and took the case to the State Supreme Court. On November 16, 1937, the Supreme Court upheld the decision. This ruling revoked the Board’s right to raise property taxes to fund public schools and heightened its fiscal challenges. Germantown’s regional superintendent held public meetings to warn taxpayers about the effects of these shortages and urged them to contact state representatives for aid. However, throughout the late 1930s and 1940s, the Board of Education, under the direction of Add E. Anderson, instituted annual budgets that limited expenditures to the existing tax revenues rather than raising the city’s taxes to fund the city’s public schools appropriately.

**The National Youth Crisis: Germantown High School 1937-1941**

As Germantown youth returned to their high school in 1937, social scientists, educational experts, and prominent journalists obsessed over the challenges that many of these young men and women were experiencing in their lives. Many of these individuals worried that the Great Depression had created a “lost generation” of youth who were more likely to graduate from high school but less likely to secure employment after graduation. These youth had watched their families struggle through the Great Depression, and now, many of them worried that there was little hope for their futures. Roosevelt had promised them relief, but many of them believed that the President had

---

44 *The Bulletin Almanac and Year Book*, 57.
47 Davis, *The Lost Generation: A Portrait of American Youth Today*. 
failed to deliver on his promises. American youth were desperate for work and cynical about their democracy. Many social scientists attacked American high schools for refusing to respond to the changes that had occurred on the labor market. However, in many ways, Germantown High School faculty could do little to change the situation. There were simply not enough jobs for the number of youth looking for employment. In 1937, American youth, ages 16-24, represented one-third of the unemployed workers. Almost 40% of youth who were eligible for employment could not find decent jobs. In the late 1930s, American youth, including those enrolled in Germantown High School, considered the challenges in the labor market and the somewhat bleak outlooks for their future. As they did reflected on their options and fears about their futures, many of them altered their high school course selections and post-graduation plans and challenged the legitimacy of their high school experience.

Between 1930 and 1940, Germantown High School removed its home economics course and added two new curricular programs, an industrial program (for boys only) and a music program. Even with these changes, the majority of students still selected the academic course (53%) followed by the commercial course (35%). However, the percentage of students in the academic course decreased by 12% during this period while the percentage of students enrolled in the commercial course increased by 46%. When one examines these data based on gender and race, other differences emerge. The academic course still remained the most popular option for the male students in the high school, followed by the commercial course, and the mechanical arts course. Between 1930 and 1940, male enrollment in the academic course decreased by 9% while the male enrollment in the commercial course increased by 20%. The majority of female students

selected the commercial course followed by the academic course for the first time in the school\'s history. Over the past decade, female enrollment in the academic course decreased by 28%; female enrollment in the commercial course increased by 118% (see figure 4.5). In 1940, female students were less likely to enroll in the academic program than male students \((p < 0.001, \text{ multinomial regression})\). These trends reflect the diminishing importance of a college education among Germantown High School graduates, particularly among the girls. Many families could not afford the expenses associated with college tuition.\(^49\) Others believed that their children could find employment with their high school diploma. Placement in the commercial course grew because many of the families thought that this course provided their sons and daughters with the practical skills for employment as secretaries, clerks, and government workers.\(^50\)

\(^{49}\) Marian Garrison, Germantown Class of 1936, Interview by Author, April 23, 2011.

\(^{50}\) For a history of the dramatic increase of clerical positions during the 1930s, see Kessler-Harris, Out to Work, 25–272; Margery Davies, Woman\'s Place Is at the Typewriter: Office Work and Office Workers, 1870-1930 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982).
In 1940, the majority of white students enrolled in the academic course (52%) followed by the commercial course (35%), which matched the overall trends in the school. Between 1930 and 1940, the percentage of white students enrolled in the academic track decreased by 13%; the percentage of white students enrolled in the commercial track increased by 45%. In 1940, 65% of the black students enrolled in the academic course followed by the commercial course (27%). Between 1930 and 1940, the percentage of black youth enrolled in the academic course decreased by 19% while the commercial course increased by 170%. While these trends suggest that black youth were less likely to enroll in the academic program than their predecessors, race was not a significant predictor for course enrollment in 1940 (p’s > 0.05, multinomial regression).
That said, these data suggest that Germantown High School youth had different ideas about the changes in the labor market and their future opportunities.  

**Figure 4.6**  **Course Enrollment, Germantown High School by Race, 1930 and 1940 Cohort**

The shifts in course enrollment were directly tied to the slow, but steady, erosion of the school’s legitimacy. Sociologist Max Weber suggests that legitimacy is tied to a willingness among subordinates to willingly comply with the rules and expectations that the superordinates have set for them.  

In this way, institutions, such as schools, have legitimacy if the students willingly comply with the expectations and standards that others, mainly the adults, have established. Typically, social scientists look at the ways that institutions or government agencies are legitimate by measuring the extent to which individuals abide by the rules and expectations that their superordinates have set for

---

51 I will analyze occupation status for the graduates when the 1940 census is released in April 2012.

them. However, the inverse is also true. It is possible to measure the erosion of legitimacy by examining the pockets of resistance where the subordinates, in this case, the Germantown High School students, refuse to comply with the established norms, rules, and expectations that the superordinates have set for them. Oral histories from several Germantown High School students who attended the school in the late 1930s and early 1940s suggest that many students refused to obey the expectations and traditions that their school community had set for them. As they refused to comply with the school’s rules and expectations, they challenged the legitimacy of their prestigious high school.

During the late 1930s, Germantown High School students continued to win community and citywide accolades and scholarships; however, evidence suggests that the school had lost some of its academic luster during the Great Depression.53 In May 1939, the school newspaper featured a student editorial, which criticized the student body for failing to produce “an honor man” for the first time in the school’s history. According to the editorialist, students were much more interested in their social activities than their academic studies, which had created the high school’s deplorable scholastic standing.54 While some students might have been more engaged in their social activities than their academic school work, evidence suggests that Germantown High School were much less interested in academic work and college placement after graduation.


In many of the high school yearbooks, Germantown High School graduates stated their goals or ambitions after high school, which ranged from the name of the college that the graduates hoped to attend to the kinds of jobs that they hoped to secure. In 1929, 47% of the graduates suggested that college was their primary ambition. Many of these graduates even specified the names of the exclusive institutions that they wanted to attend—male graduates wanted to attend Harvard and Yale while the female graduates set their sights on Wellesley and Bryn Mawr. However, ten years later, only 18% of the graduates in the June 1939 class listed college as their ambition in the yearbook. Like others in the nation, Germantown High School students worried that they could not afford college tuition, or perhaps, that a college degree did not guarantee the same opportunities as it had in the past. The effects of the Great Depression had influenced the ambitions of these graduates. They refused to comply with the academic aims of their prestigious high school, which in turn, slowly, but steadily, eroded its academic reputation and challenged its legitimacy. As the next section illustrates, students did not share the same opinions about these changes and their opportunities in the future. Oral histories suggest that often these differences were related to the student’s race, class, and gender.

In the late 1930s and early 1940, African American graduates still made up a small percentage of the graduating class—in 1940, they represented 4% of the student population at Germantown High School. Most of these graduates lived in neighborhoods with an above average percentage of African American residents when

55 Germantown High School Yearbook, June 1929, Germantown High School Archives.
56 Germantown High School Yearbook, June 1929, Germantown High School Archives. Katherine Stockton Andrus ’29 said she wanted to go to Wellesley College; Judith M. Germain Burd ’29 said she wanted to attend Bryn Mawr College; James Francis McCrulden, Jr. ’29 said that he wanted to go to Yale University; and James Francis McCurdy, III ’29 said that he wanted to attend Harvard.
57 Germantown High School Yearbook, June 1929, Germantown High School Archives.
58 Davis, Youth in the Depression, 8–10.
59 Germantown High School Yearbook, January and June 1940, Germantown High School Archives.
compared to other parts of Germantown (See Figure 4.7). Many of the black students who attended Germantown High School were the sons and daughters of prominent black leaders who had attended college and retained their jobs during the Great Depression. As a result of their residence and class, many of these graduates had connections to social networks that others lacked. For example, William Thaddeus Coleman, Jr., a black student who graduated in January 1939, was the son of William Thaddeus Coleman, Sr., the director of the Wissahickon Boys’ Club and a graduate of Hampton University and the University of Pennsylvania. His mother, Laura Beatrice Mason Coleman, earned her teaching degree from the Baltimore Coplin Normal School and taught German in Baltimore’s segregated public high school before she married. Coleman’s grandfather Mason received a patronage appointment as a postman from President William Taft, and in 1914, when Taft lost to Wilson, his grandmother staged a sit-in to protect her husband’s position. Mason was one of the only postmen of color in Baltimore at the turn of the twentieth century. From a young age, Coleman knew that his family had educational experiences and employment opportunities that only a fraction of Americans—black or white—enjoyed at the time.\footnote{William T. Coleman, \textit{Counsel for the Situation: Shaping the Law to Realize America’s Promise} (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), 9–10.}
Figure 4.7

Germantown High School Students, by Race, Percentage Black Residents, Philadelphia, 1940.

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June, 1940; U.S. Census, 1940.
Even though he had advantages that many African Americans lacked, Coleman still experienced racism and segregation from an early age in Germantown. In elementary school, he attended the Meehan School because the closest school to his home, the Fitler School, was reserved for white children. He went to Fitler twice a week for special classes and noticed immediately that the all-white school had much better facilities than his school. In fifth grade, he transferred to the all-black Joseph E. Hill School, which drew from a much larger area in the community, and as Coleman recalls, the Hill School exposed him “to a different kind of discrimination, one based on poverty, class, and envy rather than race.” He remembered that he enjoyed his time at the Hill School because the teachers reinforced many of the lessons he had learned at home about the achievements of African Americans in the United States and around the globe. He attended Roosevelt Junior High School, where for the first time in school, he remembered competing with white students and benefiting from the resources that this predominately white school offered.61

In the late 1930s, Coleman entered Germantown High School, which he regarded as one of the best high schools in the city. He enrolled in the academic course and participated on the cross-country and track teams; however, like many other students of color, Coleman was not immune from the racism that existed in the high school. One day, in his English class, his teacher, Miss Egge, told him that he would make a fine chauffer one day after Coleman had given a presentation to his classmates. In response, Coleman told her that he had no intention of becoming a chauffer. He wanted to be a lawyer and said that she could be his chauffer one day. He was promptly kicked out of school. The following morning, his mother and father accompanied him to school and promised Dr. Seely, the school principal, that they would punish him at home if he

61 Ibid., 26–29; William T. Coleman, Jr., interview by author, August 10, 2010.
conducted himself like this in the future. When Miss Egge saw his parents fine
dress, she apologized immediately for her comments and forgave her student for his
outburst.

In addition to this experience, Coleman was one of the best swimmers at his
father’s all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club and hoped to participate on the Germantown
High School swim team. Coleman introduced himself to Coach Schwartz, who led the
swim team, and told him about his skills and interest. Schwartz told him that black
students could not be members of the swim team because the team used the all-white
Germantown YMCA for its practices. Blacks were not permitted to use the all-white
YMCA swimming pool. His parents protested, but Schwartz refused to allow him to
participate. Rather than start a controversy, Schwartz cancelled the team during
Coleman’s tenure at the high school. Coleman’s father told his son that no one could
crush his spirit and reminded him that human dignity was more important than avoiding
controversy. The young Coleman held onto that for the rest of his life. Shortly after he
graduated, Coleman noticed that Schwartz had posted a flyer on the school bulletin
announcing new tryouts for the swim team.\textsuperscript{62}

Even though Coleman does not shy away from recounting the racism and
discrimination he experienced at his high school, he argued that his high school alma
mater provided him with an academic education and access to social networks that were
unmatched in Philadelphia. Coleman recalled that Schwartz, the man who barred him
from the swimming team, gave Coleman a glowing recommendation to the University of
Pennsylvania. When Coleman entered the University of Pennsylvania in the fall of 1938,
he recalled that his peers from Germantown High School, who were predominately
white, helped him cope with the racism that he experienced at the university. He went

\textsuperscript{62} William T. Coleman, Jr., Interview by Author, August 10, 2010.
onto to Harvard Law School, became the first African American man to clerk for the Supreme Court, and had a prominent career as an attorney and served as the Secretary of Transportation under Gerald Ford. Coleman, a middle class youth with a prominent Germantown family, believed that Germantown High School provided him with the educational experiences and social networks to realize his future aims. This belief enhanced the legitimacy of this institution for youth like William T. Coleman, Jr.63

Other African American students did not share Coleman’s sentiments. Alyce Jackson Alexander, an African American woman who lived in Germantown throughout her life, attended the all-black Joseph E. Hill School with William T. Coleman, Jr. Her father, Jesse Patterson Jackson, worked in a coal yard and the construction business, and her mother, a graduate of Germantown High School, worked during the day as a domestic in Chestnut Hill and ironed choir robes for several local churches. Alexander, like many of her peers, attended the all-black Germantown YWCA where she learned about the achievements of black men and women and went to Waterville Recreation Center playground even though black children were not allowed to use its swimming pool. Like Coleman, she attended Roosevelt Junior High School, and after some time, she became friends with some of the Italian and Irish girls who lived in her racially mixed neighborhood. Despite these friendships, she knew that racism existed because he parents constantly reminded her, “you can always do whatever you want to do in this life. But you have to learn more than white people because they’ll take them first.”

Even though Alexander lived at 559 E. Haines Street, a few blocks from Germantown High School, she decided to attend the predominately black Simon Gratz High School instead of the predominately white Germantown High School. Alexander

---

recalled that as she approached high school “I began to feel the prejudice. A lot of the rich, ritzy people went to Germantown—I didn’t want to put myself under that pressure. I wanted to go around with my own people, with my own friends.”

Germantown High School did not have the same legitimacy for working class youth, like Alexander, whose families lacked the social networks and incomes that middle and upper class black youth like Coleman and Tresville enjoyed.

White students made up the majority of students who enrolled in Germantown High School during the late 1930s and early 1940s; however, unlike previous cohorts, many of these students were the sons and daughters of white ethnic residents who lived in the working class neighborhood that surrounded the school. Oral histories with several white students suggest that while these students shared similar racial backgrounds, their experiences at the high school differed, which in turn, influenced their understanding of the institution’s legitimacy. The Germantown students who enrolled in the academic course and attended college believed that their high school was legitimate because it provided them with social mobility and a secure future. However, many of the students who graduated from the high school never enjoyed the benefits of a college education or a stable career. Germantown High School did not provide these students with access to social mobility, and as a result, they questioned the legitimacy of the institution.

David Alcorn, the son of two Irish immigrants who graduated from Germantown High School in 1940, described his high school alma mater as the “perfect society.” For a man like David, in many ways, it was. David’s father left school in third grade to help his widowed mother tend the Alcorn’s family farm in Ireland; he immigrated to this country

---

64 Alyce Jackson Alexander, Interview by Gregory Woods, no date. Between the Two World Wars Collection, Germantown Historical Society.
65 For a similar analysis about low-income African American youth in Washington, D.C. see Frazier, *Negro Youth at the Crossways*. 

before David was born and worked as a gardener for Germantown’s famed Wister family. Eventually, his father became a conductor on the Philadelphia Transit Company, which employed an all-white workforce at the time.\(^66\) His mother finished the sixth grade in Ireland and worked as a domestic in the home of a wealthy family in the community before having children.

When David elaborated on his experiences in high school, he recalled that he had the fortune of having Dr. Anna M. Mullikin, a “very, very bright” woman, as his mathematics teachers. Mullikin was indeed bright. She was the first woman to receive her Ph.D. in mathematics from the University of Pennsylvania. When she graduated her advisors encouraged her to take the high school teacher exam because, as a woman, there was no room for her in the mathematics department at Penn. Mullikin had the academic aptitude to be a professor, but like many other women in her time, her gender barred her from this role. As a result, she followed her advisor’s suggestion, took the high school teacher exam, and spent her entire teaching career at Germantown High School.\(^67\)

Throughout her tenure at the high school, Mullikin invited academic students, like David, to her home after school to learn advanced mathematical skills. She even hired some of her students to help her with odd jobs in her home and several other properties that she owned in Germantown. David lived across the street from her, and so, she hired him for several years to help her with this work. One afternoon, Mullikin pulled David aside and told him that her brother, who was not as bright as David, had accepted a job as a chemical engineer. She told David that this position offered a very high salary. David recalled that he had never heard of chemical engineering, but for a

\(^{66}\) For details on the PTC Strike in Philadelphia, see Wolfinger, Philadelphia Divided, 142–176.

\(^{67}\) “Faculty Faces: Dr. Anne Mullikin,” Cliveden Clipper, March 24, 1953; “Dr. Mullikin,” Cliveden Clipper, March 18, 1958.
son of two Irish immigrants, this line of work “had the right appeal...you could make a lot of money.” With Mullikin’s support, David graduated in 1940 and earned one of the city’s coveted mayor’s scholarships. He became the first member of his family to attend college, went to Penn, earned a degree in chemical engineering, and had a lucrative career. David knew that his family could not really help him with his education, but luckily for him, Dr. Mullikin offered him a way to escape his humble class and ethnic origins.  

Like David Alcorn, Germantown High School provided Marilyn M. Engle, a white woman who graduated in June 1940, with opportunities that neither of her parents had. Marilyn, or Monie as her friends and family called her, was born in the Logan section of North Philadelphia on Rockland and Broad streets. Her father was a chauffeur for a real estate man and her mother was a seamstress. Monie recalled that her father finished high school, but her mother only finished eighth grade. When Monie began junior high school, her family moved to Germantown and lived on Stenton Avenue near Logan Street. Monie described the area as “upscale, but not top of the line.” Eventually, her family moved to a middle class twin on Stenton Avenue where she walked to and from Germantown High School every day.

When Monie recalled her high school days, she said that the “glory days” of high school were one of the best times of her life. As a vocational arts student, Monie participated in the school’s arts and yearbook clubs, and in 1940, she earned a G-pin, which were reserved for Germantown’s most engaged and active students. In her senior year, like David Alcorn, one of her teachers encouraged her to apply for a scholarship to attend the Moore School of Art. Monie recalled that she did not even know that the scholarship existed, and without the support of her teacher, she would have never

---

68 David Alcorn, Germantown High School Class of 1940, Interview by Author, November 16, 2010.
applied for it. In 1940, Margaret Engle won this scholarship and entered Moore. She was the first member of her family to attend college—teachers at Germantown High School made sure that she had the financial resources to do so.69

However, there were many students at Germantown High School who were not as fortunate as David Alcorn and Margaret Engle. Ida Ruhrer, a white woman who graduated from Germantown High School in June 1943, recalled that as a child, her family was “very, very poor.” Her father was a barber, but he was addicted to gambling, and so, her mother, who had been a housewife, decided to leave him. During the Depression, Ida’s mother secured employment through the W.P.A. and made clothing in one of the many textile mills in the city. Ida’s family moved on regular basis due to their poverty. At one point, she lived on the line between Simon Gratz High School, which was predominately black, and Germantown High School, which was predominately white. Unlike Alyce Alexander, she chose Germantown High School.

When Ida entered Germantown High School, she selected the academic course and took four years of Latin, advance mathematics, and literature courses. In the fall of her senior year, her English teacher pulled her aside and suggested that she apply for a scholarship to attend Drexel University. Ida called the university and spoke to individuals in the admissions office. When she learned that the scholarship did not cover her traveling expenses to and from the university, Ida Ruhrer decided not to apply. As she recalled, “I thought to myself, I’m so poor that carfare would be a problem.” Instead of going to college, Ida Ruhrer accepted a clerical position at the Navy Yard as a typist and went to night school to learn shorthand and typing. Even though she lacked a college degree, Ida worked her way through a variety of government jobs, met her husband at the Navy Yard, and eventually, stayed at home to raise her family in a middle class home.

69 Margaret (Engle) Bjorseth, Interview by Author, June 29, 2011.
Seventy years later, Ida does not regret her decisions, but she knows that many students from Germantown High School went to college. She was not one of them because she lacked the social networks and school support that David Alcorn and Margaret Engle enjoyed.\(^{70}\)

In 1940, administrators instituted a two-tiered diploma system at Germantown High School, a traditional, curriculum diploma and a flexible, achievement diploma, to respond to the changes in the labor market and course enrollments. Students who completed their course of study and passed their coursework received a curriculum diploma. Administrators reserved the achievement diploma for any student who spent at least three years in the high school, but changed their course of study in their senior year or failed their courses in their senior year. This new system gave administrators the power to credential students based on their academic performance without changing the academic programs that had been the high school’s hallmark for decades. Students who met the requirements that the school had established received the curriculum diploma. Students who did not meet these requirements could still stay in school, which kept youth out of the stressed labor market. The separate diplomas marked these two groups upon graduation and hardened the lines of inequality—the curriculum diploma was much more valuable than the achievement diploma.\(^{71}\)

Evidence suggests that students often did not know the differences between the two diplomas and various curricular tracks. Millie Barber, a white woman who graduated from Germantown High School in 1939, recalled that her peers thought that her high school “was a pretty good place to go to school.” When Millie was two years old, her father, an optometrist, and her mother, a housewife, moved their young family from

---

\(^{70}\) Ida Ruhrer, Germantown High School Class of 1943, Interview by Author, June 29, 2011.

their small row home in Philadelphia’s Nicetown neighborhood to Germantown so that Millie and her siblings could attend Germantown’s prestigious schools. When Millie began high school, her family told her to select the academic course, which she did, but then she noticed that she had several study halls on her schedule. Millie thought study hall was “a waste since I could do my homework at home.” So, she spoke with her advisory teacher about the situation and switched to the vocational arts program, which permitted her to replace her study hall periods with art classes, which she enjoyed much more. She never spoke to the guidance counselor about the ramifications of this decision because, like many students, she thought, “you didn’t go to the guidance counselor unless you were in trouble.” However, when she graduated, she realized her decision to switch programs was a mistake. Rather than earning an academic diploma, Millie received an industrial diploma, which was much less valuable, because she listened to her advisor’s advice. Seventy years later, Millie still regrets that decision. Her industrial diploma barred her from college even though she had completed the prerequisites for college placement.72

The changes that Germantown High School implemented did little to offset the real issue: youth who entered American high schools in the 1930s had watched their mothers and fathers struggle through the traumatic years of the Great Depression and had little hope about their futures. These youth knew that many of their peers had earned a high school diploma and still had problems finding work. As their watched their peers and families struggle, they began to question the legitimacy of their high school education and the prospects for their future.

Before the United States officially declared war on Japan and its allies, Germantown High School students and families provided private funding to support

72 Millie Barber, Germantown High School Class of 1939, Interview by Author, June 19, 2011.
school activities and traditions. The school senate and class councils urged students to pay their annual dues to subsidize the costs of band uniforms, sporting equipment, and class trips.73 The mothers’ association hosted afternoon teas where Germantown faculty and educational experts discussed a range of topics from the importance of high school course selection to the rise in juvenile delinquency. The members of the association used its dues and fundraising proceeds to purchase new choir gowns, library books, and band uniforms for the high school and to support the students’ assistance fund.74 Even though the students and mothers stressed the importance of giving to the school, the money that they raised did not always meet the school’s needs or match the funding levels that they had been able to generate in the past.75

Even with this support, student participation in the high school’s clubs and activities decreased dramatically during the late 1930s and early 1940s for a variety of reasons. Data from the 1940 yearbook indicate that Germantown High School clubs and activities were still largely segregated by gender and race. Many of the clubs either had all-male or all-female memberships. Black students rarely participated either because they preferred to participate in activities in other places, such as the Wissahickon Boys’ Club, or as William T. Coleman, Jr. suggested, they were barred from clubs because of

---


their race. Frank Selemno, a white student who lived in Germantown’s Chestnut Hill neighborhood and graduated from Germantown High School in 1940, offers another reason for the lack of participation. Frank’s parents emigrated from Naples, Italy in 1919. Like many Italian immigrants in the community, his father worked as a stone mason while his mother stayed at home to take care of her young family. Frank’s father died when he was a young child, and his mother struggled financially after his death. After his father died, Frank and his brothers supported their family through a variety of odd jobs in the community. As he said, he and his brothers did “anything that could help my family make a buck.” Frank cut grass, raked leaves, and helped with minor home repairs. Frank recalled that he was not allowed to participate in any after school activities at Germantown High School because his family told him, “if you got hurt, you couldn’t work. If you couldn’t work, you couldn’t bring home any money, and if you didn’t have any money, your family couldn’t eat.” According to Frank, the only students who participated in after school activities were those whose fathers had good jobs and owned businesses in the community. Frank Selemno and others might have wanted to participate in the high school’s after school clubs, but they did not enjoy the same choices as their peers because of their race, class, and/or gender.

The concerns about the school’s scholastic standings and student participation in school activities were largely overshadowed by the concerns that high school administrators, faculty, students, and families raised about the slow, but steady, escalation of student misconduct in the high school. Students increasingly arrived to school after the tardy bell, disobeyed stairway traffic regulations, loitered in the hallways, 
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76 June 1940 Germantown High School Yearbook, Germantown High School Archives; William T. Coleman, Jr., Interview by Author, August 10, 2010.
77 Frank Selemno, Germantown High School Class of 1940, Interview by Author, August 30, 2010.
smoked in the bathrooms, and scribbled messages on the school’s freshly painted walls.\textsuperscript{78} As the problems increased, Germantown High School administration, faculty, and school senate members reminded Germantown High School students about the importance of maintaining behavioral expectations and following school rules. School senate members sponsored assemblies and conducted discussions in each homeroom to urge students to arrive to school on time, to follow the stairway traffic patterns, and to change classes in an orderly manner. The members of the senate encouraged their peers to use peer pressure and “pass along a gentle reminder to your friends, if you find any [of them] straying from the path of duty.”\textsuperscript{79}

These gentle reminders did little to alleviate the challenges. As the problems persisted, the members of the school senate increased the severity of punishment. In the past, their advisors simply reprimanded girls who left the school grounds for lunch. Now, they automatically received five hours of detention. Similarly, students who were caught smoking on school grounds were automatically suspended. Students even tried to shame their mischievous peers publicly by referring to them as “an ignorant class” of individuals in the school newspaper and by calling their decisions to scribble on the walls a waste of taxpayer money.\textsuperscript{80} Even with these measures, student misconduct continued and spread beyond the high school’s walls.

In July 1938, Joseph Jureinkonis, a 16 year old Germantown High School student, died when his friend and classmate, John Elliot, accidentally shot him with a 32-caliber revolver in Elliot’s home on 126 West Sylvania Street, which raised new

\textsuperscript{79} “A Beautiful School,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, October 4, 1938; “Remember the Campus!,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, April 20, 1939.
\textsuperscript{80} “What Are You?,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, February 23, 1939.
concerns about juvenile delinquency and violence in the community.\textsuperscript{81} In the fall of 1938, there were numerous accounts about Germantown High School students who had vandalized school and private property in the neighborhoods surrounding the high school. According to reports, students used the school’s soccer gates for an impromptu bonfire in the community, the football field goal posts as a spontaneous prop for a community parade, and destroyed personal property as part of a Halloween prank. In response, school administrators decided to replace the members of the school senate who monitored misconduct and punished offenders with faculty monitors in the hopes that the faculty would be able to control the students better than their peers.\textsuperscript{82}

\textit{Germantown’s Charitable Organizations: Supporting Youth with Less Funding}

As the rates of juvenile delinquency escalated, government officials, social workers, and concerned residents argued that the high rates of juvenile delinquency were related to a variety of factors, including a shortage of recreational sites and the expansion of slum housing throughout the city.\textsuperscript{83} These advocates turned to Germantown’s charitable organizations to alleviate the problems that existed in the community. Throughout the late 1930s and early 1940s, Germantown’s charitable organizations continued to provide recreational activities and after school support to the community’s youth. The boys’ clubs, YMCAs, and YWCAs offered academic clubs and vocational coursework in photography, cooking, and handicrafts as well as several competitive sporting teams that won citywide and national events.\textsuperscript{84} The clubs provided members

\textsuperscript{81} “High School Lad Shoots His Pal,” \textit{Germantown Courier}, July 29, 1938.
\textsuperscript{82} “Hallowe’en Etiquette,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, October 25, 1938.
with vocational guidance and college to help their members realize the various options for them after graduation. In addition to the academic and vocational support, the clubs continued to provide their members with social activities, such as club dances and movie nights. In the summer, the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club and the all-white Germantown Boys’ Club enrolled their members in summer camps at their respective locations, which in the late 1930s were filled beyond capacity. The availability of these recreational and educational programs augmented the resources and activities for Germantown youth and provided them with opportunities that their wealthier peers already enjoyed.

However, at the same time, these organizations reinforced structural inequalities and perpetuated segregation. The boys’ clubs, YMCAs, and YWCAs still maintained separate clubs for black and white youth, which effectively blocked any kind of interracial cooperation among Germantown youth. In addition to the racial segregation, the all-black Wissahickon and the all-white Germantown Boys’ Club barred female youth from club membership. M. Frances Hunter, a black woman who spent her summers in Germantown in the late 1930s and early 1940s, recalled that she used the all-black Wissahickon swimming pool every summer to escape the heat, but she was never

---


allowed to be a club member because she was a girl. Girls were not allowed to participate in many of the clubs’ activities, such as the summer camps, employment bureaus, and social outings.

During the Great Depression, residents founded the Germantown Settlement with funds from the New Deal. The settlement provided recreational activities for working and middle class white ethnics and Africans American who had moved to Germantown from other parts of the city and settled in the Morton community, which bordered Germantown High School. Vincenza (Iannuzzi) Cerrato, whose parents emigrated from Italy, was one of many girls who spent many afternoons and summer days at the settlement. Her father, like many Italians in the area, worked as a stonemason; her mother managed a small store, and after she had her children, she did piecework in her home and sold her work to wealthy residents in the community. As a member of the settlement, Vincenza learned how to grow vegetables, play the piano, and ask a boy to dance. The settlement workers even created a replica of a small town with several homes where members learned how to clean a home, visit the doctor, compare food prices, and register children for school. The settlement workers, who were affluent white women from the community, worked diligently with each of the girls to help them develop the skills that they would need later in life as wives and mothers. Even though Vincenza recalled that her neighborhood was racially mixed with Italians, Jews, and African Americans living in close proximity, she recalled that she rarely saw an African American child at the settlement. Black children, according to Vincenza, typically went to the all-black Phillis Wheatley Recreation Center, located several blocks from the
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87 M. Frances Hunter, Interview by Author, August 6, 2010.
88 “400 Boys Will Attend Turkey Day Club Dinner,” Germantown Courier, November 24, 1938.
settlement. The Germantown Settlement, like other charitable organizations in the community, separated children into distinct organizations based on their race and gender, which in turn, prevented interracial interactions among the youth. In other words, Germantown’s charitable organizations both challenged and perpetuated inequality.

Each year, the staff who worked in these organizations and the residents who assisted them encouraged their neighbors and club members to give generously to support these organizations. By the late 1930s, many of the organizations that supported Germantown youth had decided to become members of the city’s United Fund. In 1921, only six organizations belonged to the fund; by 1938, 21 organizations belonged to the fund. While the United Fund streamlined fundraising for its members, many residents worried about the fund’s centralized, citywide approach and the loss of local support for Germantown charities. Several residents donated money directly to the organizations to by-pass the United Fund and remind others about the importance of giving to charitable organizations in the community. However, even with this support, by the late 1930s, these organizations lacked the financial and voluntary resources to provide the programming that youth had enjoyed in the past.

Opportunities and Inequalities as Philadelphia’s Economy Transforms into the “Arsenal of Democracy”

Even before the United States officially entered World War II, the advent of war across the Atlantic and Pacific revived Philadelphia’s weak economy. Between 1938 and

---

1941, the city’s shipyards and electronic manufacturing companies expanded their workforce to meet the high demand for its products. As the demand for labor increased, wages soared. Migrants streamed into the city to take advantage of these new jobs and higher wages. This migration began slowly in the late 1930s and continued to rise throughout the 1940s. Even though many of the workers decided to live in the suburbs and commute to work, others decided to uproot their families and move to Philadelphia. As they poured into the city, Philadelphia faced an acute housing shortage. There simply were not enough homes to house the influx of new residents, particularly black workers who faced racial discrimination in the city’s housing market.\textsuperscript{93}

While the war transformed the city’s sluggish economy into the “Arsenal of Democracy,” the rate of industrial growth was unevenly distributed. The shipyard and radio manufacturers boomed, but the textile industry, one of the city’s largest economic sectors, did not profit much from the influx of wartime contracts. The small textile firms that dotted the city’s boundaries were not well suited for the army’s large-scale manufacturing needs.\textsuperscript{94} In addition to these differences, discriminatory labor practices barred many workers from the benefits that these new jobs offered. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, Philadelphia firms were much more likely to rely on white male labor rather than black male labor. In 1940, 30% of employable black men were still unemployed; black families represented 50% of the city’s relief rolls even though they only made up 13% of the city’s population.\textsuperscript{95} Initially, many firms in the city refused to


\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 10–11.

\textsuperscript{95} Wolfinger, \textit{Philadelphia Divided}, 98.
hire women and older workers because they did not believe these individuals were capable of doing the kind of physical labor that wartime production required.\textsuperscript{96}

However, between 1940 and 1944, the city’s labor force increased by 18% (from 884,000 in 1940 to 1,045,000 in 1944), and the percentage of black and female workers reached record levels due to several factors.\textsuperscript{97} First, in June 1941, President Roosevelt established the Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC), which stipulated that companies with government contracts could not discriminate against its workers on the basis of race and religion. Although the FEPC never lived up to its initial fanfare, its passage opened up new employment opportunities for black workers.\textsuperscript{98} Second, as men rushed to enlist in the army, the city faced a severe labor shortage. As a result, between 1940 and 1944, the percentage of black workers in the city’s labor market increased by 54% (from 10.6% in 1940 to 16.3% in 1944).\textsuperscript{99} Between 1940 and 1944, the percentage of women in the labor market increased by 22% (from 31% in 1940 to 38% in 1944).\textsuperscript{100}

Even though city officials praised these remarkable gains, several economists in the city raised concerns about Philadelphia’s economic future. Gladys Palmer, a labor economist who had studied the city’s economy for decades, urged city officials to think about how to maintain these economic levels once the war ended. She reminded them that this unprecedented growth had occurred because of an influx of wartime contracts and the exodus of male labor from the city. Women and African Americans, who were ordinarily relegated to service jobs, moved from their traditional jobs into these more lucrative positions. When the war ended, Palmer worried that white, male workers

\textsuperscript{97} Gladys L. Palmer, \textit{The Philadelphia Labor Market in 1944} (Philadelphia: Industrial Research Department, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, November 1944), 5. This figure includes the armed services.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 6.
would displace the women and black workers, leaving these individuals with limited options on the labor market. City officials ignored Palmer’s warnings and focused on the benefits of their robust wartime economy instead of planning for the city’s future.

**Changing Demographics and Increasing Segregation in the School District of Philadelphia**

As war workers flooded the Philadelphia labor market, the Philadelphia Board of Public Education, under the direction of its powerful business manager, Add B. Anderson, continually passed budgets that hardly met the needs of its ever-expanding public school system. Even though the advent of war had little influence on the school district’s budgets, the influx of new jobs and residents did affect the school district’s demographics and increased the level of school segregation in the city. Between 1925 and 1945, the racial demographics in the city’s public schools shifted dramatically—the percentage of black students in the public schools increased by 160% (from 10% in 1925 to 26% in 1945). Furthermore, since 1925, African American youth have been overrepresented in Philadelphia’s public schools. Between 1925 and 1945, the difference between the percentage of African American students in the school district—its public, private, and parochial schools—and the public school schools had increased steadily. This shift is related, in part, to the migration of African American families to Philadelphia who sought better employment opportunities during the war. However, other reasons explain this shift, as well.

School choice both within the school district, and increasingly, between city and suburban schools impacted the shifting demographics. Between 1925 and 1945, the city’s public, private, and parochial schools lost 9,265 students; however, the city lost

---

101 Ibid., 4–6.
40,000 white students. Black enrollment increased in the public schools because white families moved out of the city to suburban communities that were developing along the city's boundaries. At the same time, white families had better access to other educational options for their children than African American residents. Upper and middle class white families increasingly sent their children to the city’s network of private schools. White ethnic residents increasingly sent their children to the city’s wide array of Catholic schools, which in this period, were free to church members or charged students a small tuition (See Figure 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Schools</th>
<th>Parochial Schools</th>
<th>Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Germantown and its schools did not experience the same demographic shifts that occurred in the city during this period. Between 1930 and 1940, the racial composition of Germantown remained relatively static with African Americans comprising 9% of the population in Ward 22 and a meager 1% of the population in Ward 42. The percentage of foreign-born residents decreased in Ward 22 by 29% (from 14% in 1930 to 10% in
In 1945, African American students only represented 9% of the public school enrollment. Even though African American students still represented a small percentage of the public school population, many white students rarely saw black students in their elementary schools because Germantown still maintained several segregated schools that were either all-black or all-white schools.

**Figure 4.9** Percentage of Residents by Race and Ethnicity, Germantown, 1930-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward 42-1940</th>
<th>83%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward 42-1930</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 22-1940</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 22-1930</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** United States Census, Table 23, Population by Sex, Color, Age, Etc., for Cities of 50,000 or More by Wards, 1930, 750; United States Census, Table 34, Race and Age, By Sex for Cities of 50,000 of More by Wards: 1940, 199.
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102 United States Census, Table 23, Population by Sex, Color, Age, Etc., for Cities of 50,000 or More by Wards, 1930, 750; United States Census, Table 34, Race and Age, By Sex for Cities of 50,000 of More by Wards: 1940, 199.

103 Table No. 14, Annual School Census--1940, Enumeration of Children Between the Ages of Six and Eighteen Years, Classified by District, Sex, Race, and by Enrollment, One Hundred Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, First School District of Philadelphia, 1940, 131; Table No. 12, Annual School Census--1945, Enumeration of Children Between the Ages of Six and Seventeen Years, Classified by District, Sex, Race, and by Enrollment, One Hundred Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, First School District of Philadelphia, 1945, 127.

In 1940, Germantown youth had five options for high school: the all-male, academic Central High School; the all-female, academic Philadelphia High School for Girls; the predominately white Germantown High School; the predominately white Olney High School; and the predominately black Simon Gratz High School. Data from the 1940 yearbooks indicate that Germantown High School had fewer black students than either the all-male, academic Central High School or the all-female, academic Philadelphia High School for Girls (See Figure 4.10).

**Figure 4.10 Percentage of Black Students, 1940**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of Black Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germantown High School (n = 631)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central High School (n = 281)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia High School for Girls (n = 335)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Germantown High School Yearbooks, January 1940 and June 1940; Central High School Yearbooks, January 1940 and June 1940; Girls’ High School Yearbooks, January 1940 and June 1940.

African American families sent their children to Central and the Philadelphia High School for Girls because these schools were closer to black neighborhoods in the city and because these schools provided their sons and daughters with the academic education that many of these families desired. School choice spilled over into the city’s neighborhood high schools because during the late 1930s and 1940s Philadelphia’s Board of Public Education still maintained an open enrollment policy where students had the opportunity to attend whatever high school they wanted to attend. As the map below illustrates, 23 families took advantage of this policy, 22 were white and one was black. White families who lived outside of the Germantown High School catchment zone took advantage of this policy and sent their children to the Germantown High School, which in turn, exacerbated racial segregation in the city’s high schools (see figure 4.11).
Germantown High School Students, by Race, Percentage of Black Residents, Philadelphia, 1940.

Figure 4.11

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June, 1940; U.S. Census, 1940.
On December 8, 1941, one day after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, three Germantown High School students asked Dr. Seely, the school principal, to host a special assembly for students to listen to President Roosevelt’s address to nation and declaration of war. Dr. Seely agreed to this request and told his faculty that students were permitted to leave their classrooms and listen to the address in the auditorium. According to reports in the school newspaper, the students who attended the assembly filed into the auditorium in an orderly manner and listened intently to the President’s speech. When his speech ended, the students burst into applause and played the national anthem to demonstrate their patriotism and commitment to the war effort.

When the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and the United States officially declared war, Germantown High School, like others in the nation, shifted its from the challenges that existed in its city and community to supporting the war effort at home and abroad.1 This shift masked the growing inequalities in the high school and community and further fractured the foundation that had sustained the school’s legitimacy.

Even though the war did not formally alter Germantown High School’s curriculum, school administrators decided to introduce several new curricular offerings so that students could contribute to the war effort at home, and eventually, abroad. In November 1940, like many high school teachers across the nation, Germantown faculty announced that it would offer war production courses where students had an opportunity to learn skills for war production, such as welding and drafting sheet metal.
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Faculty sponsored these classes after school and on weekends so that Germantown High School students could continue their traditional coursework without interruption.² When the United States officially declared war, students eagerly enrolled in first aid workshops that the high school offered so that they could help their peers and neighbors in an emergency.³ In addition to these courses, the high school offered evening courses for adults to learn retail skills so that they fill vacant positions in local businesses and farming courses for students who wanted to help harvest food products.⁴ Finally, in response to pressure from Dr. John W. Studebaker, the United States Commissioner of Education, Germantown High School administrators doubled the number of physical fitness classes for seniors to condition young men for the armed services and young women for physical labor in wartime industries.⁵ Some students wondered about the effectiveness of these new programs. On March 16, 1943, a female student published an editorial in which she argued that these additional physical education courses were simply “a lot of rolling on the floor and kicking our legs like...Ziegfeld Follies’ girls.”⁶

In January 1942, a month after Pearl Harbor, Germantown High School administrators placed a temporary ban on school clubs and activities so that students could focus their “time and energy on more important things.”⁷ Six months later, administrators lifted the ban on clubs to launch Germantown High School’s Victory
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² “Men Learn Skills in Gtn. Shop,” Cliveden Clipper, November 21, 1940.
⁶ “Four Gyms a Week?” Cliveden Clipper, March 16, 1943.
⁷ “A Necessary Sacrifice,” Cliveden Clipper, January 20, 1942. See also, “School Show Dropped at G.H.S. This Term,” Cliveden Clipper, October 13, 1942.
Corps chapter. Like others in the nation, the Germantown High School Victory Corps was a voluntary organization “to train boys and girls for war service after leaving school” and “to stimulate their active participation in the war effort.” The boys and girls who enrolled in the Victory Corps participated in school-sponsored physical fitness programs and to volunteer in war-related activities in one of its five divisions: air service, land service, sea service, production service, and community service. Students received a decorative pin to designate those who were and were not in the Corps. By December 16, 1942, only fifty students had registered for the Corps. Members appealed to their peers to join and “show “Uncle Sam” that we’re united and behind him.” These appeals worked. In January 1943, the Germantown High School Victory Corps had enlisted 1500 members, which was over half of the student body.

As the war progressed, there was increasing pressure on secondary schools and colleges to accelerate students so that they could graduate more quickly and contribute to the war effort both on the home front as workers in wartime industries and abroad as soldiers on the field. The benefits and limitations of accelerated programs filled educational journals and parenting magazines. In 1942, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers urged secondary schools and colleges to maintain their traditional programs and teach adolescents the skills necessary for a post-war economy rather than

---

simply focusing on the short-term needs. Others raised concerns that juvenile delinquency might skyrocket if schools curtailed their days or accelerated students. Most school districts ignored these criticisms. The United States was facing a dire labor shortage, and government officials believed that American youth represented the perfect candidates to fill many of these positions.

In 1943, the Philadelphia Board of Education issued a citywide policy that permitted the city’s non-academic students to accept part-time employment and accelerate their high school graduation. Initially, the school district’s Junior Employment Service, which matched high school students with employers, assisted students with finding suitable positions in the city’s labor market. Interested students met with their guidance counselors and told their counselors when they needed to work. Counselors created individualized course schedules so that their coursework did not interfere with their work schedules. In some cases, students even received academic credit for work to reduce the number of credits for graduation. For example, students who worked in the mechanical trades or clerical positions received course credit from the high school. In December 1943, Germantown High School administrators permitted students to leave school for the entire month so that they could work full time in the defense industries.

Since 1915, the Junior Employment Service (JES) ran several offices throughout the city where trained employment counselors matched high school youth with prospective employers. Between 1941 and 1945, the JES matched 161,595 students with local employers and gave these youth work permits so that they could leave school and

---

work during the day. In 1943, the number of students on work permits reached its highest level with 49,675 students on work permits. The vast majority of these students, 68% of the male students and 55% of the female students, worked in wartime manufacturing industries throughout the city. The composition of these students reveals that racial and gender bias of the employment counselors—white students represented an overwhelming 92% of the students who earned work permits that year, and male students were more likely to earn work permits than female students (58% versus 42%).\textsuperscript{15} As the chart below suggests, these demographics shifted slightly as the war progressed primarily because white, male students found other ways to secure employment during the war (see figure 4.12).

\textbf{Figure 4.12 Percentage of White and Male Students on General Employment Certificates, 1941-1945}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Source:} School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the School Year 1941-1942, Table No. 45, Employment Certificates, Exemption Permits, and Age Certificates, Comparative Statements, 1937-1941, 57.

Even though the Junior Employment Service provided support to help students find part-time work and stay in school, as the war progressed and labor demands increased, high school students simply left school to find work rather than rely on JES services. To understand how the war and the booming labor market affected these students, it is important to look at the five high schools that Germantown youth could attend: the all-male, academic Central High School; the all-female, academic

\textsuperscript{15} School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the School Year 1942-1943, Table No. 47, Industries and Occupations Entered by Boys and Girls 14 to 18 Years of Age for Whom General and Vacation Employment Certificates Were Issued, Year Ended, June 30, 1943, 59.
Philadelphia High School for Girls; the predominately white Germantown High School; the predominately white Olney High School; and the predominately black Simon Gratz High School. During the war, enrollment levels at the all-male, academic Central High School and the all-female, academic Philadelphia High School for Girls remained relatively level. However, in 1944, Germantown High School and the other two neighborhood high schools, Olney and Gratz, experienced a dramatic decrease in student enrollment as students were pulled out of high school by the lucrative opportunities on the labor market. Gratz High School, which had a predominately black student population, had the largest drop in enrollment during this period from 4,082 students in 1941 to 2,526 students in 1944, a 38% decrease. Germantown High School decreased by 19% (from 3,306 in 1941 to 2,694 in 1944); Olney High School’s student enrollment decreased by 16% (from 4,183 students in 1941 to 3,495 students in 1944, see figure 4.13).
These effects were even more pronounced when one considers gender—boys were much more likely to leave high school than the girls. The percentage of male students at Germantown High School decreased from 38% of the total enrollment in 1941 to 31% of the total enrollment in 1944. Gratz High School witnessed a similar decrease in male enrollment from 29% of the total enrollment in 1941 to 22% of the total enrollment in 1944. Olney High School experienced a much smaller decrease in male enrollment during this period—male students made up 42% of the total enrollment in 1941 and 38%
of the total enrollment in 1944. Many of the jobs that were available to women during this war, which were mainly clerical positions, required a high school diploma whereas the jobs that were available for men during the war, which were primarily manufacturing jobs, did not. The labor market demands meant that female students were more likely to stay in high school than their male peers (see figure 4.14).

**Figure 4.14  Percentage of Male Enrollment in Germantown, Gratz, and Olney High Schools, 1941-1946**

Source: School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the Year Ended, June 30, 1941, Table No. 19, Enrollment and Attendance, Year ended June 30, 1941, Senior High School, 26; School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the Year Ended, June 30, 1942, Table No. 19, Enrollment and Attendance, Year ended June 30, 1942, Senior High School, 26; School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the Year Ended, June 30, 1942-1943, Table No. 19, Enrollment and Attendance, Year ended June 30, 1943, Senior High School, 26; School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the Year Ended, June 30, 1943-1944, Table No. 18, Enrollment and Attendance, Year ended June 30, 1944, Senior High School, 24; School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the Year Ended, June 30, 1944-1945, Table No. 18, Enrollment and Attendance, Year ended June 30, 1945, Senior High School, 24; School District of Philadelphia, Statistical Reports of the Department of Instruction for the Year Ended, June 30, 1945-1946, Table No. 18, Enrollment and Attendance, Year ended June 30, 1946, Senior High School, 24.
Youth in Germantown and beyond rushed out of their high schools because they knew that they could find work easily in a variety of wartime industries. Their exodus from Germantown High School eased the challenges that Germantown administrators and faculty had worried about earlier. The students who might have questioned the legitimacy of their high school education in the late 1930s simply left school in the 1940s. They were on the labor market. As these data suggest, African American students and male students were much more likely to leave high school than their white and female counterparts. During the war, black workers enjoyed new employment opportunities because of the demands that they had made on the federal government and Roosevelt’s decision to pass the FEPC. However, the existence of these new opportunities pulled thousands of students, particularly African Americans, out of their high schools and into the labor force without a high school credential. Social scientists warned that when the war ended the nation would most likely face another youth crisis.¹⁶ They were right. The youth who left their high school to secure employment during the war only thought about the short-time benefits rather than the long-term consequences of their decisions. When the war eventually ended and the jobs vanished, these youth faced many difficulties. They never earned their high school degree, and as a result, they were barred from employment opportunities that required a high school education. The inequalities between those who had a high school credential and those that did not continued to widen. Germantown administrators and faculty never discussed their concerns about the exodus of high school youth from their institution. Like the youth, they were preoccupied with the war effort, and most likely, enjoyed the calm climate that existed at

¹⁶ Melvin, Youth—millions too many?, 9.
the high school once the “youth problem” found a way to leave their prestigious institution.17

**Private Funds Shift from the School to the War Effort**

When President Roosevelt officially declared war, Germantown faculty, students, and families redirected the private funding that had sustained the school to the war effort at home and abroad. Shortly after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Germantown faculty and students organized a war bonds campaign to give Germantown students “the incentive to purchase bonds and stamps at school every week not only for themselves, but also for their friends, families, and neighbors who have made the ‘Victory Pledge.’” In the initial campaign, which spanned from January 1942 to May 1942, Germantown High School faculty and students raised over $10,000 to support the war effort.18

**Source:** “Bond and Stamp Booth,” *Cliveden Clipper*, November 3, 1942.

---

In October 1942, the school senate announced a campaign to raise $150,000 so that the school could purchase an army bomber for the U.S. Air Force. To encourage giving and competition among the students, the school senate placed caricatures of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito in the school lobby. When one of the homerooms reached a certain campaign goal, senate members “blacked out” a body part on “one of these menaces”—“an arm will be blacked out for $300, a leg for $700, the body for $10,000, and the head for $13,000.”19 After a year of fundraising, the school senate announced that the high school had finally raised enough money to purchase their bomber and publicized their achievements with a photograph of the bomber with the high school etched on its side in the school newspaper. Several months later, the Treasury Department sent the high school a certificate of merit to thank the faculty and students for their generous donations. The school senate proudly displayed the certificate in the school lobby to commemorate this recognition and accomplishment.20

---

19 “Bond Sales Top $15,000,” Cliveden Clipper, November 3, 1942.
As students rejoiced that they had achieved their fundraising goal and purchased their bomber, the school senate responded to student demands and sponsored a second campaign to purchase another bomber. The second campaign did not run as smoothly as the first. Initially, senate members boasted that the school could raise the funds for another bomber by the end of year. This did not happen. On October 31, 1944, a student committee, which included 15 girls and three boys, announced that it had decided to name the new bomber the “Angel of Mercy.” The members of the committee worried that this name was not appropriate for a war bomber, and so, they announced that they had decided to use the funds to purchase a hospital plane instead of a war bomber. In January 1945, several months after the school senate announced its second campaign, Germantown faculty and students raised over $145,000 and purchased their hospital plane, a trainer plane, and a bulldozer to support the armed services.  

Source: “Did Your Bonds Buy This Bomber?,“ Cliveden Clipper, April 25, 1944.

**Notes:**

21 “Hospital Plan is Xmas Goal,” Cliveden Clipper, October 31, 1944; “G.H.S. Goal for Sixth War Loan is $50,000 for ‘Freedom’s Angel,’“ Cliveden Clipper, November 21, 1944; “Sixth War Loan,” Cliveden Clipper,
Finally, in March 1945, the school senate sponsored a campaign where it gave each homeroom the power to decide how to use its funds—students could purchase a jeep, a gun, or a mule for the armed services. Most of the homerooms decided to purchase a mule with their campaign funds and argued that these animals would help the war-torn countries restore peace and prosperity. In May 1945, the school senate invited the students who gave to these campaigns to a special assembly to commemorate the work that they had done and to celebrate the end of the war. The individuals who did not give remained in their homerooms, and thus, this assembly fractured the members of the school community into two distinct groups: the students who gave to the war effort and those that did not.

In addition to these bomber campaigns, faculty, students, and families donated their time and services to support the war effort both at home and abroad. A month after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, several Germantown High School girls worked with volunteers from the mothers’ association to knit blankets for soldiers who were already stationed abroad. In May 1942, the Board of Education closed the high school temporarily and enlisted Germantown faculty to distribute gas, oil, and sugar ration cards to the community. The Germantown High School band, football team, cheerleaders, and “a squad of feminine golfers” marched in a citywide parade to show their patriotism and commitment to the war effort. In November 1942, students

---


25 “Hats Off to Teachers,” Cliveden Clipper, May 14, 1942. See also, “School Closes: Faculty on the Job,” Cliveden Clipper, May 14, 1942; “Teachers Aid in Oil Rationing,”
responded to calls from the Office of Civilian Defense and volunteered in a variety of “social service jobs left vacant by those who have gone off to war.” Students collected keys and tin for a scrap drive, sponsored fundraisers for the Philadelphia Red Cross, and sent handmade clothing to war-torn Russia. They held a school-wide drive and sent over 200 packages with “pocket-sized novels, cigarettes, pocket-sized games, soap, shaving lotion, shaving cream, razor blades, and non-perishable candy” to wounded American soldiers stationed in the nearby Valley Forge Hospital.26 From December 1941 to September 1945, Germantown faculty, students, and families redirected the private funds and services from the school to the war effort, and as a result, they shattered the private supports that the high school had relied on in the past to subsidize its activities and programs.

**The Emphasis on Unity Overshadows Educational Inequality**

As some students worked to initiate war-related fundraisers, others began school wide campaign to emphasize the importance of patriotism, unity, and cooperation to the war effort in the school, community, and beyond. One week after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, a Germantown student published an editorial that reminded their peers that “unity of thought and purpose” were essential to win the war and preserve democracy abroad. Another editorial, published in 1945, encouraged students to contribute to the defense of democracy in any way that they could and urged them to realize that the preservation of democracy represented the “difference between FREEDOM and SLAVERY” throughout the world.27

Even though the Board of Education and Dr. Seely, the school principal, had banned high school fraternities and societies, students knew that they still existed in the

---

26 “G.H.S. Prepares Gift Packages,” *Cliveden Clipper*, December 12, 1944.
community. In December 1943, students urged their peers to relinquish their memberships in these clubs because these organizations “foster exclusiveness, snobbishness and undemocratic practices,” which were did not complement the aims of the war or the democratic ethos that many were trying to cultivate at their high school. These societies and fraternities had existed since the high school’s founding as private clubs that enlisted white and predominately upper class students throughout their history. With the exception of a few flyers that occasionally advertised their events, the societies and fraternities remained beyond the purview of the school’s administrators and faculty, and as a result, the policy did little to curb their existence. The editorialist acknowledged that many of his peers belonged to these clubs and that membership was particularly high among club and sports leaders. However, he urged students to give up their memberships arguing, “it is up to us, who are left on the home front, too young to enter into the great fracas, to see that in the school, at least, things are kept on a democratic plane.” He encouraged his peers to support the tenets of democracy in their school and community, and at the very least, relinquish their membership in these exclusive clubs so that students “do not feel left out of things.”

Despite these appeals, students continued to maintain their allegiance to their exclusive clubs rather than embrace the tenets of democracy.

The emphasis on unity and the benefits of democracy spread beyond the high school. In 1943, Germantown High School youth officially joined the School Association of Germantown. The association, founded in 1941, worked closely with the Germantown Community Council to promote community service and recreational activities for youth. Initially, the association only included four private schools in the community: William Penn Charter School, Germantown Academy, Stevens School, and Germantown Friends.

School. The association’s membership included two members from each school, and together, these students decided on community service projects for the group and encouraged their schools to become involved in community-wide activities.

During the war, several Germantown High School registered for the city’s High School Fellowship Group (HSFG). The HSFG was a citywide group that brought high school youth together “to create better relationships and clearer understanding among people of different races and creeds” modeled after other groups that existed throughout the nation at the time. The group held its meetings at the Philadelphia Fellowship House at 1431 Brown Street and attracted youth from a variety of high schools in the city.

The fellowship group invited speakers to the fellowship house, such as Dr. Tanner Duckery, a prominent school administrator, and Dr. Mortimer Cohen, a well-known Philadelphia rabbi. In addition to inviting speakers, students wrote play, such as one entitled, *We Call It Freedom*, which they staged at the Fellowship House for group members and supporters.

Initially, the students who belonged to the fellowship group focused primarily on the programs and activities at the Fellowship House and did little to support Germantown High School. However, in 1944, the librarians at the high school announced that they had decided to create a fellowship library and purchased several books that complimented the mission of the fellowship group. According to the school newspaper, the fellowship library contained books on Judaism, such as *Candles in the Night*, and prejudice and race relations, such as *13 Against the Odds, Probing Our*
Prejudice, and The American Negro. These books, like many intercultural education programs, focused on teaching students to be tolerant of other cultural values and races. For example, Probing Our Prejudice reminded students about the dangers of prejudice values towards underrepresented groups, which the authors defined as racial and ethnic minorities in the United States. The book lumped discrimination against Native Americans with the challenges that Italian Americans and African Americans faced. After discussing a litany of racial slurs that applied to these groups, the book urged American youth to realize the damage that prejudice created in a democracy. However, like other books that stressed intercultural education, this text never addressed the structural, political, and economic inequalities that existed in the United States and how these inequalities impacted some groups more than others. The books in the Germantown High School Fellowship Library were based on the intercultural education movement that existed in schools throughout the nation, and while it was an attempt to have conversations about inequality in this country, it did little to alter what actually happened in the school, the community, or the nation.

The experiences of MaChere A. Tresville exemplify the mismatch between the intercultural education programs and the racism that black youth faced in their high school and community. In October 1943, Walter M.S. Tresville, Robert Tresville, Jr.’s uncle, approached Floyd Logan about discrimination on the Germantown High School girls swimming club. Logan led the Educational Equality League, a citywide organization committed to ending racial discrimination in the city’s public schools. In

his letter, Tresville informed Logan that his daughter, MaChere, had been barred from the Germantown High School swimming club because the all-white Germantown YWCA did not allow African American swimmers in its facilities. Tresville told Logan that black families had been dealing with racism and discrimination for decades in the community, which made many residents fearful to speak out against these practices.

He explained that he had visited the YWCA with his wife, Virginia, and spoke with the executive secretary, Miss M. Riegel, about their concerns. They voiced their opposition about this policy. Riegel responded to their accusations and agreed that the policy discriminated against black and promised to revisit the policy with her Board of Directors. Even though she wanted to change the policy, she “could not assure” them that the YWCA would change its policy because while the organization had “many liberal and democratic members” it also had several “prejudiced and narrow-minded members” who wanted to keep the policy intact. The Tresvilles also spoke to Mr. Charles Nichols, Germantown High School’s principal, who stated that he “was not familiar with this problem.” Tresville said that he intended to take the case to the Board of Education or the courts and told Logan that he “firmly” believed that “some method should be devised in these schools for equal opportunity and endeavor.” He stated that it was “my earnest desire to fight this thing through. If not for my daughter—then, for the other girls who follow.”

Logan took Tresvilles’ concerns to the Board of Education and wrote, “such undemocratic practice cannot be tolerated in our public schools, especially in times like these.” Logan encouraged the Board of Education to use its power to end the segregation

---

35 Letter to Floyd Logan, Educational Equality League, from Walter M.S. Tresville, October 5, 1943, Acc 469, Box 9, Folder 5, Germantown High School Swimming Pool: Racial Discrimination, Floyd Logan Collection, Temple Urban Archives.
of the swimming club immediately. In December, Edwin W. Adams, an associate superintendent in the school district, sent Logan and Tresville a letter stating that the YWCA had voted unanimously that “all facilities of the Association be open to all groups of members and other organized groups with which the YWCA is accustomed to work.” Adams believed this was “another fine forward step” toward desegregation in the community and invited Tresville’s daughter to participate in the club. Germantown High School avoided a controversy because the YWCA decided to desegregate its facilities. The Tresville family won their case, and in doing so, they reminded African Americans in Germantown about the importance of speaking out against injustice that existed in their local high school and increasingly interracial community.

**A City of Contrasts and the Erosion of Legitimacy at Germantown High School**

In 1937, the Federal Writers Project described the city of Philadelphia as a “city of contrasts—a city of wealth and poverty, of turmoil and tranquility, of stern laws often mitigated by mild enforcement; a city proud of its world-molding past and sometimes slow to heed the promptings of modern thought.” By the end of World War II, these contrasts were even more apparent. The city’s economy benefited immensely from wartime production levels. Migrants from rural counties and neighboring states came to Philadelphia to fill these jobs and receive higher wages. However, this growth was unevenly distributed.

---

36 Letter from Floyd L. Logan to Dr. Edwin W. Adams, Associate Superintendent, October 26, 1943, Acc 469, Box 9, Folder 5, Germantown High School Swimming Pool: Racial Discrimination, Floyd Logan Collection, Temple Urban Archives.


As the wartime contracts poured in, Philadelphia focused on its housing crisis. The solutions that the government implemented created a two-tiered system where race determined one’s housing options. These policies, which the federal and local government sponsored, increased racial segregation in the city. Even though residential segregation had existed in the city for decades, by the end of the war, the boundaries between white and black neighborhoods were much more visible. As these contrasts intensified, the city faced another fiscal crisis in its public schools, and instead of raising taxes, the Board of Education cut funding and slashed programs. These cuts happened as new, and increasingly black students, from a variety of places entered the city’s public schools. White flight, which began in the 1930s, escalated. In some cases, white families decided to stay in the city, but those that remained in Philadelphia were much more likely to send their children to private and parochial schools.

Germantown exemplified many of these contrasts. By the late 1930s, Germantown had transformed into a residential neighborhood that was home to individuals with a variety of class, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. As new residents arrived from other parts of the city and beyond, individuals in the community searched for ways to improve residential housing, provide recreational activities, and reduce juvenile delinquency. While the city relied on government funds, Germantown residents maintained their steadfast belief in locally controlled and privately funded solutions to alleviate these challenges. This approach had several shortcomings. First, residents relied on charitable organizations to implement these solutions, but these organizations did not have the funds necessary to actually support these programs. Second, even though these solutions helped residents in need, the solutions that Germantown residents implemented focused primarily on short-term reform rather than structural inequality. Poverty persisted, particularly among African American residents.
The youth crisis of the late 1930s eroded the legitimacy of Germantown High School even further. The school responded to student concerns by implementing a two-tiered credential system that challenged the school’s academic focus and increased inequality. Other factors affected the school’s culture and legitimacy: misbehavior in the school and community escalated, participation in the school clubs and sports teams decreased, and funding to augment school resources dwindled. When the United States officially declared war, the school immediately shifted from raising money for the school to raising money for the war effort. This put an additional strain on the limited funds. At the same time, it masked the inequality that existed in the high school. Germantown High School faculty, students, and families challenged these inequalities, but as the war ended, their demands for equality grew louder.
Chapter 5:
Meeting the Needs of a “Modern Generation Living in a Modern Age”
Gilbert Fuller, Sr. was born in Philadelphia on May 6, 1931. As a child, he lived at 1520 N. Olney Street in the heart of one of North Philadelphia’s African American neighborhoods. Gilbert’s mother worked as a domestic; his father worked as a laborer, and during the war, received a position in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Gilbert attended elementary school at Dunbar Elementary School, an all-black elementary school a few blocks from his home. Like other segregated schools in the city, Dunbar had an all-black teaching staff and a black principal, Dr. Tanner G. Duckery, who Fuller adored. Even though his school lacked many of the resources that all-white schools enjoyed, Fuller recalled that his principal provided his students with the best that he could under these segregated circumstances. In 1949, Fuller attended Benjamin Franklin High School, an all-boys high school located in the center of the city. During high school, Fuller worked in the high school guidance office. One day, his guidance counselor asked him if he wanted to go to college when he graduated. He told her that he wanted to apply to college, but that she needed to speak to his father about it. Several days later, his father visited his high school and met with his guidance counselor about his son’s postsecondary future. When his father came home from the meeting, he told his young son that he wanted him to attend college, but that his family could not afford the tuition. More than sixty years later, Fuller believes that his father wanted him to attend college, but instead of asking him if he wanted to go he wished his guidance counselor had just told him “that you can work your way through college. I did not know that, and I don’t think he [his father] knew.” Even though he still thinks that his guidance counselor had good intentions, Fuller regrets that she did not explain the

---

process to him and others like him "who were capable and qualified." Instead of applying to college, he graduated from high school and immediately looked for work.

When Fuller earned his high school diploma, he proudly "framed it, put under my arm, [and] went for employment . . . you couldn't tell me anything. I thought I had the ticket." As he recalled, he thought that his high school diploma "would open up the door of opportunity, to get the job" that he wanted. He was wrong. While he waited in the employment line, he talked to white men who were waiting with him. Fuller recalled that the white men repeatedly told him privately that they lacked the skills that they needed for the job or that they had dropped out of high school. But, time after time, these employment officers hired these white men and told Fuller that he needed "a little bit more" even though he had better credentials and qualifications than the white men in the office. Racial discrimination on the city's labor market barred him from the opportunities that he craved.

As the rejections continued, Fuller decided to open his own business and enrolled in trade school. Entrepreneurship, he hoped, would be his salvation. As he continued his education, he weighed various locations, and eventually, decided to relocate his family from North Philadelphia to Germantown. During his childhood, Fuller had visited the area often because his uncle lived there. He recalled that traveling to North Philadelphia to Germantown felt like you were "coming into a different city." Germantown, he remembered, "had stores equal to center city, or better, movies theatres, housing, and quality of life." It was the quality of life that attracted him to the quiet, streetcar suburb. And in 1953, he moved his family, his young wife and his children to a modest, row home on Morton Street and opened a shoe repair business on Germantown Avenue, a few blocks from his home. Gilbert Fuller, Sr. moved to the area because, like others who moved to the area in the postwar period, he wanted to give his
family the quality of life that Germantown had offered to generations of residents before him—its suburban style housing, its bustling commercial district, its quaint recreation centers, and its reputable public schools.2

When Gilbert Fuller, Sr. moved to Germantown, Philadelphia residents emerged from a victorious war to face new problems on the home front. The city’s housing crisis became more severe as individuals, particularly African Americans, moved to Philadelphia to find better work and schools. When the war ended, Philadelphia lost many of the wartime jobs leaving the city with widespread unemployment, especially among its youth. As city officials searched for ways to improve the city’s housing and economy, school officials maintained the city’s low tax rates to keep middle class families in the city and to assuage taxpayers who did not have children in the public schools. Germantown faced similar challenges as the schools became increasingly overcrowded and under resourced, particularly at the elementary school level. Germantown High School was not immune from these challenges. In the late 1940s and 1950s, the faculty and youth focused on creating a modern, comprehensive high school that fractured students into distinct groups. These distinct groups offered youth different opportunities in high school and beyond and increased the levels of inequality in the high school. The war had once masked these challenges, but as it ended and the youth entered a new phase, the students who did not benefit from these new programs challenged the legitimacy and value of the education that they received at Germantown High School. In the postwar period, meeting the needs of a “modern generation in a modern era” meant implementing more curricular tracks, more student segregation, and more educational inequality.3

---

2 Gilbert Fuller, Sr., Germantown Resident, Interview by Author, August 8, 2010.
Germantown’s Transformation from a Streetcar Suburb to an Urban Community

When Philadelphia emerged from the war, the city was in the midst of dramatic reforms. In 1950, Joseph Clark, a Democrat, won the city’s mayoral election ending the Republican machine’s century-long grip on the city. The city drafted a new charter that included provisions outlawing discrimination on all city properties, facilities, and services bringing new hope to liberal reformers who had been pressuring the city for these measures for decades. As civil rights leaders praised city officials, Philadelphia residents were in the midst of a severe housing crisis. During the war, residents diverted its manpower to the war efforts and neglected its housing stock. There simply were not enough homes to house the number of residents who had moved to the city during the war. As historians have shown, race either enhanced or constrained the options that these residents had. White residents continued their exodus out of the city and moved into new postwar housing communities, such as Germantown’s West Oak Lane. Racial discrimination barred most African Americans from these options. In Philadelphia, like other parts of the nation, African American residents turned to the communities that white residents had left behind—North Philadelphia and older parts of the city’s outlying suburbs, such as Germantown and West Philadelphia—where black residents had lived for decades (see figure 5.1). As residents scrambled for housing, government officials became increasingly concerned about the erosion of jobs in the city’s labor market as the wartime jobs left the city. As the city lost these jobs, Philadelphia’s economy gradually

---

shifted from a manufacturing economy to business-service economy.\textsuperscript{5} City officials implemented several innovative programs to curb the exodus of these industries, but they largely ignored the needs of the older outlying areas, such as Germantown.\textsuperscript{6}


\textsuperscript{6} For a discussion of the innovative programs, see Guian A. McKee, \textit{The Problem of Jobs: Liberalism, Race, and Deindustrialization in Philadelphia} (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2008). See also, Adams et al., \textit{Philadelphia}, 79.
During the late 1940s and 1950s, Germantown experienced an influx of new residents. Middle class residents, who were predominately white, purchased new homes...
in the community’s outlying areas, such as Mount Airy and West Oak Lane. Working class residents, who were increasingly black, had to settle for older homes in the community central corridor along Germantown Avenue. Rosalie August, a white woman who graduated from Germantown High School in 1949, moved out of her father’s childhood home in a predominately Jewish section of North Philadelphia to a new home located in Germantown’s West Oak Lane. When Rosalie’s family moved there, she recalled that her new neighborhood was largely comprised of white families, who like hers, had moved out of older neighborhoods in the center of the city. The only tensions that Rosalie remembered were between Irish Catholic residents, who had lived in the area for decades, and Jewish residents, who had just moved there. Most residents paid little attention to these skirmishes. Families like Rosalie’s continued to move to the area to enjoy the amenities that this quiet neighborhood offered—modern homes, open space, reputable schools, and segregated neighborhoods.7

Adrienne Morrison, an African American woman who graduated from Germantown High School in 1951, had a very different experience than Rosalie even though they only lived a few miles apart. Adrienne had lived in a quiet section of Germantown’s Mount Airy neighborhood since her birth. Her father, Irad, paid his own tuition to attend a private, segregated high school in the South. When he graduated, he enrolled at Hampton University and secured a position as a postman in Philadelphia. Her mother, Josephine Marie Scott Valentine, left high school prematurely after her doctor warned her parents that her heart was too weak for academic work. After Adrienne’s birth, she stayed home to raise her family. As a child, she remembered she was the only African American family on her middle class block. Adrienne recalled that her neighborhood was the kind of place where families left their doors unlocked and

children left their bicycles on their streets. During the summer, they often slept on their porches to escape the heat.

Even though she remembered her community as a “safe, traditional place where you did not have to worry about things,” she experienced racism on a daily basis. As a child, Adrienne recalled that she rarely played with the other white children on her block. In the late 1940s, she watched as the open fields near her homes were turned into housing developments and as the white families who had lived there for decades sold their homes. Once the white families moved out of the area, panic ensued. One afternoon, Adrienne sorted through her family’s mail and found a postcard from a local real estate agent telling residents to sell their homes before African Americans moved in and depreciated the housing values in the community. Even though she was outraged, she never told her parents about the card that they had received.8

In the spring of 1950, the Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) announced that it had selected the six-acre site of the old Germantown Poorhouse for one of the city’s new public housing sites.9 Germantown’s housing activists applauded the city’s actions, but local businessmen and real estate brokers staunchly opposed the plans arguing that the community needed the Poorhouse site for commercial development, not public housing. Many white residents expressed their opposition in terms of race. These residents were worried that a new public housing complex would attract more African Americans to the area.10 City officials refused to cave to this opposition. In June 1950,

8 Adrienne Morrison, Germantown High School Class of 1951, Interview by Author, November 8, 2011.
the City’s Planning Commission formally approved the PHA’s proposal to build public housing in Germantown.11

A few weeks later, city officials hosted a public hearing to discuss the benefits and limitations of the Poorhouse site. The PHA described the plans for the public housing site and promised to widen the streets near the site, to minimize land use with multi-story apartments, and to build a playground for children. City officials emphasized that their plans did not detract from business development; rather, they argued that better housing enhanced business development.12 When they finished, residents offered their perspectives. John W. McKay, an African American man who lived near the Poorhouse site, endorsed the plan. In an ideal society, he argued, Germantown residents would be “economically equipped to purchase [their] own home.” Since the United States was not an ideal society, the government had an obligation to help those who could not afford to purchase their own homes.13 White residents testified that they were shocked when they learned that their domestic help lived in homes that lacked indoor plumbing and modern electricity. These residents agreed with McKay: the government had to provide public housing for residents who generally earned “less than $5.00 a day.”14

Many residents disagreed with their neighbors. Herbert A. Haslam, a minister who lived a few blocks from the proposed site, argued that these plans threatened to

12 “Rittenhouse Site Hearings,” July 19, 1950, 92-102, Urb Pamphlets, Box 430, Housing Association of Delaware Valley, Temple Urban Archives.
13 Ibid, 144-145.
14 Ibid, 281.
“bring the slums” into his neighborhood.\textsuperscript{15} Representatives from several community organizations, including the Businessmen’s Association of Germantown, the Germantown Realty Board, and the 22\textsuperscript{nd} Ward Planning Committee, opposed the plans and urged the PHA to consider an alternative site on Queen Lane, in the middle of one of Germantown’s historically black neighborhoods. The PHA had considered the Queen Lane site previously. The members of the organizations, which mainly comprised of upper and middle class white business owners and residents, preferred the Queen Lane site arguing that it did not disrupt business development and afforded better recreational space.\textsuperscript{16} Even though there were some advantages to Queen Lane, the Poorhouse site was vacant, and thus unlike Queen Lane, the PHA could build a public housing complex at the Poorhouse site without displacing any residents. When the meeting ended, 23 of the 33 individuals who offered their perspectives supported the Poorhouse site and urged the PHA to begin construction immediately.\textsuperscript{17}

Even with this support, opposition to the project mounted from the business community and white residents who lived in the area. The business community argued that the land on the Poorhouse site, which was located in the middle of the community’s commercial district, should be used for economic development rather than public housing. Germantown’s city council members threatened to challenge the PHA’s decision with state officials to show their support for the business community. A few months after the public hearings, city council postponed the Poorhouse project indefinitely. Even though the opposition came from a small group of individuals, these individuals had leveraged their political powers to pressure government officials to meet their demands. Once city council postponed the Poorhouse project, the PHA explored

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, 126.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 290-92.
\textsuperscript{17} “H-Authority Hears Arguments on Public Housing Project Site Here,” Germantown Courier, July 27, 1950, Urb 39, Box 50, Germantown-Chestnut Hill Committee Chairman’s File, 1950-52.
alternatives, Queen Lane, a site in a predominately African American neighborhood, and Morton, a site in a racially mixed neighborhood.\textsuperscript{18}

As the PHA considered alternative sites, several African American residents who lived on the Queen Lane site received mysterious notices from city officials urging them to stop paying rent. When they followed the suggestion, their landlords evicted them from their homes. As these evictions escalated, Mae Elizabeth Worthy, who had lived on Queen Lane for many years, organized a petition voicing the residents’ opposition to these practices. Over 700 people signed the petition before Worthy sent it to government officials. Shortly after she sent the petition, Robert Crane, a resident who owned a taproom in the area, told newspaper reporters that he had inside knowledge from his patrons that the evictions were related to the PHA’s desires to build public housing on the Queen Lane site.

According to Crane, local city council members did not support the idea of building public housing on the Queen Lane site, and so, government officials used other tactics to remove residents who lived in the homes that they wanted to demolish. Once the renters had been evicted, the PHA purchased these homes to secure land for their project.\textsuperscript{19} However, the PHA needed more land for the project. After analyzing the area more carefully, the members of the PHA realized that the Philadelphia Recreation Department owned a recreational site on Queen Lane, which had been condemned for several years. The PHA asked city council to transfer the title from the Recreation


Department to the PHA, and when council approved this, the PHA finally had the land it needed to build its public housing project in Germantown.20

On April 21, 1952, the PHA held public hearings on the Queen Lane site. The conversations were still divided along race and class lines even though their perspectives had changed. Supporters included the upper class businessmen, progressive housing activists, and the Germantown Community Council who argued that the community needed public housing and that Queen Lane was the ideal place for it. Mae Martin, who lived on the Queen Lane site at 5320 Pulaski Avenue, acknowledged that “housing has been the cry of the neighborhood for years,” but told those present that she opposed the plan. Her home, she explained, was “on the Queen Lane site.” Alessandroni, who worked for the PHA, corrected her statement that “you mean your home is one that has been condemned.” He reminded her that the PHA only wanted to know whether anyone objected to building a housing project in the area. He looked at Martin and bluntly asked her, “Do you have any objections, Mrs. Martin?” She raised her head and responded, “None whatever. I have no objection to housing since it must be done.” She had lost the argument. As a black woman, she lacked the political power that the white business owners and residents enjoyed.21 Two weeks later, city council unanimously approved the Queen Lane site.22

One year later, the Germantown Chestnut Hill Housing Committee hosted a cornerstone ceremony where city officials unveiled the final plans for the 120-unit and where the committee announced its Charter of Good Housing. The charter stipulated
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21 “Queen Lane Hearings,” April 21, 1952, 430-1, Urb Pamphlets, Box 430, Housing Association of Delaware Valley, Temple Urban Archives, 4-6.
22 “Neighbors to Offer Housing Suggestions,” Philadelphia Tribune, May 3, 1952; Bill No. 114, Introduced March 27, 1952, Box 50, Folder 12, Gtn Chestnut Hill Housing Committee Chairman’s Files, 1950-52, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
that good housing benefitted local residents and guaranteed a bright future “for the city.” It stated that Germantown’s leaders promised to make their “cities better by effective teamwork of all public agencies, private enterprise and civic organizations.” The charter suggests that the individuals leading the charge to revitalize their community had switched from referring to Germantown as a suburb to a city. Germantown residents had associated black housing units with the city in the past; the presence of an all-black housing unit in their community made it impossible to deny: Germantown, at least the lower part of it, had transformed from a suburb to a city.\(^\text{23}\)

In May 1955, residents finally moved into Queen Lane. The site received international praise for its innovative approach to combining multi-story buildings with smaller homes scattered throughout. M. Frances Hunter, who had spent her summers playing at the all-black Wissahickon Boys Club, was among the first residents to live in the huge tower at Queen Lane. When she moved into her new home, she thought she had found a small piece of heaven. It was clean. It was quiet. It was safe. Hunter had high hopes for her future: Queen Lane provided her with a decent home in the community where she had spent the happiest moments of her childhood and fulfilled her vision of the ideal community to raise her young daughter.\(^\text{24}\) Even though it was not the PHA’s first choice for a public housing project in Germantown, Queen Lane satisfied its needs, as well. The new building was located on condemned land in a black neighborhood; the only opposition to the project came from black residents with little political power; and after it was built, no one voiced public opposition to the fact that

\(^{23}\) Queen Lane Corner Ceremony, Queen Lane Cornerstone Ceremony Program, September 27, 1953, Box 50, Folder 13, Gtn Chestnut Hill Housing Committee Membership Lists, 1947, 1952-53, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.

\(^{24}\) M. Frances Hunter, Personal Communication with Author, February 3, 2011
92.5% of the families living in Queen Lane were black. Germantown’s civic leaders had made their point. As the percentage of black residents continued to increase in lower Germantown, their bucolic suburb had become an urban community.

**Germantown’s Charitable Organizations Face a Shaky Future**

In the midst of these housing discussions, social scientists, prominent journalists, and educational experts raised newfound concerns about the level of juvenile delinquency in the nation. These authors highlighted the dramatic increase in the rate of juvenile delinquency and its widespread effect among middle class youth throughout the nation. Parents and teachers, they argued, must remain vigilant and look for early signs of delinquency in their homes and schools. Films, novels, and popular articles reinforced the idea that every child in the country was at risk of either becoming a criminal or a victim. As the popularity of these ideas increased, Germantown residents pressured their charitable organizations to provide more recreational activities to keep Germantown youth out of trouble.

As Germantown’s civic leaders discussed these challenges, many residents criticized the community for maintaining separate facilities for black and white youth.

---


Since the black organizations did not receive the level of funding that the white organizations received, black youth had far fewer recreational options. The low level of funding that the city allocated for recreational facilities for black youth compounded these challenges.\(^{28}\) To counter these problems, Germantown’s Parents and Teachers Associations and church organizations provided funds and convinced school officials to let them open several recreational centers in Germantown’s increasingly African American elementary schools. The civic leaders urged the managers of the charitable organizations to sponsor interracial activities. However, as white flight continued and racial tensions mounted, the managers had difficulty finding enough white children to enroll in these programs. It was simply impossible to maintain the racial balance. By the late 1950s, Germantown’s charitable organizations either continued to segregate youth by race and gender or transformed into institutions that served only African American youth.\(^{29}\)

There were other problems, as well. While local leaders worried about providing more recreational activities for black youth, the managers of the local YMCA and YWCA were under pressure from the national YMCA and YWCA to integrate their institutions.\(^{30}\) Germantown’s all-black and all-white YWCA maintained several separate programs for black and white youth, but decided to integrate their institutions in the postwar period. The all-black and all-white YMCA, however, refused to comply with the national calls for integration. The members of the all-black YMCA argued that the members of the all-


white YMCA had never considered them as full members, and thus, they decided to delay integration indefinitely.\textsuperscript{31} As the YMCA weighed the benefits and limitations of integration, Germantown’s civic leaders were preoccupied with the rising discrepancy between Germantown’s charitable organizations operating expenses and private donations. The operating costs of these organizations had risen dramatically as the influx of working class residents put new demands on their services. At the same time, many of the residents who had funded these organizations had either died or moved to the suburbs. As the funds dwindled, Germantown’s charitable organizations had to curtail their services.\textsuperscript{32} In the spring of 1956, the Germantown Settlement announced that it had cut several of its programs for children over the age of ten. In 1957, the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club closed Camp Emlen, the summer camp that had provided recreational activities for its members for 35 years, due to a lack of funds.\textsuperscript{33} The charitable organizations that residents had relied on for decades lacked the funds they needed to meet demands.

Despite these challenges, these charitable organizations still provided Germantown youth with recreational and educational opportunities that their working class families could not provide. Charles A. Shirley, Jr., was a member of the all-black Wissahickon Boys’ Club during the late 1940s and 1950s. His father maintained several apartment buildings in the neighborhoods for their owners; his mother worked odd jobs as a domestic in the community. He spent his childhood at his home located at 5314 Priscilla Street, a few blocks from the club and the new Queen Lane housing projects.

Every day after school, he went to the club and recalled walking by the sign that

\textsuperscript{31} Letter to Stanley Yarnall from H.H. Cain, Executive Secretary, Rittenhouse YMCA, July 2, 1946, Urb 260, Box 1, Folder Rittenhouse YMCA, 1944-46; Advisory Committee, Board of Directors and Trustees, Meeting, November 22, 1946, Urb 260, Box 1, Folder Rittenhouse YMCA, 1944-46.

\textsuperscript{32} “Germantown Settlement,” Box 2, Folder 33, Community Chest Funds, Budgets 1950-52.

\textsuperscript{33} Dorothy Anderson and Wert Hooper, “Germantown Folk Hit Plan to Close Camp Emlen This Summer,” \textit{Philadelphia Tribune}, April 27, 1957.
Coleman, the director, had hung over the club’s entranceway. The sign showcased the club’s motto, “a child is a diamond in the rough; add character and you have a jewel.” According to Charles, that motto was the foundation for the club.

When he was a senior in high school, Jim Smith, one of the club leaders, told Charles that he wanted him to go to college. He had never really considered going to college because no one in his family had attended college in the past and no one at his high school, Simon Gratz, mentioned it to him. With Smith’s support, Charles won the senatorial scholarship to attend Lincoln University. When he enrolled, administrators at Lincoln told him that he lacked the prerequisite courses to enter Lincoln. As Charles said, I thought I had found “my way out of college.” But, when Jim Smith heard what had happened, he called a colleague who worked at St. Paul’s Polytechnic Institute in Lawrenceville, Virginia and told him that he had a basketball player who needed a scholarship to attend college.

The following Monday, Charles Shirley boarded a bus from Philadelphia to Lawrenceville. He attended St. Paul’s, worked at Camp Emlen every summer, and eventually, became a teacher, first at the R.W. Brown Boys’ Club in North Philadelphia and finally, at Dobbin High School, where he worked for 35 years. Over sixty years later, Shirley remains committed to his club because, as he said, “the club was my family’s savior.” His mother and father had the freedom to take whatever work they could find because they knew that their children were at the club every afternoon. When he graduated from high school, Jim Smith made sure that Charles had a scholarship to attend college and work to cover his expenses.34 For Charles Shirley, and others like him, Germantown’s charitable organizations provided youth with recreational activities and educational opportunities that they otherwise might not have enjoyed.

34 Charles Shirley, Jr., Germantown Resident, Interview by Author, July 27, 2010.
**Racial Segregation and Educational Inequality: The Philadelphia Story**

During the postwar period, Add B. Anderson, the Board of Education’s business manager, routinely drafted one-page budgets that barely met the school district’s operating needs. Anderson passed these budgets onto City Council, who often approved the budgets during private, closed-door sessions. Residents rarely knew how the Board of Education used their tax dollars. This culture extended beyond the business manager. In 1951, the school district decided to stop reporting the teacher-student ratio in its high school and the racial composition of the schools. Over times, these policies created problems in the city’s public schools and angered city residents, labor unions, and civil rights activists. In 1947, the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers union told the members of the Board of Education that Philadelphia youth lacked the skills necessary to compete in the labor market. The union members blamed Anderson and his colleagues’ meager budgets for creating overcrowded classrooms with too many pupils and not enough teachers.

In the postwar period, the school district’s total enrollment remained relatively stable, but the percentage of black students in public schools increased by 19%. African American students were much more likely to attend overcrowded, under resourced schools than their white peers because they did not enjoy the same housing options as white families. Anderson’s policies created a two-tier system of schools: one for black students and one for white students. Civil rights activists criticized the members of the

---

Board of Education for its refusal to address segregation in the city’s public schools and urged them to allocate the funding that the schools actually needed. On May 17, 1954, Thurgood Marshall and his team of accomplished lawyers, including Germantown High School’s William T. Coleman, Jr., won their landmark case, *Brown v. Board of Education*. Civil right activists praised the court’s decisions and hoped that Philadelphia might finally integrate its public schools. However, when the Supreme Court issued its ruling, the members of the Board of Education told the city that they wanted to study the levels of segregation before they implemented any reforms. Their response galvanized the civil rights leaders into organizing a larger movement to desegregate the city’s public schools. These leaders refused to remain silent. They wanted change now.

In Germantown, white residents, who had moved to the community because of its reputable public schools, raised concerns about the location of their children’s elementary schools. According to residents, their main concern was that many of the schools were located near busy intersections or train crossings, which made the commute to and from school dangerous for young children. For example, Kim Hirschman, a white woman who moved to Germantown in the early 1950s and
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41 Floyd Logan, *President’s Annual Report*, April 18, 1955, Educational Equality League Collection, TUA.
graduated from Germantown High School in 1960, recalled that the racially mixed Emlen School was the closest elementary school to her home. Her parents and their neighbors were worried about their children walking to and from school because the Reading Railroad was situated between their homes and the Emlen School. These concerned parents formed a committee to pressure the school district into building a new school for their children. School officials agreed to their request and opened the Day School in 1952. In others, the school district built new schools in these new predominately white communities to ensure that white families had predominately white schools for their children. As historian Michael Clapper shows, these new schools served several purposes: they alleviated overcrowding at the older schools, satisfied the demands of concerned parents, and created an increasingly segregated system of public elementary schools.42

As the segregation in the elementary schools intensified, the Germantown Community Council’s Human Relations Committee sponsored a series of community wide conversations to discuss the level of segregation in the community’s elementary schools. The committee also asked school district officials to provide them with a map indicating the community’s elementary school boundaries and each school’s racial demographics. During these meetings, most of the residents agreed that segregation existed—several white residents admitted that used the school district’s transfer policy to bypass the school that was closest to their homes so that their children could attend predominately white schools. African American families, on the other hand, had to send their children to overcrowded, segregated schools. When they tried to transfer their

children, school district officials routinely refused their requests. Instead of challenging the school district directly, the Human Relations Committee formed a sub-committee, with black and white members, to study the nature of segregation more deeply. The committee members pledged to examine the school district’s transfer policy, which they believed, exacerbated school segregation throughout Germantown. Even though the members knew that this study would be time-consuming, they urged residents to be patient and promised to approach school district officials once they understood the nature and extent of segregation in Germantown’s elementary schools.

The residents were particularly concerned about the racial shifts that had occurred at the Emlen School when the Day School opened in 1952. These concerns reached a new pitch when the committee invited Dr. Harry Giles, the director of New York University’s Human Relations Study Center, to address Germantown residents. Several days before the meeting, Dr. Edward T. Myers, Germantown’s regional superintendent, briefed Giles on the community’s challenges stating that Germantown had been considered “a high class residential area” for decades. After the war, the community had witnessed several demographic shifts as the community’s older, white families moved out and African American families moved in, which Myers argued,
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44 Bonnie Marglous, Human Relations Committee Meeting Notes, December 6, 1955, Box 54, Folder 44 Gtn. Human Relations Committee, 1953-57, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Letter from Roger Scattergood, Chairman on the Sub-committee on Education, Box 54, Folder 45, Human Relations Comm. (1955-56), Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Nathaniel Morgan, Minutes of the Education Sub-committee, January 12, 1956, Box 54, Folder 45, Human Relations Comm. (1955-56), Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; See also, Minutes of the Human Relations Committee, February 25, 1956, Box 54, Folder 44 Gtn. Human Relations Committee, 1953-57, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
created segregated schools in the community “due to geography.” Myers failed to tell Giles that segregated schools had always existed in Germantown.

When Giles spoke, he told the residents to study the situation, to organize community wide events, and to plan for short and long-term goals that promoted integration. When he finished speaking, the event organizers urged the audience to ask questions. Even though the organizers said that they wanted to have an open discussion, they selected questions that residents submitted earlier to focus the discussion on tolerance and acceptance of others rather than the community’s shortcomings around integration. For example, the organizers allowed residents to ask questions about how to raise children to be tolerant citizens. They did not allow residents to ask questions about the levels of school segregation in the community. For example, residents were not permitted to ask “How can children in the Day School gain knowledge of different kinds of people when it is 98% Jewish?” or “How can we as parents give our children knowledge of different kinds of people in day-to-day contact when their school—Emlen—has gone from 40% to 95% colored in three years?” The organizers omitted these questions from the discussion because they wanted to focus on racial harmony and fellowship rather than school segregation in the community. Ignoring the problems only increased the levels of segregation and inequality between these two schools.

Several months later, representatives from over 20 neighborhood associations, civic groups, and religious groups drafted a plan to end school segregation in Germantown’s elementary schools. These representatives argued that while some of the
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45 Letter from Edward T. Myers, Superintendent, District 6, to Dr. Harry H. Giles, Director of the Human Relations Study Center, March 13, 1956, Box 22, Folder 45, “Preparing Children for Living in Our Community Conf.” (April 1956) & Follow Up Conference (October 1956), Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
46 A Conference of Community Organizations in Germantown and Mt. Airy.” April 19, 1956, Box 4, Folder 17 J-Miscellaneous, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; List of Unanswered Questions, Box 22, Folder 45, “Preparing Children for Living in Our Community Conf.” (April 1956) & Follow Up Conference (October 1956), Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
segregation could be attributed to residential segregation, they knew that there were “children living in the same area [of Germantown], sometimes in the same block, who go in one direction to the school if they are white and in another direction if they are colored.” Most of their discussion focused on the transformation of the Emlen elementary school from a racially mixed school to a predominately African American school even though it was located in racially mixed residential area. They attributed this transformation to several factors. They blamed the school district for excluding an all-white neighborhood when they drew new boundaries for Emlen and for appointing black teachers to the school— the residents contended that white families assumed that black teachers only worked at black schools and transferred their children out of Emlen. Finally, the residents argued that white families were more likely to ask for “student transfers,” which the school district offered, than black families. They believed that this practice was not racist, per se, rather they suggested that the families that requested transfers “would accept or welcome a neighborhood integrated school but do not wish to isolate their children” in all-black schools. The residents submitted their demands to school district officials. They wanted the school district to use its legal powers, granted by Brown v. Board of Education, to appoint a racially mixed faculty, redraw school boundary lines, and abolish the student transfer policy immediately.

Within a week, Dr. Myers, Germantown’s regional school superintendent, responded to the residents’ demands and told the press that he did not plan to integrate the schools. Myers argued that school segregation stemmed from residential
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47 William T. Coleman, Jr., Interview by Author, August 10, 2010.
segregation, and thus, the segregation was beyond the school district’s control. However, he did admit that the Emlen and Day School had experienced a shift in student enrollment. Emlen had become an all-black school; Day was an all-Jewish school. According to Myers, the only way to address this segregation was by transferring some students from the all-white Day School to all-black Emlen school and vice versa. This solution, he argued, forced integration onto the community. Even though the situation at Emlen and Day was not ideal, he was not interested in forcing a policy that many white residents would simply not support. When the representatives who drafted the integration plan heard Myers’s response, they were infuriated. Myers refused to admit that the schools were indeed segregated, and while he dodged the issue, the segregation in Germantown’s schools and the demands to end it continued to escalate.\footnote{Mercedes M. Dodds, Secretary of the Religious Community Council of Stenton, “Letter to the Editor,” \textit{Germantown Courier}, June 22, 1956, Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Meeting Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Human Relations Committee of Germantown, September 18, 1956, Box 54, Folder 44 Gtn. Human Relations Committee, 1953-57, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Letter to a Friend from Ruth L. Miller, Secretary of the Committee on School of the Religious Community Council of Stenton and the Emlen Federation of Civic Organizations, September 24, 1956, Enclosed, “A Statement for Better Integrated Schools in Philadelphia,” Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.}

Even though residents tried to sustain the demands, school district officials staunchly opposed measures to desegregate the city’s schools. In 1958, two events occurred in the community’s schools—one at a private school and another at a public school—which inadvertently diverted attention away from the discussion about school segregation. After careful consideration, Germantown Academy’s Board of Trustees announced that it had decided to move the prestigious private school from its current location in the heart of Germantown to a new campus on a 160-acre estate in Fort Washington, Pennsylvania, a quiet suburb ten miles beyond the city’s limits. The school had been in Germantown since its founding in 1759, but as its bicentennial anniversary approached, the trustees argued that the academy needed open space to expand its
academic and recreational facilities. The school’s decision to move out of the area raised concerns among business owners who worked near the school original site and upper and middle class families who had relied on the community’s private schools for their children’s education.\textsuperscript{50}

As the community adjusted to this news, reports surfaced about an incident at the all-black John T. Emlen elementary school. On October 28, 1958, an unidentified man walked into the school and molested a seven-year-old black girl in the school’s lavatory. After the incident occurred, the young girl told her teacher what had happened, but the teacher ignored her concerns and dismissed her from school at lunchtime. When the young girl arrived home, she told her father what had occurred. He immediately took her back to school and demanded to speak to the principal. The principal told him that she did not believe the child’s accusations and asked him to wait in the office. It was her lunch hour. She did not want to be interrupted. He did not wait. He called the police, and based on their advice, he admitted his daughter to the hospital to verify her accusations. The doctors confirmed her story. She had been sexually assaulted.\textsuperscript{51}

Two weeks later, the Emlen Home and School Association held a meeting to discuss what had happened at the school. Over one hundred individuals came to the meeting to voice their frustrations with the conditions at the school and the principal’s response to the assault. The principal attended the meeting and told listeners that she was not allowed to speak about the incident in public. The parents were outraged, and so, they organized the Emlen School Protest Committee. The committee drafted a

\textsuperscript{50} Michael Clapper, “The Constructed World of Postwar Philadelphia Area Schools: Site Selection, Architecture, and the Landscape of Inequality” (University of Pennsylvania, 2008), 35.

petition that called for the immediate removal of the Emlen School principal. Emlen parents and teachers signed the petition and urged the Board of Education to act.\textsuperscript{52}

School district officials cited the principal’s fine record of over 40 years of service to the Philadelphia public schools and refused to remove her. The committee continued its campaign and enlisted the support of the NAACP. It urged local organizations and newspapers to support the protests and publicize what had happened. The black press and the Daily News covered the events; however, the Germantown Community Council, the community’s engine of social change, refused to take a stance on the issue.\textsuperscript{53} Even though the members of the committee were frustrated with the GCC’s decision, many of them were not surprised. It was not the first time that the GCC had refused to support civil rights initiatives in the community. The committee continued its drive and gathered date to support their cause—the principal, members argued, had made several racist remarks about the community, such as telling her teachers that “the neighborhood went downhill the moment black residents moved in, and that she counseled white families out of the school. Furthermore, they highlighted other assaults that had occurred at the school, but unlike this incident, had never been reported.\textsuperscript{54} Still, school district officials refused to remove her.\textsuperscript{55} However, the committee had made her job unbearable, and on


\textsuperscript{53}Letter to Judith Lynn Coles from John F. Gummere, November 20, 1958, Box 50, Folder 8, Emlen School Assn. Clippings, 1958-59, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.


January 13, 1959, Miss A. Reaga Mullen, the Emlen School principal, announced her retirement. The black residents who created and belonged to the Emlen School Protest Committee had finally won. However, the publicity surrounding the incident and these protests shocked the community and raised new concerns about the safety of Germantown’s elementary schools, black and white. Moreover, this campaign distracted these activists from the movement to desegregate its public schools. By 1959, almost five years after the passage of *Brown v. Board*, Germantown’s elementary schools were deeply segregated, and within time, this segregation affected its junior and senior high schools.

**The Educational Marketplace Continues to Offer a Range of Schooling Options in the Postwar Period**

As residents focused on segregation in the elementary schools, Germantown families continued to take advantage of the school district’s open enrollment policy where families, at least in theory, could register their children at any neighborhood high school in the school district. The elite high schools, the all-male Central High School and the all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls, on the other hand, were only open to students who met the rigorous entrance requirements. In 1950, the all-female, elite Philadelphia High School for Girls had a significantly higher percentage of black youth than Germantown High School (p < 0.02), but the all-male, elite Central High School did not. Simon Gratz High School had a significantly higher percentage of black youth than Germantown High School while Olney High School had a significantly lower percentage of black youth than Germantown High School (see figure 5.2, p’s < 0.001, chi-square test of independence).
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56 “Emlen’s Principal Quitting January 31; Center of Furor,” *Philadelphia Tribune*, January 13, 1959.
The youth who attended the elite schools generally lived in the predominately African American communities in the center of the city and outlying areas, such as the neighborhoods near the University of Pennsylvania in West Philadelphia (see figure 5.3). The data in the map also indicate that Germantown boys were much more likely to attend the city’s elite schools than Germantown girls. The differences in the racial compositions in the neighborhood high schools were often related to the school district’s open enrollment policy. In 1950, several families leveraged this policy to send their children to Germantown High School instead of Simon Gratz High School even though Gratz was technically their neighborhood high school (see figure 5.4). As figure 5.5 shows, African American families who lived in Gratz’s catchment area were much more

---

likely to use the school district’s open enrollment policies than white families in these neighborhoods.
Figure 5.3

Germantown High School & Elite High Schools Graduates, June 1950

Figure 5.4

Germantown High School & Neighborhood High School Graduates, 1950

Source: Germantown High School Yearbook, June 1950; Olney High School Yearbook, 1950; Simon Gratz High School Yearbook.
Germantown High School, Residence, Youth by Race, Percentage Non-White Residents by Census Tract, Philadelphia, 1950

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June, 1950; U.S. Census Bureau, 1950.
Meeting the Needs of a “Modern Generation Living in an Modern Era”

When the war finally ended, government officials and educational experts urged American youth to leave their wartime positions and return to high school. These youth, the officials and experts argued, had served their duty to the nation, and now, they should give their job to a GI in need of work, return to high school, and finish their degrees.58 However, American youth refused to leave the labor market.59 Many of them admitted that they liked going to work more than going to school. Many needed the money to support their families. Others had become accustomed to having their own income and wanted the money to pay for consumable goods and recreational activities. During the war, American youth could easily find positions in wartime industries. These positions offered worked union protection and decent wages, which made them much more desirable than the limited employment options that American youth had enjoyed in the past. Once the war ended, the labor market was saturated with veterans who were looking for work and other workers who wanted to find work with the benefits that the wartime industries had provided. As these individuals competed for employment, American youth were forced out of the industrial factories and into service positions in local restaurants and retail stores. While these positions offered more flexible hours, service work had lower hourly wages and less union protection.60 In 1946, Germantown local civic leaders raised concerns about this shift and urged local businesses to hire

Germantown youth. Even though the youth might have appreciated this gesture, it did little to alleviate the problem. There were simply too many individuals looking for work.

As these shifts in the labor market occurred, social scientists, educational researchers, and prominent journalists published a series of books and articles about the escalating rate of youth who left high school without a degree. One study suggested that in 1943-44 70% of American youth attended high school, but that only 40% of those who attended high school actually graduated. In article after article, the authors argued that these youth left early because the high school’s academically focused curricula had little relevance to their futures. This had to change. In May 1945, one month after the war ended, these individuals gathered to discuss the future of the American high school.

Near the end of this gathering, Dr. Charles A. Prosser, a well-known educator, suggested that high schools should prepare 20% of their students for college, 20% of their students for skilled trades, and 60% of their students for life beyond high school. Prosser’s plan provided these 60% with life adjustment training, which was a combination of vocational and social training to help students adjust to adult living. Supporters rallied around this plan. They believed that it fit neatly with the idea of equality of opportunity, offered youth attractive options to lure them off the labor market and into school, and granted local schools the authority to create individualized programs to meet student needs in
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the postwar period. Prosser’s 20-20-60 plan split American youth, including those at Germantown High School, into distinct groups limiting the opportunities for non-academic youth and increasing inequality in these institutions. As this happened, Germantown youth challenged the legitimacy and value of their high school credential as well as the school traditions and organizations that had sustained the institution’s reputation for decades.

In 1947, an editorial appeared in the school newspaper that echoed the national conversation about the American high school curriculum. According to the author, Germantown High School’s academic curriculum with its emphasis on the 3Rs did not reflect the needs of a “modern generation living in a modern era.” Germantown faculty responded to this critique by expanding the curriculum to meet the needs of this modern generation and to entice early school leavers to stay in high school until they graduated. By 1950, the high school offered eight distinct curricular programs: academic, commercial, distributive education, industrial, mechanical arts, music, agriculture, and vocational arts. High school faculty augmented these changes with new elective courses that emphasized vocational skills, such as a distributive education program where students worked part-time in a retail store during the school day; a clerical practice course where students practiced clerical skills in class; and several health care courses where students developed skills as X-ray technicians and nurses.

66 “Germantown Presents a Variety of Courses,” Cliveden Clipper, February 2, 1950; Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June, 1950, Germantown High School Archives.
Germantown High School also restructured and expanded its guidance program to provide youth with the support to select the appropriate program, graduate from high school, and plan for their postsecondary futures. From the moment Germantown High School students entered the building, they were bombarded with messages about the importance of meeting with their guidance counselors to select the course of study that most closely matched their academic attitude and vocational interests. To meet the ever-increasing demands on the school’s guidance counselors, the administration increased Germantown’s guidance staff from one counselor in 1941 to five counselors in 1947. In 1949, the administrators split the counseling staff into four distinct groups: the first group assisted students with general programs, the second group worked on course schedules, the third group provided students with vocational information, and the final group focused on college placement for the academic students. While this new organization might have made advising students easier for the school’s guidance counselors, it created a hierarchical structure that increased inequality among students by limiting college counseling to the academic students. The expansion of the high school curriculum, elective courses, and counseling staff reflected the characteristics of a modern, comprehensive high school and further fractured the high school into distinct groups and increased inequality among its students.


Rosalie August, a white woman who graduated from the high school in 1949, remembered that the youth who attended Germantown High School were “very carefully tracked” when the war ended. According to Rosalie, the high school faculty offered the academic program for youth who planned to attend college, the industrial arts program for youth who wanted to learn a skilled trade, and the commercial program for “smart girls whose families did not want to send them to college.” As a student, Rosalie felt that her high school felt like a fragmented institution with a small group of Jewish youth; a large group of Protestant youth; and a tiny group of African American youth. Rosalie enrolled in the academic program in high school because she knew that her parents wanted her to attend college when she graduated. She remembered interacting with non-academic students during her homeroom period; however, she never saw the students who enrolled in the industrial arts programs because their courses were held in a separate part of the building. As she said, in the late 1940s, Germantown High School seemed like a “traditional comprehensive school” where students were tracked into distinct courses and interacted mainly with individuals from their own ethnic and racial backgrounds.

As the school introduced these new programs and electives, Germantown faculty and students raised concerns that Germantown’s academic reputation had deteriorated. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, school administrators and guidance counselors reminded students about the availability of college scholarships. They urged students to take advantage of citywide job fairs with local businessmen and military recruiters to explore vocational options. In 1947, the high school even hired a job placement

---

counselor to help students find part-time work. Faculty led several vocational clubs, such as the Future Teachers of America club, where students discussed their career aims with one another. Yet, even with these initiatives, the school community—administrators, faculty, and students—worried that the students had not achieved the same levels of academic success as their predecessors. Fewer and fewer students won citywide and local scholarships. Many argued that the competition for these awards had increased as high school and college enrollment swelled making it more difficult for Germantown students to win. Furthermore, local clubs had sponsored many of these scholarships in the past. For example, Germantown’s Haverford and Bryn Mawr College sponsored specific scholarships for Germantown High School graduates. After the war, as alumni moved to the suburbs, these clubs closed and ended the local scholarships that many Germantown students had enjoyed in the past.

While students worried about their peers’ inability to win scholarships, Germantown faculty were increasingly worried about students who lacked basic reading skills. As the concerns mounted, Germantown administrators hired two reading specialists to help students who were struggling with their coursework. To encourage students to use their services, the teachers decorated their room with comfortable

---
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reading tables and chairs rather than traditional desks and purchased popular books that they thought the students might enjoy more than their Shakespeare and Milton. The reading specialists reminded teachers and students that they were available to meet with students before and after school to assess their needs.\textsuperscript{76} In addition to these services, the members of the national honor society provided free after school tutoring to students who needed extra support.\textsuperscript{77}

Despite these changes, in 1950, the majority of graduates still selected the academic program (46\%) followed by the commercial program (35\%). Between 1940 and 1950, the percentage of youth who enrolled in the academic program had decreased by 13\% while the percentage of youth who selected the commercial program stayed the same. Among female graduates, the commercial course was the most popular followed by the academic course. The percentage of female youth who selected the academic program decreased by 13\% while the percentage of female youth who chose the commercial program increased 8\% from 1940 to 1950. The percentage of female youth who enrolled in a vocational program—vocational arts or music—rose slightly. Unlike the female students, the academic program remained the most popular followed by the vocational courses—industrial and mechanical arts—and the commercial program. The percentage of male youth in the academic program increased by 9\% while the percentage of male youth in the commercial program decreased by 260\% between 1940 and 1950. Finally, during this period, the percentage of male youth who selected the vocational courses rose by 86\% (see figure 5.6). When using a multinomial regression to control for


other variables, female youth were less likely to enroll in the academic program than male youth in 1950 ($p < 0.001$).

**Figure 5.6** *Course Enrollment by Gender, Germantown High School, 1950*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Study</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June 1950, GHS.*

In addition to these differences, the academic program still remained the most popular option among white graduates (46%) followed by the commercial program (35%). Between 1940 and 1950, the percentage of white youth who enrolled in the academic program decreased by 12% while the percentage of white youth who selected the commercial program remained the same. Black youth reflected these trends—49% of the 1950 graduates selected the academic program while 38% of the graduates selected the commercial program. The percentage of black youth who enrolled in the academic program decreased by 27% whereas the percentage of black youth who chose the
commercial program increased by 46% from 1940 to 1950. Moreover, there are stark differences between black male and black female enrollment. Between 1940 and 1950, the percentage of black males in the academic program remained the same (67% in each cohort), but the percentage of black females in the academic program dropped by 33% (see figure 5.7).

**Figure 5.7 Course Enrollment by Race & Gender, Germantown High School, 1950**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Study</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of Study</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June 1950, GHS.

Like earlier trends, these curricular shifts reflected the cultural and economic changes that occurred during the postwar period. In 1940, women represented 41% of
the nation’s college graduates, but by 1950, this figure had dropped to 24%.\textsuperscript{78} This shift is related, at least in part, to the veterans who used their GI benefits to attend college when they returned from the war. In addition to the influx of veterans, in the late 1940s and early 1950s, cultural critics and educational experts wrote several articles about the dangers of higher education for American women. College-educated women, these authors argued, were prone to developing intellectual capacities that were often unattractive to male suitors or at odds with the cultural norms of the happy housewife who did not need a college education to perform her duties. These articles also warned about the promiscuous sexual lives of college women, which these critics warned, often made it difficult for these women to find husbands later in life. In other words, women needed to focus on their lives on the marriage market, not the labor market.\textsuperscript{79}

Even though these new course options hardened the lines of inequality, oral history evidence suggests that Germantown High School simultaneously challenged and reproduced the structural inequalities that often blocked educational and economic advancement among women and African American youth. According to Max Weber, legitimacy is linked to a willingness among a group of subordinates to willingly comply with the rules and expectations that the superordinates have established.\textsuperscript{80} In this way, legitimacy can be measured by the willingness of Germantown youth to meet the expectations that the faculty have set for them. In the postwar period, Germantown faculty had two aims for their students. For the academic students, they expected that these youth would attend college when they graduated. However, they only expected


that non-academic students to graduate from high school. Postsecondary schooling, in other words, was a luxury reserved for a select group. The institution had legitimacy for those youth who willingly complied with these expectations. However, many youth refused to comply with these expectations and challenged the legitimacy and value of the education that they received at Germantown High School.

Vincenza (Iannuzzi) Cerrato, the daughter of two Italian immigrants who graduated from Germantown High School in 1949, lived a few blocks from the high school on 473 E. Mechanic Street. Her father worked as a stonemason and built many of the homes in Rosalie August’s West Oak Lane neighborhood; her mother worked as a storekeeper until she had children, and then she did piecework for wealthy women in Germantown’s Chestnut Hill community. Neither of her parents finished high school. As a child, Vincenza attended the Catholic school attached to Germantown’s Italian Holy Rosary Church until fourth grade when she begged her mother to let her transfer to the Fulton School, a public school in her neighborhood. Like Rosalie, Vincenza attended Roosevelt Junior High School, and eventually, Germantown High School where she enrolled in the commercial course with many of the young girls from her neighborhood. According to Vincenza, the commercial course made sense for Italian girls because “the Italian people didn’t educate a girl, they thought it was useless, you know, it wasn’t important because a girl was going to get married.” That is exactly what Vincenza did. Shortly after high school, she married her childhood sweetheart, an Italian man who lived in her neighborhood. Within a few years, she had several children and moved to the suburbs. As a commercial student and the daughter of two Italian immigrants, neither her family nor the Germantown faculty expected her to go to college. Vincenza willingly complied with the expectations that her family and her high school had
established for her, and thus, she thought the education that she received at Germantown High School was valuable and legitimate.81

As the civil rights movement gained momentum in Philadelphia and beyond, Germantown youth continued to challenge the racism that existed in their high school and community. For black students, the racism that they experienced as Germantown High School students clearly influenced their memories of their high school experience. However, their willingness to comply with the expectations that the faculty set for them were directly linked to the personal support that the faculty provided to these students. Like their predecessors, the level of support that they received was often related to their class background. In the late 1940s and 1950s, upper and middle class black youth still benefitted from more faculty support than their working class peers.

Adrienne Valentine Morrison was one of the few of black graduates in Germantown High School’s June 1951 class who lived in Germantown’s Mt. Airy neighborhood, a middle class community located a few blocks north of the high school. As a child, Adrienne attended Emlen Elementary School, which she described as an “excellent school.” Her teachers noticed her academic skills at an early age and ensured that she had challenging work at school. When her mother had emergency surgery, Adrienne recalled her kindergarten teacher’s kindness as she tried to assure Adrienne that her mother would be fine. Even though she thought she received a good education at Emlen, it was far from perfect. In second grade, Adrienne remembered that she was one of the only black children in her class. Every Friday afternoon, her teacher gathered her students for story time. The children brought in their favorite books and read them together. However, every week, the teacher read Little Black Sambo at the end of story

81 Vincenza (Iannuzzi) Cerrato, Germantown High School Graduate Class of 1949, Interview by Author, June 29, 2011.
time. Adrienne hated this activity. Every time her teacher read the book, Adrienne’s classmates laughed at her and the other black children in her classroom. Adrienne knew the book was inaccurate. Her parents had taught her that at home, but she still had to sit in her classroom quietly and listen to it. Even though she hated this class and the racism she had to endure, she still believes that the Emlen School, which was a mixed race school when Adrienne attended it, gave her the academic skills to help her succeed in school.

When she finished Emlen, Adrienne attended Roosevelt Junior High School, and eventually, Germantown High School where she continued to experience racism. In her junior year, Adrienne became a member of Germantown High School’s national honor society program. She recalled that the teacher who led the society “looked at me as if I were a pane of a glass.” The teacher, who Adrienne described as “the only one who was overtly racist,” never spoke to her. She “looked annoyed” that Adrienne was there. Adrienne recalled that when it was time for the society’s annual dinner she told her mother that the school was having dinner to celebrate the achievement of the society’s members. Her mother looked at her and asked her why she was not dressed for the occasion. Adrienne told her mother that she did not want to attend the dinner. She had to tolerate this racist teacher during the day, but that she did not have to tolerate her during her free time. In response, her mother turned to her and said, “You earned the honor. You are going.” Adrienne devised another plan. She would get dressed for the dinner, leave the house, walk out of her mother’s sight, go to her friend’s house, and arrive at the high school when she thought dinner would be over. Her mother must have suspected something because she offered to walk her young daughter to the high school, which according to Adrienne, she rarely did.
The dinner was held at Pelham Manor, which Adrienne remembered, was “very, very exclusive.” She let her mother walk her to the dinner club. On the way, Adrienne thought of another way to escape: she would wait until her mother had left, and then, quietly sneak out of the building and visit her friend’s house. But, when she arrived, her mother stood at the bottom of the steps with her arms crossed, which Adrienne interpreted as, “I dare you,” and waited for her daughter to enter the dining room. Before she entered the room, a senior, a white girl, came to the door and said, “Adrienne, I’m so glad that you are here.” Adrienne recalled that this young woman introduced her to senior members and stayed with her until she was completely comfortable at the event. Adrienne turned around to say goodbye to her mother, but she had already left. Adrienne’s mother wanted her daughter to attend the dinner because she knew that her daughter had worked diligently to earn those academic accolades. At the dinner, the teacher who led the society never spoke to her. She was the only black student at the event.

Even though this experience clearly shaped her memories of Germantown High School, Adrienne still described her high school as a wonderful place largely because Dr. Virginia Raacke, the school guidance counselor, identified Adrienne as a promising student. When Adrienne entered the school, Raacke placed her in the elite, accelerated academic course. A few months after school started, Raacke asked Adrienne to meet with her to discuss her future. In the meeting, Raacke complemented Adrienne for her strong academic record and told her that she wanted her to maintain her record so that she could attend Bryn Mawr College. Adrienne recalled that Dr. Raacke supported her throughout high school by protecting her from racism at the high school and providing her with opportunities that many students never had. According to Adrienne, “I was Dr. Raacke’s girl.” She remembered that many of her teachers knew that Dr. Raacke
protected her. Even though many of the teachers were racist, Adrienne believes that they acted differently around her because they did not want to “mess up Dr. Raacke’s student.” She remembered that Raacke “found out very quickly” that Adrienne “loved a challenge” and provided her with opportunities that many students never had. She urged Adrienne to participate in the National Honors Society, the Fellowship Club, and the Schools Community Council.

In high school, Dr. Raacke selected Adrienne to be Germantown High School’s representative for the American Friends workweek in North Philadelphia. Adrienne recalled that David Richie, who led the camp, “opened our eyes to the real world” of poverty and racism that middle class children, like Adrienne, had never experienced. The youth helped paint and plaster homes, visited a homeless women’s shelter, observed Philadelphia court hearings, and ate breakfast with homeless men. Adrienne remembered David Richie telling the students that they had to sit at separate tables and eat the breakfast that the men ate. She recalled, “it was rough keeping it [the food] down. It was so terrible. And they were gulping it up as it was Le-Bec Fin.” Richie wanted the youth to see different religions. They visited Rabbi Cherry, a prominent religious leader in Germantown, and Adrienne, who had never been outside of her church, thought the experience at the synagogue “was lovely.” This experience shaped Adrienne’s future.

After graduating from Germantown High School, Adrienne attended Temple University on a scholarship, and eventually, enrolled in Bryn Mawr’s School of Social Work even

---

though she did not think she “belonged” in Bryn Mawr’s exclusive Philadelphia Main Line community. When she completed her studies, she worked tirelessly to desegregate the social work staff at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and Germantown Hospital where she encountered the same racism that she had experienced as a member of Germantown High School’s National Honor Society.83

While Adrienne Morrison believed that her experience at Germantown High School and the mentorship she received from Dr. Raacke helped her succeed after she graduated, many African American students did not share her sentiments about their high school. The data in this chapter suggest that most black graduates in the 1950 class enrolled in the academic program. However, oral history evidence indicates that the majority of black students who attended the high school selected non-academic courses. Some of these classes, such as the industrial arts and mechanical arts programs, were located in separate parts of the building, isolated from the academic programs. Many of these students never graduated from high school because they did not believe that their education was legitimate.84 Many of the black students in the non-academic programs left high school early, which helps to explain the discrepancy between the yearbook data, which only included the course enrollment for Germantown graduates, and the oral history evidence, which suggest that many youth, particularly African American male youth, left school early.

Ernest Cuff was one of these black students who challenged the legitimacy of his education and left Germantown High School before he earned his degree. Like many of the other students in his class, Ernie was born and raised a few blocks from Germantown High School. His father, Arkie, worked in a local bakery and brought home leftover
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treats to his children each day; his mother, Esther, worked at home raising her children. As a young child, his family lived in one of the older homes at 522 W. Mt. Pleasant Street, which felt like “a rural setting.” The home had no indoor toilet, just an “outhouse that someone had enclosed on the back porch.” Eventually, his family moved into a “much bigger house” at 106 E. Sharpnack, in the heart of Germanton’s increasingly working class and increasingly African American neighborhood. In the late 1930s, Ernie attended the Emlen School with Adrienne Morrison, but unlike Adrienne, Ernie’s teachers “put me in a class with the dumb kids.” Ernie hated it. Rather than attending school, he simply “skipped it. I went off into the woods and goofed around, sometimes, I got into trouble. I wasn’t a school person.”

He went to Roosevelt Junior High School, and eventually Germantown High School where his guidance counselor placed him in the industrial course with many of the other working class boys from his neighborhood. Ernie recalled that he did not select the academic course “because that was more for whites. I knew I could do it, but the incentive was not there.” Even though he did not want to be in the academic course, he remembered that he always loved to learn new things and wanted to excel in school. In high school, he used his own money to purchase a drawing board and T-square to practice his skills at home. He remembered his math teacher, Ms. Duffy, who defied school policy and taught trigonometry to her all-black industrial class. According to Ernie, when she started these lessons, none of the students knew what to do because most of them had never taken algebra or geometry. To his delight, Ernie excelled at this work, and eventually, he began to tutor his peers in class. However, after a few weeks, Ms. Duffy told her students that they would not be learning trigonometry anymore. Ernie believed that the school administrator punished Ms. Duffy for teaching her students these advanced skills because after she made that announcement “she was
never the same.” He described Ms. Duffy as a patient teacher who worked tirelessly to give her students access to the academic skills she thought they needed.

When I asked Ernie if there were other teachers like Ms. Duffy, who taught him the skills typically reserved for academic students, he looked directly at me, and with a touch of bitterness and anger, he said, “No. She was the only one, male or female.”

Ernie argued that his other teachers did not provide him or his peers with the skills that they needed for the labor market or college placement. He recalled a lesson where the teacher gave his students a steel block and told them to use a hand-held file to make angles on the four sides of the block. Ernie described this activity as “stupid and pointless.” He knew there were machines in factories that did this work. According to Ernie, Germantown High School faculty barred African American students from many of the educational opportunities that their white peers enjoyed. He said it was impossible for black students to earn As and Bs. It was impossible for them to be academically successful. Several months before he was supposed to graduate, a high school administrator approached Ernie and suggested that he leave school with a high school certificate. He knew that a high school certification had no value. As he said, the certification “meant nothing…it was just a piece of paper to keep you quiet…to pacify you.”

Ernie’s parents wanted him to graduate from high school. They urged him to be patient and “wait” for racism to end because they did not believe he “could fight the system on his own.” He refused to comply with their demands, and instead of taking the certificate, Ernie dropped out of high school and entered the army. He did not believe his education was legitimate because he knew it was not preparing him to be successful after graduation. According to Ernie, at the time, he did not really understand why he was being treated differently. He was a kid and did not really recognize racism. He just
knew that he wanted the pain to end, and so, he dropped out of high school. Over sixty years later, he does not really regret this decision. Even though dropping out of high school made his life more difficult, he did not want to cope with the virulent racism that he experienced at the high school. He entered the Korean War as a member of the army. When he returned to Philadelphia, he earned his G.E.D. and worked in a variety of different sectors during his lifetime.85

The Foundation that Had Sustained the School for Decades Crumbles

During the late 1940s and 1950s, Germantown students still collected class dues and sponsored school-wide fundraising campaigns to raise funds for school activities and programs. The Booster’s Club urged students to purchase athletic tickets to defray the expenses associated with the school’s athletic teams and to increase attendance at the school’s sporting events.86 The student association and school senate encouraged their peers to pay their assessment taxes. The senate used these taxes to purchase new uniforms for band members and the cheerleading squad, to support the United Fund, and to provide supplies to schools in war-torn regions of Europe and economically depressed regions in the South.87 Germantown students even donated their time volunteering to repair homes throughout the community and worked with other high
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school students from Simon Gratz and Benjamin Franklin High School to research urban renewal ideas in the city. On several occasions, Germantown High School won citywide accolades for leading the city’s high schools in charitable fundraising and community service.

Despite these efforts, the levels of funds that the students raised barely met the school’s needs. First, donating funds to war-torn Europe and poverty-stricken parts of the South diverted funds from the school. Second, Germantown High School students voiced their opposition to many of the fundraising campaigns arguing that these campaigns only helped a select group of students. They believed that the booster’s club and school senate were undemocratic organizations that collected funds and allocated these funds as they wished without asking the student body what they wanted. As a result, many students refused to donate. The private funding that had supported the school’s clubs and activities for decades ended.

The concerns that students raised went beyond fundraising. In the postwar period, students worried that the student participation rate in the school’s clubs and activities had dropped. On March 4, 1947, one student wrote an editorial entitled, *Why*

---


Can't We Win?, which discussed the school’s lackluster athletic teams. The baseball team only won seven of its 14 games; the basketball team only won two of its 17 games. When the editorialist interviewed the coaches of these teams about their difficulties, the coaches argued that students were too interested in personal glory, too sensitive to criticism, and too busy to participate. The editorialist encouraged his peers to participate in athletic activities as soon as they entered Germantown High School to help the school's teams improve their records.92

In addition to their concerns about the student participation rates, students were equally worried that the school did not have enough teachers to sponsor the clubs that they wanted. Between 1946 and 1958, Germantown High School experienced one of the highest teacher turnover rates in its history. These turnovers were due to retirements of teachers who had worked at the school for decades—such as Miss Edna Bramble, who retired in 1946 after working at Germantown since its founding in 1917; Dr. May Sutch, who retired in 1947 after 23 years at the school; and Miss Elizabeth Evans, who retired in 1948, and like Miss Bramble, had worked at the high school since its founding. In addition to the retirements, the school district routinely transferred Germantown teachers to other schools.93 Even though some individuals worried about the turnover rates, the high percentage of retirements and transfers provided school district officials with several cost-saving mechanisms. First, the new hires generally had less experience and fewer educational credentials than their predecessors, which meant that the school

district could offer the new teachers lower salaries. Second, the teacher turnovers gave the school district a way to increase class size and save costs. As teachers retired and transferred to other schools, Germantown High School administrators hired over 150 new teachers between 1946 and 1958. Unlike their predecessors, these new teachers were married and had families, which made it more difficult for them to stay after school and sponsor student clubs.

As students worried about the lack of participation in the school clubs and a shortage of teacher sponsors, several students raised new concerns about the school senate. In 1946, these students charged that the school senate hardly resembled a democracy since only a small, select group of students participated in it. The students argued that the homeroom representatives and officers rarely changed and that the senate rarely responded to student needs. In response, the school senate revised its election process. In the past, the school senate elected the members of the Committee of Ten (the senate’s governing body) and the senate president and vice-president. In 1946, the school senate drafted a new policy, and for the first time in the school’s history, the students elected these officers directly. The senate encouraged students to increase
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their participation in extra-curricular activities and placed a suggestion box in the school cafeteria for students to voice their concerns anonymously.97

Initially, many of the students applauded the school senate’s reforms. During lunch, several students used the suggestion box to voice their concerns. Some students urged the school senate to convince the school administration to let girls leave the school for lunch. Others wanted the senate to let the students play music in the lunchroom, to start a photography club in the school, and to purchase badges for the school’s student monitors.98 Even though the senate read these suggestions carefully and reported on them in the school newspaper, they rarely did anything with the suggestions that students made. For example, when the girls asked to have open lunches, the members of the senate stated that they did not have the authority to change the lunch policy.99 The senate did not deliver on its promises, and as a result, students continued to argue that the school senate seemed more like a “high and mighty clique” instead of democratically elected body.100

In 1948, several students intensified their critiques calling the school senate a dictatorship and urged immediate reform.101 The members of the school senate responded by creating more transparent campaigns, and for the first time in the school’s history, they hosted a public senate meeting to show students how the senate actually

operated. Even with these reforms, the school senate lost the power and influence that it once had. The students refused to participate in the school wide elections and to donate to the senate’s fundraisers. In 1949, administrations selected students to replace the members of the school senate as hallway and lunchroom monitors. The criticisms and erosion of power that the school senate experienced is related, at least in part, to the dramatic demographic shifts that occurred at Germantown High School during this period. Before the war, the high school served primarily upper and middle class white youth who had lived in the community for most of their life. In the postwar period, Germantown High School experienced an influx of new youth—middle class white youth like Rosalie August, working class white ethnics like Vincenza Cerrato, and African American youth like Adrienne Morrison and Ernie Cuff. Moreover, the war itself brought new ideas about the myriad shortcomings of democracy in this country. Germantown youth thought about the promises and limitations of democracy in their own school and realized that the school senate seemed more like a dictatorship than a democracy. These changes that occurred in society spilled into the school bringing newfound challenges and demands on organizations, like the school senate, which had existed in the high school since its founding.

**Germantown Girls Promote Modern Dating Rituals and Fashion Crazes**

As students challenged the power of the school senate, female students began to articulate new ideas about their roles in society and lives in high school. The postwar period was filled with cultural images of middle class women who willingly stayed at home to care for their families in their new suburban homes. Even though historians have demonstrated that many women did not conform to this image, Germantown High

---
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School administrators, faculty, and students often promoted the idea that June Cleaver had replaced Rosie the Riveter as the feminine ideal. In the postwar period, local companies published advertisements in the school’s newspaper to encourage girls to apply for short-term positions that they could do before they found the man of their dreams. These advertisements romanticized the appeal of careers that complemented a young woman’s feminine demeanor and gave them enough time to concentrate on more important things, such as finding a husband. For example, the school newspaper ran an advertisement for a 10-week modeling course where students learned the skills of “this proud, high-paid profession” and developed “the charm and poise” for a “successful business and social life.” To prove the success of the course, the advertisement had a photograph of June McAdams, winner of Miss Philadelphia in 1943, with her perfect up-do, gleaming teeth, glossy lips, and glistening pearls.

While local companies published these advertisements, female students wrote editorials and articles that suggested that they were not really interested in being June Cleaver, at least not in high school. These articles challenged the feminine ideals that these advertisements promoted by encouraging young women to be more assertive in their dating rituals and more daring with their clothing options. On January 20, 1948, Joyce Jasner published a poem in the school newspaper entitled, For Girls Only. In the second stanza of the poem, Jasner wrote:

If “weakly” you spend Saturday night
Wanting a man with all your might
Now is the time to reverse your fate
Go out and grab yourself a date!

---

If your fella doesn’t seem quite ready
To pop the question of going steady
Don’t be bashful; ask him yourself.
Otherwise you’ll be left on the shelf.

If you’ve got your eye on his senior prom,
You can’t make him ask you by dropping a bomb.
Start being tactful and turn on the charm.
A bit of hinting can’t do any harm.

The author wanted her peers to disregard what they had been taught about dating. If they wanted to date a particular man, she believed that young women should feel free to “ask him yourself” rather than wait idly for him to do it. Girls who waited for men to ask them on a date, Jasner argued, were often “left on the shelf.” At the same time, Jasner instructed her peers to use their charm to hint about what they wanted.106 This poem conformed to the traditional ideals of womanhood by reminding young women about the importance of finding a man to date, but at the same time, it challenged traditional ideals by encouraging Germantown girls to ignore gender norms and go after whatever they wanted.

While Jasner urged her peers to adopt new dating rituals, other girls published articles about fashion crazes that had surfaced at the high school during the postwar period. Articles appeared in the school newspaper describing women who exposed a bit more skin with their bikinis and Bermuda shorts or pushed the gender boundaries with their dungarees and men’s shirts. As these new trends surfaced at the high school and the community, Germantown girls expressed different opinions about the fashion crazes. Several girls criticized their peers’ decision to swap their flowing skirts and tailored cardigans for their rugged dungarees and men’s shirts. The critics argued that these new fashion crazes did not reflect the “frills and flowers” of future mothers. Rather, the

clothing that these women wore promoted their sexuality and masculinity. Historians have demonstrated that both women and men were actively challenging gender norms during the postwar period, and as this happened, Germantown girls reminded their peers of the potential dangers of these new fashion crazes—they were either too sexy or too masculine.¹⁰⁷

In 1952, Sandra Vetere, a Germantown student, warned her peers that they might be “easily mistaken for one of [their] beaus” if they replaced their feminine skirts and cashmere cardigans with masculine dungarees and untucked shirts.¹⁰⁸ A few years later, in 1953, Mary Lorenzo echoed these concerns stating that she simply could not understand why her peers wanted to “wear dirty dungarees with one pant leg rolled up higher than the other, with insane-looking patches stuck all over them, and a man’s shirt that, when the tails are worn outside, reach down to her knees.” Lorenzo told her peers that these clothes made them unattractive, and perhaps even worse, she believed that these clothes transformed her peers into tomboys who were more interested in climbing over school desks and showing boys that girls could ride their bicycles with their feet dangling over the handlebars just like the boys. Having expressed her disappointment, Lorenzo urged her peers to show their pride in their feminine side by wearing a comfortable skirt, a woman’s shirt, a luxurious cardigan with perfectly curled hair and light cosmetics.¹⁰⁹

Even though some girls urged their peers to resist the latest fashion crazes, other girls published articles in the school newspaper, which pointed out the appealing aspects of these new clothes. Although she agreed that these new trends made women look more like men, Lois Pearson told her peers that they should break with convention and adopt

¹⁰⁹ Mary Lorenzo, “To Be or Not to Be, a Girl,” The Cliveden Clipper, May 19, 1953.
these new trends. According to her, these masculine clothes and sexually provocative clothes were more comfortable and convenient for modern women. Even though they were not exactly the same message, Pearson encouraged her peers to adopt one of these styles to show that they were living the modern lifestyle. While she encouraged this, she reminded her peers that there were some risks associated with their decision to break with the past and sport these new trends. Pearson noted that she knows that many families forbid these clothes; girls who wear them, she argued, might find themselves in a heated debate with their mothers and fathers or might be jealous of their peers who are allowed to wear whatever they want. When they left their homes, there were other risks. Pearson told her peers that she had seen several elderly women glare at teenagers who pranced around Germantown wearing tight dungarees and men’s shirt. After listing the risks, Pearson turned to the benefits and suggested that when men see women in the latest fashions they often turn their heads and smile with approval.\textsuperscript{110}

In addition to the articles, students published cartoons that displayed the appeal of these new clothes. On April 12, 1951, the newspaper published a cartoon entitled, “Flapper: 1951’s idea of 1926,” which illustrated the difference between a female bathing suit from 1926 and the modern, bikini of the 1950s, which revealed much more to the observer than its outdated predecessor (see image).\textsuperscript{111} Several years later, the newspaper published another cartoon, which suggested that women who wore these new fashions were not exactly like their academic predecessors. The cartoon, entitled, “Studying for a Test,” included three women wearing the latest fashion crazes—Bermuda shorts, masculine loafers, and slim fitting pants. The staged scene, with a woman sitting on the floor, another on her bed, and a third fixing her hair at the vanity, suggest that female


\textsuperscript{111} “Flapper, 1951’s Idea of 1926,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, April 12, 1951.
students would rather lounge around and fix their hair than study for an academic exam. The cartoon had a clear message: young women at Germantown High School were more interested in fixing their hair than focusing on their academic work.112


As Germantown students weighed the benefits and dangers of these new fashion crazes, some students raised concerns that teenage consumption and material extravagance had gone too far. On April 17, 1956, the editor of the school newspaper wrote an editorial in which she stated that many girls in Germantown High School have the good fortune of owning “a stunning collection of cashmere sweaters and a different skirt for each day of the week.” These women argue that administrators should let students wear whatever they want. The editor stated that if she had the money that these girls had, then, she might agree with them. However, as she pointed out, this kind of clothing collection was beyond the reach of middle and working class families. When these girls saw their wealthier friends in luxurious wool frocks and plush silk lined coats, they rushed home to ask their families for money to buy new clothes. Their families usually denied their requests because they do not have enough money for these goods or because they did not subscribe to these modern ways. The author argued that this led to depression for these middle and working class girls resulting from the envy of the clothing and accessories of wealthy girls. Rather than creating factions, the author urged school administrators to adopt uniforms, like the parochial schools had. This, she argued, would end the “I’m rich, you’re poor” attitude in the school and would alleviate the pressures that many parents currently feel.\footnote{“Do School Clothes Matter,” \textit{Cliveden Clipper}, April 17, 1956.}

Vincenza (Ianuzzi) Cerrato, the daughter of two Italian immigrants who graduated from Germantown High School in 1948, recalled that she was not allowed to wear these new fashions, and even if she had been, her family could not have afforded to buy cashmere sweaters and fancy skirts. Her father, like most men in her extended
family was a stonemason. Cerrato and her mother made all of their clothes. Cerrato said that that was typical for the Italian girls who were her closest friends in high school. She often felt left out and knew that the others girls had more material goods than she did. She remembered a doctor’s daughter who went to the main shopping center in Germantown and seemed to have a new cashmere sweater and wool coat every week.  

While these new, modern fashions promoted freedom, they also hardened the lines of inequality by delineating the young women who had the financial means to wear these new material goods and those who did not.

As girls pushed the boundaries of dating and clothing norms, they also advocated for equality in the school, particularly the restrictions that the school administrators placed on their abilities to participate in competitive sports. Since its founding, Germantown High School administrators and faculty had sponsored competitive, interscholastic sports for boys only. Girls, they argued, were simply too weak both physical and mentally to endure the physical exertion and competitive nature of interscholastic sporting events, and as a result, the girls were only allowed to participate in intramural sporting teams with their Germantown peers. Even though the school maintained its policies, the complaints raised new awareness about gender inequality in the school.

**African American Youth Challenge the Idea that Segregation is a Southern Problem**

During the postwar period, Germantown High School administrators, faculty, and students tried to assure the school community that racism did not exist in their high school. The school sponsored an annual Friendship Week, which highlighted the contributions of African Americans to the nation and ended with a joint birthday

---

celebration for Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass. Dr. E. Snyder Thomas, the rector of the all-black St. Barnabas P.E. Church, hosted the event and urged interested students to participate. Students joined a variety of clubs, such as the Linguist Club and the International Club, which focused on cultivating “friendship and understanding among people” from different racial and cultural backgrounds. In addition to these school clubs, both black and white students attended programs at the Philadelphia Fellowship House with students from other schools and institutions throughout the city. Female students were much more likely to participate in these clubs than their male peers—in 1950, the linguists club had 15 girls and one boy; the fellowship club was all girls.116

The emphasis on fellowship and harmony increased after the passage of Brown v. Board of Education. In 1957, a student published an editorial entitled, “The Germantown Way,” which described the challenges of school integration in the South. In the editorial, the students assured Germantown students that they did not need to worry about school integration in their community. After all, Germantown was in the North, and those problems only existed in the South. The editorialist argued that Germantown High School students had always been allowed to participate in school activities regardless of their racial or religious background. The author went even further and argued that if a segregationist from the South visited Germantown High School he or she would be probably be “amazed to see Negro and white students laughing and learning together.” This friendship and cooperation between black and white students, she suggested, was just “the Germantown Way.”117

116 Germantown High School Yearbook, January 1950, Germantown High School Archives.  
The article that students published in the school newspaper and the images that they used in the school yearbooks gave the impression that the school was a harmonious place where black and white students mingled freely. Oral histories with several white students who attended the high school during this period supported this view. Many of these individuals insisted that the high school did not promote racism. They argued that black and white students cooperated with one another and that the school treated everyone equally.\textsuperscript{118} However, other oral histories from both black and white students challenge this view.\textsuperscript{119} Racism existed, but as one student suggested, it was “camouflaged.”\textsuperscript{120} In other words, it existed, but in a less overt way than the past. By insisting that racism was a southern problem, Germantown administrators, faculty, and students quietly ignored the challenges in their high school. African American students, on the other hand, could not ignore this racism. They experienced it on a daily basis in their high school and beyond. They had watched their country fight a war to preserve democracy abroad, and now, they were preparing to fight another battle to realize democracy at home. After the war, Germantown High School students echoed earlier calls to end racism in their high school.

In 1949, reports surfaced that the prom organizers had decided to seat the black and white students separately during dinner. The event, which was hosted at the exclusive Cedarbrook Country Club, commemorated the end of a student’s high school experience. Rosalie August, who graduated from Germantown High School in 1949, recalled that several black students staged protests in the school and community about the racism that they had experienced at the school prom.\textsuperscript{121} By the end of the month,

\textsuperscript{119} Rosalie August, Germantown High School Class of 1949, Interview by Author, May 10, 2009.
\textsuperscript{120} Anonymous, Germantown High School Class of 1958, Interview by Author, October 21, 2011.
\textsuperscript{121} Rosalie August, Germantown High School Class of 1949, Interview by Author, May 10, 2009.
Germantown Community Council’s Human Relations Committee, which was supposed to address racism in the community, had already responded to the prom incident internally to avoid a public discussion about what had happened at the school prom and other forms of racism at the high school.\textsuperscript{122} The human relations committee decided to suppress conversations about racism. Racism was indeed camouflaged in the 1950s, but the students refused to remain silent. They wanted their school to change.

\textit{Residents Complain about the High Schools Overcrowded Conditions and Demand Action}

Throughout the 1950s, the School District of Philadelphia’s business manager, Add B. Anderson, resisted efforts to increase the school district’s budget even though the city’s student enrollment levels had risen dramatically during the postwar period. Between 1950 and 1957, Germantown High School’s student enrollment increased by 18%, and as the children of the baby boom began to enter high school, many residents worried that the school was becoming overcrowded. On January 6, 1957, the Germantown Community Council’s school committee sponsored a public meeting to discuss the rising student enrollment and overcrowded school conditions. The committee invited school district officials and high school administrators to present detailed information on the school’s current challenges and outline the school district’s plans for its future.

During the meeting, Mr. Charles Nicholas, who had been the high school’s principal for several years, told those present that the school currently enrolled 2,864 youth. Ideally, he said, it should only hold between 2,200-2,300 youth. Nichols admitted that it was difficult to manage the school with this level of enrollment, but that

he was more concerned about the school’s future growth. He told those present that the faculty had canceled several “special classes for slow learners, special reading classes, and some of the extra curricular programs” in the high school because the school lacked space and teachers. Then, he reminded listeners that Germantown High School had changed its catchment boundaries in 1948 to alleviate overcrowding at Simon Gratz High School, a predominately black high school, in the southern part of Germantown. In 1957, Simon Gratz High School had space to accommodate additional students due to population shifts in the area. Nichols did not address the fact that the school district still had an open enrollment policy, so Germantown High School youth could have enrolled at Simon Gratz. He did not address it because none of the parents in the auditorium that evening would have voluntarily transferred their sons or daughters to Gratz. By 1957, Simon Gratz High School had developed a reputation as one of the most dangerous and low-performing high school in the city and its student body was almost entirely African American.123

Dr. Myers, Germantown’s regional superintendent and Nichols’ supervisor, interrupted Nichols and reminded listeners that Germantown High School actually enrolled between 400 to 500 students who lived outside the schools boundaries. Most of these students, both black and white, lived in Simon Gratz High School’s catchment zone. They used the school district’s open enrollment policy to enroll at Germantown instead of Simon Gratz, which based on their residence was their local neighborhood high school. Myers told those present that school district officials had decided to end the city’s open enrollment policy in 1960. When the school district ended its policy, the youth who lived in Simon Gratz High School’s catchment zone would not be permitted to register at Germantown High School. They would have to attend Simon Gratz. This new

policy would alleviate some of the overcrowded conditions at Germantown High School because these 400 to 500 youth who used the open enrollment policy would have to leave Germantown and return to their neighborhood high school.

After Myers finished his discussion about open enrollment, Nichols told those present that the faculty had suggested that the school district build a new wing on the west side of the building for the school’s vocational programs. Once the new wing had been built, the academic programs could be housed in the school’s original 1915 building. According to Nichols, the faculty had proposed this plan during the Great Depression, but no one had ever calculated the costs. Nichols argued that the new wing would provide more space and modern classrooms for the vocational programs. It had another benefit: it segregated academic students from non-academic students as black student enrollment continued to increase at the high school. When those in attendance heard this plan, they urged Nichols and Myers to do what they could to secure the funds needed to build this new wing. Residents, they argued, had already begun to move out of the area because they were concerned about the school’s overcrowded conditions. They told the speakers that they wanted “a modern cosmopolitan high school which would adequately serve the needs of the Germantown community.” Myers promised to give the members of the committee the spacious high school that they demanded.124

Reports surfaced about the overcrowded conditions in local and citywide newspapers. In 1957, The Philadelphia Inquirer published an article stating that

---

124 Meeting of the Schools Committee of the GCC, January 6, 1957, Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA. See also, Letter to GCC from Earle N. Barber, Jr., president of the Business Men’s Association of Germantown, December 3, 1957, Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Letter from John F. Gummere, Acting Chairman of School Committee, December 9, 1957, Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Letter from John F. Gummere, Chairman of School Committee, January 17, 1958, Box 3, Folder 33, GCC Correspondence, 1957-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; Letter from Leon J. Obermayer, President of the Board of Education, to John F. Gummere, January 20, 1958, Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
Germantown High School administrators had to assign classes to the cafeteria, to the faculty lounge, and to the fourth floor corridor. According to the reporter, students were thinking about algebra while they ate their tomato soup in the cafeteria. Rosalie August, the white woman profiled earlier in this chapter who graduated from Germantown High School in 1949 and returned to the school as an English teacher in the late 1950s, taught in a makeshift classroom in the fourth floor corridor. August recalled that she received a portable blackboard and several desks to set up her classroom, and for the most part, students behaved despite their substandard learning environment. The main problem was the heat. It never really reached the fourth floor in the wintertime. August complained about it to her supervisor, and when she did, he told her that if she did not like the conditions she could always “go back to her kitchen and take care of her children.”

No one could deny the high school’s overcrowded conditions and the surge in student enrollment during the 1950s. However, when one takes a longer view, one finds that the high school actually enrolled many more students during the war period. In 1941, Germantown High School had 3,306 students; in 1957, the school had 2,658. Even though there was a new focus on increasing the graduation rate in the postwar period, the high school actually had fewer graduates in 1957 than 1941 (see figure 5.8). The school had 712 graduates in 1941 and 620 graduates in 1957. In other words, the overcrowded conditions were not related to an increase in the number of graduates. In September 1956, Nichols told reporters that the high school had 613 classrooms with more than 35 students; in September 1957, the high school had 826 classrooms with more than 35 students.

125 Pearl Aldrich, “Sharing, Shifting, Extra Free Time Ill of Germantown HS Overcrowding,” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, Box 13, Folder 36, Comm. on Schools 1956-58, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
Figure 5.8 Student Enrollment, Germantown High School, 1941-1957

The school was not overcrowded. Its classrooms were. The overcrowded classrooms were not related a surge in the school's enrollment. Rather, they were related
to Add B. Anderson’s reckless budgetary decisions. During the 1950s, Anderson did whatever he could to limit the school’s districts operating expenses, including increasing the number of students in the secondary school classrooms. Germantown High School had fewer teachers in 1957 than 1941, which affected the average classroom size in the school. As the classroom size increased, the school had to find spaces that were large enough to accommodate the students. The old classrooms in the original 1914 building were simply too small to hold 40 students, and so teachers like Rosalie had to teach in the fourth floor corridor, the faculty lounge, and the school cafeteria.

The school district had two options: it could hire more teachers to reduce class size or build a new building to increase the physical size of the high school classrooms. In 1958, the Board of Education decided to expand Germantown High School based on the plan that Germantown faculty had drafted 14 years earlier with separate wings for academic and vocational students. The residents had what they wanted: a modern comprehensive school that segregated students into distinct buildings based on curricular placement. In other words, modernity in the postwar period meant that the high school offered students a variety of courses, placed them in distinct curricular tracks, and increased the inequality between the students who received the academic education that had drawn families to the community for decades and those who received the vocational programs that were the hallmark of a comprehensive, high school. As the inequality in the community and high school escalated, Germantown youth increased their demands and urged school officials to respond to their needs.
Chapter 6:

Urban Renewal and Racial Unrest,

1958-1967
On June 12, 1958, over 400 graduates, families, and friends gathered in the Germantown High School auditorium to commemorate commencement, the end of one’s high school experience and the beginning of a new phase. In many ways, the event resembled earlier commencement ceremonies. The school orchestra provided music as the graduates walked through the carved archways at the entrance to the room. Vince Ghivizzani, the president of the student association, led the pledge of allegiance. Sondra Weinberg, the vice-president of the senior class, read a passage from the Bible. Bobbi Horowitz, the valedictorian, addressed her peers with inspirational words as they moved into the next phase of their life. Virginia Raacke, who like her female predecessors served as the assistant to the principal, presented awards to the graduates. Many of these awards, like the Mary S. Holmes Award, were named for individuals who had made their own contributions to the school’s past. At the end of the ceremony, the school’s concert choir and select members of the graduating class sang “Hail Alma Mater,” a song seeped in tradition. Yet, in the midst of all this tradition, it seemed clear to everyone gathered in the auditorium that summer evening that Germantown High School had changed dramatically since its founding.

In 1920, the graduating class of Germantown was overwhelmingly female (72%) and white (99%). Most of the graduates in the 1920 class listed college as their ambition after high school even though only a small percentage of American youth attended college at the time. By 1960, the percentage of African American youth at the high school had risen to 27%. Students were more likely to list undecided as their ambition than college. The school, on the other hand, seemed mired in the past, quietly ignoring the changes that had occurred as well as the increasing levels of student resistance. While
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1 “400 Members of the Senior Class to Graduate from School Auditorium at 8 p.m.,” Cliveden Clipper, June 12, 1958.
2 Germantown High School Yearbooks, 1919-1921.
3 Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June, 1960.
the faculty and administrators tried to downplay the changes, the ongoing challenges of inequality fractured the school community into two distinct worlds—one for the remaining segment of middle class, predominately white students and another for the increasing segment of working class, predominately black students. Even though some students transcended these boundaries, the school provided different educational experiences for students based primarily on race. As white families continued to move to the suburbs or find other educational options, the residents who had sustained its legitimacy for decades suddenly abandoned the institution making Germantown High School the prototype of an urban high school, an institution reserved primarily for middle and working class African American youth, particularly male youth, who had no other schooling options.

**Urban Renewal Divides the City into Distinct Parts**

As local economists and community activists struggled to revitalize the city’s economy, government officials and city planners in Philadelphia were engaged in two distinct urban renewal projects. One to transform the neighborhoods near the city’s business and university districts and another that, with the assistance of the private housing market, increased residential segregation between black and white residents. Bulldozers demolished blocks of the city’s aging housing stock replacing them with bold, modern skyscrapers to attract economic development to the city’s urban core and lure federal funding for the city’s prestigious universities. In Society Hill, city planners engaged in a local project to renew the city’s historical buildings and cobblestone streets to their noble, colonial past, changing the neighborhood into an isolated haven for the city’s wealthiest residents that received national acclaim. In North Philadelphia, similar changes were underway dislocating thousands of residents to make room for new development that never came. As historian John F. Bauman suggests, by 1964, North
Philadelphia, which had one of the largest concentrations of African American residents in the city, “emerged as a wasteland of substandard housing, poor services, poverty, and high crime rates.”

As city officials implemented these reforms, white families continued their exodus from the city’s center and Philadelphia’s streetcar suburbs to new housing developments in the Northeast section of the city and other suburbs just beyond the city’s limits. Racism barred black families from these new communities. African American families from virtually every class background were forced to remain in the city due to the racism in the housing market. As white families fled, black and white families were further isolated from one another, and the city’s poorest residents found that they were increasingly concentrated in certain parts of the city—North Philadelphia, West Philadelphia, and of course, Germantown (see figure 6.1).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Carolyn Adams et al., \textit{Philadelphia: Neighborhoods, Division, and Conflict in a Postindustrial City} (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), 75–87.}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Racial Composition, Philadelphia, 1960

Figure 6.1

As urban planners and government officials focused on transforming the city’s urban core, Germantown’s business elites, religious leaders, and private school administrators formed an independent organization, Concern for Germantown (CFG), to address their concerns about the area surrounding the Germantown Friends School, an elite private school founded in 1845. Anxiety about the conditions of the neighborhood reached their peak in 1958 when Germantown Academy, another elite private school in the area, decided to move its campus from Germantown to Fort Washington, a suburban community located several miles outside the city. One year later, Concern for Germantown commissioned Henry S. Churchill, a local urban planner, to design an urban renewal plan for the area around the school and the community’s central business district. Churchill’s plan emphasized the area’s assets—the community’s prestigious private and public schools, luxurious mansions, fine landscapes, and modern FHA homes—and shortcomings—overdeveloped apartments, haphazard conversions, inconsistent commercial development, vacant storefronts, abandoned factories, inadequate recreation, and slum-filled streets.\(^1\) The shortcomings, Churchill argued, were related to an increase in absentee landlords who refused to repair their homes, the influx of working class residents from other parts of the city, and the exodus of jobs from the community. Between 1953 and 1956, the number of businesses in the area had remained the same, but the number of workers had decreased by 30% (from 12,177 workers in 1953 to 8,415 workers in 1956) leaving many residents without work.\(^2\)

Even though he was concerned about the unregulated development and weak economy, Churchill argued that Germantown’s future rested on the quality of its public schools and stated that “there is no chance of maintaining a healthy and vigorous

---


\(^2\) Ibid., 36
community [in Germantown]...if the public school system does not raise its sights and standards.” According to him, Germantown’s white, middle class residents would continue their flight to the suburban “white ghettos” if the public schools did not improve. In addition to his concerns about the public schools, Churchill was worried that many of the CFG members had not considered the impact of racial change on the community’s future. He stated that this was particularly startling since many of these individuals were heads of social welfare and educational institutions in the community. Those that had thought about racial change had different opinions about it. Some of the individuals that he spoke with believed that Germantown’s increasing racial diversity was a community asset and urged local organizations to find ways to embrace the changes that had occurred. Other individuals, however, did not see racial diversity as an asset. According to Churchill, one man told him that he was not interested in urban renewal because “Germantown was going to turn colored...the important thing was to get out.” Churchill urged the members of CFG to host community meetings to give residents an opportunity to discuss the benefits and limitations of his plans and recommendations.

Three months after Churchill released his plans, Henry Magaziner, a distinguished Philadelphia architect with connections to Germantown, published another proposal to restore Germantown’s commercial district. Magaziner’s plan called for a comprehensive urban renewal project to transform Germantown into a community with expansive shopping malls, open parking lots, and modern traffic patterns in the shadows of a “colonial compound.” Magaziner wanted to use federal urban renewal funds to demolish slum housing and construct with modern buildings fashioned to

---

3 Ibid., 9.
4 Ibid., 9.
match the colonial homes that had lined Germantown Avenue for centuries. He urged residents to review the plans that he had designed along with the Churchill report and suggested that they find private funding from a foundation to support a more robust study of the community’s needs. He wanted his readers to imagine the possibilities that this plan had for its immediate community and the city of Philadelphia writing:

A restored Society Hill plus a restored Germantown Avenue would give Philadelphia something which few other American cities have. Philadelphia would be able to show the visitor what Colonial life was like both in the big city and in the small town. But aside from the history lesson—tourist attraction aspect, the two areas would complement each other in other ways, too. Together, they would provide Philadelphians with a well rounded series of living opportunities, ranging in character from center city to suburb.

Germantown, Magaziner argued, was in a unique position to influence its future and reclaim its position as a leading suburb in the city.

Even though the plans differed, Churchill and Magaziner both wanted to attract and retain upper and middle class residents, and thus, they emphasized middle class consumption. Churchill wanted to improve the public schools to keep these families in their neighborhoods. Magaziner wanted to build shopping malls with huge parking lots that mimicked suburban developments just beyond Germantown’s border. Like other urban renewal plans across the nation, these proposals threatened to displace middle and working class African Americans who had lived in the area for decades or had moved to the area during the postwar era to enjoy the amenities that Germantown offered. In addition, neither of these plans provided adequate solutions to address the challenges that these African American residents faced: the dramatic loss of employment, the
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7 Ibid., 40.
persistence of discriminatory housing practices, and the escalation of public school segregation in the city of brotherly love (see figure 6.2).\(^8\)

\textbf{Figure 6.2}
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\caption{Germantown Urban Renewal Plan Boundaries, Churchill (1956) and Magaziner (1963)}
\end{figure}

\(^8\) David Young, “The Battles of Germantown: Public History and Preservation in America’s Most Historic Neighborhood During the Twentieth Century” (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 2009), 225.
Although these plans had clear shortcomings, in 1961, the Germantown Community Council (GCC) organized a series of local town meetings to give residents an opportunity to provide feedback about the Churchill and Magaziner plans. According to reports, most of the residents who attended the meetings agreed with the two men who drafted these proposals. The commercial district felt outdated and lacked parking. The community did not have enough recreational facilities. The public schools were overcrowded and under resourced, which had forced many families to find other educational options in the area, such as parochial and private schools, or to move out of the area. Others worried that the city’s open enrollment policies had opened their schools to residents who lived outside of Germantown, which they believed, contributed to the challenges in Germantown’s schools. Residents from Upper Germantown and Mt. Airy raised concerns about the Emlen School, which had been an integrated school for most of its history, but had become an overcrowded school that relied on portable classrooms to accommodate the increasing numbers of African American students. None of the residents mentioned Germantown High School.

Even though the residents shared many concerns, the meetings also highlighted the tensions in the community that the two plans had overlooked—residents disagreed about Germantown’s boundaries, about which neighborhoods needed the most attention, and about the vision for Germantown’s future. The tensions about the community’s boundaries, its future, and its schools were rooted in the deep class and racial divides that characterized the area.
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9 “A Fact Sheet on the Local Town Meetings to Be Conducted by the Physical Planning Division of the Germantown Community Council,” January 15, 1961, Box 10, Folder 7, Physical Planning Division Meetings on Community Planning Problems, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.

10 Report to Physical Planning Committee of Germantown Community Council, Morton NC, Box 10, Folder 7, Physical Planning Division Meetings on Community Planning Problems, March 9, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; “Schools Town Meet Targets,” March 16, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA, Box 64, GCC Scrapbook. See also, Penn-Knox Neighborhood Association, March 23, 1961, Box 10, Folder 7, Physical Planning Division Meetings on Community Planning Problems, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.

11 Section I-Upper Germantown & Mt. Airy, February 23, 1961, Box 10, Folder 7, Physical Planning Division Meetings on Community Planning Problems, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
racial divisions that had existed in the community for decades, particularly those between lower Germantown’s working class, and increasingly black, communities (what residents called Germantown) and upper Germantown’s middle and upper class, and predominately white, communities (what residents called Mt. Airy and Chestnut Hill).  

While residents discussed these plans, city officials offered their perspectives and reactions. Aaron Levine, the executive director of the citizens’ council on city planning, argued that the plans provided residents with a positive outlook for the future, but it failed to outline the steps to achieve the proposals’ aims. Dr. Ernest O. Kohl, Germantown’s regional school superintendent, addressed the concerns that residents had raised about the quality of the community’s public schools arguing that “public apathy” had contributed to the problems in the schools. He agreed that there were “too many Johnnys who still can’t read” in Germantown’s public schools, but worried that the community expected schools to solve all of society’s problems without the public support that they once enjoyed. Even though there were many concerns about the limitations of these proposals, Edmund Bacon, the executive director of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, decided to proceed with Magaziner’s plan and lobbied the federal

---


14 “Public’s Responsibility to Pick Up Schools’ Lack,” January 19, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA, Box 64, GCC Scrapbook.
government to provide funding to restore Germantown to its glorious historic past by creating a historic, suburban shopping wonderland with open parking lots and wider city streets. Urban renewal, Bacon and his colleagues argued, promised to return Germantown to its glorious past as one of the most desirable communities for upper and middle class white families to live and raise their children.15

Almost a year after Bacon announced his plans, several Germantown businessmen who were connected to influential city officials organized Colonial Germantown, Inc. to show their commitment to urban renewal in the area. The members paid $1,500 per year to belong to the organization and encouraged city officials, including Mayor Tate, to fund urban renewal efforts immediately. In response, Tate allocated $25,000 in city funds to finalize Germantown’s urban renewal plans and personally promised to preserve the community’s historical heritage, to restore the community’s attractive residential area, and to build a major regional shopping center with a thriving central business district. Tate wanted Colonial Germantown, Inc. to work closely with city officials and oversee the renewal efforts.16

Even though the members of the Colonial Germantown, Inc. supported the mayor’s plans, the study delayed action for another year. In May 1963, Magaziner and his associates finally released the first part of their revised plans for Germantown’s urban renewal. Like his earlier proposal, Magaziner’s revised plans focused on demolishing older buildings and leveraging the historical center to create a unique shopping center with several large parking lots. By combining the beautiful, historic mansions with the

---

15 “$25 Million Redevelopment Corp. Suggested for Gtn.,” April 13, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA, Box 64, GCC Scrapbook.
suburban amenities that shoppers wanted, he promised to strengthen Germantown’s business center and local economy. In addition to the business district, he provided plans for the residential communities that bordered the area. Magaziner reminded readers that the “character and quality of homes determine the type of population” that lives in any community. The proposed urban renewal area contained some of the finest homes in the city as well as some of the poorest homes. According to Magaziner, “the blighted areas bring persons of low economic and cultural backgrounds, while the better areas attract people higher on the economic and cultural scale.” He wanted to remove the “blighting influences” in the area so that Germantown could “regain the place that it once had.”

Even though his plan targeted the homes of African American residents, Magaziner never mentioned the racial backgrounds of these residents in his proposal. His plan focused solely on the commercial district and ignored the residents’ concerns about the lack of recreational facilities and quality of Germantown’s public schools.

After Magaziner published his revised plan, the Germantown Community Council organized another series of town hall meetings to discuss the implications of his proposal on the community. Three groups, the Greater Morton Civic Association, the Germantown Settlement, and the Germantown Friends School, expressed the most vocal opposition to Magaziner’s plan. Rather than wait for the public hearings, the Greater Morton Civic Association wrote to city’s planning commission about their concerns. In their letter, they agreed that urban renewal in Germantown seemed “long overdue,” but argued that Magaziner’s plan focused too much on the business district and not enough on the residential communities. The association members told the planning commission

---

that Magaziner had selected several buildings “in excellent condition” for demolition. They opposed his plans and urged the planning commission to think critically about urban renewal rather than simply demolishing historical buildings to provide open land for a regional shopping center and parking lots.

The leaders of the Germantown Settlement echoed many of concerns that the Greater Morton Civic Association had expressed. Like the members of the Morton Association, the settlement members worried that the proposed plans focused too much on demolition, which meant that many residents would be forced out of their homes and neighborhoods. They stated that “forced” relocation “must be avoided wherever possible.” They urged the leaders of urban renewal to include neighborhood associations in the planning process in a more meaningful way than simply asking them to attend town hall meetings. At the same time, the settlement members went further and reminded residents that the city and nation was in the midst of a “period of racial upheaval.” The Magaziner plan, they argued, might exacerbate racial tensions because the city would have to relocate “the poor, including many Negroes, out of the community and into inevitably worse conditions.” Racial friction, they noted, existed through the community. The members of the settlement argued that these “frictions of lingering prejudice and irritation of cultural differences...cannot be pushed aside or ‘relocated,’” rather residents must work together to alleviate the racism in Germantown. The settlement members opposed the Magaziner plan because it called for the removal of black, working class residents, from the community. They urged local leaders to
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18 Letter to Graham S. Finney, Assistant Executive Director, City Planning Commission, July 14, 1963, Box 55, Folder 4, Central Germantown Urban Renewal Plan, 1960, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
19 Germantown Settlement, Statement on the “Planning Study of Central Germantown,” July 25, 1963, Box 55, Folder 4, Central Germantown Urban Renewal Plan, 1960, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA. For earlier concerns about the “racial upheaval” in the nation and the city, see Letter to Mayor Tate from Joseph L. Behmer, President, Board of Managers, Germantown Settlement, June 14, 1963, Box 1, Folder B of M, President Correspondence, 1955-69, Urb 220, GCC Collection, TUA.
reconsider their proposal and create a plan that addressed the needs of residents who lived in the urban renewal area.

Finally, after Magaziner published his revised plan, alumni and leaders from Germantown Friends School, the elite private school in the heart of Germantown’s business district, sent several letters to the Germantown community council and the city planning commission outlining their concerns. In one of these letters, two school leaders reminded city planners and community leaders that the school had seriously considered “moving to a new site in [suburban] Montgomery County.” The school leaders had decided against this plan because they knew that the school’s departure would have had a negative impact on the community. However, they were worried, once again, about the lack of space in the area for staff parking, children recreation, and school expansion. They opposed the Magaziner plan’s suggestion to widen the streets for a “super highway” surrounding the school because the school needed their land for future expansion, particularly the land on Coulter Street, on the south side of the school. The leaders stated that they were “gravely concerned” about this proposition and told those involved in the planning process that they were not interested in “discussing inadequate solutions” to their needs. They told the leaders of the planning process that they wanted to be “informed on all developments . . . and to be brought into discussions before decisions are reached.” In closing, the school leaders wrote, “we know that the school is important to the community and we are confident that our legitimate concerns will be fully recognized.”

The school had made its case, and after sending these letters, the social service agencies in the city officials and local business leaders responded and

---

expressed their commitment to an urban renewal plan that kept the private institution in the community.\textsuperscript{21}

After these hearings concluded, William H. Will, the executive director of the Germantown Community Council, issued a statement about Magaziner’s revised proposal. In it, he praised residents for their “widespread interest and general support” for urban renewal in Germantown, but he warned city officials that many residents felt that Magaziner had proposed a “commercial plan” under the auspices of urban renewal and “dumps the problems of the business district into our residential communities.” Will continued stating that several residents were gravely concerned that the plans fit the needs of the businessmen who belonged to Colonial Germantown, Inc. and argued that the community needed a plan that put residential needs first. Like the members of the settlement, he was concerned that black residents might bear the brunt of the renewal efforts through the demolition of their homes and relocation to less desirable neighborhoods. He reiterated the importance of keeping the Germantown Friends School in the community and urged city planners to reconsider its plans to widen streets near the school. In conclusion, Will reflected on the town hall meetings and stated that many residents had accused them of siding with the city planners and local businessmen instead of representing the residents’ public interests.\textsuperscript{22} One week after he issued this statement, William H. Will announced his resignation as the executive director of the council.\textsuperscript{23}

One month after Will resigned, the leaders of the Germantown Community Council stated that they support “many of the underlying principles of the Magaziner

\textsuperscript{21} Letter to Stephen C. Clark, Clerk, Germantown Friends School, and Henry Scattergood, Principal, Germantown Friends School, from Edmund N. Bacon, Executive Director, Germantown Settlement, August 13, 1963, Box 55, Folder 4, Central Germantown Urban Renewal Plan, 1960, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
\textsuperscript{22} William H. Will, Elements for Consideration in the Evaluation of The Plan for Germantown, September 19, 1963, Box 55, Folder 4, Central Germantown Urban Renewal Plan, 1960, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
\textsuperscript{23} “Hail and Farewell,” September 26, 1963, Box 64, Scrapbook, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
proposal” because it addressed “the problems which demand serious attention in Germantown, namely, the restoration of our commercial district and solving the problems of traffic flow.” According to them, the revitalization of Germantown’s business community would catalyze economic development throughout the community.24 In December 1963, Earle Barber, Jr., the president of the Germantown Community Council and leading businessman, spoke at a public hearing with city council about Magaziner’s plans. Barber told council that he did not know of one group or one individual in the community that opposed Magaziner’s plans for urban renewal in Germantown.25 The residents’ criticisms about the public hearings were accurate: the members of the Germantown Community Council sided with city officials and local businessmen rather than the African Americans in the residential areas targeted for renewal.

On July 18, 1964, only sixteen days after the passage of Lyndon B. Johnson’s Civil Rights Act of 1964, a off-duty police officer shot James Powell, a fifteen year old African American boy, in New York City. The Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) organized a rally and several protests to challenge the increasing levels of police brutality and ongoing racial discrimination in the country. CORE wanted the police officer removed from duty. The following day, riots erupted in Brooklyn, and five days later, in Rochester. The riots in the North challenged the narrow geography that many leaders in the Johnson administration had associated with the civil rights movement. As Ramsey Clark, an assistant attorney general when the riots broke out, later recalled, “When we thought of the North we didn’t think of civil rights.”26

24 “Summary of Community Views,” October 1963, Box 18, Folder 170, Correspondence Reports, 1963-65, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
25 Memo to Germantown Courier, December 6, 1963, Box 55, Folder 4, Central Germantown Urban Renewal Plan, 1960, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
On Friday, August 28, 1964, two police officers—Robert Wells, who was black, and John Hoffer, who was white—responded to reports that they had received about a stalled car blocking the intersection between Twenty-Second Street and Columbia Avenue. When they arrived on the scene, they found an intoxicated African American couple arguing in the car. Hoffer, a white police officer, tried to persuade Odessa Bradford, the driver, to move the car out of the intersection. When she refused, he attempted to forcibly pull her out of the car. As he was doing this, James Mettle, a bystander who had gathered with a crowd of people at the scene, attacked Hoffer. Wells immediately radioed the police station for additional help. As Matthew Countryman notes, by the time the police arrived and arrested Bradford and Mettle, “bricks and bottles were raining down from nearby rooftops onto the police cars that were responding to Well’s calls.”

Philadelphia’s riots had officially begun.

The August 1964 riots lasted three days, from August 29th through August 31st, killing two and wounding 339 individuals—100 police officers and 239 black residents. Businesses in the area were decimated with damage estimated at three million dollars. Philadelphia, the city that civil rights leaders had once pointed to as a model, had experienced the political upheaval and social unrest that many of its liberal reformers had hoped to avoid. The 1964 riot forced liberal reformers and city officials to reconsider their approach to racial reform and urban renewal, particularly in the area where the riots had occurred. Throughout the fall of 1964, citizens from a variety of racial and class backgrounds gathered at different venues to discuss several solutions to alleviate the racial tensions and unrest in the area. While they gathered, city officials met to

---


28 Countryman, Up South, 156.
discuss the future of urban renewal in North Philadelphia. From 1964 to 1966, city officials used federal funding from the Johnson administration’s War on Poverty and Model Cities program to transform North Philadelphia’s housing and businesses.\(^29\) As they focused on racial unrest near the city’s center, city officials tabled Germantown’s urban renewal plans. The historical shopping center in the once-quaint suburb was not critical to their vision for the city’s future.

**Concerns about Funding and Integration in Germantown’s Charities**

As residents discussed ideas about urban renewal, the leaders of Germantown charitable organizations were increasingly worried about inadequate funding sources, decreasing membership rates, and escalating racial challenges. In 1959, the Germantown Community Council and the Germantown Settlement told members that the United Fund, its main funding source, had not reached its fundraising goal since 1956. With this budget shortfall, the GCC told residents that many of Germantown’s charitable organizations had been operating “under extreme hardship” and urged residents to donate what they could to help the United Fund reach its 1959-1960 fundraising goal.\(^30\) Even though the Germantown Settlement had supported the United Fund for decades, by the 1960s, the leaders of the organizations complained that the organization’s membership with the United Fund barred them from soliciting individual donations for their charities.\(^31\) The lack of funds raised new criticisms about the centralized structure of the city’s United Fund and forced these organizations to provide services to poor residents in Germantown even though they did not have the funding that they had enjoyed in the past.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 160–164; Bauman, *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal*, 188–190.
\(^{30}\) Report from the Council, September 28, 1959, Box 21, Folder 15, Luncheon Meeting, 1958-60, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
\(^{31}\) Program Committee Meeting, May 7, 1959, Box 1, Folder 1-30, Committees-Programs 1958-59, Urb 220, GS Collection, TUA.
The budget shortfalls forced these organizations to curtail services and raise membership dues, which impacted the level of youth membership in many of these organizations. In 1960, the members of the Penn-Knox neighborhood association stated that “membership in these organizations is the exception rather than the rule.”32 Evidence suggests that the lack of membership was related, at least in part, to the funding challenges. For example, in 1959, the Germantown Settlement announced that the organization had to cut its summer day camp because it lacked the operating funds. In 1957, the settlement admitted 130 children to the camp, but in 1959, the camp enrolled only enrolled 69 children. Even though the lack of funds impacted enrollment in the day camp, evidence suggests that racial change in the neighborhood also influenced the levels of enrollment in the settlement’s programs. In the same report, the leaders of the settlement noted that they were dealing with a tension between fostering interracial understanding and providing the camp experience to the children “who want and need it most.”33 The settlement workers stated that it was much easier to find black children to enroll in the camp than white children, but that this racial imbalance threatened the organization’s ability to encourage interracial socialization. However, evidence suggests that their concerns were actually more related to funding concerns than integration. The settlement workers stated that they had operated camps in the past that enrolled more black children than white children, which according to them, had negatively impacted their funding revenues.34 In 1960, the settlement hosted separate

32 Penn-Knox Neighborhood Association, March 23, 1961, Box 10, Folder 7, Physical Planning Division Meetings on Community Planning Problems, 1961, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
34 Staff Meeting, May 18, 1959, Box 2, Folder 2-11, Staff Meeting Minutes, 1958-60, Urb 220, GS Collection, TUA.
programs for black and white children. Thus, the organization’s concerns about integration were more about finding funding revenues than fostering understanding among various groups. As the neighborhood’s racial demographics continued to change from a mixed race community to a predominately black neighborhood, the settlement continued to face challenges about the lack of funds and members, but perhaps more importantly, its relation to the residents and its role in the community.

As the Germantown Settlement struggled to define its role, in 1958, the leaders of the all-black Rittenhouse YMCA announced that it had merged with the national organization and become a branch of the Metropolitan YMCA of Philadelphia. The leaders told their members that they had decided to move the Rittenhouse YMCA from its current location, at 132 W. Rittenhouse Street, in the heart of the black community and few blocks from Germantown High School to an undisclosed location in Mt. Airy, an increasingly integrated, but predominately white, middle and upper class community in Upper Germantown. Even though the YMCA never justified this decision, J. Archibald Childs, a black resident who had lived in the area since the 1930s, suggested that the Rittenhouse YMCA decided to move because the all-white Greene Street YMCA, which was located a few blocks away, did not want to integrate the two organizations. The leaders of the Rittenhouse YMCA knew that the national organizations would not allow two segregated branches, and so, the Rittenhouse YMCA moved to Mt. Airy and forced its black clientele to integrate the Greene Street YMCA on their own. Many residents refused to do this. Forced integration had its costs. Germantown’s African American community lost the charitable organization that had served them for decades.

35 Group Work Program, Oct-Nov 1959, Box 1, Folder 1-22, Committees-Industrial and Group Services, Urb 220, GS Collection, TUA.
Segregation and Demands for Reform Escalate Throughout the School District

In 1959, the Board of Education, under massive pressure from civil rights leaders, passed a resolution, which stated that the Board of Education and the School District of Philadelphia did not discriminate against anyone on the basis “of race, color, religion, or national origin.” However, this resolution did little to change the reality in the city’s schools. By the late 1950s and early 1960s, residents argued that the Board of Education and its powerful business manager, Add B. Anderson, had neglected the needs of the public schools for far too long. The School District of Philadelphia had one of the highest rates of school segregation and one of the lowest teacher salary scales in the nation. School buildings were antiquated and overcrowded. Many children lacked textbooks and other necessary materials. When Add B. Anderson died suddenly in 1962, concerned residents seized the moment and demanded reform in the city’s public schools.

For decades, African American organizations, including the NAACP and Floyd Logan’s Educational Equality League, had been pressuring the school leaders to desegregate the city’s public schools. In 1960, Logan publicly condemned the members of the Board of Education for stating that Philadelphia had one of the nation’s best integration policies. Logan argued that the city’s schools were deeply segregated and that black students were forced to attend high school where they graduated lacking the skills “for decent employment—much less college education.” As the frustrations with the school district mounted, concerned residents, including members of Germantown’s West Mount Airy’s neighborhood association, conducted their own survey to gather data.

on the racial segregation in their local schools. In 1962, the Urban League published their findings to illustrate the racial segregation and overcrowded conditions in the city’s public schools. According to the report, 29% of the city’s public schools had black student enrollments of 90% or more and 35% of the city’s public schools had white students enrollment of 90% of more.Civil rights leaders continued to pressure school officials to alter the policies that had contributed to this segregation and demonstrate their commitment to the American ideals of equality and equity.

Even though Germantown had prided itself on the community’s approach to integration for decades, the report suggested that the community’s elementary schools were deeply segregated. So segregated that on June 7, 1961, the NAACP announced that it had filed a lawsuit, Chisolm v. Board of Education, on behalf of eight students who attended the Emlen Elementary School in Germantown’s Mount Airy neighborhood. The lawsuit charged that the Board of Education had deliberately adjusted the school boundaries to create two segregated elementary schools in the heart of a racially diverse community. In 1952, African American students represented 64.4% of students enrolled at the Emlen School. The following year, the Board of Education opened a new school, the Day School. Once that school opened, the lawsuit claimed, school officials redrew Emlen’s boundaries and appointed a white teaching staff at the Day School and an increasing black teaching staff at the Emlen School. By 1955, the percentage of African American students in the Emlen School had increased by 33.7% (from 64.4% in 1952 to 86.1% in 1955). By 1961, the schools were completely segregated. Students at the Emlen

---


School were forced to attend school in several portable classrooms that the school district had provided to deal with the overcrowded conditions even though there was space for them a few blocks away at the all-white Day School. The NAACP thought it had found the perfect case to attack northern school segregation.42

However, the case was mired in problems from the beginning. First, it sat in the courts for two years. When it reached the courts in 1963, A. Leon Higginbotham, who had initially been appointed to lead the case, had withdrawn as counsel because he had accepted an appointment to the Federal Trade Commission. Cecil B. Moore, the leader of Philadelphia’s NAACP, appointed Isaiah Crippens, a trusted colleague and friend, to the case. But, when Crippens examined the evidence, he was not convinced that the NAACP could win the case. Rather than argue a case that they might not win, Crippens and Moore pressured the members of the Board of Education to draft a desegregation plan immediately. Crippens told the Board that he would pursue the case, if they did not do what he wanted them to do.43 On September 28, several days after its deadline, the Board finally produced a desegregation plan that satisfied these two men.44 Moore and Crippens thought that the Board of Education had made some positive steps towards integrating the city’s schools and accepted their desegregation plan.45 Even though the NAACP eventually had to drop the case, it brought national attention to the challenges of school segregation in Philadelphia’s northwest corner.

In the middle of the discussions about the Chilsolm case, the Board of Education revised its 1959 non-discrimination policy to show its commitment to the “integration of

both pupils and staff.” Dr. Allen H. Wetter, who had served as the school district’s superintendent, announced his retirement. In March 1964, the Board formally announced that it had appointed Dr. C. Taylor Whittier, the superintendent of Montgomery County School District and renowned expert in school integration, as the city’s next superintendent of schools.46 Finally, the Board members agreed to conduct two studies, one by Ada H. Lewis, the vice-president of the Board of Education and chair of the special committee on non-discrimination. The other study, conducted another by William R. Odell, a professor of education at Stanford University, aimed to analyze racial segregation and academic achievement and recommend reform to improve these conditions in the city’s public schools.47 The Board of Education tried to disconnect the link between these new studies and the Chisolm case by stating from the outset that the studies were not “prompted by any litigation.”48 The new superintendent, whose appointment received praise from the civil rights leaders in the city, promised to read these studies and use their findings to craft new policies to alleviate racial unrest and segregation in the city’s schools.49

The Lewis report, which was conducted with a 100-person committee comprised of Board of Education members and other civic leaders, argued that school integration was deeply connected to school improvement. The report outlined the dramatic increase of black students in the city’s public schools noting that the increase had been much greater in the city’s elementary and technical high schools (see figure 6.3). The report also pointed out that white parents were more likely to send their children to parochial

48 Ibid., 56.
or private schools than black parents. In June 1963, 52% of the children in the public schools were black while only 10% of the children in parochial schools were black.\textsuperscript{50} To understand how these population shifts and school segregation impacted the city schools, the Lewis committee sent surveys to school principals throughout the city to gather data on school conditions. After examining the data, the committee found that students who attended schools where African American students made up 70% or more of the student body did not enjoy the same educational resources as their other peers (see figure 6.4).

\textbf{Figure 6.3} \textit{Percentage of Black Students, School District of Philadelphia, 1957-64}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Schools</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High Schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical High Schools</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{50} Lewis, \textit{Report of the Special Committee on Nondiscrimination}, 24.
### Figure 6.4 Comparison of Schools in Philadelphia by Racial Composition and Resources, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schools with 30% or less black student enrollment</th>
<th>Schools with 30 – 70% black student enrollment</th>
<th>Schools with 70% or more black student enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age of School Buildings</td>
<td>39.2 years</td>
<td>42.5 years</td>
<td>42.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding (10% above capacity)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Part-time Classes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Class Size</td>
<td>35.5 students</td>
<td>35.3 students</td>
<td>36.8 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Classes with 40+ students</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Classes with less than 30 students</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have adequate textbooks</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have adequate equipment</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Achievement in Reading</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Achievement in Math</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The educational disparities between black and white students existed in the public high schools, as well. African American students were underrepresented in the secondary school’s academic programs—they comprised 18.1% of the students in the academic tracks even though they made up 33.3% of the total enrollment. They were overenrolled in the other tracks representing 80.5% of the students in the homemaking track, 72.8% of the students in the modified tracks, and 56.0% in the trade preparatory
track. The committee argued that the city had predominately white and predominately African American high schools, but insisted that these patterns stemmed from residential segregation not school district policies. The remainder of the report focused on several recommendations to the Board of Education to improve the situation from the assignment and examination of teachers to the implementation of motivational programs for high school students. Even though the study clearly outlined the levels of segregation in the city, the members of the Board of Education lacked the political will and financial resources to realize the recommendations in the Lewis study.

William R. Odell published his 389-page report documenting the challenges in the city’s public schools on February 1, 1965. Odell echoed many of the themes that the Lewis report had highlighted—Philadelphia’s public schools were increasingly segregated and that this segregation stemmed from residential segregation rather than the school district’s policies. He went further and suggested that a child’s socio-economic background and family education level were directly related to his or her educational outcomes. In contrast to the Lewis report, which had deliberately avoided the use of standardized tests because they felt these assessment were culturally and racially biased, Odell used IQ tests and other standardized assessment to illustrate the discrepancies in the educational outcomes among students in the public schools. These assessments showed that African American youth made up the majority of students in the lower achievement levels with black boys at the lowest levels.
Odell did not support desegregation. Rather, he urged the members of the Board of Education to provide “supplementary learning experiences” for black children in their homes, their churches, and other community agencies as much as in their schools. With respect to the secondary schools, Odell noted that the school district had one of the highest dropout rates in the nation—27% of the city’s youth dropped out of school before they finished high school—21% of white youth and 39% of black youth. The rates were larger for male students (34%) than females (20%). He urged the school district to be more diligent with its supports for students, particularly those in the bottom IQ quartile where 60% of the students dropped out of school.

Among high school graduates, he found that male students were more likely to attend college than female students (30% v. 17%), but that female students were more likely to find employment after high school than male students (56% v. 39%). Even though he was concerned about these findings, Odell stated that the weak labor and educational outcomes stemmed from problem in the city’s labor market rather than its educational system.

Shortly after he published his report, civil rights leaders condemned his finding calling the study a flop. Odell struck back at these claims that he done exactly what the board of education had asked him to do—he studied the conditions in the school district without making political claims about segregation. By refuting integration and relying on faulty assessments, Odell made claims about segregation joining a growing number of academic and social science researchers, on the right and the left, who attributed these disparities to the individuals, specifically the black urban poor, rather than the policy
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57 Ibid., 34–35.
58 Ibid., 45–47.
59 Ibid., 52-53.
decisions, in the city and school district, that had contributed to the educational outcomes in Philadelphia. In doing so, he diverted attention away from the Board of Education and placed the blame squarely on the families who were forced to send their children to these overcrowded, under-resourced schools.

While residents waited for these reports, civil rights leaders and activists continued to critique the slow pace of change while acknowledging the innovative ideas that Whittier brought to Philadelphia. He established citizen advisory committees in its eight regional districts to serve as a liaison between the Board and local residents. He encouraged the district to adopt the K-4-4-4 school configuration model. This model had been used in other district to curb school segregation—students were bused to educational campuses where they attended smaller schools in one place. He supported the idea of “combat pay” for teachers who worked in the city’s lowest-performing schools. He appointed Robert L. Pointdexter, an 29-year school district veteran, as his deputy superintendent making Pointdexter the highest ranking African American education official in the nation.

However, as Anne E. Phillips points out, Whittier and the board’s calculated response and new program were carefully calculated to maintain “the racial animosity and division” in the city. Civil right leaders continued to pressure the school district to address the racial disparities in the city’s public schools and provide Philadelphia’s youth, black and white, with the same resources.

As civil rights leaders clamored for reform, white residents reacted to these changes in a variety of ways. Many residents simply left the city to isolate their children from their black neighbors or to find schools with better resources. Others pulled their

---

64 Ibid., 68.
children out of the public schools and placed them in parochial or private schools. Those that stayed had a variety of responses. Some residents simply sent their children to their neighborhood school. Other residents, like those near the Bryant School in West Philadelphia, challenged any attempt to integrate their neighborhood schools.\textsuperscript{65} Finally, in Germantown, one group, the West Mt. Airy Neighborhood Association, made national headlines for its commitment to integration in their local community. The members of association promised to subsidize the school district through any effort to ensure that children in their community enjoyed the “best possible teaching staff, curriculum, textbooks, equipment, buildings, and playgrounds.” These individuals believed that interracial cooperation was “a rewarding thing, not only in terms of sharing mutual interest, but also in terms of living the ideals for which our country stands.”\textsuperscript{66} Citizens like the individuals who belonged to the West Mt. Airy Neighbors Association were incredibly rare in the city—both in their commitment to racial integration and their ability to subsidize schools resources with their own funds.

\textit{The Secondary School Marketplace Reflects the School’s District Segregation Patterns}

Germantown families had always enjoyed a variety of educational alternatives, such as exclusive private, parochial, and public schools. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, these families continued to act as educational consumers searching for the educational options for their children. Like their predecessors, one’s race, class, and gender constrained their schooling options. Upper and middle class families often bypassed the public schools and sent their children to the community’s prestigious private schools. In the late 1950s, William T. Coleman, Jr., an African American

graduate of Germantown High School’s 1939 class, enrolled his children in Germantown Friends Schools, an elite private school, rather than the local public schools that he attended in his youth.\textsuperscript{67} Many families also decided to send their children to the city’s parochial schools instead of the local public schools. Between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of students who enrolled in parochial schools increased by 13\%\textsuperscript{68}. Parochial schools relied on their parishes to subsidize tuition, and thus, these schools were a viable option for families regardless of class. However, Philadelphia’s parochial schools were still deeply segregated by race.\textsuperscript{69}

Even though many residents focused on the segregation in the city’s elementary schools, evidence suggests that the city’s secondary schools were becoming increasingly segregated. In 1960, Germantown High School graduates remained predominately white (72\%), but the percentage of black graduates had increased by 150\%. In 1960, black youth were more likely to attend Germantown High School than the all-male, elite Central High School, but less likely to attend Germantown than the all-female, elite Philadelphia High School for girls (see figure 6.5). These data suggest that black males were less likely to attend an elite high school than black females. Race and gender influenced the level of inequality that Philadelphia youth experienced.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{67} William T. Coleman, Jr., Germantown High School Class of 1939, interview by author, August 10, 2010.
\textsuperscript{70} See Appendix, Data and Analysis, Chapter 6.
Although the percentage of African American youth in Germantown High School represented a dramatic shift, there were even more significant changes at Simon Gratz High School. By 1960, 98% of Simon Gratz’s graduates were African American creating an entirely segregated high school in the community. Even though the school district had ended its open enrollment policy, families still found ways to send their children to Germantown High School even though they lived outside the school’s boundaries. In 1960, 11 black students and 21 white students used the district’s open enrollment policies to attend Germantown High School instead of their neighborhood high school. Many of these youth lived in predominately African American neighborhoods, and as one graduate suggested, their families leveraged these policies to avoid sending their children to schools, like Simon Gratz High School, that had a predominately African American student body (see figure 6.6). Racism coupled with the fact that schools, like Gratz, had developed a reputation as institutions with fewer resources and more violent incidents pushed families to look beyond their neighborhood high schools.71 In 1960, Germantown High School, which was predominately white and relatively calm, represented an attractive educational option for families who wanted to segregate their
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children in a predominately white school or to send their children to a safer school with better resources.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{72} See Appendix, Chapter 6 for Data and Analysis.
Figure 6.6

Germantown High School Graduates by Race, Racial Composition, Philadelphia, 1960

Source: United States Census, 1960; Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June, 1960, GHS Archives.
As the challenges in the district mounted, C. Taylor Whittier announced his resignation as the superintendent of schools. In 1967, almost a year later, the board of education appointed Mark Shedd, a Harvard-trained educator who had served as the superintendent of schools in Englewood, New Jersey, to be Philadelphia’s next superintendent of schools. For a year, Shedd studied the conditions of the city’s school to understand its strengths and weaknesses and told residents that he was committed to making the schools “more responsive and more relevant” to their communities. Shedd’s appointment received praise from civil rights leaders and others who hoped that the school district would finally address segregation in the city’s public schools. However, by the time Shedd officially assumed his position, Philadelphia’s schools were some of the most segregated schools in the nation. At Germantown High School, the inequality that had existed since the school’s founding increasingly fractured students into two worlds based increasingly on race and gender.

_Germantown High School: A New Wing Delivers on its Promise of Inequality_

On February 28, 1961, after three years of construction, Germantown High School’s new east wing opened with 37 modern classrooms. The industrial arts and home economics departments and the school’s new child development center were moved to the basement level. The new visual arts department and updated language department were housed on the first and second floors. The high school’s commercial program shared the third and fourth floors with the distributive education program, a program founded in the 1950s to prepare Germantown students for retail positions.

---

Before construction began, the Board of Education promised the community that this new wing would be equipped with the latest technologies and equipment to prepare Germantown youth for the labor market. When the wing officially opened, Germantown administrators, faculty, and students praised the board of education for its vision and commitment to their neighborhood high school.75

The new wing afforded another feature: it separated the student body into distinct buildings based on their curricular placement. Once the new wing officially opened, academic students attended classes in the high school’s original 1915 building while vocational students attended classes in the new wing severing the student body into distinct groups. As one student noted, this new arrangement separated upper and middle class, predominately white students, from the working class, increasingly black students, who attended the neighborhood high school. In other words, even though the students emphasized the “opportunities” that this new wing afforded, the opening of this new wing also increased the level of educational inequality between the students who were in the academic program and those who were not.76 As students shuffled to their respective parts of the building, the inequality at Germantown High School became much more visible to its faculty and students. Furthermore, the inequality was increasingly based on race and gender. By the end of the decade, many residents withdrew the local support that had sustained their neighborhood high school since its founding. Germantown High School was increasingly regarded as a school for black children who lacked other schooling options in the city’s segregated school system. While this racism had existed in the school for decades, in the 1960s, African American students challenged this inequality publicly and demanded that the faculty and

76 “New Wing Big Asset to Gtn.,” Cliveden Clipper, February 28, 1961.
administrators provide them with the academic education that many of their white peers enjoyed.

Throughout the late 1950s and early 1960s, Germantown High School administrators and faculty still encouraged high school youth to meet regularly with their guidance counselors and homeroom advisers about their course placement and postsecondary plans. In 1960, the academic course still remained the most popular curricular option among Germantown High School graduates followed by the commercial course. Between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of graduates who enrolled in the academic course rose by 16% while the percentage of graduates who enrolled in the commercial course decreased by 17%. Female graduates reflected these trends. For the first time in decades, the majority of female graduates selected the academic program followed by the commercial program. Over the past decade, the percentage of women who selected the academic program rose by 35% and the percentage of women who selected the commercial program dropped by 21%.

The male graduates, in contrast, did not reflect the school’s overall trends. Even though the majority of male graduates enrolled in the academic course, a higher percentage of male graduates enrolled in vocational courses than the commercial course. Between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of male graduates who enrolled in the academic course dropped by 9% while the percentage of male graduates increased by 77%. Unlike the female graduates, the percentage of male graduates who selected the commercial course surged by 180% (see figure 6.7). Data from the school yearbooks indicates that for the first time in the school’s history, female youth were more likely to enroll in the academic program than male youth (p < 0.001, multinomial regression). These shifts
reflect the dramatic rise in the percentage of women who enrolled in
postsecondary education during the early part of the 1960s.77

Figure 6.7 Course Placement, Female and Male Graduates, Germantown High School, 1960

Reflect the dramatic rise in the percentage of women who enrolled in
postsecondary education during the early part of the 1960s.77

1. The vocational courses include music, vocational arts, industrial arts (males only),
mechanical arts (males only), trade preparatory (males only), and home economics
(females only).

When one compares course enrollment by race, other differences emerge.

Between 1950 and 1960, the percentage of white youth who enrolled in the academic
program increased by 30% while the percentage of white youth who selected the
commercial program decreased by 26%. The percentage of black youth who selected the
academic and commercial programs decreased by 31% and 13%, respectively, and the

77 120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait (National Institute for Educational Sciences,
January 19, 1993), 55.
78 See Appendix, Chapter 6 Data and Analysis.
percentage of black youth who enrolled in the vocational programs increased by 77%. Data from the school yearbooks suggest that African American females enjoyed more academic opportunities than African American males. While some of these differences are related to the fact that female students did not enroll in the vocational tracks, these shifts also reflect the surge in college enrollment among African American females between 1950 and 1960 as well as the new opportunities for them on the labor market. By 1960, black youth regardless of their gender were less likely to be enrolled in the academic course and were more likely to enroll in the commercial and vocational tracks than white youth. As the percentage of black youth rose in the high school, curricular placement was increasingly tied to the youth’s race and gender (see figure 6.8). Even though a higher percentage of African American females were enrolled in the academic and commercial tracks than their African American male peers, as women, they still faced many obstacles and lower pay on the labor market.

---

Source: Germantown High School Yearbooks, January and June 1960, GHS.

1. The vocational courses include music, vocational arts, industrial arts (males only), mechanical arts (males only), trade preparatory (males only), home economics (females only), and general courses.

**Germantown Youth Respond to the Nation’s Civil Rights Movement**

As the inequality escalated in the high school, Philadelphia youth engaged in local and citywide activities to address racial discrimination in their country, city, and neighborhoods. In the spring of 1960, Judy Blanchard, a student at the Germantown Friends School and a member of the Germantown Community Council’s school committee, organized a “sympathy protest” for youth to show their support for civil
rights activities in the South and in Philadelphia. During the preparations, the
adults who sponsored the school committee urged Blanchard and her peers to use the
protest to bring awareness to the overt discrimination that existed in the South as well as
the “hidden away” discrimination that existed in the North, including Germantown.
Even though the adults support the idea, they told the youth that they had a right to
demonstrate as individuals, but that they could not “wear any clothing that would
identify them with their school.” In other words, the youth were welcome to march, but
they could not implicate their school in these activities. Blanchard eagerly solicited
others to join her cause, but as the adults listened to the youth discuss their plans, they
noticed that many of the members of the schools committee either criticized the aims of
the protest or remained silent during the discussions. The members of the school
committee did not necessarily agree with Blanchard’s belief that racism existed or her
solution to address it.  

After the youth participated in these protests, Wallace W. Knief, the editor of
Germantown’s local newspaper, The Germantown Courier, published an editorial that
condemned the youth protesters. Knief told his readers that he had met with the youth
before the protest occurred and urged them to “go down South” where racism actually
existed rather than staging a protest in Germantown where, according to him, white and
black individuals were treated equally. He criticized the adults who sponsored the
schools committee for encouraging the youth to participate in these protests and
suggested that the youth were “victims of innocence and misguided enthusiasm.”

Within days, several residents sent letters to the newspaper applauding Knief’s

81 Memo to JFG, JWW, RFP, OEJ, Senior School homeroom teachers; Other faculty, for their information,
1960, Box 15, Folder 68, Principals & Faculty Advisors, 1960-63, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
82 Wallace W. Knief, “One Small Voice,” Germantown Courier, March 31, 1690, Box 19, Folder 211, SCC
Newspaper Clippings, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA. For a description of the pickets, see
In response, Robert W. Boynton, the headmaster of the Germantown Friends School, wrote a letter that challenged Knief’s “crude comments” about the youth and the racial harmony that he described in his editorial. He argued that the youth who staged the protest should be praised for their courage and commitment to racial equality and urged residents to realize that these youth represented the “promise for the future.”

Even though these youth faced staunch criticism from residents, they continued to picket with other youth in the city and engaged in a movement to end racism in the South and in their community.

As the members of the school committee joined others on the picket lines, Germantown High School youth increasingly tried to divert attention away from the racism in their high school and community by showcasing the achievements and contributions of black youth. Each week, the school newspaper featured short student biographies to highlight the awards and accomplishments of Germantown’s finest students. Many of these articles focused on African American students to demonstrate the contributions that these students made to their school and their integration in the student body. The school newspaper also featured the elections of several black students to the student assembly and committee of ten, which represented the student government. In 1958, Charles Ballard became the school’s first student assembly president. Two years later, in 1960, the students elected Frank Rider, an African American student assembly president.
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83 Vincent P. O’Keefe, “Picketing Remarks Bring Commendation,” Germantown Courier, April 4, 1960, Box 19, Folder 211, SCC Newspaper Clippings, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
84 Robert W. Boynton, Head of the Senior High School, Germantown Friends School, “Letters to the Editor,” Germantown Courier, April 1, 1960; Alton T. Lemon, “Letters to the Editor,” Germantown Courier, April 1, 1960, Box 19, Folder 211, SCC Newspaper Clippings, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
American boy who ran cross country and track at the high school and whose parents were teachers in the school district, as the president of the student assembly. The newspaper articles about Rider emphasized his leadership skills, congenial personality, and college-bound future. A few weeks before he graduated, Rider described his high school as an institution that has “students of all religions, races, and mental abilities. Yet they all blend together to create a school based on understanding and consideration for one another.” In the early 1960s, the school newspaper’s coverage and the election of these African American youth made Germantown High School seem like the perfect, integrated schools where students were treated equally and lived “in perfect harmony” with one another.

As the school newspaper promoted the idea that racial harmony existed at the high school, the ever-increasing spatial segregation of students reinforced the idea, particularly among white students, that racism and discrimination did not exist in the community. Mariana Eckardt, a white woman who lived in Mt. Airy and graduated from Germantown High School in 1963, recalled that her parents raised her “to respect and honor diversity” from a very young age. However, as an adolescent, she said that she did not know much about the civil rights movement. She never saw the images broadcast on television and did not understand the discrimination that her black peers faced at the high school and in their community. Even though Mt. Airy was considered a racially diverse community, she attended a predominately white elementary school as a child and socialized primarily with white children on her block.

In 1960, when her parents decided to send her to Germantown High School, Marianna recalled that many of her mother’s friends questioned her decision. They told her that the school’s academic program had deteriorated and that there were better schooling options in the community for her. In high school, Marianna remembered that she was friendly with African American students during school, but rarely saw them once she left the building. Many years later, when she purchased a home in Germantown and learned more about racial inequality in this country, she realized that “the students who lived in Mt. Airy went north [after school ended] while the other students went the other way.” In other words, Germantown’s middle and upper class youth boarded the trolleys after school to their quaint, suburban-style communities while Germantown’s working class youth walked a few blocks either east or south to their homes to the areas slated for demolition and urban renewal. As students commuted to and from school, black and white youth led separate lives in Germantown’s deeply segregated communities. In the 1960s, white students, like Marianna, were unaware of the racism and unrest because their privileged lifestyle sheltered them from the harsh realities that others experienced.\(^{89}\)

Unlike Marianna, black youth understood the nature of racism in the community and their high school because they experienced it on a daily basis. As the civil rights movement gained momentum, these individuals increasingly challenged the racism in their local high school. In 1961, Roland E. Johnson, an African American public school teacher, sent a letter to Floyd Logan, the leader of the Educational Equality League, an organization that had been committed to civil rights and education for decades. In the letter, Johnson told Logan that the leaders of Germantown High School’s cheerleading

squad routinely barred black youth from the team. Specifically, he told Logan that he had sent a letter to Ernest O. Kohl, Germantown’s regional superintendent, asking him to investigate why Norma Holland, a young African American woman, had been disqualified when she applied to be on the cheerleading squad.\(^\text{90}\) When Logan contacted Kohl about the situation, Kohl sent him a copy of the judging sheet that Bernadette F. Strouse, the faculty sponsor, used to assess prospective cheerleaders. According to Strouse, cheerleaders had to maintain a C average and have good behavior to apply. If the applicants met these criteria, they were invited to attend several training sessions to learn the cheers. After that, a panel of faculty and students judged each student on appearance (50%), form (25%), and pep (25%). Even though these measures were clearly arbitrary, Kohl and Strouse insisted that their decisions were based on the student’s performance, not their race.\(^\text{91}\) With the support of Holland’s parents, Logan continued to press his concerns, and eventually, Strouse allowed her to participate on the squad.\(^\text{92}\)

Later that spring, Holland’s classmates elected her to be the president of her class. Her aunt, Sylvia Hawkins Beard, an African American teacher who worked at the high school during the 1960s, recalled that Holland used her “strong personality” to challenge racism in the school. For example, during her senior prom, the faculty sponsors tried to refuse to take photographs of black youth. When Holland entered the room, she asked the faculty sponsors to take a photograph of her with her date. According to Beard, the faculty told her that her niece was “uppity” because her aunt worked at the high school. Beard did not think that her niece was uppity; rather, she

\(^{90}\) Letter from Roland E. Johnson to Floyd Logan, May 2, 1961, Educational Equality League Collection, Box 9, Folder 6, Germantown High School, TUA.

\(^{91}\) “Selection of Cheerleaders,” Educational Equality League Collection, Box 9, Folder 6, Germantown High School, TUA.

\(^{92}\) Interview with Dr. Samuel Beard and Ms. Sylvia Hawkins Beard, by Louise Strawbridge, No Date, Box, African Americans in Germantown between the World Wars, Germantown Historical Society.
thought the teachers not accustomed to black youth who questioned their authority and spoke out against inequality publicly. When Holland asked the faculty to take her photograph, she was not being uppity. She simply wanted the faculty to treat her like her white peers.

As the racism intensified, many African American youth, such as Linda Singleton, simply withdrew from their high school. Linda was the daughter of Arnold Winslow Gallimore, a Tuskegee airmen, and Thelma Mae West, a house wife who stayed at home while her daughter was young. In the mid-1950s, Linda and her mother moved to Philadelphia and lived in a new row house on Chew and Upsal Street in the Mount Airy section of Germantown. By the 1950s, her neighborhood was a typical middle class African American community with “good neighbors and excellent transportation to the city.” According to Linda, residents in other parts of Germantown “thought you were doing well if you lived in this area.” Her maternal grandparents lived on the other side of Germantown Avenue in a large one-family house on Pelham Road, one of Germantown more exclusive upper class neighborhoods. They were the only African American residents on the street.

When she moved to the area, Linda enrolled at Roosevelt Junior High School where the faculty placed her in the academic track since she had the prerequisite courses from her previous school, a military school in Poughkeepsie, New York. Linda recalled that she was the only African American woman in her class because most of the black students were placed in the vocational or commercial tracks. When she started high school, she enrolled at the Philadelphia High School for Girls, but found that the curriculum was too rigid. Linda remembered that her teachers wanted her to memorize

---

93 Interview with Dr. Samuel Beard and Ms. Sylvia Hawkins Beard, by Louise Strawbridge, No Date, Box, African Americans in Germantown between the World Wars, Germantown Historical Society.
everything she studied, but she did not think that they valued creativity or critical
tinking. So, in her junior year, she transferred to Germantown High School. As a
Germantown student, she found the curriculum much more appealing, but had a difficult
time dealing with the racial inequalities at the high school.

Linda recalled that she was the type of student who loved to learn and always
tried to answer questions in class when she thought she knew the answers. One day, her
teacher asked the class a question, and naturally, Linda raised her hand. The teacher
looked around the room and asked the question again. Linda recalled that one of her
friends, Jerry, told the teacher that Linda had raised her hand to answer the question.
Reluctantly, the teacher asked Linda to respond to the question, which she did correctly,
and moved onto the next part of the lesson. Linda said that this happened repeatedly in
high school because she was the only African American student in her academic courses.
According to her, the social isolation made her feel withdrawn from her schoolwork, and
so, she decided to work at her mother’s beauty shop on Germantown Avenue after school
instead of participating in activities and clubs. In 1963, at the age of 16, Linda graduated
from Germantown High School and enrolled at Tuskegee University. Eventually, she
earned her doctorate in educational counseling, where many years later, she returned to
Germantown High School to provide the high school youth with the support that she
never received.94

*Racial Violence Rises Raising New Questions about the High School*

As the black youth experienced racism at their high school, Philadelphia made
national headlines on March 21, 1960 when a group of black teenagers stabbed John
Campagnia, Jr., a white honor student who attended South Philadelphia High School, as
he was walking home from school. The motives for the stabbing were not clear, but

---

reports surfaced that described Campagna as an “innocent victim of a revenge attack.”

Several days later, on March 27, 1960, a group of white men shot and wounded Diane Nelson, a 12 year old African American girl, while she was walking through her South Philadelphia neighborhood. A month later, the men who committed this crime had not been identified. Even though youth violence had plagued the city for decades, the media coverage of these incidents spurred new fears about the level of violence in communities that had undergone dramatic racial change, such as South Philadelphia, West Philadelphia, and Germantown.

On November 15, 1960, a group of black youth beat James Devine, a white teenager, at a bowling alley located a few blocks from Germantown High School. The melee ensued when Devine called one of the black boys a n----- In response, the black youth pulled Devine into the bathroom and punched him repeatedly. The manager evicted the boys from the scene, and according to reports, the dazed Devine allegedly ran through the glass door at the bowling alley where the police found him bleeding on the sidewalk. The police took Devine to Germantown Hospital where he was treated for serious injuries to his head, eye, arms, and kidneys and arrested the black youth who had punched Devine, including one who attended Germantown High School. The families of the black youth publicly apologized for the assault and assured the community that these young men were “good boys” when they were “not drinking.” Even though Devine’s racial slur instigated the violence, his family remained silent about what had happened.

In Germantown, like many other parts of the nation, the consequences and perception of  

violence differed among black and white youth—the black families felt the need to apologize for their sons’ behavior while the white family did not.\footnote{Chester Coleman, “Declares Dazed Gang Victim Leaped Through Glass Door,” Philadelphia Tribune, November 15, 1960.}

On October 27, 1962, reports surfaced that three young men attacked Samuel Gerrick, a black honor student, as he was leaving Germantown High School. The young men asked Gerrick to give them money. When he refused, they struck his head shattering his glasses and throwing him to the ground. The principal responded to the incident telling reporters that these young men were part of a group that routinely loitered near the high school and taunted students on their way home.\footnote{Junius Bond, “3 Youths Held in Attack On Gtn. High ‘A’ Student,” Philadelphia Tribune, October 27, 1962.} In the early 1960s, even though violence seemed to be increasing, these incidents occurred outside the school building. However, on December 8, 1964, Germantown policed arrested a male student for stabbing his classmate on the second floor of Germantown High School.\footnote{Chet Coleman, “Boy, 15, Arrested in Germantown High School Stabbing Incident,” The Philadelphia Tribune, December 8, 1964.} The violence that had existed on the streets for decades had finally seeped into the building. This raised new concerns about safety of the community and the high school.

In the midst of these reports of violence, the leaders of the Germantown Community Council school’s committee, a consortium of students and teachers from the community’s public and private high schools, gathered to evaluate the committee’s work since its founding. As the members thought about the committee’s 21 years of service to the community, they began to think about the committee’s future and the state of secondary education in Germantown. After the meeting adjourned, reports surfaced that Mother Francis Joseph, an administrator at Ravenhill Academy, a private, Catholic school for girls, had raised several concerns about the conditions at Germantown High
School and its future membership on the schools committee. Mother Francis Joseph told the youth that she graduated from Germantown High School “when it was a good school.”

Several days later, Mary Ellen Brown, a teacher at Germantown High School, wrote a letter to Mother Francis Joseph about her comment. In the letter, Brown told Mother Francis Joseph that her remarks had damaged the reputation of the schools committee and angered the Germantown faculty and students who had heard her statement at the meeting. Brown acknowledged that “a lack of money and public support of the public schools” made it impossible for Germantown faculty to provide the resources that the youth actually deserved. At the same time, she believed that the public high school had other advantages over the private schools: a diverse student body and a “spirit of friendship and cooperation among Negro and white students and teachers.” Brown admitted that she had heard several unflattering stories about Germantown High School, but urged Mother Francis Joseph to be more careful about spreading false claims about her alma mater.

In many ways, Brown’s attempt to discredit these comments had little impact. Mother Francis Joseph’s comments had power in the community because she was a well-known educator and alumna of Germantown High School, but perhaps more importantly, because her remarks coincided with white flight, rising violence, and research about the culture of poverty and the impact of schools on low-income students.

---
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of color. As the student enrollment at Germantown High School shifted from being predominately white to predominately black, many residents shared Mother Francis Joseph’s belief that Germantown High School was not a good school for their children. The benefits of Germantown High School, its academic program and diverse student body, felt irrelevant to Germantown families, who in the past might have sent their children to public schools. They wanted a good school in a safe location, and thus, they continued to move their children out of the school. At the same time, even though the violence had escalated and created legitimate concerns, Dr. Samuel Beard, Jr., who served as the second black principal of Germantown High School beginning in 1967, recalled that many of the white families fabricated stories about the violence so that they could transfer to the Northeast High School, a new high school located in a predominately white section of the city. In other words, some families moved their children out of the school because they were worried about their children’s safety; others created stories about violence to move their children out of the school because they did not want their children to attend a high school with an increasingly black student enrollment.

Resident Propose Innovative Plans to Address Youth Violence and Segregation

As racial unrest and youth violence increased throughout Germantown, government officials and local residents argued that the rise in violence was related, at least in part, to the shortage of recreational activities and employment options for American youth. In the mid-1960s, federal officials argued that racial discrimination in

---

102 For an example see Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1963).
103 Interview with Dr. Samuel Beard and Ms. Sylvia Hawkins Beard, by Louise Strawbridge, No Date, Box, African Americans in Germantown between the World Wars, Germantown Historical Society. See also, Rosalie August, Germantown High School Class of 1949, Interview by Author, May 10, 2009.
the labor market had contributed to rising violence and unemployment among African American youth. During the Johnson administration, the federal government created several programs, including the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, to address these problems and increase employment. In 1964, the leaders of Germantown Community Council founded the Germantown Improvement Program for Summer Youth (GIPSY) that combined vocational training with summer employment for Germantown youth. Unlike other employment programs in the city that focused on providing employment opportunities for black youth, such as Leon Sullivan’s Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OIC), the GIPSY program accepted black and white youth from a wide range of economic backgrounds and schools to promote interracial and interclass socialization among its participants.

Between 1964 and 1966, GIPSY participants worked in several local businesses and helped maintain the historical museums in the community. According to annual reports, the program was a rousing success in promoting interracial cooperation and ensuring that the youth met their long-term aims. One participant told GIPSY leaders that he had wanted to drop out of high school before he participated in the program, but after finishing the program, he decided to stay in school until he graduated. The program’s funding, which was a combination of private funding from Germantown residents, foundational support from city institutions, and federal aid from the Johnson administration, lasted three years. In 1966, as the war in Vietnam escalated and the level of private aid dwindled, the founders of the program announced that they lacked the funds to run the GIPSY program. The innovative approach to increase employment opportunities and interracial socialization among the community’s youth was over.

While residents focused on youth employment, several members of the Germantown Community Council’s schools committee demanded that school district
officials endorse a new program to alleviate school segregation and provide more funding in the community’s schools. The proposed program called for new school boundaries to create integrated schools, teacher transfers to promote integrated staffs, and if necessary, student busing to alleviate residential segregation. In the past, the schools committee argued that school segregation was directly tied to residential segregation. However, in the spring of 1963, the members of the committee told schools officials that they believed the board of education had deliberately manipulated public school boundaries to maintain segregated schools in the community. School officials responded to these claims and argued that the segregation patterns in the schools reflected residential segregation in Germantown and other parts of the city. As white residents continued to move out of the city and community, it was becoming more difficult to argue against their claim.\(^{104}\)

In the spring of 1964, Ray Donner, a research consultant who worked with the Ford Foundation’s Educational Facilities Laboratory, announced that community renewal program officials had commissioned him to conduct a study of the current state of Germantown’s public schools to develop a comprehensive plan for their future.\(^{105}\) When these plans were announced, Germantown residents were optimistic that Donner would provide them with a plan to end segregation in the local public schools. In December 1964, Ray Donner, the consultant on the project, met with the members of the schools committee and told them that he was considering an innovative way to leverage the community’s historical buildings to create school clusters in the center of
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Germantown to promote small, integrated schools in the heart of the community.
The members of the schools committee hoped that Donner’s plans to centralize school facilities would end school segregation, distribute school resources equitably, and restore educational quality in Germantown’s public schools. However, when Donner finally published his plans in 1966, many residents were disappointed. During the initial discussions of the plans, Donner had given the members of the school committee the impression that Germantown youth would be bused to and from their neighborhoods to attend school full-time in one of many small, integrated schools in these buildings. After studying the situation in the community, he suggested having Germantown youth spend 90% of the time in their current, segregated elementary schools and 10% of their time in one of the small schools in the educational complex. The idea was that students would stay in their neighborhood schools to focus on academic skills and spend part of their week in the educational complex socializing with other students from the community. Donner concluded that an integrated school complex would be a “psychological shock” and “upset white parents to the point of hastening the flight to the suburbs.”

While the members of the school committee praised certain aspects of the report, they were deeply frustrated that Donner had shied away from his original plan of integrating the school and had suggested that one high school was adequate in the community. By 1966, Germantown High School was operating on a shift schedule—with half of the students attending school in the morning and the other half of the students attending school in the afternoon—to accommodate the school’s increasing enrollment levels. Moreover, it was becoming increasingly segregated. White families had already fled the neighborhood schools creating an untenable situation. The schools

---
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committee believed that the educational complex was the only way to reverse this trend. To persuade residents and the board of education to support the educational complex as they had originally envisioned it, the members of the schools committee and other concerned residents participated in citywide rallies, held town meetings, and attended local lectures.\textsuperscript{108}

These efforts had little impact. Other Germantown residents challenged their views and hosted their own meetings where they argued that the educational complex would require “more busing” and not necessarily provide the integration that many believed it would. Rather than building an educational complex, these residents urged Germantown citizens to support a proposed school loan and a six-year building plan that would supposedly spur integration by building new schools, including a new high school for Germantown, on the borders of white and black neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{109} In March, the Board of Education announced that it had rejected the idea of building educational parks as a way to solve segregation in the city. Instead, the city would maintain the traditional 6-3-3-school model with elementary, junior high, and high schools and address school segregation through new construction and busing in certain areas.\textsuperscript{110} This announcement incited individuals throughout the city who had been fighting segregation for decades as well as those who wanted to maintain segregation in their neighborhood schools.\textsuperscript{111}

However, on May 17\textsuperscript{th}, voters decided to approve the $60 million dollar school loan to

\textsuperscript{108} Jack Smyth, “City Ghettos are ‘Racial Concentration Camps,’ Negro Psychologist Tells Chestnut Hill Group,” Box 61, Folder 51, Racial Tensions, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA; “NAACP Urges Halt of Gov’t Fund to City,” Box 61, Folder 51, Racial Tensions, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
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finance new school construction in the city.112 Residents tried to fight this decision, but once the loan passed, Germantown’s plan to build an innovative educational complex and tackle school segregation had ended.113

When the community learned that the School District of Philadelphia had abolished its innovative school plan, residents turned their attention to pressuring school officials for a new high school to relieve overcrowding at Germantown High School. In the spring of 1966, the Germantown Community Council’s Schools Committee hosted a series of town hall meetings to discuss the benefits and limitations of the three proposed sites. The discussions revealed different opinions. Residents in the West Oak Lane area, a predominately white and Jewish neighborhood, backed the West Oak Lane site.114 The Northwest Neighbors Association, another predominately white neighborhood, urged the school district to select the Awbury-Nolan site. The school committee opposed these two sites. Building a high school at West Oak Lane or Awbury-Nolan, both predominately white neighborhoods, would have fractured the community even further along racial lines. Germantown High School would have effectively been a high school for black children while a new school located at West Oak Lane or Awbury-Nolan would have been a high school for white children. Mrs. Thornhill O. Cosby, the African American woman who led the school committee, argued that Germantown High School was one of the only schools in the city that had a chance of being “a stable, integrated high school.” Cosby and the other members of the schools committee urged the school district to build the new school in East Falls, a racially mixed neighborhood, so that the

113 “Rights Marchers Threaten to Bar School Construction,” Philadelphia Inquirer, August 22, 1966, Box 61, Folder 53, Schools in Philadelphia, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
new school did not create a white and black high school in the community.\textsuperscript{115} However, the consultant that the school district hired to study the new high school site stated that West Oak Lane was the best option of the three. Cosby urged residents to voice their opposition to this idea, but by the winter of 1967, it seemed that the schools committee had lost another battle to maintain some level of integration in the community’s public high school.\textsuperscript{116}

\textit{The Community Returns to Urban Renewal and Neglects Germantown High School}

In the midst of the discussions about the future of Germantown’s school, several urban planners who served as consultants for the Philadelphia City Planning Commission published several reports outlining new proposals for urban renewal in the community.\textsuperscript{117} In contrast to earlier plans, the plans in these new proposals focused on a narrow segment of Germantown’s central business corridor and the streets surrounding Germantown Friends School, the elite private school whose leaders had opposed the city’s urban renewal plans in the early 1960s. The urban planners who conducted the study and published this report warned city officials to act immediately to avoid further “decay” in Germantown.\textsuperscript{118} Several months later, Edmund N. Bacon, who had led the urban renewal efforts in the city for decades, declared that city officials could not “afford the luxury of a fragmented approach to the urban problem...Now we must see the city as


\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 1–25.
a whole.” Having secured more than $2 billion dollars in public and private funds, Bacon finally returned to Germantown to discuss the city’s plan for urban renewal in the area. When Bacon returned to the community, in February 1967, he found that many residents had different opinions about the new plans. Jack Hornung, the executive director of Colonial Germantown, Inc., which lobbied on behalf of the community’s business interests, described the study as a “competent, useful working document for renewal in Germantown.” Mrs. Wesley P. Thompson, who served on the Germantown Citizens Committee on Planning and Renewal, which was a subcommittee of the Germantown Community Council, stated that the study’s “entire approach” seemed “negative and shortsighted.” Thompson believed that the study’s shortcoming stemmed from its reliance on outdated demographic data from the 1960 census and on its narrow geographical focus on a small segment of the community. Dr. Robert Anderson, who also served on the subcommittee, charged that the members of Colonial Germantown, Inc., who he described as a “small group of absentee businessmen, only two of whom live in Germantown,” had purposefully influenced the study’s outcomes to address their needs over the community’s.120

One month later, Charles Squire, a city official who managed Germantown’s urban renewal project, announced that city officials had cut Germantown’s urban renewal fund in half—from $15 million to $8 million—after the Department of Housing and Urban Development reduced the city’s funds. Squire promised to maintain several projects, including the acquisition of properties on Coulter Street for the Germantown Friends School; acquisition of Germantown Academy’s properties for commercial

development; acquisition of property behind Rowell’s Department Store for new parking; and the controversial Rittenhouse-Belfield Avenue bypass. Several initiatives were eliminated, such as acquiring the Acme supermarket for a parking garage; rehabilitating the industrial area near Church Lane; and removing two bars on Germantown Avenue. He told residents that the city wanted to conduct another study before proceeding with new plans, but assured them that renewing the area around the Germantown Friends School was his first priority. When the residents heard Squire’s announcement, they urged city officials to include local residents in these discussions to ensure that the revised plans still met their needs.\footnote{121}

Several weeks later, the Germantown Community Council’s citizens’ planning committee held another meeting to talk about the revised plans. However, when the residents gathered, they were more interested in criticizing Colonial Germantown, Inc. than discussing the city’s proposal. Residents charged that city officials only listened the powerful business interests and ignored their concerns. Hornung and Barber, Jr., who led the organization, disputed the claim and suggested that they had repeatedly invited at least 16 local civic groups to their meetings, but no one came. A few days after the meeting, Gustave G. Amsterdam, the chairman of Philadelphia’s Redevelopment Authority, threatened to divert urban renewal funds from Germantown and urged these groups to resolve their disputes immediately.\footnote{122}

In September, City Council held hearings on the plan. The members of Colonial Germantown, Inc. urged council to approve the plan immediately and “lift Germantown out of the uncertainty that has paralyzed it for a generation.” David Cohen, a Democratic candidate for city council, disagreed and stated that the plan was deeply flawed and

\footnote{122} Jack Smyth, “Germantown Renewal Dissension Might Cause Diversion of Funds,” \textit{The Evening Bulletin}, May 18, 1967, Box 64, Scrapbook, Urb 39, GCC Collection, TUA.
ignored the residents’ concerns. Olivia Y. Taylor, a longtime YWCA board member, agreed with Cohen stating that the current plan seemed to suggest that cars were more important that Germantown youth. When the hearings finally ended, city council approved the plan to build the bypass and dislocate 81 families from the area, most of whom were African American. When the hearings finally ended, Councilman Kolankiewicz, who represented the area, stated that he had never received as many letters from his constituents as he had during these discussions. However, from the beginning, no one mentioned the need to improve the area around Germantown High School. Rather, the businessmen who ran Colonial Germantown, Inc. were much more concerned about preserving historical structures and Germantown Friends, the elite, private school in the middle proposal renewal district. In other words, the Germantown Improvement Project, as one newspaper reporter called it, centered on retaining upper and middle class white residents rather than improving the community for everyone.

On October 4, 1967, City Council approved yet another study to consider the benefits and limitations to the Central Germantown Urban Renewal Plan, but made it clear that the main area under consideration was near Germantown Friend School, the elite private school, not Germantown High School, the community’s once prestigious public high school.

**Students Walkout Bringing Newfound Attention to the Neglect at Germantown High School**

On November 17, 1967, David Richardson, an African American man who graduated from Germantown High School, led a group of students on a school walkout.

---
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These individuals walked out of their high school in the middle of the afternoon and marched through the community to meet other activists at the board of education’s headquarters on 21st Street and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, in the heart of Philadelphia. By the time that the protest officially began, over 3,500 students had gathered to show their solidarity and strength as well as their frustration and anger about the racial disparities throughout the school district. These students wanted the Board of Education to increase the percentage of black teachers and administrators in their schools and mandate black history for everyone in the city’s public schools. As the crowd grew, Frank Rizzo, the city’s police commissioner, ordered 400 policemen to end the protest. Police brutality had been increasing for years, particularly in the city’s black neighborhoods, and thus, the presence of police at this peaceful rally raised concerns among the youth.

According to reports, in the middle of the protests, several police officers tried to arrest a youth for standing on a parked car. As this happened, several other youth gathered around the police and escalated tensions between the two groups. The police attacked the youth as they tried to storm City Hall, a few blocks from the protest site, driving them from the protest site back into their neighborhoods. Along the way, the youth smashed the windshields of cars that were parked on the streets. Several bystanders told the police that the youth assaulted them during their retreat. When the violence ended, the police arrested 57 participants and recorded 22 injuries. The violent exchange between the youth and the police made national headlines. Newspaper reporters repeatedly characterized the peaceful protest of youth who simply wanted better schools as “Negro riots” in the city of brotherly love. Mark Shedd, the superintendent of the city’s schools, and Richardson Dilworth, the Board of Education president and former mayor, blamed the police force for escalating the violence and
creating disorder in the city. According to Dilworth, plainclothes police officers were on the scene as the youth were protesting. These officers had everything until control until Rizzo, “without our request, set loose a couple of hundred men swinging clubs and beating children.” 126 Several days later, a group of 1,000 white youth and teachers gathered at the protest site to demonstrate their commitment to racial equality in their city. During these protests, one teacher told reporters that the city’s schools were “more like jails...the kids hate them.” 127

By 1967, it would be difficult to deny that racial disparities existed in the city’s public schools, but the walkout brought these racial disparities and student unrest to the city’s attention in a new way. Many residents had never seen large groups of black youth march through their neighborhoods or the kind of police brutality that ended the demonstration shortly after it began. Sixty years ago, when the leaders of the campaign had fought to secure a high school building in their community, they never thought that the conditions at the school would be this difficult. The inequality that was embedded in the school’s foundation since its founding had increased dramatically over the past 60 years. By 1967, when David Richardson led the walkout to demand better educational opportunities for African American youth throughout the city, Germantown High School had finally become an urban school—a place reserved primarily for African American youth who lacked other options.

Epilogue:

*An American High School Transformed*
In February 2007, when the news of Frank Burd’s injuries filled the city’s newspapers, I was in the middle of a research project on university-community relations at the Henry C. Lea Elementary School, located a few blocks from the University of Pennsylvania’s campus. The principal, Michael Silverman, had agreed to let me conduct this study as part of a course that I was taking on the history of the university’s relationship with public schools in Penn’s West Philadelphia neighborhoods. While city officials discussed the challenges at Germantown High School, West Philadelphia High School students staged several protests and a walkout to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the educational resources at their high school. The teachers at Lea were concerned about these events, but their concerns shifted when they found out that their principal, Michael Silverman, had been selected as the new principal of Germantown High School. One morning before the students had arrived, Silverman told me the news. He explained that he was not returning to the Lea school because the search committee had selected him to be the principal of Germantown High School. He hoped that I could continue my research at the Lea school and promised to speak to the new principal about my project to ensure a smooth transition.

I think that he expected me to wish him well on his journey and agree with his suggestion to finish my work on Lea the following year. Instead, I asked him if I could follow him to Germantown to document his practice at this troubled school. Even though I was not exactly sure what this project would look like, I wanted to show others what he did. Over the past five years, with his leadership, Lea had moved from one of the worst schools in Philadelphia to a place where families felt comfortable sending their children. Academic achievement and student safety improved dramatically. When I interviewed the teachers about this transformation, they credited Silverman. They were devastated when they heard that he was leaving. But, he knew what he was doing. He
was leaving to show that he could do the same thing at a high school. He felt that he had done all he could at the Lea School. It was time for him to leave. For Silverman, Germantown had a personal connection. He lived two blocks from the high school, in a middle class enclave in West Germantown. Silverman knew firsthand that the community, the school district, and the city had abandoned his neighborhood high school for decades. He wanted to change that. I wanted to watch him—to document the change, to illustrate why strong school leadership mattered, to prove that urban school could change, and to show that these institutions were salvageable.

And while I witnessed many remarkable transformations that year, many moments of hope and opportunity, I was struck by the fact that I learned more about the school’s so-called glorious past than its current challenges. When I spoke with the staff about the reform efforts, they generally prefaced their comments with vivid descriptions of the school’s past accomplishments. They wanted to convince me that it had once been a first-rate institution that, like other urban schools in the city and nation, it had declined over time. They wanted me to understand that the school’s contemporary challenges, the inequality that existed there, were new. Many of the staff at the school had even graduated from the high school. These individuals were deeply attached to their alma mater and wanted me to realize that it was a different place today. They told me about their wonderful teachers and kind administrators. They discussed their lives since graduation and explained that their high school had given them opportunities that other Philadelphia youth lacked. In other words, their experiences at Germantown High School gave them access to postsecondary education, and eventually, a more secure future. Sometimes, they even pointed out the school’s architectural gems: the carved woodwork that still rises above the entrance to the school, the original artwork that is tucked away in several administrative offices, and the trophy cabinet that displays the
school’s achievements at the entrance to the east hallway. This narrative existed beyond the school. When I spoke with other alumni and local activists, I heard the same story: Germantown High School had once been a place where students received a first-rate education. Today, the school was a last resort for low-income students of color who lacked other educational options.

As I listened to this narrative again and again, I noticed two things. First, everyone wanted to frame the history of Germantown High School as a declension narrative where the glorious institution decayed over time giving rise to inequality and failure. Second, very few people wanted to connect the challenges of the school to the challenges in the community, city, and nation. No one discussed the fact that the windows on the houses near the high school are broken and boarded up with makeshift sheets of plywood to block the winter’s cold winds and the summer’s blazing heat. That just beyond the school parking lot is a distressed public housing complex rife with drug and gang activity. That on Germantown and Cheltenham Avenue, the main thoroughfares in the community, men and women linger on the streets throughout the day because they have no work. That the small mills and locally owned businesses had relocated to the nearby suburbs and beyond. That entrenched poverty and institutionalized racism paralyzes many individuals from living the lives that they had hoped to have. Furthermore, they refused to acknowledge that just beyond this entrenched poverty are some of the wealthiest neighborhoods in the city and the most elite educational institutions for Philadelphia youth. The lines are clearly drawn between those families who are forced to send their children to failing schools, like Germantown, and those who have better options.

As I reflected on what I experienced that year, I wanted to believe that the declension narrative was accurate. After all, I had spent several years working as a
teacher and administrator in urban schools, and now, I was in the midst of earning a doctorate to gain the skills to improve these institutions. It was comforting to believe the declension narrative, to believe that schools had once worked for everyone, but somewhere along the way, had lost their institutional magic. But, when I looked at the community and spent more time at the school, I was not so sure that I agreed with the declension narrative that I had heard told so many times. There were small signs that offered clues that this inequality was actually not new: the fur coats that the young Germantown women wore to high school, the limousines that brought these youth to school, the fiscal crisis that the school district faced in 1916, and the discussion of needy youth in the school’s newspaper when the Germantown High School opened. These clues raised new questions about the school’s past and forced me to focus on the history both within and beyond the school’s walls. The one thing that I did not question was that our nation’s urban schools often failed to provide the education that America’s low-income youth of color need today.

Germantown High School’s grim statistics were a constant reminder of the challenges at the school. In 2011, 68% of Germantown youth scored at the below-basic level on the reading section of the Pennsylvania System of State Assessment (PSSA), the commonwealth’s high-stakes test. On the math section of this test, 74% of the youth were at the below-basic level.¹ In the 2010-2011 academic year, only 40.5% of Germantown High School youth are on-track to graduate from their high school in four years.² Even though the validity of the measures has been questioned, these figures suggest that Germantown High School is not providing its youth with the academic skills

necessary to enroll in college, to enter the 21st century workforce, or to escape the poverty that many of these youth have already experienced in their short lives.

The challenges at the school extend beyond the low-levels of academic achievement. In 2007, officials in the Pennsylvania Department of Education designated Germantown High School as one of the state’s seven persistently dangerous high schools due to the number of violent incidents that have occurred in the school. Dangerous incidents include weapons possession—guns, knives, or other weapons—or behavior that typically results in arrest—homicide, kidnapping, robbery, sexual offenses, and aggravated assaults.3 In the 2008-2009 school year, one year after students attacked Frank Burd, Germantown High School staff reported 48 assaults, 23 drug charges, 18 weapons possession, and three thefts.4 The violence that exists the school affects the learning environment for Germantown teachers and students—only 48% of the teachers and only 56% of the students said that they feel safe and believe that their others feel safe in and around the school.5 Today, the word, urban, is shorthand for all of these things. It summarizes what we often do not want to say aloud—that the public schools that serve the low-income, students of color routinely fail the children who attend them. This term also masks the history of these schools making the very policies and practices that contributed to these challenges over time invisible today. Rather than looking carefully at the history, we have simply said that our urban schools are failures. It would be difficult to dispute that. But, it is still not clear how this transformation occurred.

Simply denoting our urban schools as victims of modern developments such as
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urbanization does not address the specifically historical origins of the problems these institutions and urban youth face today.

Current scholarship on the history of urban high schools and the stories that I heard at Germantown High School focus primarily on the institution’s glorious past, suggesting that these institutions were once the hallmark of our nation. Scholars argue that the current challenges in urban schools are the direct result of punctuated moments in time—the failures of Brown v. Board of Education, the dramatic white flight from the city, and the subsequent resegregation of our nation’s urban schools into schools, such as Germantown High School, which are reserved for low-income, students of color, and other schools, such as elite magnet schools and suburban schools, which are reserved for middle and high-income, predominately white youth. In other words, these moments fractured our nation’s schools into those that serve poor youth and their more affluent peers. This change had led to gross inequality between these groups and has contributed to the fiscal challenges of urban school districts across the nation. In doing so, the current scholarship and the declension narrative obscures the everyday policies and practices that led to the challenges of these institutions and gross inequality that exists today.

This dissertation argues that this story of decline is too simplistic. Even though the failures of Brown v. Board of Education, the dramatic white flight from the city, and the subsequent resegregation of our nation’s public schools clearly affected urban schools, this study demonstrates that the educational inequality that plagues our nation today was embedded in our nation’s high schools since their founding. In the beginning of the twentieth century, Germantown High School enrolled many youth who came from low-income families, attended their neighborhood high school, excelled in their academic courses, and as a result, defied racism in society and moved beyond their class
means. In short, they achieved the American dream: moving from working class families to middle, and even, upper class worlds that seemed beyond one’s reach. The stories of individuals like Berthold Levy, David Alcorn, Miriam Garrison, and Adrienne Morrison conform to the existing narrative—these men and women attended the high school and experienced social mobility, in part, because of the education that they received while they were students at Germantown High School. For these students, their high school credential and experience challenged structural inequality and afforded these youth access to opportunities and a more prosperous future.

However, this was not always the case. In 1907, when the leaders of the high school campaign pressured city officials for the funding to build a new high school, they wanted to protect their upper and middle class, white children from the chaos and confusion of the city’s urban core, particularly the city’s immigrant and black residents. The inequality that exists today was embedded in the fabric of the high school from its founding. Over time, Germantown increasingly offered one type of education for white, affluent youth and another type of education for low-income youth of color. Data indicate that in 1920 African American graduates were more likely to be placed in the academic track than their white peers. Their families knew the value and legitimacy of an academic education, and thus, they pushed for their children, especially their daughters, to be placed in this program. When the school refused, they sent their children elsewhere. Germantown High School faculty replicated these structural inequalities forcing black families to send their children to other schools, placing African American and female youth in the back of the room, giving them F minuses in algebra, refusing to teach them the skills that they needed to compete in the labor market. Young men and women, like Marion Campbell, Savannah Holman, Ernest Cuff, and Linda Singleton challenged this inequality by questioning the legitimacy of their high school
education and the value of its credential. For them, Germantown High School did not resemble the first-rate institution that the school’s current staff insisted had once existed.

This dissertation deliberately connects the school’s history to the economic, cultural, and political changes that occurred in the community, city, and nation to show how the inequality extended beyond the high school’s walls. In 1907, when Germantown residents started their campaign for a neighborhood high school, the School District of Philadelphia was in the midst of financial turmoil. There simply were not enough seats to house the number of children that were pouring into the city’s schools. City officials routinely refused to allocate the funds that the Board of Education needed to run its urban schools. As the political pressure mounted and the tax rates changed, city council finally caved and gave Germantown residents what it wanted. After that, the community relied on the private funding to ensure that their neighborhood high school provided a first-rate academic education for its affluent, white youth. They used their funds to support a wide network of charitable organizations that provided recreational and educational activities to the community’s youth.

The fiscal challenges and novel solutions that the residents used to alleviate these challenges is still part of the landscape of urban schools today. In 2012, two of the Philadelphia’s most reputable elementary schools, Greenfield and Meredith, raised several thousand dollars to pay for operating expenses that the school district refused to cover. These funds, which the upper and middle class families willingly gave, ensured that these two public schools, located in the heart of city’s most affluent communities, met the needs of the children that they served. In other cases, local universities provide
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the private funds that schools need to provide a first-rate education for middle class residents. For example, during Judith Rodin’s presidency, the University of Pennsylvania opened a public elementary school, the Penn Alexander School, located in its West Philadelphia community. The school, which was touted as an exemplary partnership between the School District of Philadelphia and the university, receives an additional $1,000 per pupil subsidy from the university to ensure that the institution has the funds it needs to be successful. Finally, Philadelphia’s network of charter schools relies heavily on private funding from a variety of sources, including the Bill and Melinda Gates, Walton, and Broad Foundations. Like traditional public schools, many of these networks host websites where interested parties can donate funds to support these schools. Even though these solutions differ, the problem is the same. The fiscal challenges that these schools currently face and the reliance on private funds that many of them use to alleviate these problems have existed in nation’s schools since their founding. In short, urban school districts have never allocated enough funding to provide its youth with the education they deserve.

Even though the roots of educational inequality and fiscal challenges extend to the institution’s founding, Germantown High School, its community, city and nation has transformed over the past century. The school’s statistics provide a snapshot of the changes that have occurred over time—the high levels of poverty, high incidents of violence, and low-level of academic achievement. However, statistics often obscure the effects of these challenges on the youth who are forced to attend this school. Their educational options are limited due to the location of their home, the income of their families, and the color of their skin. Two stories of two young black men that I met at the

---

8 For an example, see http://kippphiladelphia.org/support-us/donate.html
high school illustrate both the possibilities and challenges that still exist today at Germantown High School. Both of these men, Keith Meredith and DaShawn Williams, defied the statistics—they graduated from Germantown High School in the traditional four-year time frame and immediately enrolled in college to pursue their postsecondary degrees. When they left their high school, they were considered Germantown High School success stories.

I met Keith Meredith in the middle of his junior year. One of the math teachers at the high school let me ask his students if they wanted to help me collect yearbook data for my dissertation. The yearbooks were stored in the back room of the school’s library. During their free periods, students visited the library and worked with me entering names from the yearbooks into a database that I had created for this study. Keith was one of these volunteers. During the summer, Keith and another Germantown student, Eli Williams, received funding from a local historical non-profit to conduct oral history interviews with Germantown alumni. During their senior year, these two men received a scholarship from the Philadelphia Youth Network to continue their research with me.

On June 16, 2011, Keith Meredith graduated from Germantown High School with the other members of the class of 2011. With support from his family, his teachers, and the members of the student success center, a federally subsided college preparation program located in the high school, Keith applied to several colleges and decided to attend Lock Haven University. He received federal funds and a special scholarship, offered through the Last Dollar program, to defray Lock Haven’s steep tuition. In addition, he was accepted to and enrolled in a special summer program at the university to help first-generation students, like him, with the transition to college life. Lock Haven

---

9 Out of respect to the family, I have decided to use a pseudonym.
University, like many state schools in Pennsylvania, is located in the middle of the commonwealth, amid the wooded trees and quiet rural life in an overwhelmingly white community. As an African American man who had lived in Philadelphia his entire life, Keith was a bit apprehensive about starting his life at Lock Haven. However, as he began his college life, he felt that he had made the perfect choice. Keith found his college courses engaging and challenging. He enjoyed meeting new people. He loved the fresh, clear streams near Lock Haven where he could cool down from the summer's blasting heat, and perhaps more importantly, he appreciated the fact that he did not need to worry about breaking Philadelphia’s 10pm nightly curfews, which city officials had put in place for minors following the flash mobs that had occurred earlier that summer.

In the fall of 2011, several of Keith’s Germantown High School friends joined him at Lock Haven University to begin their college careers. Together, they made a pact to help one another during college, to ensure that they made it through their first year, to keep their grades high for their scholarships and futures, and to achieve what they had come to Lock Haven for—their college diplomas. According to Keith, they did this because they knew that their high school had a bad reputation and that many black males dropout of college. They wanted to defy the statistics.¹⁰ Today, Keith and his high school friends are still at Lock Haven University entering their sophomore year. Keith has decided to pursue a degree in secondary education and hopes to become an English teacher, like Ms. Shirley, his AP English teacher. Ms. Shirley is widely revered at the high school as the teacher who pushes her students to improve their writing, to study for their SATs, to fill out several college applications, and to move onto their postsecondary education. Ms. Shirley provides her students with the opportunities that many urban youth lack, despite the challenges at her school. And Keith wants to do the same with his

¹⁰ Personal Communication, Keith Meredith, July 13, 2012.
future—to be the teacher who inspires other students of color to rewrite the statistics. With the support from his family and his high school, Keith Meredith is well on his way.

Like Keith, I met Dashawn a few months before he graduated from Germantown High School. Dashawn was one of the thirty-two students in Brandon Miller’s senior English class. Brandon and I were enrolled in the same doctoral program at Penn. He had taught English at Germantown High School for three years after graduating from Morehouse College. In the spring of 2008, I approached Brandon about working with him and his students on their senior project. Senior projects, which were traditionally 8–10 page papers, had been a requirement for graduation in the School District of Philadelphia for decades. Brandon and I wanted to push the youth to think beyond a traditional term paper and engage in participatory-research on a meaningful topic to them. Our approach had many shortcomings. The students in Brandon’s class were much more accustomed to filling out worksheets and answer short response questions than they were devising an independent research proposal on a topic that mattered to them. As a result, students often wanted us to provide them with their topics or explicitly tell them what they needed to do to pass the requirement and graduate. DaShawn was different. When we asked him what he wanted to study, he immediately told us that he wanted to write a paper about Emmett Till, the fourteen-year-old African American boy from Chicago who was brutally murdered in 1955 for supposedly whistling at a white woman, Carolyn Bryant, who worked at her husband’s grocery store near Money, Mississippi. DaShawn told us that he had learned about Till’s story from his father, DaShawn Williams, Sr., who worked at the high school as a parent liaison and mentor to young black men, making far less in this position than he could have anywhere
else. His father worked in the school because he was committed to giving his son the education that he never had and to providing families with an ally that they could trust.

Several weeks later, I asked DaShawn if he had seen the PBS documentary about Emmett Till. When he said that he had not seen it, I borrowed a copy from my university library and told him to watch it and let me know what he thought. The following day, DaShawn came to class and told me he had watched the documentary with his father. Both of them, he said, thought the film made the story more real with its photographs and commentary, but most of all, because it described Emmett Till’s mother’s decision to have an open casket at his funeral so that everyone could see what the men did to her son’s body. DaShawn told me that he wished others could see it. After listening to his reactions, Brandon and I had an idea. Rather than having DaShawn write a research paper about Emmett Till, we thought he should teach other students at his high school about this remarkable story so that they would know what he knew. Even though he was nervous about presenting the story to his peers, he agreed. For the next two weeks, Brandon and I helped DaShawn and his partner, Jeremy, prepare their presentation using the documentary as a guide. The day before they had to present to their peers, DaShawn and Jeremy asked one of the school police officers, Officer Jones, to stay after school and critique their presentation. When they finished, Officer Jones told them that he had never heard the story, his voiced cracked slightly as he talked to these two young men. He was so proud of them. Watching his reaction, I knew that they were ready to present their material.

The following day, DaShawn and Jeremy came to school early to set up their projector and make sure that the technology worked properly. Throughout the school day, Germantown youth listened as these two young men presented what they had
learned about Emmett Till and shared the documentary with their peers. Brandon and I sat in the back of the classroom watching in awe. Students cried when they saw the film. They were angry that they had never known about what had happened to Emmett Till on that fateful day. Many of them were terrified that this had happened to someone that was so young. Then, students shared their own experiences of racism and loss in their own city so many years later. As we watched these two young men present their work over and over again, Brandon and I knew that despite the failures of our new approach, this was a success. More importantly, if we had tried to teach this, it would have never have been this effective. DaShawn and Jeremy had captivated their peers with their knowledge of this incident and their willingness to teach others what they had learned. It was a rare moment in this urban, failing high school.

When DaShawn graduated in 2008, he had been accepted to Indiana University of Pennsylvania, a state school located outside of the city. His father was elated. College, after all, represented the golden ticket. The following year, his father told me that he had left college and returned home. He missed his city, his family, his friends. This was the last time I had heard anything about DaShawn.

In the spring of 2012, I received an email from Brandon Miller, DaShawn’s English teacher. The subject of his email, “sad news,” warned me about it content. He wanted to let me know that one of our students, DaShawn Williams, had passed away the previous evening. Brandon told me that he did not know any of the details surrounding his death, but he thought I should know.

When I read Brandon’s email, I was shocked, confused, and angry. Having read countless studies and books about violence in urban areas, I knew that homicide was the primary cause of death for black men in DaShawn’s age group. I wanted to deny it. After all, those statistics were meaningless. Even though I had worked in some of the worst
urban schools in the city, I had never taught anyone who had died at such a young age. Or if I had, I did not know about it. I had always believed that that happened to other people’s students, but not mine. My students, I had reasoned, were different. They were not statistics. DaShawn’s death, at such a young age, shattered my hopeful naïveté that this only happened to other people’s students, that my students were safe from the violence that I knew so many youth in our inner cities experience daily. Unlike Frank Burd, his story never reached the media. For days, I searched the local newspapers and emailed friends and colleagues for clues about what happened. Eventually, I realized that it didn’t really matter, and so, I gave up. What mattered was that his death, at such an early age, is indicative of the myriad challenges that our nation’s low-income, youth of color face today. By all accounts, DaShawn was considered a Germantown High School success. But, today, he is another statistic. Another homicide. Another invisible life that was taken far too soon.

The experiences of Keith Meredith and DaShawn Williams remind us of the hopes and failures that exist in our nation’s urban schools today. Keith forces us to recognize the importance of educational institutions in giving urban youth access to opportunities that improve their futures. DaShawn forces us to recognize that these institutions are not immune from the challenges that exist beyond their walls. History, it seems, reminds us that these problems are not new. The inequality that exists at Germantown High School, its community, and city was embedded in the foundation of the institution. Today, the lines of educational inequality have hardened creating a wide gap between those that have access to better educational opportunities and those that do not. As this has happened, the barriers to overcome the entrenched poverty and intense violence that exists in urban spaces, like Germantown, has become increasingly difficult
the low-income youth of color, like DaShawn Williams, who have long lacked the educational opportunities that their more affluent white peers have always enjoyed.
Appendix: School Data and Analysis

Chapter 2, Description of Data
Graduation Data, 1920
I used the 1919-1922 Germantown High School yearbooks to create a database of student names and street addresses (n = 917). Using ancestry.com, I cross-referenced those data with the 1920 United States census to gather demographic information on the graduates’ race, nativity, parents’ occupational status, and ward residence. I found 82% of the names from the original database (n = 795). Initially, I collected data on the occupational status of the graduates’ mothers and fathers. However, since few mothers worked in the labor market (5.4%), I decided to omit these data from my analyses below.

I used the same technique to gather demographic data on the graduates of the all-female, elite Philadelphia High School for Girls (n = 193) and the all-male, elite Central High School (n = 247).

Finally, I gathered demographic data on youth who lived in the community but did not graduate from Germantown High School. I created a database based on three variables from the Germantown High School graduates database—gender, birthdate, and ward—to create a comparative sample of youth. The comparative sample (n = 795) contained youth who did not graduate from Germantown High School even though they were the same gender, were born in the same year, and lived in the same ward as the Germantown High School graduates.
**Figure 2.1a  Demographic Data, 1920**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Germantown High School Graduates (n = 795)</th>
<th>Central High School Graduates (n = 247)</th>
<th>Philadelphia High School for Girls Graduates (n = 193)</th>
<th>Community Youth (n = 795)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nativity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents &amp; Student Native-born</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Parent &amp; Student Native-born</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, Foreign-born; Student Native-born</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, Student Foreign-born</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Occupational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, Proprietors</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/ Salesperson</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborers</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborers</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/ Unknown</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germantown Residence (Ward 22 or 42)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Two agricultural workers were omitted from the Germantown High School sample and one agricultural worker was omitted from the Central High School and Community samples to keep the categories consistent. These data include deceased fathers, which is why the number do not correspond with figures in the chapters.
**Question 1:** Are there any significant differences between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who lived in the community and did not graduate from Germantown High School?

To answer this question, I conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race, nativity, and father's occupational status). The results of the chi-square tests of independence were significant (p < 0.01) which suggests that there is a significant difference in the racial composition (p = 0.00) and nativity (p = 0.00), and father’s occupational status (p = 0.00) of Germantown and Community youth.

After I ran the chi-square test of independence, I ran a binary logistic regression to calculate the probability that youth in this sample graduated from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 1) versus the probability that the youth in this sample did not graduate from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 0). The binary logistic regression technique generates logistic coefficients, which estimate the average change in the log odds of a particular event (in this case, Germantown High School graduation) per unit change in the response variables, holding constant the other variables in the model.

**Figure 2.2a— Categorical Variables for Binary Logistic Regression, 1920**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Codes and Reference Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Black = 1 (ref), white = 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nativity | Nativity\(_0\) = Parents, Student Native-born (ref)  
           | Nativity\(_1\) = One Parent, Student Native-born; One Parent Foreign-born  
           | Nativity\(_2\) = Parents, Foreign-born; Student Native-born  
           | Nativity\(_3\) = Parents, Student Foreign-born |

**Model**

\[
Germantown \text{ High School Graduate} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{race} + \beta_2 \text{nativity} + \beta_3 \text{father’s occupational status}
\]
**Figure 2.3a Binary Logistic Regression Analysis, Predicting Germantown High School Graduation, Germantown High Youth and Community Youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE $\beta$</th>
<th>Wald's $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Exp($\beta$) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>38.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-1.151</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>8.255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_1$</td>
<td>-1.077</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>30.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_2$</td>
<td>-.927</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>27.851</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_3$</td>
<td>-1.457</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>19.676</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-1.425</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>46.775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.576</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>36.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-.760</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>4.521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-.886</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>1.876</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-1.649</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>36.283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer-Lemeshow</td>
<td>4.861</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 2:** Are there any significant differences between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from the all-male, elite Central High School?

To answer this question, I conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there were any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race, nativity, and father’s occupational status). To account for any gender bias, I ran these analyses on data for the male graduates from these schools. The results from the chi-square of independence suggest that there is a significant difference between the nativity (p = 0.000) and father’s occupational status (p = 0.001) and Germantown High School and Central High School graduates. However, the chi-square test of independence is not significant for race (p = .277).

After I ran the chi-square test of independence, I ran a binary logistic regression to calculate the probability that youth in this sample graduated from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 1) versus the probability that the youth in this sample did not graduate from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 0). The binary logistic regression technique generates logistic coefficients, which estimate the average change in the log odds of a particular event (in this case, Germantown High School graduation) per unit change in the response variables, holding constant the other variables in the model.

**Model 1**

\[ \text{Germantown High School Graduate} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{race} + \beta_2 \text{nativity} + \beta_3 \text{father's occupational} \]
**Figure 2.4a** Binary Logistic Regression Analysis, Predicting Germantown High School Graduation, Germantown High Youth (Males Only) and Central High School Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald’s χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β)</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>11.181</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-1.046</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.489</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_1</td>
<td>-1.059</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>6.850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_2</td>
<td>-2.393</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>69.607</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_3</td>
<td>-2.450</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>22.138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>15.521</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.521</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>2.141</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-.515</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>1.617</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>-.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-.692</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>-.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-1.529</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>6.742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>-1.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-.738</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>-.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>2.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>-.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit Test</td>
<td>4.498</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Question 3:** Are there significant differences between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from the elite, all-female Philadelphia High School for Girls?

To answer this question, I conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race, nativity, and father's occupational status). Two of these chi-square tests of independence were significant (p < 0.01) which suggests that there is a significant difference in the racial composition (p = 0.00) and nativity (p = 0.00) between Germantown High School and the Philadelphia High School for Girls (non-Germantown) graduates. The chi-square of independence for father's occupational status was not significant which indicates that there is not a significant difference in the father’s occupational status (p = 0.147) between Germantown High School and the Philadelphia High School for Girls (non-Germantown) graduates.

After I ran the chi-square test of independence, I ran a binary logistic regression to calculate the probability that youth in this sample graduated from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 1) versus the probability that the youth in this sample did not graduate from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 0). The binary logistic regression technique generates logistic coefficients, which estimate the average change in the log odds of a particular event (in this case, Germantown High School graduation) per unit change in the response variables, holding constant the other variables in the model.

**Model**

\[
\text{Germantown High School Graduate} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{race} + \beta_2 \text{nativity} + \beta_3 \text{father's occupational status}
\]
**Figure 2.5a**  Binary Logistic Regression Analysis, Predicting Germantown High School Graduation, Germantown High Youth and Philadelphia High School for Girls Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald’s χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-2.019</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>16.249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_1</td>
<td>-595</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_2</td>
<td>-1.196</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>20.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity_3</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>10.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>4.901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>1.783</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>1.897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit Test</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 4: Are there any significant differences between the youth who enrolled in the academic, commercial and vocational programs at Germantown High School in 1930?**

First, I calculated summary statistics on the demographic variables and course enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Home Economics</th>
<th>Mechanical Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students (n = 679)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Youth (n = 499)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Youth (n = 180)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth (n = 8)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth (n = 671)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Occupational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (n = 124)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers (n = 259)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Sales (n = 99)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson (n = 108)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer (n = 36)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker (n = 20)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer (n = 5)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or Unknown (n = 28)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I ran a multinomial regression analysis:
\[
\text{Course enrollment} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{race}} \text{race} + \beta_{\text{gender}} \text{gender} + \beta_{\text{father's occupational status}} \text{father's occupational status} + \beta_{\text{foreign-born/native-born parents}} \text{foreign-born/native-born parents}
\]

Reference category: commercial program
### Figure 2.6a  Multinomial Regression Analysis, Course Enrollment, Germantown High School Graduates, 1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( SE \beta )</th>
<th>Wald’s ( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Exp(( \beta )) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>14.443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>2.649</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>5.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>14.134</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>141.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0( ^b )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>3.334</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0( ^b )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born Parents</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born Parents</td>
<td>0( ^b )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0( ^b )</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-.517</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>3.446</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>-.920</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>8.136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-1.355</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>18.443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.284</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>8.522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-2.492</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>15.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-2.498</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>4.736</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-.707</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^b \) indicates data is removed due to insufficient observations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald's χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Science Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-18.278</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>1239.962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>-14.366</td>
<td>8211.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0⁰</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>17.814</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>54503024.537</td>
<td>54503024.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0⁰</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born Parents</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born Parents</td>
<td>0⁰</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0⁰</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>-1.114</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-1.131</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>4.520</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.933</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>3.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-18.418</td>
<td>4429.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-19.028</td>
<td>9621.877</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-.745</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3—Data and Analysis

Description of Data

Graduation Data, 1930

I used the June 1929 - June 1931 Germantown High School yearbooks to create a database of student names and street addresses. Using ancestry.com, I cross-referenced those data with the 1930 United States census to gather demographic information on the graduates’ race, nativity, home ownership status, and parents’ occupational status (n = 673). Again, I collected data on the occupational status of the graduates’ mothers and fathers. However, since few mothers worked in the labor market (8%), I decided to omit these data from my analyses below.

I used the same technique to gather demographic data on the graduates of the all-female, elite Philadelphia High School for Girls (n = 146) and the all-male, elite Central High School (n = 162).

Finally, I gathered demographic data on youth who lived in the community but did not graduate from Germantown High School. I created a database based on three variables from the Germantown High School graduates database—gender, birthdate, and ward—to create a comparative sample of youth. The comparative sample (n = 673) contained youth who did not graduate from Germantown High School even though they were the same gender, were born in the same year, and lived in the same ward as the Germantown High School graduates.
**Figure 3.1a Demographic Data, 1930**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Germantown High School Graduates (n = 673)</th>
<th>Central High School Graduates (n = 162)</th>
<th>Philadelphia High School for Girls Graduates (n = 146)</th>
<th>Community Youth (n = 673)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nativity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents &amp; Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Parent &amp; Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, Foreign-born; Student Native-born</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents, Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Occupational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, Proprietors</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Salesperson</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborers</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborers</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response (unemployed/</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 1:** Are there any significant differences between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who lived in the community and did not graduate from Germantown High School?

To answer this question, I conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race, nativity, home ownership status, and father’s occupational status). The results of the chi-square tests of independence were significant (p < 0.01) which suggests that there is a significant difference in the racial composition (p = 0.01) and nativity (p = 0.00), home ownership status (p = 0.00) and father’s occupational status (p = 0.00) between Germantown High School and the youth who lived in the community.

After I ran the chi-square test of independence, I ran a binary logistic regression to calculate the probability that youth in this sample graduated from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 1) versus the probability that the youth in this sample did not graduate from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 0). The binary logistic regression technique generates logistic coefficients, which estimate the average change in the log odds of a particular event (in this case, Germantown High School graduation) per unit change in the response variables, holding constant the other variables in the model.

**Model**

\[
\text{Germantown High School Graduate} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Race} + \beta_2 \text{Nativity} + \beta_3 \text{Father’s Occupational Status} + \beta_4 \text{Home Ownership Status}
\]
**Figure 3.2a**  Coding Scheme for Binary Logistic Regression, Central High School Enrollment, 1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$, Race</td>
<td>0 = white youth, 1 = black youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$, Nativity</td>
<td>1 = Parents, Student Native-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = One Parent, Student Native-born; One Parent Foreign-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Parents, Foreign-born; Student Native-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Parents, Student Foreign-born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_4$, Home</td>
<td>0 = owned home, 1 = rented home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.3a  Binary Logistic Regression Analysis, Predicting Germantown High School Graduation, Germantown High School and Community Youth, 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald's χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>66.977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-1.157</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>7.032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity0</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>24.404</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity1</td>
<td>-2.480</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>67.285</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity2</td>
<td>1.662</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>25.513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.271</td>
<td>2.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity3</td>
<td>68.883</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-.616</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>4.806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.360</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>15.538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-1.925</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>15.242</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-2.034</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>33.985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership Status</td>
<td>-2.495</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>224.186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer-Lemeshow</td>
<td>4.861</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Question 2:** Are there any significant differences between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from the all-female, elite Philadelphia High School for Girls?

To answer this question, I conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race, nativity, home ownership status, and father’s occupational status). The results of the chi-square tests of independence were significant (p < 0.01) and (p < 0.05) which suggests that there is a significant difference in the racial composition (p = 0.000) and nativity (p = 0.000), home ownership status (p = 0.038) and father’s occupational status (p = 0.005) between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from the Philadelphia High School for Girls in 1930.

After I ran the chi-square test of independence, I ran a binary logistic regression to calculate the probability that youth in this sample graduated from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 1) versus the probability that the youth did not graduate from Germantown High School (GHS grad = 0).

**Model**

\[
\text{Germantown High School Graduate} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{-Race} + \beta_2 \text{-Nativity} + \beta_3 \text{-Father's Occupational Status} + \beta_4 \text{-Home Ownership Status}
\]
**Figure 3.4a  Binary Logistic Regression Analysis, Predicting Germantown High School Graduation, Germantown High School and The Philadelphia High School for Girls, 1930**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE ( \beta )</th>
<th>Wald's ( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( \text{Exp(( \beta ))} ) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>23.941</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>-2.900</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>17.614</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.014 .213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.342</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-1.062</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>8.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.171 .699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-1.740</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>44.473</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.105 .293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-3.134</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>14.272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.009 .221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6.595</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>.779 2.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>3.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>.929 4.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>.719 2.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>.658 4.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-.663</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.125 2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>20.987</td>
<td>22217.396</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>1301810354.176</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.248 2.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership Status</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.398 1.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goodness-of-fit Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer-Lemeshow</td>
<td>5.471</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3: Are there any significant differences between the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from the all-male, elite Central High School?

To answer this question, I conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race, nativity, home ownership status, and father’s occupational status). The results of the chi-square tests of independence were significant \((p < 0.01)\) and \((p < 0.05)\) which suggests that there is a significant difference in the nativity \((p = 0.000)\), home ownership status \((p = 0.001)\) and father’s occupational status \((p = 0.001)\) of the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from Central High School in 1930. The chi-square test of independence was not significant for race \((p = 0.129)\), which means that we cannot assume that there is a significant difference in the racial composition of the youth who graduated from Germantown High School and the youth who graduated from Central High School.

After I ran the chi-square test of independence, I ran a binary logistic regression to calculate the probability that youth in this sample graduated from Germantown High School \((GHS \text{ grad} = 1)\) versus the probability that the youth did not graduate from Germantown High School \((GHS \text{ grad} = 0)\).

Model

\[
\text{Germantown High School Graduate} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{-Race} + \beta_2 \text{-Nativity} + \beta_3 \text{-Father’s Occupational Status} + \beta_4 \text{-Home Ownership Status}
\]
**Figure 3.5a  Binary Logistic Regression Analysis, Predicting Germantown High School Graduation, Germantown High School and Central High School, 1930**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald’s $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>37.954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>11.926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-1.078</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>2.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.082 1.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.914</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_1$</td>
<td>-1.493</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>12.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.097 .522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_2$</td>
<td>-2.956</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>88.226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.028 .096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity$_3$</td>
<td>-4.188</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>26.804</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.003 .074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.228</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.562 3.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>.415 3.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>.433 2.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-.462</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.161 2.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-1.946</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>5.701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.029 .706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-2.214</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.007 1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-1.435</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.072 .783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership Status</td>
<td>-.813</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>6.957</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.243 .812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.058</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Goodness-of-fit Test*
**Question 4: Are there any significant differences between the youth who enrolled in the academic, commercial and vocational programs at Germantown High School in 1930?**

First, I calculated summary statistics on the demographic variables and course enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Home Economics</th>
<th>Mechanical Arts</th>
<th>Vocational Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 578)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Youth</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 309)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Youth</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 269)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 569)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Occupational Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 222)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Sales</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or Unknown</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I ran a multinomial regression analysis:

\[
\text{Course Enrollment} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{Race}} + \beta_{\text{Gender}} + \beta_{\text{Native-born/Foreign-born Parents}} + \beta_{\text{Home Ownership Status}}
\]
### Figure 3.7a Multinomial Regression Analysis, Course Enrollment, Germantown
### High School Graduates, 1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald’s χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>2.584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>2.584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>1.184 – 2.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- – ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.969</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>17.990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.243 – .594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- – ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born Parents</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.961 – 2.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- – ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--- – ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-1.034</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>7.448</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.169 – .747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>-.758</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>2.945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.197 – 1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-2.154</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>27.958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.052 – .258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.734</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>10.296</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.061 – .509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.077 – 7.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.067 – 7.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned Home</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>.603 – 1.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Domestic Science Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE $\beta$</th>
<th>Wald’s $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Exp($\beta$) -- odds ratio</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>-32.781</td>
<td>2693.809</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race (Black)</strong></td>
<td>-14.191</td>
<td>4797.691</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race (White)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>15.586</td>
<td>1477.082</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td></td>
<td>5871039.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native-born Parents</strong></td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign-born Parents</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager-Proprietor</strong></td>
<td>14.618</td>
<td>2252.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
<td>2231952.563</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerical-Salesperson</strong></td>
<td>14.903</td>
<td>2252.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
<td>2966907.888</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craftsperson</strong></td>
<td>15.095</td>
<td>2252.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
<td>3595568.415</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skilled Laborer</strong></td>
<td>15.274</td>
<td>2252.740</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
<td>4301441.650</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Worker</strong></td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>9973.545</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unskilled Laborer</strong></td>
<td>-1.042</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed/Unknown</strong></td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>5513.453</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owned Home</strong></td>
<td>-.750</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td></td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Rented Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE $\beta$</th>
<th>Wald’s $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Exp($\beta$) -- odds ratio</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(SE \beta)</td>
<td>Wald's (\chi^2)</td>
<td>(df)</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(\text{Exp}(\beta)) – odds ratio</td>
<td>95% Conf. Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical Arts Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.248</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>1.891</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>.057 35.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>.057 35.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0^b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>15.586</td>
<td>1477.082</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>5871039.006</td>
<td>.000 .^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0^b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born Parents</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>5.783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>1.217 6.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born Parents</td>
<td>0^b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0^b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.222 2.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.183 3.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.221 3.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-.740</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.064 3.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>.094 74.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-14.561</td>
<td>3563.611</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 .^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>.105 52.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned Home</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>.837 8.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Home</td>
<td>0^b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE $\beta$</td>
<td>Wald’s $\chi^2$</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Exp($\beta$) – odds ratio</td>
<td>95% Conf. Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Arts Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.940</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>-14.833</td>
<td>3084.059</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>2.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>3.039</td>
<td>.660 14.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-born Parents</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>.497 5.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born Parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager-Proprietor</td>
<td>-1.189</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.072 1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Salesperson</td>
<td>-.545</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.117 2.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>-2.183</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>5.378</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.018 7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Laborer</td>
<td>-1.475</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.021 2.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Worker</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>.137 61.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Laborer</td>
<td>-16.784</td>
<td>6895.360</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unknown</td>
<td>-15.426</td>
<td>3422.973</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned Home</td>
<td>-.336</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.209 2.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented Home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Chapter 4—Data and Analysis**

**Description of Data**

*Course Enrollment Data, 1940*

These data were gathered using the January and June 1940 yearbooks. First, I ran summary statistics on course enrollment and several demographic variables.

*Figure 4.1  Course Enrollment, Germantown High School, 1940*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial Arts</th>
<th>Mechanical Arts</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Vocational Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 629)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 353)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 276)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 27)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 601)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I ran a multinomial regression analysis:

\[
\text{Course Enrollment} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Race} + \beta_2 \text{Gender}
\]

Reference category: commercial track
**Figure 4.2a  Multinomial Regression Analysis, Course Enrollment, Germantown High School Graduates, 1940**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald’s χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>50.803</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>2.321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-1.187</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>36.769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Arts Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>14.231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-18.873</td>
<td>1584.955</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical Arts Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>4.025</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-18.859</td>
<td>1193.811</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE β</td>
<td>Wald’s χ²</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Exp(β) – odds ratio</td>
<td>95% Conf. Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-20.503</td>
<td>4043.282</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>-16.654</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000 – .000</td>
<td>.000 – .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0ᵇ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>16.802</td>
<td>4043.282</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>19811336.308</td>
<td>.000 – .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0ᵇ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Arts Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.101</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>23.641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>-16.790</td>
<td>4868.559</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.000 – .000</td>
<td>.000 – .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0ᵇ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.959 – .363</td>
<td>2.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0ᵇ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5—Data and Analysis

Graduation Data, 1950
I used yearbooks from the following schools to gather data on the racial composition of the graduating class and conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage Black Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germantown High School (n = 578)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central High School (n = 452)</td>
<td>16% (p = 0.654)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philadelphia High School for Girls (n = 351)</td>
<td>18% (p = 0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney High School (n = 1032)</td>
<td>0% (p = 0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Gratz High School (n = 1054)</td>
<td>36% (p = 0.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Data

Course Enrollment Data, 1950
These data were gathered using the January and June 1950 yearbooks. First, I ran summary statistics on course enrollment and several demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial (includes Distributive Education)</th>
<th>Industrial Arts</th>
<th>Mechanical Arts</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Vocational Arts</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students (n = 578)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Youth (n = 366)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Youth (n = 212)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth (n = 71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth (n = 507)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I ran a multinomial regression analysis with condensed variables (academic, commercial, and vocational—including industrial arts, mechanical arts, music, vocational arts, and agriculture):

\[
\text{Course Enrollment} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Race} + \beta_2 \text{Gender}
\]

Reference category: commercial track
### Figure 5.2a  Multinomial Regression Analysis, Course Enrollment, Germantown High School Graduates, 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$SE\beta$</th>
<th>Wald’s $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Exp($\beta$) – odds ratio</th>
<th>95% Conf. Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>8.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>.773 2.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0(^b)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2.336</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>65.331</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.342</td>
<td>5.869 18.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0(^b)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.319</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>89.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>.459 2.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0(^b)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.841</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>111.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>46.578</td>
<td>22.803 95.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0(^b)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6—Data and Analysis

Graduation Data, 1960

I used yearbooks from the following schools to gather data on the racial composition of the graduating class and conducted a chi-square test of independence to see if there are any relationships between the dependent variable (Germantown High School graduate) and the independent variables (race).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage Black Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germantown High School (n = 776)</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central High School (n = 545)</td>
<td>3.1% (p = 0.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philadelphia High School for Girls (n = 275)</td>
<td>17.5% (p = 0.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Gratz High School (n = 185, January 1960 only)</td>
<td>98.4% (p = 0.0001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Data
Course Enrollment Data, 1950

These data were gathered using the January and June 1950 yearbooks. First, I ran summary statistics on course enrollment and several demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Vocational Arts</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Industrial Arts</th>
<th>Mechanical Arts</th>
<th>Trade Prep</th>
<th>Home Economics</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students (n = 769)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Youth (n = 485)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Youth (n = 284)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Youth (n = 213)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Youth (n = 556)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I ran a multinomial regression analysis with condensed variables (academic, commercial, and vocational—includes industrial arts, mechanical arts, music, vocational arts, and agriculture):

Course Enrollment = $\beta_0 + \beta_{\text{Race}} + \beta_{\text{Gender}}$

Reference category: vocational track
### Figure 6.2a  Multinomial Regression Analysis, Course Enrollment, Germantown High School Graduates, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE β</th>
<th>Wald’s χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(β) – odds ratio</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>101.458</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>-.620</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-1.651</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>32.813</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.876</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>57.974</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>3.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Black)</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>3.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-2.828</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>64.649</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Interview Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Morrison</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1951</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>11.8.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyce Jackson Alexander</td>
<td>Germantown Resident</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Gregory Woods</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Mitchell</td>
<td>Germantown Resident</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>5.15.2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berthold Levy</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1930</td>
<td>White (Jewish)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>5.5.2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Shirley, Jr.</td>
<td>Germantown Resident</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>7.27.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Alcorn</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1940</td>
<td>White (Irish)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>11.16.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Cuff</td>
<td>Germantown High School Student</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>8.6.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Fuller, Sr.</td>
<td>Germantown Resident</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>8.10.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen G. Faust</td>
<td>School District Employee</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>7.21.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Interview Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Ruhrer</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1943</td>
<td>White (German)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>6.29.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Chait Hirschman</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1960</td>
<td>White (Jewish)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>2.25.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Singleton</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1963</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>2.2.2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Frances Hunter</td>
<td>Germantown Resident</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>8.6.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Bjorseth</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1941</td>
<td>White (Jewish)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>6.29.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianna Eckhart</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1963</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>10.18.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Campbell</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1937</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>8.6.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millie Barber</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1939</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>6.29.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>Interview Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Beard</td>
<td>Germantown Resident</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Louise Strawbrige</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Holman</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1936</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>8.6.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Hawkins Beard</td>
<td>School District Employee</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Louise Strawbrige</td>
<td>No date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincenza (Iannuzzi) Cerrato</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1949</td>
<td>White (Italian)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>6.29.2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William T. Coleman</td>
<td>Germantown High School Graduate, Class of 1938</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Erika Kitzmiller</td>
<td>8.10.2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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